Three social science disciplines in Central and Eastern Europe: handbook on economics, political science and sociology (1989-2001)

Kaase, Max (Ed.); Sparschuh, Vera (Ed.); Wenninger, Agnieszka (Ed.)

Three Social Science Disciplines in Central and Eastern Europe.
Handbook on Economics, Political Science and Sociology
(1989-2001)

Three Social Science Disciplines in Central and Eastern Europe.
Handbook on Economics, Political Science and Sociology (1989-2001)

Edited by Max Kaase and Vera Sparschuh,
co-edited by Agnieszka Wenninger

Social Science Information Centre (IZ) / Collegium Budapest

First published 2002
by GESIS/ Social Science Information Centre (IZ), Bonn/Berlin
Schiffbauerdamm 19,
10117-Berlin, Germany
and
Collegium Budapest Institute for Advanced Study
Szentháromság utca 2.
1014-Budapest, Hungary

Cover: Gerri Zotter
Language editor: Mitch Cohen

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Three social science disciplines in Central and Eastern Europe**:** handbook on economics, political science and sociology (1989-2001) / edited by Max Kaase and Vera Sparschuh, co-edited by Agnieszka Wenninger
Includes bibliographical references and index
ISBN 3-8206-0139-2

This publication was financed by EU Commission, DG Research/Socio-economic Research (5th Framework Programme: Improving the Human Research Potential & the Socio-economic Knowledge base) and co-financed by GESIS/ Social Science Information Centre (IZ) Bonn/Berlin. The CD-Rom was produced by the IZ.

Production: GESIS Branch Office Berlin, Germany
Printed by: Séd Nyomda, Szekszárd
Distribution: GESIS/ Social Science Information Centre (IZ), Bonn/Berlin; Collegium Budapest Institute for Advanced Study; Maison des Sciences de l` Homme, Paris

ISBN 3-8206-0139-2

Content

Ulrike Becker, Max Kaase, Gábor Klaniczay, and Vera Sparschuh
Social Sciences in Central and Eastern Europe on the Verge of EU Enlargement....... 7

Introductory essays
Andrei Pleşu
Financing Difference: Fostering the Social Sciences in the Field of Tension Between Homogenization and Differentiation........ 12

Elemér Hankiss
Brilliant Ideas or Brilliant Errors? 17

Economics
János Mátyás Kovács
Business as (Un)usual........ 26

Bulgaria	Mitko Dimitrov	34
Czech Republic	František Turnovec	50
Estonia	Tiia Püss	65
Hungary	László Csaba	83
Latvia	Raita Karnite	102
Lithuania	Linas Čekanavičius	121
Poland	Tadeusz Kowalik	135
Romania	Paul Dragos Aligica	152
Slovakia	Július Horváth	168
Slovenia	Jože Mencinger	187

Hans-Jürgen Wagener
Demand and Supply of Economic Knowledge in Transition Countries 195

Political Science
Hans-Dieter Klingemann
Political Science in Central and Eastern Europe: National Development and International Integration........ 206

Bulgaria	Georgi Karasimeonov	213
Czech Republic	Jan Holzer and Pavel Pšeja	226
Estonia	Raivo Vetik	246
Hungary	Máté Szabó	258
Latvia	Andris Runcis	275

Lithuania	Algis Krupavičius	286
Poland	Stanisław Gebethner and Radosław Markowski	306
Romania	Daniel Barbu	322
Slovakia	Darina Malová and Silvia Miháliková	343
Slovenia	Danica Fink-Hafner	358

Sociology

	Pál Tamás Followers or Activists? Social Scientists in the Reality Shows of Transformation	376
Bulgaria	Nikolai Genov	386
Czech Republic	Michal Illner	405
Estonia	Mikk Titma	425
Hungary	Dénes Némedi and Péter Róbert	437
Latvia	Aivars Tabuns	452
Lithuania	Anelė Vosyliūtė	467
Poland	Janusz Mucha and Paweł Załęcki	484
Romania	Maria Larionescu	502
Slovakia	Zuzana Kusá, Bohumil Búzik, Ľudovít Turčan and Robert Klobucký	518
Slovenia	Frane Adam and Matej Makarovič	536
	Piotr Sztompka The Condition of Sociology in East-Central Europe	548

Other disciplines

	Mihály Sárkány Cultural and Social Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe	558
	Tomáš Kučera and Olga Kučerová Population science in Central and Eastern Europe: Implications for Research and Practice	567
	Marie-Claude Maurel Central European Geography and the Post-Socialist Transformation. A Western Point of View	578
	Grażyna Skąpska Law and Society in a Natural Laboratory: the Case of Poland in the Broader Context of East-Central Europe	588

Index

	Institutions	606
	Names	620

Appendix

	List of participants	636
	Institutions responsible for handbook edition	666

Social Sciences in Central and Eastern Europe on the Verge of EU Enlargement

Bearing in mind the extent to which the overall context of the social sciences in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) has changed since 1989-90, the questions of the rebuilding of and, in some cases, the new foundation of academic institutions, as well as of the content of teaching and research in the social sciences, arise naturally. Operating under the assumption that the social sciences are an integral part of the science system and of culture at large, after a decade of socio-political transitions, the moment seems right to assess the status of the social sciences in CEE.

The idea for the project emerged during the year 2000 at Collegium Budapest in discussions with Max Kaase, Wissenschaftszentrum (WZB, Berlin) and a former member of the Academic Advisory Board of Collegium Budapest; Helga Nowotny, the Chair of the Academic Advisory Board; Andrew Sors, Head of Unit (Social and Economic Knowledge Base) at DG Research of the European Commission, Brussels; and Gábor Klaniczay, rector of Collegium Budapest. The concrete shape of the project was developed in close cooperation with GESIS/Social Science Information Center (Branch Office Berlin). The Institute for Human Sciences (IWM, Vienna), the Wissenschaftszentrum (WZB, Berlin), Centre Marc Bloch (Berlin), and Maison des Sciences de l'Homme (MSH, Paris) were further collaborators.

The project objective was to produce a comprehensive overview of the state of three social science disciplines in this region: economics (including labor market research); political science (including administrative science as well as policy analysis); and sociology (including social policy). The project was limited to these three disciplines because including a larger array of social science disciplines, desirable as it would have been, would have gone far beyond what was possible with the resources available for the task. For the same reason, the project was also limited to the CEE countries seeking entry to the European Union. It was envisaged to produce a compendium in the form of a handbook pinpointing the developments of the last decade in the three fields and also functioning as a map of orientation for future cooperation with scholars in this region. We are very pleased to present this book, which attempts a systematic look at the state of these three social science disciplines in terms of both infrastructure and research.

At the beginning of the project, there was an academic interest in establishing a firm basis for a reliable assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of important contemporary social science disciplines in CEE. Envisaged was a comprehensive collection of relevant and compatible data from the ten countries based on further-developed, already existing databases offered by GESIS in Berlin under the guidance of Ulrike Becker and the Political Science Network of EPSNet directed by Hans-Dieter Klingemann. A set of negotiated criteria and a multi-step evaluation and confrontation by outside critics of the country reports that were written by carefully chosen local experts established the frame of reference of the project. Also, the need was felt to overcome an often pre-set (and principally Western) theoretical agenda before this stocktaking took place. This is because many political, cultural, and linguistic factors, both in the West and in the CEE countries, have prevented and still encumber the creation of a regular and reliable flow of information, a stable set of academic values, and a transparent image of key figures, institutions, and important productions in the three fields.

Before the democratic transition, the academic system in Central and Eastern Europe was organized more or less according to the Soviet model: the academies of sciences were the core research actors and presented various impediments to a pluralistic, university-centered model with pre-World War II antecedents, which could have communicated more easily with researchers in the West. As a consequence, the socio-political transitions affected the social sciences in the East deeply, although not in a homogenous way, due to differences in the "philosophies" of the organization of science and its specific disciplines in Eastern European countries and due to economic constraints arising from the transition to market economies. The years of transition and the widening circle of international contacts have resulted in significant changes, as this study shows. In teaching and, not least, thanks to considerable European aid programs (Sokrates, Tempus), new curricula have been successfully introduced. In research, the rate of participation in international and European projects has significantly increased and international standards of evaluation have gained ground. Researchers in both the East and the West must now recognize these changes. With EU enlargement imminent, the European Commission also has a direct practical interest in helping to create a firm basis of information on this region for scholarly as well as for practical purposes.

During the initial discussions in preparing the project design, a lot of practical and methodological issues came to the fore; as mentioned above, it soon became clear that not all social science disciplines and not even all of Central and Eastern Europe would be included.

The aforementioned three disciplines were chosen for several other reasons in addition to practicability: (1) they are rather evenly represented and institutionalized in all the countries concerned (in contrast to anthropology, for instance), (2) there already exist several international surveys and databases from which this initiative could profit (in contrast to historical research, for instance), and (3) their quantitative methodologies and theoretical tools lend themselves rather easily to comparative analysis (in contrast for instance to other social sciences with important links to the humanities, like history, or to the natural sciences, like a particular branch of psychology).

Limiting the countries to be examined to "accession countries" mainly reflected considerations of feasibility. 30 country reports, 30 commentaries, and a set of synthetic keynote speeches and expert comments is about the limit that a project like this and the readers of the reports can meaningfully manage. To include the other half of the region and a number of additional disciplines was clearly beyond the reach of the project, if it was to be finished in a reasonable span of time.

A third issue of the debates was whether a discipline-oriented survey is the right approach to deal with these fields, or whether a topically structured, interdisciplinary overview would be preferable. For the sake of systematic comparison, the decision was made to stick to the somewhat traditional discipline/country structure.

In sum, then, a project course was designed to gather the information required and at the same time to allow a fair degree of comparability. Furthermore, though the project was limited to the ten CEE EU-accession countries and to the three disciplines mentioned, at least a survey of the recent situation of anthropology, demography, geography, and legal studies is also included. As far as history is concerned Sorin Antohi presented an illuminating lecture on its recent development in Eastern Europe during the concluding conference.

The authors of the reports were asked to address the following issues: The situation of the discipline before 1989, its redefinition since 1990, core theoretical and methodological orientations, funding, public space and academic debates, and a view of further development. The authors could optionally supplement their reports by a selected bibliography. The authors met at Collegium Budapest in October 2001 to discuss their first drafts. Then a pre-final draft was sent to a "discussant", a scholar in the same field (with the caveat that he/she should belong to another institution and/or generation). At the concluding conference in January 2002, the authors and the discussants met again at Collegium Budapest for a joint discussion. The authors were then asked to take into account in the final version of the country reports whatever valid criticism and suggestions were made by the discussants and in the discussion. The comments of the discussants will be made available on the planned website of the project.

The handbook project brought about new challenges in preparing and disseminating the material by means of documentation and information technology. Therefore, from the beginning, the intention was not only to prepare the written version of the handbook, but also to aim for an electronic version, in order to make it a living database and a long-term documentation of the three social science disciplines in Central and Eastern Europe on the Internet. The main task of the GESIS/Social Science Information Center (Branch Office Berlin) is to foster East-West communication in the social sciences by easing the information flow and thus helping to build up stable and sustainable structures of East-West cooperation. This goal of the GESIS Branch Office Berlin fits perfectly with the handbook project, because it meets the GESIS' interest in bundling experts' knowledge on the social sciences in Central and Eastern Europe, as well as on transformation research, international comparisons, and research on Central and Eastern Europe in the Western European countries.

From the beginning, the databases of the GESIS Branch Office Berlin formed the main basis of the project survey. These databases on social science institutions and research projects in Central and Eastern Europe have been built up since 1992 and serve as a base for a variety of information services pertaining to the social sciences to Central and Eastern Europe. For the handbook, this database was updated and expanded by means of an email survey as well as by the expert knowledge of the authors. For the survey, a questionnaire was developed that integrated elements of the institutional surveys both from the GESIS and from a project of the European Thematic Network Political Science directed by Hans-Dieter Klingemann at the WZB Berlin. The questionnaire has been sent to about 400 major social science academic institutions in all ten countries and the respective disciplines. A CD-ROM enclosed in the handbook presents an overview on Central and Eastern European institutions in the respective countries relevant for economics, political sciences, and sociology (about 700 institutions). This CD-ROM was designed and prepared by the GESIS Branch Office and permits direct access to the database INEastE in the Internet. Thus, the user not only gets further information on the relevant institutions, but also access to Central and Eastern European institutions in the whole range of social sciences disciplines and countries (about 1,800 institutions in mid-2002). This database is continuously updated and also allows direct access to the homepages of the institutions.

The linkage between the written version of the handbook via CD-ROM to the Internet version can be regarded as a first step toward the electronic presentation of the handbook in the Internet. The articles and comments of the handbook will be taken as the nucleus of an Internet offer that allows ongoing comments and discussions on further developments. The printed version of the handbook may thus be seen as a starting point for a long-term information exchange and scientific discussion on topics pertaining to the Central and Eastern European social sciences. The idea is to further develop the possibilities of the Internet for the sake of scientific communication and thus to foster East-West bottom-up networking on the European level. A first version of the Internet offer of the handbook will be available at the beginning of 2003 under http://www.cee-socialscience.net.

The handbook consists of three parts. Andrei Pleşu and Elemér Hankiss offer two introductions to the field, approaching it from different perspectives. Pleşu pleads strongly for the conservation of diversity while creating the European Research Area. Hankiss gives a sophisticated and at the same time entertaining introduction to the development of the social sciences in Central and Eastern Europe before and after the fall of the Iron Curtain.

The main part of the book presents the development and state of three social science disciplines, presented in alphabetical order. The ten reports of each discipline are framed by an introduction to the field – by János M. Kovács (economics), Hans-Dieter Klingemann (political science), and Pál Tamás (sociology) – and a summarizing report – by Hans-Jürgen Wagener (economics), and Piotr Sztompka (sociology).

The next part of the book contains essays related to the development of several other social science disciplines: anthropology (Mihály Sárkány), demography (Tomás Kučera/Olga Kučerová), geography (Marie-Claude Maurel), and legal studies (Grażyna Skąpska).

An index ends the volume with the names and institution information followed by the appendix including authors of the reports, discussants, conference contributors and other persons involved in the project.

First of all, our special thanks go to Collegium Budapest, the first Institute of Advanced Study founded in post-communist Central Europe (now celebrating its 10th anniversary). Fred Girod, the Secretary of the Collegium Budapest, accompanied the project perfectly from the very beginning

to the end. Also the whole staff of the Collegium has been outstandingly supportive; the workshop and especially the conference required engagement beyond the call of duty, but all colleagues helped in a very friendly way to organize and support the conferences.

Tünde Szabolcs should be distinguished by name. She was responsible for the technical preparation and organization of the two meetings. She not only did a great job; she also felt responsible for the project and helped with comments and stimuli. Márta Hetei, Anna Bíró, Edit Farkas, and Vera Kempa should also be thanked personally.

In the preparation of the project, Mihály Csákó (Budapest) played an important role. Several other fellows of the academic year 2000/2001 supported the enterprise with discussions and comments: Jens-Joachim Hesse (Berlin), Piotr Sztompka (Crakow), Ivo Možný (Brno) and particularly Edouard Conte (Paris/Budapest), who showed untiring interest in the project. We do appreciate very much their contributions.

At the GESIS/Berlin Branch, Agnieszka Wenninger, Wolfgang Mallock, Jana Meichsner, and Jevgenia Kusnezova greatly supported the handbook and CD-ROM edition. Mitch Cohen took care of language-editing the reports and articles. The student Olga Sparschuh provided the last revision of the references and selected bibliographies.

Andrew Sors and Nikolaos Kastrinos from DG Research of the European Commission never ceased to help with constructive suggestions and emotional encouragement. Finally, the project owes a debt of gratitude to Dr. Achilleas Mitsos, Director General of DG Research, who not only maintained an ongoing interest in the project, but also supported it concretely in giving one of the main lectures entitled "Creating a European Research Area (ERA) in an Enlarging European Union" at the concluding conference in January 2002.

Ulrike Becker, Max Kaase, Gábor Klaniczay, and Vera Sparschuh

October 2002

Introductory essays

Andrei Pleşu

Financing Difference: Fostering the Social Sciences in the Field of Tension Between Homogenization and Differentiation[1]

I will begin with a little story, a true one. The first large private university in Romania was founded as early as 1990; its founder was anything but unknown. This person had spent a very long time as cadre director in the communist Ministry of Instruction, a position that gave him practically unlimited power in choosing and supporting teachers and professors on all levels throughout the country. Everyone's academic career went through his expert hands. In cooperation with the security forces, this person decided whether a professor was morally and ideologically "acceptable" and whether one could count on his "political correctness" and his militant zeal. Aside from these impressive prerogatives, the new apostle of privatization could point to another merit ensuring him invulnerability and inviolability. He was the one who had fabricated the bogus diplomas attesting Elena Ceausescu's university and research qualifications.

At that time, I had the honor of getting to know this party functionary personally when he called me to him in 1988 and urgently demanded that I break off all contact with my foreign friends, who were inevitably categorized as enemies of the people. "You are a weed in the garden of socialism," my interlocutor stated, "and weeds have to be rooted out!"

After the Revolution, this person got on wonderfully. He created the foundation "The Romania of Tomorrow" – what other name could the foundation have taken!? – and, using money he had discreetly amassed in the good old days as well as the connections that had survived the great upheavals of 1989, managed to put on its feet a university that is still the largest of its kind in Romania. But what is especially interesting is that this member of the former nomenclature also enjoys substantial foreign support, especially from the United States.

I had just been made Minister of Culture when it reached my ears that a group of "experts" from across the Atlantic had diverted funds – originally earmarked for the Ministry of Education – to this new institution of higher education in the hands of the old specialist in ideological landscape architecture. The donors' arguments were irrefutable: We don't want to support the crypto-communist government, we want to give private initiative a chance, they said. The Minister of Education at the time was an outstanding philosopher who had earned his doctorate at the end of the 1930s with Gabriel Marcel. During the dictatorship, he had not been permitted to teach, among other reasons because the cadre director had displayed exemplary watchfulness. The cadre director was rewarded for this watchfulness a second time, this time by the US political experts: Suddenly he was the great reformer and a pioneer of privatization, while his victim, the former student of Gabriel Marcel, had served communism, solely because he was the Minister of Education in the first post-revolutionary government, which the worldwide intelligentsia had simply labeled a continuation of the Ceausescu regime!

This true story, I believe, can make very clear some aspects of the *privatization* in the formerly communist countries as well as illuminate some cases of *external funding* often enjoyed by these countries' often fragile institutions.

Privatization in Eastern Europe – in education as in other areas – is far from being a linear and clear process. The first to dare the step into the private economy tended to be dubious characters. These were people with enough money to take a business risk; and that meant they could only have been beneficiaries of the earlier regime. The heroes of beginning capitalism, unfortunately,

[1] This paper was read in Berlin at a symposium on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Volkswagen Foundation. Andrei Pleşu contributed it as a foreword to this volume with the gracious permission of the VW Foundation. Malte Kessler translated the paper from the Romanian into German, and Mitch Cohen translated the German version into English. The printed version deviates slightly from the text of the lecture.

were not the enlightening liberal, but the entrepreneur with a suspicious past or the simple adventurer. The founder of a private university is not driven by new rules and principles, by a vision of reforming the development of instruction, but quite simply by the instinct for a profitable investment.

His clients are not completely innocent, either. Most of the students who matriculate at a private university do so because they have not been accepted at a state university. Ambitious parents indulge in the luxury of buying the title of "student" for their children, and that makes the whole family feel one social rank higher. With such criteria of selection, we can assume that only exceptions among the young people at the private universities are really capable of competing. As for the professors, they usually see their activity at the newly founded private institutions of higher education as an additional source of income to supplement their meager salaries. Until 1994, the corps of professors at the private universities consisted of practically the same people as at the state universities.[1]

The chair at the "private employer" was felt to be a "second job", a lucrative supplement to the "main position". Later, regulations were passed that forced the private institutions to hire at least 50 percent of their professors "full time", but this did not improve the situation: The chairs at these universities became refuges for pedagogical failures.

Despite all the expectations aroused by the "magical" concept of "privatization", the first private institutions of higher education proved unable to come up with the necessary coefficients of renewal and restructuring in the global institutional landscape. The mere fact that the private universities are rapidly increasing in number (five years ago, there were 62 state and 40 private universities in Romania, while only 10 private universities were accredited in Russia) provides no guarantee of an optimal course of the reform process.

And now we come to the foreign financial donors. In itself, the idea of tying generosity to a given direction is quite welcome. But the precondition is that this generosity is based on good knowledge of the "terrain". Without reliable information and without constant effort to adjust to local conditions, philanthropy runs the risk of turning into an inefficient and ineffective choreography, a benevolent naiveté. In other words, the sponsor must know very precisely *whom* he is helping and what the beneficiary's specific configuration is. To this end, he needs competent, credible advisors who are intimately familiar with the local state of affairs. Simply reading the newspapers or showing up for a 2- to 3-day plunge in the "exotic" landscape of the country in question can hardly provide enough data. The fact that people work with overly extensive and overly general concepts – and "Central and Eastern Europe" is already one of them – is already evidence of superficiality. The problem of financing institutions in Poland is fundamentally different from the problems of financing similar institutions in Slovenia, Bulgaria, or Moldova. Helping Ukraine presents completely different strategical and tactical problems than does helping Romania, Slovakia, or Macedonia. Without strict competence on the *differences* between the countries that once belonged to the communist bloc and without a nuanced understanding of the differences in mentalities and historical stages between the sponsoring and the sponsored countries, the danger is that the attempts to help will miss their target.

Good intentions are a noble moral motive, but are not sufficient. It would be ideal to find a balance between the demands of making East and West compatible, local desires (or urgent needs), and the deeper expectations of the researchers in the East.

These are researchers who were forced to work on prescribed topics for decades and whom one clearly cannot expect to immediately see that, to gain access to money, scientific interest must be repackaged in orientation toward a new repertoire of topics. Topics that, although not commissioned and prescribed, are still imposed by economic, social, and sometimes even ideological constraints. These are researchers who had to submit to specific methods, languages, and strategies that were decided outside their individual choice. The concrete language (of "politically correctness") may be less absurd than the wooden language (of political conformity), but that does not make it any less standardized and, fundamentally, any more agreeable. And finally, these are researchers who, even during their training, were forced to accept a strict “canon” of bans and permissions. What they expected from the “normalization” after 1989 was the freedom of a canon devoid of political sensitivities, and not the limitations of a new canon with new bans and new permissions. These researchers are shaped by the long-lasting pressure of politicization, driven and tormented by arbitrary censors whose sole competence consisted in dividing libraries between the permitted books on the one side and the “dangerous” books on the other side. To approach these minds with new lists of taboos, with fashionable recommendations and regulations, is an approach not devoid of a certain “mental cruelty”.

This reminds me of a story about Ava Gardner that I found in a text by Wolfgang Frühwald. Ava Gardner decided to leave one of her husbands and submitted “mental cruelty” as grounds for divorce. Asked to explain this in greater detail, she said Thomas Mann’s *Magic Mountain* was the cause. “He forced me to read this damned book!” Mutatis mutandis, Eastern Europe’s intellectuals sometimes feel like Ava Gardners terrorized by “civilizing” spouses. And in this case, it’s not even Thomas Mann.

All these remarks are meant only to underscore that what is needed is not only good intentions, but also tact. Action must be taken simultaneously on the levels of money, of institutions, and of mentalities. In a European Commission report on the state of the educational system in Romania in 1997, two main hurdles are mentioned: the low funding provided by the government and the general resistance to changes. The funds are indeed minimal, on average 4 percent of gross domestic product (i.e., 4 percent of an already modest sum). Additionally, the education budget is the first thing sacrificed when urgent needs arise – for example in 1999, when a substantial part of this budget was used to pay off foreign debt.[2]

The resistance against changes, in turn, is not stubborn rejection, but more an unsureness about the proposed project and the legitimate wish to save what still can be saved of local traditions, accumulations, and experience. Even if, for example, the balance of curriculum reform, institutional decentralization, and preparation for school in several specific areas of developing practical abilities has been modest, the system can still be quite competitive in the area of general education. In this area, “backwardness” is more a triumph, and the outmoded sympathy for the “encyclopedia of knowledge” deserves to be rethought and re-evaluated in a world where young people on the street answer the question “What is the Holy Trinity?” with, at best, “Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité!”

Here we should add that the Central and Eastern European researcher, slightly schizophrenically, strives simultaneously for European integration while maintaining a certain mental identity and a certain autochthonic “tone” of his own. In other words, he wants to join a symphonic team, not a predictable monotony.

For this reason, the sponsor who decides to promote a synchronization of Eastern European research and education with that of the West must come up with a twofold, somewhat self-contradictory strategy. On the one hand, he has to finance the *homogenization* of the two academic realms, and on the other hand, he has two maintain each of their *specificities*, specialnesses, and peculiarities. People often speak about the high demands for homogenization, more rarely about maintaining specificities, and when they do, then in vague terms. Up to a point, this differing stance is understandable. European integration cannot take place as long as the East and the West are at different stages of development, as long as the two halves of the continent do not speak the same institutional, logistical, and structural language. Before the issue of the “specific differences” and of local color can be approached, bringing Eastern Europe back to *normality* must have undisputed priority. In the years after 1989, significant progress has been made in this respect: the circulation of students and professors in both directions, access to information, the provisioning of libraries, generous academic support programs (grants, summer universities, transdisciplinary debates, etc.).

But this does not mean the process is completed. At least in Romania, there is still a chronic lack of specialists (especially in the educational system), and decades of dictatorship have enormously weakened some disciplines (archaeology, art history, economics and legal studies, religious studies, etc.). As already mentioned, there is also a severe lack of funds for instruction and research, which greatly hampers university life – from the condition of the buildings to the lack of the usual amenities (student dormitories, cafeterias, student rates for public transportation), from the halfway adequate stipends for students to the salaries of professors. Subscriptions to specialized journals, the purchase of books, opportunities to take direct part in international academic life – all of these suffer from the need to economize. Taken together, this shows that the *difference* between East and West is precisely the kind of difference that reflects the East's precarious position and that must be eliminated.

The question that thereby arises is whether there is another kind of difference, a difference that deserves to be maintained, fostered, and offered to the West as an alternative experiment, without thereby giving up efforts toward "normalization". For example, I have often asked myself how a Central European university would have to be to be truly useful, a university like the one in Budapest, which exists thanks to the generous financing from George Soros. Should it take competitiveness with the other great European universities as its unwavering goal? Do we in Budapest, Sofia, Bucharest, or Zagreb want to feel just like Heidelberg, Uppsala, or the Sorbonne (and is this even possible)?

I, personally, would think about an individualized *design* of such universities, making use of local sources and archives and local competences. Here, chairs would naturally find their place whose content would be determined by the intellectual and historical strengths of the region. In such a space of broad religious and denominational diversity (Catholicism, Orthodoxy, Protestantism, Judaism, Islam), a chair for interreligious studies definitely makes sense, and the same is true for ecumenical studies with an emphasis on the sociology of tolerance. Legitimate would also be an intensification of Byzantine studies, a field still very limited in the West, but which is essential today more than ever, since a true European unification is unthinkable without a good base of knowledge of the continent's eastern resources. Another urgent project, it seems to me, is the founding of permanent research centers on eastern Jewry, with its extensive ramifications from Czernowitz to Vienna, from Poland to the isolated enclaves south of the Danube. The field of dictatorship, authoritarian regimes, and transition economies would be studied primarily in the eastern universities, where libraries and "laboratories", theory and "fieldwork", so to speak, lie in close proximity. I think it is much more normal to study the physiology of communism and the sociology of poverty in Bucharest, Belgrade, or Bratislava than in Munich or Montreal.

In brief, it is my opinion that a financing of the restructuring projects that was more imaginative, more flexible, and more attentive to the local resources would be very welcome. Here we could also consider not only a diversification, but also a certain *specialization* of financial sources. I think, for example, that private foundations are better suited than state institutions to be *sponsors of difference*. Relatively untouched by the travails of political relationships and bureaucratically coded state interests, they could take the time for labor-intensive, thorough field research and the liberty of less conventional initiatives.

In this respect, the New Europe College's experience with the French sponsors has been illuminating. We wanted them as our partners from the beginning, but we kept bumping into the limits of a system in which the practice, and I would even say the "culture", of the foundations is very limited. The money comes from the state, so the state sets the conditions. And it does so in accordance with the priorities of its own strategies – which is certainly normal. For example, every financial support must be justified by a certain propagandistic component or by arguments of "national policy". Chances for funding are thus restricted to the more or less francophone and necessarily francophile projects. One could slightly derisively exaggerate and claim that, because it lacks the instrument of private foundations, France can really only finance itself, even if it does so indirectly, through external institutions and projects. In other countries, there are foundations that, without submitting to political or national criteria, are active in a limited range of topics. One example of this is the Templeton Foundation, which funds only research projects concerned with the relation between science and religion.

The addition of a third element could add certain freshness to the relationship between Western donors and Eastern recipients. The danger, namely, is that the binomial relationship "donor-recipient" will turn into an oversimplifying routine. In reality, both the backward poor and the flourishing model face new challenges that they have to master together. Beyond the fact of giving and the fact of taking lies *seeking*. The prospect of globalization presents us with challenges that neither East nor West are prepared for – even if the West's variant of unpreparedness is organized and more stable, while the East's variant of unpreparedness is confused and impoverished. But the one and the other are both seeking for solutions. And this common search creates space for countless forms of partnership: the asymmetries can complement each other harmoniously, the differences can become inexhaustible reservoirs of ideas.

The problem of "models" is growing more complicated by the day. In a certain way, we have the advantage this time: We have a model, a suitable point of reference – the West. But what are the West's models? Where are the coordinates to be sought for the unavoidable necessity to restructure that will spare no one in the coming era? In the United States of America? In the Netherlands, as some suggest? In Japan? No one knows yet. The uncertainty in which East and West are suspended, in different rhythms and on different levels, is the danger and simultaneously the opportunity of tomorrow.

No matter how much the developed countries may have done and how much that is not done the formerly communist countries pursue, we find ourselves, on both sides, faced with decisive and unforeseeable changes and upheavals. Everything is still before us. The revolution of globalization corresponds to a planetary change of climate. And if we have to go through a planetary change of climate, it makes absolutely no difference whether one lives in a villa or in a tent. Survival solutions can be found for both variants – on the condition that we know the advantages and disadvantages of each.

---

1 All the information presented in this section is taken from a paper by Robert D. Reisz, *Education for the Transition. Part III. Higher Educational Policy in Central and Eastern Europe*, published under the aegis of the CEP and the IWM, Budapest (1997-).

2 See Andrei Marga, *Unterrichtsreform und die Herausforderungen des neuen Jahrhunderts*, New Europe College, 1999.

Elemér Hankiss

Brilliant Ideas or Brilliant Errors?[1]
Twelve Years of Social Science Research in Eastern Europe

To replace political philosophy by the history of political philosophy means to replace a doctrine which claims to be true by a survey of more or less brilliant errors.
Leo Strauss: *City and the Man.*

The high quality, sound empirical foundations, and serious argumentation found in the papers in this volume allow me to be – in these introductory words – slightly less serious and a bit more personal than my colleagues.

When drawing up the balance sheet of social science research in Eastern Europe in the last twelve to twenty years, do we survey "more or less brilliant errors", as Leo Strauss suggested in another context? Or do we discover brilliant ideas? I think that we have both of these experiences. But my intention here is neither to speak about the mistakes we may have made, nor to deliver the *laudatio* of our achievements. I am going to tell my personal version of what has happened in the last twenty years. I shall trace the trajectory between 1980 and 2002, i.e., from what I propose to call "The Age of Expectations" to our present "Age of Perplexity", from an age of plans and proposals to an age of questions and questions.

My division into periods is rather arbitrary. And a bit provocative. Namely, I divide these twenty years into no less than seven periods. This must sound absurd and unacceptable in the first instant. But do not take the word "period" too seriously. These seven items might also be called trends, or schools of thought, or various kinds and styles of "scholarly approach". I also have to admit that these periods greatly overlap in time. But in spite of these *caveats*, I think it might be interesting to try to distinguish them.

Due to time constraints, my overview will be schematic and rudimentary. I could even say that, to a slight extent, it will have the character of a caricature, since I shall describe these periods by accentuating only their most salient features. In each case I shall try to find, first, a MOTTO for the period in question. Then I shall mention the MAIN GENRES of research in the period, followed by the MAIN QUESTION scholars tried to answer in the period. Next, I shall try to list the MAIN ISSUES that were dealt with. I shall also try to outline the FRAMEWORK within which scholars interpreted their findings. I shall describe the style of APPROACH that characterized their work and, finally, I shall describe the scholarly MOOD of the period.

The Age of Expectations (1980-1989)

The first period precedes the time span under scrutiny in this conference. It is the 1980s, and I propose to call it "The Age of Expectations". Its MOTTO might be "the squaring of the circle". Why "squaring of the circle"? Because we social scientists who lived and worked in those years tried to solve something that could not be solved. We tried to transform state socialism into democracy and market economy without letting the Soviet Union or our own apparatchiks notice our doing so. This was, of course, impossible, but we tried hard to square the circle. That's why I think this motto fits the period.

---

1 This was an oral contribution at the conference on Political Science Research in Eastern Europe, 1990-2000, organized by Jean Blondel and Jan Zielonka in collaboration with the European Consortium for Political Research. Florence, November 9-10, 2001.

The main GENRES were daydreams, utopias, and scenarios. Here is a sample of some of the major and/or notorious scenarios:

- Geopolitical scenarios (center/periphery, imperialism, the decline of empires, convergence);
- Historical scenarios (backwardness, "three Europes", modernization, proletarianization, embourgeoisement, democratization, oligarchization);
- "Doomsday" scenarios (nuclear catastrophe, the third world war, the collapse of the Soviet Union, civil wars, ethnic conflicts, fundamentalist revolution;
- Deadlock scenarios: (neo-Stalinist restoration, "muddling through", "Ottomanization", "new Yalta", "Finlandization", normalization, national communism);
- Populist scenarios (Central European populism, slavophilism, the good czar scenario);
- Reforms without freedom (reform dictatorship, the technocratic scenario);
- Market plus centralized politics (feasible socialism, manager socialism, the South Korean road to capitalism);
- Economic democracy ("Galbraithian socialism", self-managing socialism, shareholder socialism, entrepreneurial socialism);
- Transition scenarios (constitutional socialism, dual political system, intra-institutional pluralism, corporatist state, self-limiting democracy);
- The moral revolution (new evolutionism, silent revolution, anti-politics, existential revolution).

Every week or every month, a new hypothesis, a new theory, a new program, or a brand new scenario was proposed for the transformation of the world or at least of state socialism. And they were discussed passionately in the countries of Central Europe. I also call them "immodest proposals". Why were they "immodest"? You certainly remember Jonathan Swift's famous pamphlet from 1729, titled "A Modest Proposal", in which he proposed to solve the problem of the devastating poverty in Ireland by prompting poor people to fatten their children and sell them for food.[1] Following his example, we tried to convince the apparatchiks that it was in their own best interest to go to hell.

The main QUESTION to be answered was, invariably, how to square the circle. How to pull off the trick? As we shall see in a moment, we answered this question in a number of ways. I do not remember whether we believed or did not really believe in our own answers.

The main ISSUE of the age was to reform or not to reform the system. Or: whether it is possible or impossible to reform it.

The FRAMEWORK was "The West" as myth, as the Holy Grail. The West was our benchmark, and the myth of the Western world the framework within which our thoughts moved. The West was the ideal of perfection, the Holy Grail, which we had only to touch and then we would be saved, then all our problems would be solved overnight. Let me tell an anecdote that may illustrate our frame of mind in those years. On a gloomy November morning, I met one of my friends in the street. He had a bad cold. I, as a civilized person, gave him all the usual silly advice. Go to bed; drink a lot of hot tea, etc. But to anything I said he kept repeating: No, it wouldn't help. No, it wouldn't help. Finally, losing my temper, I asked him why he did not want to help himself. "Well, I cannot help myself", he answered. "Nothing can help us as long as the Russians are here".

Our APPROACH was moral, normative, *aufklärerisch*. We lived, as a matter of fact, in the illusion that once we entered the Paradise of the West, we would not even catch a cold. Our approach was, as you see, foolishly naive. It was strongly moral in its character. It envisioned the world as the struggle between Good and Evil. It was normative, since we proposed programs that should have been accepted and implemented by those in power. And it was "*aufklärerisch*".[2] We thought that, with the help of rational thinking, everything could be solved.

Our MOOD was a kind of pessimistic optimism. We were hoping against hope, we were stubbornly optimistic, though we knew that the chances of success were minimal. James Bond's motto could have been ours in those days: "Never say never."

As I have mentioned, a great variety of scenarios were drawn up in those years. What happened to these enormous intellectual (and moral) efforts? Did they evaporate without leaving a trace? Have they become anachronistic after 1989, in the new world of democracy and the market economy?[3] Surveying this selection, one can hardly avoid the question of what has remained of all these brilliant or foolish ideas?

Well, they did not overturn the Soviet Union or the communist systems in their own countries. But they played an important role in keeping people intellectually and morally alive in the long decades of oppression; in shaping social consciousness; in generating a more and more critical spirit even in the ranks of the Communist Party; in keeping the spirit of opposition and human dignity alive; in preparing a new political and economic elite for the duties they would have to perform after 1989; and in preparing a peaceful transition from state socialism to democracy in 1989-1990.

If we compare the 1980s with our present situation, the change is, of course, extremely positive. Instead of dictatorship, oppression, poverty, and economic decline, we now have democracy, freedom, a modest affluence, and dynamically growing economies. But perhaps we have also lost something important. We may have lost the effervescence of ideas so characteristic of the 1980s, we may have lost the critical spirit, the courage to ask important questions, and the determination not to accept the world as it is.

We have certainly become better social scientists, we have learned the latest methods, but have we not lost some of the former openness and creativity of our minds? Have we not lost at least part of our ability to ask the really important question? Maybe we have. Maybe we have not. Instead of jumping to conclusions even before we have started our survey of political science research in the 1990s, let's check what happened to us and to our discipline in those years. Let's see the remaining six "periods".

The Age of Transitology (1990-1994)

The MOTTO of "The Age of Transitology" was "From Trabant to Mercedes". This refers to a joke well known in the early 1990s. The question: What is the transition from state socialism to democracy and to market economy like? The answer – it is like transforming a Trabant into a Mercedes while driving – was meant to characterize the difficulties of East European transition.

The characteristic GENRE of this period was transitology itself. As far as the main QUESTIONS and ISSUES of the period are concerned, we were eager to understand what was happening to us and to the world. Where did we come from and where were we going? How to make the transition? How to transform our world quickly enough to avoid missing this unique historical opportunity? Is this a revolution? And if it is, what kind of revolution is it: a revolution from below, or from above? Is it a "negotiated" revolution (if such a thing exists at all)? Is it a social or a bourgeois revolution? Or – heaven forbid – a counter-revolution? Or is it a historical compromise? Is it only a regime change? Or also a systemic change? Or should we, too, "*penser la révolution*", á la Furet, and accept the fact that continuity has been more important than change? After an interruption of forty years, Western-type modernization and embourgeoisement have been simply resumed, and that's it.

Our benchmark, the FRAMEWORK of our analysis in this period was Max Weber and Co. Our APPROACH was eclectic and, at the same time, deeply imbued with political philosophy. Our MOOD was a kind of catching-up neurosis. When we realized soon after 1989 that we were not the pets and darlings of the European Union, we understandably felt the urgency of catching up with the West. Let me illustrate this urgency, this haste, with an anecdote. Michael Burawoy, who is now professor of sociology at Berkeley, was a PhD student in Hungary in the 1970s. He spent more than a year in various factories as a simple factory hand. When he finally left the country, we accompanied him to the airport. At the gate, taking his leave, he said to us, "You Hungarians are nice guys, you work hard, you do everything in your power to make life better in your country. But something is wrong with this whole business. You are like people who are running up an escalator, at breakneck speed, but the escalator is running downward."

After 1989, the escalator first stopped and then started to run upward. But we still felt that our speed might not be enough to catch up with the West.

The Age of Apprenticeship (1992-1994)

Even before recovering from the fever of transitology, we settled down and started to do our apprenticeship in Western- or American-type political science research.

"The squaring of the square" might be a fitting MOTTO for this period in our scholarly lives. We were stunned by the sheer amount and high quality of Western social science research. We were overwhelmed by myriad tables, figures, and statistics. We had the impression and were also told that our Western colleagues had solved practically everything. And consequently all we had to do was to learn from them, to apply their methods to our societies, to become modest pieces in the puzzle of international, comparative research. In other words, all we could and should do was solve once more what had already been solved. In other words: to square the square.

Number crunching, journal articles and Excel tables were the main GENRES of this period. There was no central QUESTION of the period. There was instead a warning: "No questions, please!" – because questions had already been answered and to raise new questions would have been politically incorrect (though in those years we did not use this expression yet).

Western political science served as a FRAMEWORK in our analyses. Political parties, parliaments, elite groups, democratic institutions, and the like were the basic ISSUES discussed and researched by most of our colleagues. They did a good job; they had learned their *métier.* The atmosphere was a bit colonial, but the quality of research kept improving. By this time, our papers and books had become strictly empirical, descriptive, and comparative in their APPROACH. A quantifying rage swept over the field. The MOOD was a mixture of zeal and civilized boredom.

The Age of Professionalism (1995-)

This has been a more advanced stage in our research activities. Facts, facts, facts: this was our motto and credo. We were writing heavily footnoted papers, monographs, and policy papers; we fell in love with classifications and typologies (GENRE), we kept looking up our names in citation indexes. Our QUESTIONS were: How do institutions function? How to compare political developments in various countries? How are decisions made? Our approach had become institutionalist and functionalist, we were keen on working with precise definitions, and we studied the way institutions functioned and decisions were made. In addition to the traditional ISSUES (governments, parliaments, constitutions, elites, parties, etc.), new issues emerged as well, first of all the problems of the process of EU integration and of globalization. Our MOOD became cool and professional. Or did it not?

The Age of New Fears (1994-1999)

There has been a disturbing note in the scholarly life of this region throughout this last decade, an undercurrent of passions, animosities, and fears. The political and ideological cleavage of our societies appeared also, though to a lesser extent, in our discipline. That's why I think *"We and They"* might be an appropriate MOTTO of this period. The main GENRE of this undercurrent was polemics. Nation, ethnicity, identities, and ideologies were the main ISSUES. The opposition of a kind of Herderian versus a Popperian philosophy may have been the metaphorical FRAMEWORK of our thinking. The general APPROACH was emotional. The MOOD was distrust, fear, and intolerance.

I do not know the degree to which this was a general problem in the region. It has certainly been a problem in Hungary. It infected our way of thinking and, as a consequence, compromised our professionalism in many ways. It did a lot of harm to our country and damaged our discipline as well. I could even speak in this respect of a new "*trahison des clercs*", a new treason of the intellectuals, because too many of us got involved too early, too easily, too much, and too subserviently in politics. If some of our colleagues entered the new political class, it was okay. They quickly forgot their scholarly selves, and we quickly forgot them. But a considerable number of political scientists in academia made the mistake of mixing the two fields: scholarship and politics. They got emotionally involved in politics, they could not keep their distance, and they lost their objectivity. Instead of being their subject of research, politics has become a kind of opium for them, a new sort of the "*opium des intellectuels*" of Raymond Aron.

Fortunately this straying of some of us has not destroyed decent and authentic scholarship in this part of the world. It has been only an undercurrent, a side effect, while the main body of political science research remained healthy, sane, and reliable.

The Age of Perplexity (1998-)

We have been perplexed since our former vision of a clear and simple trajectory leading us from state socialism to Europe and democracy grew more and more blurred by a number of new problems, questions, and uncertainties. The MOTTO of the period might be: My God! Its characteristic QUESTIONS were: Where have we arrived? What is going on with us and in the world?

Even our basic concepts have become vague and fuzzy. Let me give an example. In the 1980s and early 1990s, the concept of democracy was clear and unambiguous. Democracy meant democracy. Full stop. In recent years, however, it has disintegrated into a welter of different meanings. Let me list some of these nowadays widely discussed meanings: democratura, formal democracy, heterogeneous, electoral, patrician, incomplete, consolidated, majoritarian, pluralistic, consensual, consociational, contractual, neo-corporatist, "agonistic", liberal, non-liberal, radical, grassroots, interactive, deliberative, discursive, post-modern, post-national, supra-national, multi-layered, polycentric, democracy by numbers, democracy by intensity, democracy without democrats. This rich variety of meanings reminds me of the words of the king-actor in *Hamlet,* in the scene in which he explains that they can play any genres, "tragedy, comedy, history, pastoral, pastorical-comical, historical-pastoral, tragical-historical, tragical-comical-historical-pastoral".

Let me add that it was not a postmodern fervor, but life itself, that deconstructed the concept of democracy in this radical way. The same thing has happened to some of our other basic ISSUES and concepts, like sovereignty, governance, social contract, progress, justice, and others.

Our previously stable benchmarks have disappeared; our FRAMEWORK of interpretation has crumbled. In addition to reports on empirical research projects, thought papers have become the characteristic GENRE of the period. Hermeneutics has reemerged from oblivion. Perplexity characterizes our MOOD. Which in itself is not bad. This perplexity, this teeming of questions, this deconstruction of our traditional concepts may challenge us, may prompt us to revisit our traditional ideas, to re-examine our basic principles, to reinterpret the world around us.

The Age of Uncertainty? (2001-)

We are entering a new age. We do not know yet what the major issues, what the new problems, opportunities, new anxieties, and new challenges will be. We do not even know what the FRAMEWORK of our thinking will be. Will it be a new world order? Or a new world disorder? We do not know yet what kind of new approaches and methodologies we will have to develop.
A MOTTO? Not yet, but a QUESTION: How to cope with uncertainty?

Uncertainty has always been a major element of future developments. But the events of September 11 have warned us that in the coming years and decades we will probably have to cope with an unusually high level of uncertainty. There are already people who have proposed to call it "The Age of Uncertainty".

With a bit of exaggeration, I could say that in the last decade or two we, as citizens and as social scientists, slept the sleep of the just. We have lived in a fool's paradise. We indulged in the illusion that after so many centuries of turmoil and tragedy, the world is now, at long last, progressing towards a Kantian universal peace. Democracy, legality, and human rights are winning ground all over the world, the conditions of economic growth and affluence are given, and we will have time to solve, step by step, the problems of poverty and global injustice. September 11 woke us up with a horrendous bang. Its impact may prove to be like that of the earthquake of Lisbon in 1755, which – according to the testimony of Voltaire – shook the Enlightenment's faith in a harmonious and rational universe and the glorious future of humankind.

Hopefully we shall be able to recover from this shock and reassert our faith in a relatively peaceful progress. Which is not to say that we need not prepare ourselves for the challenges of an age of uncertainties.

We, as social scientists, have to help our fellow citizens prepare themselves for various possible futures, various possible worlds. We have to carefully analyze the major economic, social, political, cultural, and spiritual trends in the world, the motive forces underlying our present world, the forces that will, or may, shape our future. *"Scenarios"* may become once more, as they were in the 1980s, the characteristic GENRE of this new period in the history of our discipline.

Post-September 11 scenarios may give an idea of how uncertain our future is. There are open questions in all fields. Throughout the 1990s, we were told that the *age of ideologies* had come to an end and that a new age of sober *pragmatism* was emerging. September 11 has shown that powerful new ideologies with dangerous emotional loading may overwhelm even the most developed and enlightened nations. We were also told that we arrived at the *end of history* and all we would have to do in the future was to spread an already good model all over the world. And again, in the wake of September 11, history is coming back to us with a vengeance. We do not know yet either whether in the coming years the FRAMEWORK of our lives and thinking will be that of a *"new world order"* or that of a *"new world disorder"*. Will we have a Pax Americana or a Bellum Americanum? A Pax Americana, or a War between the North and the South, or a global war on terrorism? Will we live in a free world or in a world whose developed part will withdraw within the walls of a Fortress Europe, Fortress USA, or Fortress West, surrounded by a sea of poverty, despair, and lethal conflicts? Will societies and people's minds remain open, or will they close down? Will we be able to preserve a multi-cultural world, or will we become entangled in a destructive clash of civilizations? Will democracy or the temptation of law and order prevail, or will the temptations of authoritarianism prove too strong to resist? What will happen to the process of globalization? Will it slow down or accelerate? Will the present process of globalization, driven by business interests, go on, or will it be transformed by social and local interests? Will September 11 and its aftermath transform our lifestyle and our present civilization of consumerism and radical individualism? And if they do, what may come afterwards? A new Puritanism? A new communitarianism? Or something else? Are we entering the "E"-age, the Electronic Age, or the "F"-age, i.e., the Age of Fear? Shall I continue?

Prospects

The conditions and the objectives of our research work may change in this coming age. We may need new tools, new approaches, and a new way of thinking to be able to study and construe this new world. Let me call attention to a few fields in which I think we should strengthen our positions.

Theoretical Deficit

In recent years, being involved in empirical and analytical studies, we have had less time and energy to discuss the basic issues of our discipline and those of our world. This theoretical deficit may become a serious handicap if we need new tools, new ideas, and new hypotheses to understand a new world.[4] The almost total absence of critical theory in Eastern Europe is a serious deficiency in an age in which a new world order or disorder is emerging and should be analyzed with special intensity.

Data Deficit

Strangely enough, we also struggle with a data deficit, in spite of one or two decades of intense empirical and quantitative research work. We have plenty of survey data and data coming from institutional analysis. But September 11 has shown us that we need much more non-survey type data. Let us call such data grassroots data or anthropological data on the everyday lives, behavior, reactions, "habitus", beliefs, and networks of people in our countries.

Monitoring

September 11 has also called our attention to the fact that monitoring social development around the world should be taken much more seriously. It should be better coordinated. The existing "social surveys", "barometers", and "monitors" should work with more articulate instruments; their outcomes should be analyzed more thoroughly than they currently are.

The State of the Nation

State-of-the-nation reports should be drawn up and published in as many countries as possible, including variables and chapters on the economy, politics, society, culture, international position, etc. The present reports, prepared by various international agencies, focus on specific fields and issues. Comprehensive and comparable pictures and assessments of individual countries, which are still missing, could improve global cooperation.

Trend Analysis

In a world changing at such a speed and running toward so many possible (and impossible) futures, the analysis of latent economic, political, social, and cultural trends is of special importance. Relatively little has been done in this field in recent years.

Causal Analysis

In the same way, more efforts should be devoted to the study of motive forces, interests, belief systems, aspirations, and strategies underlying these trends.

Conflict Analysis

In the 1960s and 1970s, conflict analysis was extremely popular in Western social sciences, but it went into eclipse in the 1980s and has played a relatively small role in East European social sciences. This is a serious deficiency in a region and period of transition in which the potential for conflict is dangerously high.

Systems Analysis

There are relatively few projects that study societies, regions, and the globe with the instruments of systems analysis.

Unintended Consequences

In a world that may become more and more unpredictable, the analysis of unintended consequences and contingencies (Festenstein), of irrational factors (Elster), and of complexity and inherent uncertainty (Kitschelt) may become of primary importance.

Cross-Cultural Analysis

In a globalizing world, cross-cultural studies obviously become indispensable. There is already a huge and excellent body of comparative studies of parliaments, political parties, constitutions, the rule of the law, etc. But this type of studies should be extended to a great number of other political, economic, social, and cultural factors. How do Western and other institutions and political cultures mesh? How relevant and adaptable are Western concepts and institutions in other civilizations (including parts of Eastern Europe). What have been and what may be the local responses to Western concepts and institutions? These and similar questions should be carefully studied.

Social Movements

September 11 has called our attention to the importance of social movements. How do they start, how do they gather force, what are their goals and aspirations, what are their basic principles and norms of conduct, what is their potential for conflict, and what are their underlying motive forces? Answering these questions may become more important in the coming years and decades than replicating some of our institutional analyses.

The Human Factor

The founding fathers of political philosophy – Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke, Montesquieu, John Stuart Mill – all started by studying "human nature", proceeding from there to the analysis of political institutions. Later this tradition fell into oblivion. It is time to resuscitate it. Recent events have shown all over the world – in Cambodia, Rwanda, Bosnia, the Middle East, as well as New York – that the human factor plays a decisive role in shaping our history. The so-called "soft variables" have become harder and harder, and to ignore them could jeopardize our survival chances. And would certainly compromise the quality of our research work.

I may be mistaken, but I think that we in Eastern Europe and our colleagues anywhere in the world badly need comprehensive research projects to study the human personality, people's needs and motivations, their basic values, visions of the world, belief systems, behavioral patterns, life goals and life strategies, their ideas about the meaning or meaninglessness of their lives, their expectations, fears and anxieties, their frustrations and deprivations, their models of happiness, their ideas about a "just world", their identities and roles, their sources of self-respect, and so on and so forth. Knowing more about the human factor, we would know much more about our world as well, and about our tasks, prospects, and chances in a new world.

In the title of this paper, I asked whether the survey of the last ten to twenty years of political science research in Eastern Europe would be a survey of brilliant ideas or of brilliant errors. I think that we may safely conclude that it is a survey of both.

---

1 "I have been assured by a knowing American of my acquaintance in London, that a young healthy child well nursed is at a year old a most delicious nourishing and wholesome food, whether stewed, roasted, baked, or boiled; and I make no doubt that it will equally serve in a fricassee or a ragout."

2 "*Aufklärer*" in German refers to someone who, in the spirit of Enlightenment, believes in the almost absolute power of human reason to solve everything and to transform the world into a place of peace, harmony, and morality.

3 I have tried to answer this question in a paper titled "Ou sont nos idées d'antan. Les sciences sociales en Europe Centrale avant et après 1989", Prague, le 3 Mars 2002 (to be published later this year).

4 In the conference at the European University Institute in Florence, several participants mentioned and deplored this theoretical deficit. Jan Zielonka, for instance, and Ferdinand Müller-Rommel, Ian Kubik and Rudolf Rizman. They also quoted similar opinions by Staniszkis, Bauman, Wnuk-Lipinski, and others. (Political Science Research in Eastern Europe, 1990-2000. Conference organized by Jean Blondel and Jan Zielonka in collaboration with the European Consortium for Political Research. Florence, November 9-10, 2001.)

Economics

János Mátyás Kovács

Business as (Un)usual
Notes on the Westernization of Economic Sciences in Eastern Europe

This talk is about complexity, irony, and praise. During the past two decades, I have published a few papers on unexploited opportunities, I mean, on chances to westernize that economists have missed in Eastern Europe.[1] Looking back on these twenty years, I see myself talk, in a masochistic obsession, first about the parochialism of market socialism (this was my *Leitmotiv* during the 1980s) then – in the 1990s – about "constructivist" legacies of reformism, to use Hayek's phrase, in developing the economics of the transformation. A couple of years ago, I even reached back to the Holy Bible for an analogy. By invoking the story of the prodigal son, I tried to show the dire conditions of Eastern European scholarship when returning, after a more than seven-decade journey, to the family home of Western economics.

I do not have to tell you how unpopular this kind of reasoning is even if the historian a.) attributes the unexploited opportunities to these dire conditions rather than to the scholars themselves; and b.) regards himself as a member of the same research community, that is, as one of those who, in their own research programs, have missed quite a few chances to borrow ideas from the West.

Young versus old?

In the new millennium, let me stop lamenting and deal, for a change, first with complaints that have been made by some of our distinguished colleagues about some *other* distinguished colleagues of ours. As our discussions in the project workshops demonstrated, the intellectual historian is confronted with a ready-made dichotomy in the everyday discourse of the profession, no matter whether in Warsaw or Prague, in Bucharest or Tallin. It is based on two essentially generation-dependent lamentations. I swear, I do not sharpen the tongue of the self-appointed classifiers.

According to numerous members of the older generations, economic science in the region has been inundated by the Western mainstream. This is actually a process of spiritual colonization. Among the colonizers we find young aborigines who, upon their return from PhD courses in the West, begin to introduce standard neoclassical thought in higher education with all the enthusiasm of neophytes – unfortunately, on the level of third-rate universities in the US. They are increasingly profiting from international research projects and, while believing that they have reached the peaks of universal economic science, they are mere data providers for and plagiarists of their idols. These newcomers' main preoccupation is in building sterile mathematical Models (with a capital "M") of a few variables. Pure methodology based on shaky assumptions of rational choice is preferred to the real world. Scientific imagination stops at the border of the models, generalization is constrained, and normative conclusions are pale. If they nevertheless leave pure economics behind for a moment and venture to advocate government policies, they tend to apply dogmatic neoliberal solutions in a rather aggressive manner. All in all, snobbery, elitist myopia, and professional chauvinism prevail in the new vanguard.

In contrast to this critique, those whom their older colleagues call "young Turks" are convinced that it is still the ex-reformers of the old regime who dominate economic culture in Eastern Europe. These reformers are engineering the transformation in close collaboration with the political elite. Under the pretext of a new political economy, they tend to subordinate economics to politics. You find them in the advisory bodies of the parties and the governments and on editorial boards, that is, in every committee that distributes public money and official titles. They have replaced reform with transformation under the aegis of a rather statist version of *Soziale Marktwirtschaft*. This is the bottom line of their capacity of innovation. These "transformers" continue to adore Grand Designs and vast social experiments without proper empirical knowledge, although they love to talk about Reality (with a capital "R"). As former Marxists, they idealize verbal and historical arguments, fuzzy concepts and ambiguous metaphors, so the institutional reform programs they propound are inaccurate and parochial. Keynesian leanings, state intervention, and again state intervention...

These complementary lamentations passionately reinforce each other. Yet, I suspect that any economist in this room would feel embarrassed if the "young-versus-old" dichotomy were applied to describe his or her scientific record. Anyway, who has not yet seen dozens of *old* model-builders and, conversely, *young* social engineers around? Is model building and neoliberalism logically connected? If you lean toward Keynes, do you forget mathematical analysis? If someone opts for Walter Eucken, should he or she be considered less Westernized than a follower of Milton Friedman? Obviously, the actual frontlines intersect each other and confuse the simple dual scheme. Did I say "frontlines"? The easiest (and cheapest) task for a historian would be, of course, to discover, in a Foucaultian way, a desperate power struggle within the research community behind the veil of the discourse on generations. I leave this task to the warriors themselves. I would like to call your attention instead to another basic component of classification, which is camouflaged by complaining about the generational cleavage.

East versus West

I will focus on the concept of the East-West divide, an important facet of our workshops, which features in the project proposal as "New East-West Asymmetries". Westernization (again I quote the common parlance of quite a few economists in the region) means "civilization". The Westernizers are more professional and educated, are much closer to the state of the art in research, use more sophisticated and reliable research techniques, and – last but not least – draw clear boundaries between academia and policy advocacy. Hence, the West is tantamount to higher scientific quality. This is an old argument; its composition has not changed much since the first *zapadniki* began to adore the Occident in the middle of the 19th century.

It would be tempting to borrow spiritual ammunition from Edward Said, Larry Wolff, or Maria Todorova to fight the "Orientalist" message of this argument by pointing to the fact that the West invents its own East as a low-quality constituting Other in economics, too. Indeed, the single Nobel Prize won by Leonid Kantorovich many, many years ago (and shared by Tjalling Koopmans), the rare occasions in which the *oeuvre* of an Eastern European economist is acknowledged by an entry in an encyclopedia or a renowned textbook published outside the former Eastern Bloc, or – to summarize the national reports in this project – the formidable fact that, during the past decade, Eastern European authors have hardly increased the frequency of their publications in leading journals of the profession – all these sad things can partly be explained by Western disinterest and condescension. But only partly, I believe. The other part, however, belongs to *our* sphere of responsibility. Right or wrong, we are still rather different. I said "different" not "inferior". This proud proposition requires from me a large portion of self-discipline, but will perhaps make the analysis less biased. In the following, I will do my best to apply the term "Westernization" in its possibly most value-free version, as a synonym for cultural exchange, encounter, or diffusion.[2]

Hoping for equal exchange

Do you remember what we expected, back in 1989, to happen in terms of Westernization in our countries? Let me reconstruct the main strand of public opinion in the research community of the time about taking over economic ideas (discourses, paradigms, schools) from the West. Hopefully, I am not too far from reality in retrospectively postulating the following list of rather optimistic expectations shared by a great majority of economists. Here I will rely on the results of four projects in the current history of economic thought: the Vienna program on "Comparative Reform Economics", initiated by Márton Tardos and myself between 1987 and 1989; the "Legacy –

Imitation – Invention" project, which I ran in Hungary in 1995/96; the comparative project on "Economics and System Change" organized by Hans-Jürgen Wagener in Frankfurt/Oder between 1994 and 1997; and finally this project.[3] The list of expectations consists of six items:

1. *Convergence in institutionalism*. Both major schools of economic thinking under communism, i.e., official textbook political economy and reform economics, would disappear: the former would collapse while the latter would merge with neo-institutionalist theories flourishing in the West. Thus, the new mix would have an authentic Eastern European segment, a kind of "borderline-case economics". What do I mean by this? Back in communism, we were proud to be able to offer a genuine *in vivo* analysis of market distortions in the planned economy (shortages, campaigns, investment cycles, overcentralization, informal economy, etc.), which could otherwise only be examined *in vitro* as borderline cases in most of the advanced Western economies. At the end of the 1980s, one could also predict that this sort of analysis would expand because, in the course of the post-communist transformation, economists in Eastern Europe would follow the borderline-case trajectory of research in studying large-scale marketization and privatization, i.e., phenomena that are rather infrequent in advanced capitalist economies. We also knew, however, that our ideas could become an integral part of the literature on property rights, government failures, bargaining, etc., only if they were formulated in the scholarly language of the West. In other words, we could not hope for success in the international arena with our (I would say) "speculative institutionalism" (think of the amorphous "plan-and-market" discourse of the time), which was less empirical and, at the same time, less abstract-axiomatic than the new institutionalist concepts applied by our Western colleagues. Nevertheless, many of us trusted in a peaceful cohabitation of the local tradition of verbal-historical research and the incoming formalized models in the future.
2. *Normative gains*. The new East-West combination in institutional economics would also improve the normative performance of reform theories. By borrowing from the *Ordo* liberals, the reformers would be able to advocate much more complex and viable regimes of *Soziale Marktwirtschaft* than those devised even by the radical versions of market socialism. Quality improvement was conceived of as an evolutionary process: by touching on the taboos of state ownership and one-party rule, the notion of the *socialist* market would grow into that of the *social* market. The incoming ideas would serve as a catalyst or a last drop in the glass (as we say in Hungary). With this last drop, the Eastern European economist could in turn open up to less statist, socially less committed branches of institutionalist thought, as well.
3. *Convergence in mathematical economics*. The expected institutionalist hegemony notwithstanding, research would be likely to surge in standard neoclassical economics as well. Since the publication of János Kornai's *Anti-Equilibrium*, however, this presumption no longer had top priority on the list of expectations. Again and again, the specificity and not any lack of scientific knowledge was emphasized when Eastern European economists characterized themselves. Accordingly, the inflow of the Western mainstream was expected to rehabilitate, enlarge, restructure, and systematize rather than revolutionize what was called "mathematical economics" in our region. True, in doing so, the West would jeopardize the school's normative conclusions, such as computopia and planometrics, that is, wishful thinking about optimizing the Soviet-type economy. The spread of standard micro- and macroeconomics would certainly devalue the position of input-output analysis, a celebrated field of mathematical economics; but econometrics and mathematical statistics, for instance, would need no paradigm shift at all. Ironically, the question of which interpretation of the neoclassical synthesis would be received from the West with greater interest (I, for example, supposed at that time that a fierce debate between monetarists and neo-Keynesians would erupt in Eastern Europe in the early 1990s) did not really bother the research community.
4. *Freedom to choose*. As the example of new institutionalism shows, mainstream economics would arrive hand in hand with non-mainstream theories in Eastern Europe, and the borders between them would be at least as permeable as they are in the West. As a consequence, the

economists in the region would be provided with a great variety of research programs, orthodox and heterodox alike, and would enjoy choosing freely among them.

5. *Exports from the East*. Learning would be a two-way street: economic sciences in the West would also borrow scientific ideas from our region. We were ready to learn, but also to teach. As a minimum program, we would be able to export a certain economics of communism, which would occupy its due place in universal economic sciences as perhaps the most significant borderline-case theory in the age of modern capitalism. (Of course, as always, exportation would be contingent upon certain imported goods from the West.) Moreover, in a larger historical and methodological context, Eastern Europe seemed capable of delivering, via the economics of communism, the theory of an unfeasible economy, which plays a role similar to that assumed by the *perpetuum mobile* in physics. More precisely, it was expected to supply ample empirical evidence and an original conceptual scheme to substantiate the Mises-Hayek hypothesis of the impossibility of rational economic calculation under collectivism. In addition, communist economics was likely to be included in the textbooks of economic history and comparative economic systems, and – as a *memento mori* – in economic policy manuals, too, with the aim of teaching future generations of economists all over the world about what is *not* to be done. Finally, in 1989, nothing seemed to prevent the Eastern European economists from making scientific discoveries outside their traditional/local research fields sooner or later and from exporting scholarship to the West.
6. *Quality improvement: yes and no*. The overall scholarly quality of economic research would improve, no doubt about it, thanks to the evaporation of the textbook political economy of communism (and also of the less precious part of reform economics) with all their sub-scientific propositions. All other expected developments would be subject to question in terms of scientific quality. If the reception of economic ideas would also be accompanied by a takeover of the infrastructure of economic education and scientific production in the West, the ratio of positive and negative effects would be unpredictable. The choice of scientific ideas would be greater but this would apply to less scientific and pseudo-scientific ideas, too. Seen from a sociology of science perspective, Eastern European scholars would be subjected to the same kind of rivalry in the academic market (locally and globally) as their Western colleagues, and the patterns of recruitment, promotion and mobility would also be similar, while censorship would not distort scientific communication any longer and the political market would not exert a larger influence on their research programs than in the West. A good part of scholarly output would come from private institutions, but the state would also heavily invest in economic research. As a result, in economics a thin layer of "elite culture" would probably coexist with a thick one of "mass culture". The former would produce high-quality goods whereas the latter would basically work along the lines of a "garbage in – garbage out" technology, a technology well known from the textbook political economy of communism. At the same time, the new *crème de la crème* of the research community would not necessarily be superior to the old elite: formalization might prove to be a straitjacket for innovative ideas and the threat inherent in the "publish or perish" principle might drastically shorten the time for quiet reflection characteristic of research activity under communism – at least this is how a great number of economists speculated about the future history of the discipline in 1989.

To sum up, these expectations reflected a rather self-confident (and not at all submissive) attitude toward the performance of Eastern Europe in the international market of economic ideas and toward a rather cooperative and frictionless scholarly exchange with the West. The lack of friction meant that what we wanted to come in would arrive and that what actually came in would be what we originally intended to receive. Also, to use the language of political correctness, the economists in the region were portrayed not as handicapped or disabled but as *differently abled* persons who had authentic products to sell in that market. We tacitly assumed that it would be us who decided what to buy. The two economic cultures would complement each other and/or converge; that is, the incoming culture would not eradicate and replace the indigenous one. The best features of both would be combined while the worst ones would be offset. Mutual adjustment would be an organic process; the East would not have to go through a purgatory and would not arrive in a paradise. We were intellectually prepared for cross-fertilization; the knowledge we had accumulated so far was about to burst out like a subterranean river.

From an "externalist" point of view, that is, from the perspective of change in the sociological and political framework of economic sciences, Western-led dissemination would be relatively successful. "Internally", however, that is, in terms of the scholarly contents of the research programs, the imported good of methodological precision via formal models would not suppress local traditions, but create promising blends with some of the Grand Ideas born in Eastern Europe. Because of a considerable improvement in the external conditions of scientific progress, we would witness a new era, (to put it in lofty terms) "the era of internalism", in which party congresses, censored journals, and politically-embedded scholars would not determine the paths of progress any longer. At the same time, the role of peer-reviewed publications and the faculty library (or the faculty club for that matter) would become much more nuanced in shaping scientific evolution.

This era would therefore be a period of creating a better-than-normal situation in economic research in the region. It would be a sort of "business as *un*usual". The quality of economic thought in Belgrade or Bratislava would transcend not only the level of Lima or Cairo, but also hopefully that of Athens and Helsinki. The Eastern European economist would not become an indistinguishable agent of American economic science culture, a scholar of "secondary freshness", to quote Mikhail Bulgakov's witty phrase.

A little help from Cultural Studies

After having raised the "what did we expect?" question, one has no other choice but to ask whether these expectations have materialized during the last ten years. Do we already have the *magnum opus* in the economics of communism? Did East and West really meet in new institutional economics? Has scientific exchange become more equal, etc., etc.? It would be impossible and unfair, I believe, to start answering these questions before this project ends. However, in reading the project papers, I can't help offering the authors a couple of half-baked concepts for recycling or rejection, concepts that might nuance the historical assessment of Westernization in economic sciences in the region. In closing, I will risk illegal border crossing and borrow from the Cultural Studies literature: without accepting its postmodern/postcolonial message.[4] If you say that, under the pretext of borrowing a few concepts from there, I tend to smuggle some of my own assumptions into the analysis, I am afraid you are right.

My notes will concern the actors of transnational exchange, the process of reception, and the results of Westernization.

The cast. First, I advise examining whether the model of a two-person game suggested by the term "Westernization" (the West and the East, or even more roughly, the United States and the East) applies to the international exchange of economic ideas. On the side of the cultural emitter we find alternative "Wests" (Chicago and Cambridge, the World Bank and the ILO, etc.) nearer and farther "Wests" (Freiburg and Chicago), as well as traditional communication channels and contacts (Paris and Bucharest, Stockholm and the Baltic capitals). What if the West that influences us is actually Far East, say a Chinese scholar returning from Berkeley to Beijing, the capital of a communist country (what a shame)? On the receiver's side, there are also a whole series of countries, institutions, groups of scholars, fields of research, etc. who/which may display significantly different patterns of borrowing. I am pretty sure that, despite a growing American impact on university education throughout the region, this project will find interesting differences in receiving economic science culture from the West, differences, for instance, between a paper written by a graduate student at CERGE in Prague on privatization and a talk given by a professor of economics at the Catholic University of Budapest on fair business practices. Actually, both persons in the game, the emitter and the receiver, can originate in one way or another in the region (think of the former Hungarian finance minister, Lajos Bokros, now a World Bank official, giving advice in Poland or Croatia). Owing to the global circulation of scholars and institutions, as well as to the proliferation of joint ventures in research and education, it is increasingly difficult to decide who the Eastern European economist and what exactly an Eastern European economic idea is. In the economic research group of our project, for example, there are three economists whose birthplace, affiliation, and the place and the language in which they publish greatly differ. Though it is a commonplace to say so, we had better rethink the concept of national economic science.

The West supplies packages of competing (or even mutually exclusive) ideas and schools or provides the East with a broad menu of theories to choose from. Moreover, exchange is usually contingent upon mediators/translators who interpret, modify, repackage, or distort the original message. (Think, for example, of Jeffrey Sachs and his ambiguous role in popularizing economic liberalism in the former Eastern Bloc.) To make things even more complicated, the mediator can be a colleague from Eastern Europe (a long-time Harvard professor, a former émigré, or a temporary World Bank official). Or please note, for instance, the emergence of new, European research networks. Does anyone among us have an idea who the intellectual "owner" of the discoveries made by this project will be? Can we regard them as genuine Eastern European discoveries in the history of social sciences? Similarly, as the example of the revival of the Austrian school in the US demonstrates, ideas that once emerged in our vicinity may well return to us through American mediation. Nevertheless, the image of the "Huge American Ruminant" that swallows our inventions, ruminates them, and sends them back to us, is too crude for my taste.

The plot. Second, I would advise closely scrutinizing the very act of scientific reception. The principle that "what is transferred is transformed" may apply even in the absence of mediators. The quality of a borrowed idea may deteriorate (or improve, for that matter) in the mind of the receiver. Or its meaning can change substantially. If you use Pepsi Cola to dilute low-quality rum, a favorite cocktail in Hungarian pubs, the message may turn into its opposite. It will be Pepsi without the Pepsi Feeling. Now, what should we think of those colleagues of ours, former professors of official political economy who have in the meantime converted to the new faith and today teach at a Department of Public Policy, use a standard American textbook (in translation), but do not understand its mathematical apparatus? In general, the borrower can pay lip service to the lender and just simulate the takeover of a certain scientific good, say, by imitating its rhetorical components, by appropriating only a minor part of a large cultural package, or by borrowing various parts in an eclectic manner. (I guess the reception of the rational choice paradigm in our region serves as an example here.) Finally, what we consider a veritable takeover may turn out to be a joint effort (in which the West is nothing more than a catalyst or a junior partner) or a simple coincidence. Insiders could tell dozens of stories about "silent contributions" made by Eastern European economists to research programs initiated in the West, contributions that have not even been registered as parallel or complementary discoveries (if you ask me, the studies of the informal economy are a prime example).

Lessons. These are probably even more complicated than the cast and the plot. An outsider like myself finds by and large two narratives in current Cultural Studies literature. Unfortunately, both offer rather bleak prospects.

1. One of them is rooted in post-colonial discourse and suggests a militant conclusion. With such a gaze, the historian of ideas sees nothing else but unequal exchange, servile imitation, cloning, and "McDonaldization".[5] In our field, Westernization would mean an overall diffusion of American textbook economics (more precisely, of its junk version), a devastating defeat of the old university curricula. The sweeping victory of low-quality reception will in turn prevent the Eastern European economist from becoming a dangerous competitor in the global market of scientific production, while the best brains are drained away from the region. What is this if not the well-known vicious cycle of dependency? – which of course does not exclude the possibility of creating a few high-quality multinational islands (centers of excellence) in the sea of economic scholarship in the region.

2. The other narrative, which is definitely closer to my heart, offers a more skeptical view of "cultural invasion" and a pragmatic/resigned conclusion. Instead of suspecting a forced homogenization of cultures, it focuses on path dependency, resistance, and compromise in the process of reception. (By the way, if you are interested in path dependency in its literal sense, please walk along a dark corridor in any university of the region and look at the nameplates.) Accordingly, Eastern European economic sciences would show clear signs of creolization/hybridization (or glocalization if you please), with partial and provisional defeats and victories. The hybrids, however, may prove to be lasting and include, among a number of consistent and innovative ones, also largely incoherent and definitely frustrating species, in which the worst features of the two scholarly worlds are combined. A widely feared example of the latter would be a combination of copying low-quality and/or distorting high-quality ideas in the course of reception with retaining (in fact in worse shape) our old institutional system of economic sciences.

In the opening sentence of my talk I promised complexity, irony, and praise. I hope I haven't bored you too much with the complicated and often ironical details of Westernization. Have I forgotten about praising the profession? Actually, I haven't. For I cannot imagine a greater compliment in such turbulent times as ours than the one I have been alluding to throughout my presentation: the profession has not collapsed. Moreover, as this project shows, it is interested in its own history. As far as I can see, the final country reports will not read like either obituaries or heroic stories. Just business as usual...

---

1 See J.M. Kovács "Reform Economics: The Classification Gap", in: *Daedalus*, Winter 1990; "From Reformation to Transformation: Limits to Liberalism in Hungarian Economic Thought", in: *Eastern European Politics and Societies*, Winter 1991; "Compassionate Doubts about Reform Economics (Science, Ideology, Politics)", in: J.M. Kovács & M. Tardos (eds.): *Reform and Transformation. Eastern European Economics on the Threshold of Change*, London, Routledge, 1992; "Which Institutionalism? Searching for Paradigms of Transformation in Eastern European Economic Thought", in: Hans-Jürgen Wagener (ed.): *The Political Economy of Transformation*, Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1993; "Planning the Transformation? Notes about the Legacy of the Reform Economists", in: J.M. Kovács (ed.): *Transition to Capitalism? The communist legacy in Eastern Europe*, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick and London, 1994; "Örökség, utánzás, felfedezés. Közgazdasági gondolkodás Magyarországon 1989 után" (Legacy, Imitation, Invention. Economic Thought in Hungary after 1989), in: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, April 1996; "A tékozló fiú sorsa. A kelet-európai közgazdasági gondolkodás (és története) hasznáról" (The Story of the Prodigal Son. Notes about the Value of Economic Thought and Its History in Eastern Europe), in: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, April 1997; "Sound Interventionism? Challenges of the Transformation in Eastern European Economics", in: Martin Bull & Mike Ingham (eds.): *Reform of the Socialist System in Central and Eastern Europe. Progress and Prognosis*, Macmillan 1998; "Praising the Hybrids. Notes on Economic Thought Ten Years After", in: *East European Politics and Societies* 1999/2.

2 In the following, due to the lack of time, I will not make a distinction between the various mechanisms of disseminating economic ideas (the market transaction, the contamination, the communication, the cultural/epistemic community, etc. approaches). Cf. Peter A. Hall *The Political Power of Economic Ideas: Keynesianism across Nations*, Princeton UP, 1989; Vincent Ostrom *The Meaning of Democracy and the Vulnerability of Democracies*, Michigan UP 1997; David C. Colander, Alfred W. Coats (eds.): *The Spread of Economic Ideas*, Cambridge UP, 1993; A. W. Coats (ed.): *The Post-1945 Internationalization of Economics*, Duke University Press, 1997. For comparative purposes, see in particular the following papers in the latter volume: S. Ambirajan *The Professionalization of Economics in India*; Back Choi, Young *The Americanization of Economics in Korea*; Ikeo, Aiko *The Internationalization of Economics in Japan*; P.L. Porta *Italian Economics through the Postwar Years*; M.R. Loureiro *The Professional and Political Impacts of the Internationalization of Economics in Brazil*; J.J. Polak *The Contribution of the International Monetary Fund*; B.A.Vries *The World Bank as an International Player in Economic Analysis*; I. Maes *The Development of Economic Thought at the European Community Institutions*; V. Montecinos *Economists in Political and Policy Elites in Latin America*; A.C. Harberger *Good Economics Comes to Latin America*, 1955-95.

---

3 See Kovacs & Tardos (eds.): *Reform and Transformation. Eastern European Economics on the Threshold of Change*, London, Routledge, 1992; Hans-Jürgen Wagener (ed.): *Economic Thought in Communist and Post-Communist Europe*, Routledge 1998; Kovacs: "Örökség, utánzás, felfedezés. Közgazdasági gondolkodás Magyarországon 1989 után" (Legacy, Imitation, Invention. Economic Thought in Hungary after 1989), in: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, April 1996; Research project: *Three Social Science Disciplines in Central and Eastern Europe*, Collegium Budapest/IZ Sozialwissenschaften, 2001/02.

4 See J.M. Kovacs "Rival Temptations – Passive Resistance. Cultural Globalization in Hungary", in: Peter Berger and Samuel Huntington (eds.): *Many Globalizations*, Oxford University Press, 2002; Arjun Appadurai *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis, 1996; Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash, and Roland Robertson (eds.): *Global Modernities*, London, 1995; Ulf Hannerz *Cultural Complexity*, New York, 1992; Roland Robertson *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, Thousand Oaks, 1994; John Tomlison *Globalization and Culture*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1999.

5 See Fredric Jameson and Masao Miyoshi (eds.): *The Cultures of Globalization*, Duke University Press, Durham, 1999; Serge Latouche *The Westernization of the World*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1996; Robert Phillipson *Linguistic Imperialism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992; George Ritzer *The McDonaldization of Society*, Pine Forge Press, Thousand Oaks, 1993; Immanuel Wallerstein *Geopolitics and Geoculture*, Cambridge University Press, 1997; Rob Wilson and Wimal Dissanayake (eds.): *Global/Local. Cultural Production and the Transnational Imagery*, Duke University Press, Durham, 1996.

Mitko Dimitrov

Economics – Bulgaria

Discussant: Roumen Avramov

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

The spectrum of Marxism-Leninism

In the period 1948-1989, Marxism-Leninism was not only the official but also the only allowed basis and framework for economic science, research, and the training of economics students at Bulgarian institutions of higher education.

In the period 1944-48, along with the changes in political life characterized by the Communist Party's complete takeover of power, Marxist-Leninist ideology was completely imposed in economic science and education. University lecturers whose views differed from the official ideology were dismissed from work – retired or fired.

Marxism-Leninism dominated economic science completely throughout the entire Communist period of the country's history. There were hardly any differences within the paradigm, with two exceptions: the problems of the market and the market character of socialism were posed and discussed at the beginning and at the end of the period.

At the beginning (1948-49), an eminent Bulgarian statistician and financier, Ivan Stefanov, at that time Minister of Finance, was an adherent of the idea of preserving a planned economy, but one open to European markets (Shapkarev, 1999: 10, 38). Soon after, he was fired and sent to work at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, BAS, where he established the Institute of Economics. Several months later, he was sentenced to life imprisonment in a typical Stalinist trial, similar to these in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. Not until the 1960s and 1970s was market socialism discussed again. Then it was argued more broadly and with greater depth (Petrov, 1969; Popov and Miloshersk, 1979) and became part of the common views of Orthodox Marxist-Leninist revisionism, which spread in most Eastern European countries.

The rest of the time, economic science in Bulgaria was settled within the framework of official Marxism-Leninism. What changes there were reflected the common changes in the political system. The period until 1956 was more dogmatic than the next period and was strongly colored by Stalinism. Afterward and especially during the 1970s and 1980s, discussion of improvements to the economic system began, but within the socialist framework. Almost every 5 years, new economic models were proposed to resolve the contradictions of the socialist economic system. The main problems discussed included "owners and managers", "organizational structure change", "extensive vs. intensive growth", and "workers' and directors' motivation". Discussion was actually more a pseudo-scientific argumentation about an imitation of changes than a search for solutions.

In 1989, at the very end of this period, an economic model was introduced that seemed at first sight radically different from Marxism-Leninism. The state was to withdraw from operative enterprise management; organization was to resemble company organization in countries with a market economy; private property, under the name of "citizens' property", was to gain recognition along with state and cooperative property; the establishment of Bulgarian companies abroad was to be stimulated, etc. This model was not introduced as a result of public debates, but was established and imposed from above. As practice in the next several years confirmed, this model turned out to be a very suitable framework to decapitalize state companies and transfer state assets to the possession of representatives of the nomenclatura.

Pre-war traditions

Economic science in Bulgaria developed along with the development and consolidation of the Bulgarian state and matured during the period between the two world wars. In the mid-1930s, totalitarian economic views began to spread; the traditional economic schools reacted critically against this. The pre-war tradition in economic science was discontinued during the period 1944-48, when Marxism-Leninism was imposed as the only possible framework of development of the field of economics.

The two main movements around which the representatives of economic science grouped were, first, the pragmatic, which addressed the problems of developing the national economy and, second, the theoretical, which comprised the Bulgarian representatives of basic theoretic schools of Western European economic theory.

The representatives of the first movement were mainly politicians or business representatives with ambitions in politics. The most eminent were Stefan Stambolov, who as Prime Minister from 1887-94 began Bulgaria's industrial protectionism, and Alexander Stamboliski, Prime Minister from 1919-23, who stressed the development of the farming sector, including the establishment of cooperation.

The main representatives of the second movement were Georgi Danailov (of the school of institutional history and social legislation), Simeon Demostenov (of the subjective school), and Ivan Kinkel (of the theory of the cyclic character of economic development). The most eminent representative of economic science in this period was Oskar Anderson (statistics, finance), one of the most famous Eastern European economists of the 20th century, who worked in Bulgaria for more than two decades. He and other economists, as university professors and researchers, established schools in various fields that played a significant role in the dissemination of their respective theories in Bulgaria. Most Bulgarian economists' contributions in the pre-war period were applied-scientificly oriented.

Probably the strongest school was the school of statistics. Along with Anderson, many statisticians worked in Bulgaria at that time, defending doctoral degrees at the most prestigious European and American universities – Kiril Popov, Prokopi Kiranov, Ivan Stefanov, Anastas Totev, and others. This group laid the foundations for modern statistics education at the institutions of higher education and for studies applying state-of-the-art statistical methods and approaches.

Between the two world wars, Bulgaria had a well-established network of institutions of higher education and economic studies. There were three specialized institutions of higher education in economics – the Balkan Near East Institute of Political Sciences (Balkanski blizkoiztochen institut za politicheski nauki, 1920, Sofia), the High School of Business (Visshe Targovsko Uchilishte, 1921, Varna), and the High School of Business (Visshe Targovsko Uchilishte, 1936, Svishtov). Studies were carried out at the Statistical Institute for Business Studies (Statisticheski Institut za stopanski prouchvania) at Sofia University (1934), the Institute for Farming Business Studies (Institut za zemedelsko-stopanski prouchvania) at the Agrarian Faculty, and elsewhere. The most prestigious scientific journals were *Spisanie na Balgarskoto ikonomichesko druzhestvo* (journal of the Bulgarian Economic Society, 1826-1944) and *Stopanska missal* (Economic Thought, 1929-1938), which was published by the Association of Economics Academicians in Bulgaria.

The impact of Western theories

Throughout the entire socialist period, Western theories had a very limited and indirect impact on the development of economic science in Bulgaria. The translation of books was limited to several old classic authors; access to original editions was limited; and only the field of econometrics applied modern methods and models.

An examination of the bibliographic editions shows that not a single book written by a Western economist was translated in Bulgaria until 1980. During the period 1981-1984, several books by Adam Smith, David Ricardo, and others were published. In the period 1981-89, around a dozen books on management were translated, most of them of a popular, rather than scientific, theoretical nature.

During this period, scholars and scientists could acquaint themselves with modern theories and economic studies by Western authors mainly by means of the controlled access to this literature. The main libraries in Bulgaria – the National Library, the Library of BAS, and others – possessed rich collections of books and journals on economics. For example, during the first decades, the Library of the Institute of Economics of the BAS (Ikonomicheski institut na BAN) bought dozens of books annually and afterward 150-200 per year; at the end of the 1980s, it had more than 4,700 books. During the period 1950-59, it subscribed to 40-50 periodicals; later, 150-190.

Most of this material was statistics or editions from international organizations – the UN, the Economic Commission for Europe, the International Labor Organization, and others. There were relatively few theoretical editions. For example, there were only 3-4 referenced theoretical journals.

Access to Western books and journals was supervised. The books and the journals were divided into two groups. The first group was defined as ideologically dangerous, and access to it was based on permission. Access to the other Western books and journals was based on registration. Not until the 1980s was the greater part of the Western economic literature made openly and freely accessible, in special reading rooms. Here we do not comment on the selection of and access to literature at the research centers of the Academy for Social Sciences and Social Management (Akademia za obshtestveni nauki i sotzialno upravlenie) of the Communist Party, because the supervision there was realized mainly by carefully selecting the people who worked there.

Under conditions of limited and supervised access to Western theories, their impact could be felt only in fields whose relationship to the official ideology was neutral, i.e., economic modeling. In 1962, a “Laboratory on Economic Modeling” was established at the Institute of Economics of the BAS. The training disciplines “Economic Modeling” and “Econometrics” started to be taught in many majors of the economics departments. This enabled modern models and econometric methods to be applied in the analysis of economic reality.

There were two approaches to econometrics. Representatives of the first (Mateev, 1987) thought economic modeling, combined with management computerization, could solve the problem of information insufficiency and establish the conditions to introduce an entire system for the centralized management of the national economy. The representatives of the second group were pragmatically oriented econometricians and used modern models and methods as technical instruments for economic problem solving. Their main interests were in the balance of inter-branch relations, optimization models, prognostic models, operational study, and the massive service theory.

One impact of Western theories was the growing interest in cybernetics and its effects on economic theory and management (Nikolov, 1968). Problems discussed included the economic base of value and the economic systems’ cybernetic management base, but on the whole, this movement had limited impact.

As interest grew in the development of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in the developed countries and of a program to establish SMEs in Bulgaria, the problems of this sector began to be discussed in the mid-1980s. This made it possible to defend the position that SMEs are a vital, necessary constituent of any modern economy and to erode the position that the socialist economy should consist only of big enterprises.

Oppositional activities

The issue of oppositional activities in Bulgaria before 1989 is complex. The Communist Party’s total control over social activity after 1948 made it impossible to publish any opinion of economists with oppositional attitudes. It was forbidden to disseminate foreign-published articles and books by oppositional authors living in the country.

In Bulgaria, views differing from the official ones existed and were discussed. These included the aforementioned discussions of a market socialism and of the opportunities to apply modern mathematical models and analysis methods, but the proponents of all such views presented them as attempts to improve the socialist economic system or to solve technical problems and as having nothing to do with politics. The difference in the views was not related to oppositional activity or the authors' distance from the official paradigm; they were therefore considered under other categories.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

The change of paradigms

Right after the democratic changes in Bulgaria in November 1989, Marxism-Leninism's claim to be the only foundation for economic science was abandoned. Lecturers and researchers in the field of economics very rapidly and facilely adopted democratic values and the market economy. The real transformation of views and the mastering and application of new approaches and scientific instruments has in fact taken a longer time. Unlike in the natural sciences, in economics, all lecturers and researchers had to re-qualify in new, different fields. For econometricians and statisticians, re-qualification involved no huge changes, but even in these fields re-qualification was a necessary condition for successful scientific activity.

The basic ways re-qualification was and still is realized are self-training, participation in Western universities' programs, and joint studies with personnel from both East and West. Most scientists, especially of the young and middle generation, used all three paths to re-qualification in the new teaching and research fields they chose.

Two periods can be clearly differentiated in the process of paradigm change: until 1994-95 and thereafter. The first period was characterized by a massive invasion of translated or rehashed textbooks. Older lecturers and those who did not speak foreign languages, in particular, replaced terms only imitatively, using the "market language" of the overview without really changing the essence of the content. During this period there were almost no defended dissertations in economics and the number of habilitations radically decreased.

The second period as a whole saw a real change of paradigm by means of the scientists' re-qualification. The characteristic phenomena of the first period still exist, but they no longer dominate, and their significance is decreasing.

The change of elites

The change of elites is directly related to scientists' ability to re-qualify themselves and also has clearly expressed age, governmental, and institutional dimensions. The scope of the Bulgarian economic sciences' elite's activities includes the management of economic universities, faculties, departments, and research institutes and centers; scientific councils of these sections; the specialized scientific councils; and the membership of the national accreditation and attestation commissions.

The membership of the appointed bodies changed mainly during the previous period. This change came mainly for natural reasons, but at separate stages this process was speeded by "soft" administratively political measures. The institutes related to the Communist Party were closed down and the opportunity for members of the former Communist Party's leadership to be appointed to university managing positions was forbidden for the period of five years. The rejuvenation of the membership of the aforementioned bodies was encouraged. An accreditation system for institutions was introduced, as was the attestation of lecturers and researchers; this enabled and normalized the process of the natural change of elites.

New institutional structures

Substantial changes were implemented in the institutional structures of economic science in Bulgaria after 1989. These included closing down the party training and research centers, restructuring the other training centers, and establishing new, mainly non-governmental or private universities and research centers. Without being revolutionary, the change at the institutions was great enough to enable the redefining of academic science.

At BAS, the institutes in economic science were restructured entirely. The Institute of International Relations and Socialist Integration was closed down. The Institute of Economics was restructured after the institution was accredited and the employees received attestation. As a result of these measures, the number of economics researchers at BAS was reduced by more than three-quarters.

The institutions of higher education with economics majors also underwent considerable change. The three existing economics universities (in Sofia, Varna, and Svishtov) changed their inner structures and started restructuring their curricula in accordance with the requirements of the newly introduced three-stage educational system of Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctor's degrees. A National Agency for Evaluation and Accreditation (Natzionalna Agentzia za Otzenka I Akreditatzia) was established with the purpose of estimating the extent to which the universities, faculties, departments, and curricula corresponded to the current requirements for higher education. Seven universities established economic faculties. Three new private universities with serious training in economics started teaching students. Four new private colleges specialized in economics education were also founded.

The research institutes that were related to the government underwent great changes. The branch institutes of the individual ministries and of the Planning Committee were discontinued or privatized. An Agency for Analyses and Prognoses was founded; initially, it was affiliated with the Cabinet; for the last five years it has been at the Ministry of Finance. These institutions, as well as the analysis department with research center at the Bulgarian National Bank (BNB), prepare monthly, tri-monthly, semi-annual, and annual papers on the Bulgarian economic situation. These institutions' researchers also publish studies on other significant problems of economic development. Many new non-profit research centers were founded. Dozens of economics centers are registered, but only a few have prevailed and succeeded in finding their own niches in economic studies. These changes have resulted in a new network of research and educational institutions, creating the conditions for conducting pluralistic economic studies.

Rehabilitation, repatriation, new departures

Since there was little clearly stated oppositional activity, the question of rehabilitation for scientists persecuted by the regime was not on the agenda. At the very end of the communist period (1989), four university lecturers, one of them a professor of political economy, protested against the personal regime of Todor Jivkov and thus fell into disgrace. Their rights were re-established immediately after November 1989.

There is no case of famous economics researchers returning from emigration. There have been several cases of favorable cooperation in which Bulgarians worked at Western universities, developed cooperative projects, or collaborated on publications (see e.g. Zloch-Christy, 1996).

The number of economists emigrating from Bulgaria increased over the last decade. These are representatives of the young and middle generations. Some of them have taken good positions at universities and research centers, including posts in international organizations. This has a positive impact, because it establishes the conditions for expanding the geographic scope of and for more profound research on economic problematics related to Bulgaria.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

The revival and adaptation of major pre-war traditions

Considering the time passed and the development of economic theory in the second half of the 20th century, the revival of pre-war traditions in Bulgaria is quite unlikely. Interest is increasing in the theoretical heritage of the pre-war period and in the personal contributions of individuals who played important roles – not only scientists, but also businessmen and politicians who applied a particular economic policy. One such example is the reviving interest in the personality of Stefan Stambolov and in his policy of protecting Bulgarian business development. But most people realize that protectionism is impossible in the contemporary world. This interest provides a basis for a more accurate estimation of persons and events in the history of economic and political theory.

New East-West asymmetries

In the last 12 years, a large step was taken toward integrating Bulgarian economics in world science. Hundreds of joint research and education projects were carried out, dozens of joint scientific conferences were organized, and hundreds of Bulgarian economists presented their scientific reports at international seminars and conferences. Most research workers and lecturers attended short- or long-term specialization training at leading research centers and universities. Many of them know personally and work together with the best specialists in their fields. Many Western European scientists co-publish in foreign editions or in foreign languages with their Bulgarian colleagues.

The specifics of a studied topic, i.e., the transition to market economy, accession to the European Union, specific problems of Southeastern Europe and Bulgaria, often made cooperation a necessary precondition for the successful completion of a project. The transfer of know-how had to be combined with Bulgarian participants' expert knowledge of both national and regional specifics. Gaps in Bulgarian economists' knowledge of theory and methodology remain to be filled, and the great asymmetry in knowledge existing at the beginning of the period must still be gradually overcome.

New approaches

The methodology and methods of research have been completely revamped. This has involved the mastery of new, previously unapplied approaches and the application of familiar methods that were unused either because economic practice did not require them or because social and political conditions ruled out their application.

The transformation of economic science also affected the ratio of quantitative to qualitative approaches. On the whole, quantitative approaches to acquiring new knowledge took greater importance. Empirical research and the induction method have found very broad application. For example, a variety of new methods are applied in the study of enterprises. Case studies are widely applied, including sample-based questionnaire inquiries.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Transition as a major or exclusive object of study

The transition to a market economy had a very strong impact on the nature and scope of economic research after 1989. This is quite obvious, since the whole economy had to be transformed and restructured; the process had started, but the ways, approaches, and outcomes were not clear. The problems to be studied were of common concern to all Eastern European countries, though some of them proved to be particularly severe and stubborn in Bulgaria.

One of the first issues provoking heated discussion was the depth and sequence of reforms: whether there should be a “shock therapy” or a sequence of small, even steps. Decisions on this issue are politically very sensitive. In Bulgaria, these problems were solved very inconsistently. The first 8 years of the transition period saw only a simulation of reforms, and the reluctance to implement fast, thorough reforms in the economy was justified by the need to preserve the living standard of the population. As a result, the Bulgarian economy registered one of the deepest slumps among the Eastern European countries, combined with a total decapitalization of state enterprises and mass impoverishment of the population. Not until 1997 were stabilization on the macroeconomic level and annual economic growth rates of 4-6% achieved.

Another set of debated issues was ownership structures and the process of privatization. In the early stages of transition, the view was widely shared that a market economy can successfully operate under prevailing state ownership and that therefore there was no need to accelerate the privatization of state-owned enterprises. The delay of privatization in Bulgaria was accompanied by the actual refusal of the state to exert control over state enterprises, thus facilitating their decapitalization. Issues to be mentioned in this regard include: enterprise restructuring, including managerial and organizational restructuring; financial recovery; and the bad loans problem.

The social and economic problems of transition are another large set of studied issues. Unemployment and the labor market and the transformation of pension and social insurance systems were widely discussed, as well.

The topics of research changed considerably after 1997. The reasons for this include the implementation of the currency board, which provided the conditions for macroeconomic stability; the privatization of most enterprises; and the start of negotiations for accession to the EU. In this way, some of the debated problems found their solution. On the other hand, answers were also provided by the more successful experience of the Central European countries. As a result, the focus of research, especially after 1999, moved from transition to the market economy to Bulgaria’s accession to the European Union.

The currency board is one of the issues most discussed after 1997. Due to its importance, it is considered both independently and from the viewpoint of the accession process. Actually, the critics of the currency board regularly find reasons to re-start the discussion. Their main arguments are that the currency board reduces the competitiveness of enterprises, increases the trade deficit, and prevents incomes from rising, which could be used as a tool to accelerate economic growth. The opposing arguments of the adherents of the currency board are that macroeconomic stability facilitates the rationalization of enterprises, that the trade deficit does not result from the currency board, but is inherent to all Central European countries, and that Bulgaria has a real opportunity to end the currency board by integrating in the EU and replacing the BG Lev with the Euro. Besides, they argue, payments are balanced and the foreign exchange reserve is increasing, so there is no reason to put the currency board on the agenda.

Various aspects of the accession process are analyzed. The terms of accession with the EU are discussed from the viewpoint of Bulgaria’s readiness to meet the economic membership criteria and the need to improve the economy’s competitiveness. The potential benefits and losses of integration are estimated. Following the crisis in Kosovo and the Stability Pact initiative, the issue of Balkan economic cooperation versus European integration became very current. Fears are often expressed that a greater focus on cooperation within the region, where only Bulgaria and Romania have started integration negotiations, might delay or even substitute for EU membership.

In the past period, researchers’ interests included some other problems as well, such as those of corporate management, SMEs, and the shadow economy. Analysis of corporate management focused on state enterprises’ corporatisation, control system efficiency, the protection of minority shareholders, etc. The problems discussed about SMEs involved sector development, enterprise financing, the identification of target groups for assistance, etc. Interest in the shadow economy focused on measurement, the conditions and factors of its existence, and ways to reduce its scope. Interest is also increasing in corruption, including its measurement, reasons, and factors, the spheres most affected, its impact on the economy, and its relation to the accession process.

The choice of themes

Research themes are selected on both institutional and individual levels. Individual research is often financed externally on a project basis, so the priorities of the financing institutions and research programs play a very important role.

The national academic research institutes determine research priorities, accounting for the priorities of the countries and the potential of their associates. After the start of negotiations for integration, the Institute of Economics at BAS determined the priorities of its research activity.

There are two types of non-governmental research centers: with and without a clearly defined field of research. The first try to carry out projects in the field they feel has the strongest research potential. The second attempt to get involved in numerous projects in various fields. In most of the latter cases, permanent staff is small and the centers rely on attracting outside experts to accomplish the research projects.

The impact of thematic orientations on institutional structures

Changes in the thematic orientation of economic research had a definite impact on both the institutional structure of economic science in Bulgaria and on the internal organizational structure of large research centers.

Non-governmental research centers were created entirely in connection with the new problems of the country's economic development. Terms like the market economy, entrepreneurship development, the study of democracy, liberal strategies, etc. are only a few of the key words in the names of these centers. They clearly indicate the orientation of their research activities.

A large number of institutes in the governmental sector were closed down because their thematic orientation, for instance planning, proved to be inadequate to the new problems. The newly established centers, like the Agency for Economic Analysis and Forecasts, meet the demands of new realities in both the selection of researchers and their thematic orientation.

The restructuring of academic institutes is also determined by the change in research themes. The Institute of International Relations and Socialist Integration was closed down mainly because its former thematic orientation was inadequate. The Institute of Economics was accredited, leading to the determination of new research domains, followed by a fundamental change in the Institute's internal structure.

Private vs. public funding

The change in funding structure is one of the most substantial changes affecting economic science. Generally, funding is insufficient in volume. Its sources are diversified but incomplete in coverage.

Budget funding was sharply reduced not only in absolute values, but also as a share of GDP. Some of the budget funds are directed to project financing through the Scientific Research Fund. The funds are very limited, the share of all social sciences being only 3 percent.

Business has no practical importance as a source of funding for economic science. The grave financial condition of companies and the lack of incentive to fund and sponsor research prevent them from participating in science funding.

International programs are the major source of research project financing. Non-governmental research centers are actually the sole source of funding, while some of the budget-subsidized organizations use them as an important tool for diversifying funding.

5. Public space and academic debates

Debated themes, problems, methods

The problems of academic science and higher education – the organization, restructuring, and financing of science, as well as the relation between studies and education – have been the subject of numerous public discussions.

As a result of these discussions, a new law on higher education was passed and a restructuring of the educational system began. A three-stage educational system was introduced, with Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctor's degrees. A restructuring of the curricula and major content started according to the requirements of this scheme. Efforts were made to improve universities' management and material equipment. A National Agency for Evaluation and Accreditation (NAEA) was established.

During the last 12 years, interest in economic education in Bulgaria has been strong. The number of economics students increased more than tenfold. This enabled the establishment of new faculties and new departments, but most do not have sufficiently good programs or qualified lecturers. The radically increased number of students does not help restructuring, because it means lecturers who have not changed the content of their subjects can deliver lectures. The hope is that NAEA can help eliminate the weaknesses by setting requirements for universities, faculties, institutions, and the major curricula at their accreditation.

The discussions about restructuring academic science led to significant changes. The Agricultural Academy was closed down, while its institutes were transferred to the supervision of the Ministry of Agriculture. At the Bulgarian Academy of Science, the institutes were accredited and the scientists attested, leading to a 20% decrease in the number of institutes and a 40% decrease in the number scientists. The consequences of restructuring were greater in economic science. One of the two institutes was closed down, while the number of scientists decreased to less than a quarter.

The question of the necessity of an Academy with research institutes was discussed very heatedly. Some argued that this was a Soviet type of institution, while science in the developed Western countries is conducted in research centers at universities. Others insisted that the Academy of Sciences in Bulgaria was an institution with long traditions, founded before the country's liberation, and also that many Western countries had national networks of research centers and closing down the institutes of the Academy would reflect unfavorably on the national scientific potential. What everyone agrees on is that science and education should be implemented together.

The solution of this problem of academic economics was to open the Institute of Economics of BAS to students' education. The Institute established a joint business faculty with the University at Veliko Turnovo and trains students on behalf of the university. Apart from this, it organizes joint MBA programs with other universities. This approach makes it possible to solve the problem of combining education with research at one institution.

Principal academic journals

The main academic journals in Bulgaria are the *Ikonomicheska misal* (Economic Thought) and the series *Ikonomicheski izsledvania* (Economic Studies). *Economic Thought* comes out 6 times per year and covers the entire spectrum of economics. It is a national scientific/theoretical journal published by the Institute of Economics of the BAS. The editors of the journal are well-known economists, representatives of the main academic centers in the country. They accept articles with proven scientific merits and contributions to the theory and practice of economics. Each article is read by at least two editors. Many issues of the journal contain materials written by famous foreign authors (both classic and contemporary); some of them are written especially for the journal. All articles have a summary in English.

Economic Thought contains discussion of the problems of economic reform and of business policy in the Bulgarian economy, including the problems of the financial system, privatization, the new industrial policy, the development of priority industries and sectors in the Bulgarian economy, social problems, international economic cooperation, and integration in worldwide economic structures. From 1985 until 1992, the journal came out once a year in Russian and English. From 1992 until now, one issue is published in English; it includes articles by Bulgarian authors on the problems of the Bulgarian economy. The journal has a circulation of 500. 90 copies are disseminated among the largest libraries in the world.

Economic Studies publishes articles with the results of scientific studies on significant and interesting modern economic problems. The articles in this journal are longer – up to 40 pages. The series *Economic Studies* was founded in 1950 as *Izvestia na ikonomicheskia institut* (Announcements of the Economic Institute). In 1985, it took its present name: *Economic Studies*. Since 1998, the series has been published by the Institute of Economics BAS along with the Academy of Economics (Stopanska Akademia – "D.A. Tsenov") and since 2000 also in collaboration with the Economic University (Ikonomicheski Universitet) Varna. The edition has had a national scope since 2001. *Economic Studies* publishes the results of the studies of scientists from the whole country on a broad spectrum of economic problems – economic policy, branch restructuring, regional and ecological policy, financial and fiscal problems of transition, company ownership and behavior, social insurance, foreign economic relations, and European integration. The studies are published after two positive reviews. Each study is accompanied by a summary in English. *Economic Studies* comes out three times yearly with a circulation of 500. Apart from Bulgaria, it is subscribed to by more than 50 large foreign national libraries, international organizations' libraries, and libraries of well-known universities.

Selection of publications in world languages

The opening of the country after 1989 was an exceptionally favorable opportunity to publish works by Bulgarian authors in the world languages, mainly English. This is of particular significance for economics. The representatives of other fields, i.e., the natural and hard sciences, had the opportunity to establish contact with world science as well as to publish in approved scientific editions even before 1989. But this was out of the question for economic science.

The publications are not distributed evenly among the various languages. More than 90% of the journal articles and books published are in English, because of the role that the English language plays as a means of communication in modern science. Many famous journals or publishing houses publish in English even if they are not situated in English-speaking countries. Moreover, the working language of almost all conferences is English and it is customary for conference papers to be published in English, as well.

The geographic dissemination of these publications is very wide. The European countries – Great Britain, France, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Greece, and others – have the largest share. Of countries outside Europe, the USA (Smatrakalev, 1998; *The Economics of Sustainable Agriculture*, 1993), and Japan (Loukanova, 1998; Dimitrov, 1994) publish Bulgarian economists most often. The journals Bulgarian economists most often publish in are: *Europe-Asia Studies* – (e.g. Minassian, 1998; Peev, 1995; Minassian, 1994), *MOCT-MOST* – (e.g. Avramov and Sgard, 1996; Dobrinsky, 1994), *South East Europe Review* – (e.g. Houbenova-Delisivkova, 1998; Mintchev, 1999), *Economic Systems* – (e.g. Peev and Hare, 1995), and *Revue d'etudes comparatives Est-Ouest* – (e.g. Mintchev, 1999). They also publish in the series of *ILO* – (e.g. Beleva and Tzanov, 2001; Tzanov, 1998), the *World Bank* – (e.g. Djankov and Hoekman, 1996), and other international organizations. The eminent publishing houses that publish the most Bulgarian economists are Avebury/Ashgate – (e.g. Petrakos and Totev, 2000; Vladimirova and Rangelova, 1998; Zloch–Christy, 1996; Jones and Miller, 1997; Todorov, 1994), Edward Elgar Publ. – (e.g. Keremidchiev, 1999; Helmenstein, 1998), Kluwer Academic Press – (e.g. Chobanova, 1999; Danchev, 1999), and Dartmouth Publ. Co. – (e.g. Rangelova, 1995; Houbenova-Delisivkova, 1994).

Some English-language publications are also released in Bulgaria. The journal *Economic Thought* publishes one issue yearly in English. The results of many joint research projects and international conferences are also published in English by Bulgarian publishing houses – (e.g. Dimitrov, Andreff, and Csaba, 1999; Tchipev, Backhaus, and Stephen, 1998; Dimitrov, 1997; Angelov et al., 1997; Nenova and Kanavese, 1996; Dimitrov and Todorov, 1996; Avramov and Antonov, 1994).

Most of these publications are related to the problems of transition and Bulgaria's integration in the EU, and they are published in journals that specialize in these themes. Still only a few articles are published in theoretical journals specialized in the separate fields of economic science like *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* – (e.g. Totev and Petrakos, 2000), *Small Business Economics* – (e.g. Rangelova and Bartlett, 1997), and *Economic Analysis* – (e.g. Estrin, Dimitrov, and Richet, 1998). There are two reasons for this. First, the problems of transition and integration are the most topical and studied. Second, the necessity for economists to thoroughly requalify themselves and the short time passed have not permitted the accumulation of knowledge that would facilitate Bulgarian economists in making theoretical contributions.

New manuals, databases

After 1989, access to new economic literature published in Bulgaria and other countries improved considerably.

During the first years, the lack of new literature was combated mainly through purchases and donations. The donations, especially of textbooks, played a significant role, since Bulgaria suffered financial difficulties similar to those of other Eastern European countries. The main university and scientific libraries received donations of textbooks in the basic economic subjects. The most active donors were the SABRE Foundation, the Volkswagen Foundation, and others. Donated were the Edward Elgar Reference Collection with Critical Writings in Economics (15 volumes), the North Holland Manuals in the basic economic fields (15 volumes), and – at the main libraries – other significant series with key works and reference books.

Immediately after 1989, Bulgaria started publishing new economic literature, initially translated and later also original works. New textbooks were written in almost all training subjects, and reference literature was published. An Economic Encyclopedia consisting of 5,000 articles and economic terms is forthcoming (2002).

6. Views on further development

International cooperation

After 1989, economic science in Bulgaria made serious steps toward overcoming its former isolation. Stable relationships were established with the main research centers in the EU countries and in other countries as well. Bulgarian researchers accumulated experience through specialization and participation in many joint international projects and conferences.

Cooperation with the EU member countries is the most dynamic sphere. Before 1989, Bulgaria was among the countries with practically no contacts with Western European science. The start of EU research programs directed at assisting research in the transition economies facilitated cooperation.

The PHARE-ACE Program is one of the programs that has had the strongest effect on cooperation. Bulgarian economists' participation has been quite successful, since the projects they won are comparable to the projects won by Hungary or the Czech Republic, for instance. Programs like COST, TEMPUS (higher education restructuring), NATO economic programs, etc. had an important impact as well. In the framework of international programs, most the active cooperation was established with Germany and the UK. The second most intense contacts are with Greece, France, Belgium, and Holland.

Cooperation with other Eastern European countries is determined by two main factors – the similarity of the problems studied and the opportunities for external funding. This explains why contacts are most intense with countries that are Bulgaria's partners in same international funding programs. Among these, the most intensive cooperation is maintained with the Central European countries, i.e., Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

International programs for funding cooperation in the field of economic research are a good basis for creating research networks. For Bulgaria, multinational cooperation is more important than bilateral cooperation. But given the advanced stage of this process, it continues developing even with bilateral projects.

Most international cooperation is based on projects. It is usually carried out on an informal basis, often accounting for the researchers' institutional affiliation. The experience of the first year after opening 5 Framework Programme for Bulgaria shows that participation mostly takes the form of partnerships in joint research projects. Results achieved on other research programs are good prerequisites for Bulgarian economists to successfully enter the single European research area.

The impact of accession

The accession process affects economic research in several ways. There is an increase in funding. The thematic orientation of programs is changed. Like other accession countries, Bulgaria has access to EU research programs. This opens new financing opportunities, but at the same time presents a challenge to the participants. The priorities of the EU programs are related to EU problems, not to CEE problems, as was the case in the PHARE Program, where CEE researchers had comparative advantages as local experts, which made them competitive in a familiar field of study. Another considerable change imposed by the accession process is the more pragmatic orientation of research. Most accession-assisting funding is directed at investment projects, including infrastructure, increasing the capacity of administration, managers, and entrepreneurs, assistance to agriculture, and regional development. Part of the funding is allocated to research, but with a strong eye to practical application. Various ways the accession process affects economic research will pose new challenges for scientists and research institutes to adjust to these new realities.

The problem of the "brain drain"

As a whole, Bulgarian economic science is not affected by the "brain drain" problem. Compared with other countries or with other fields in Bulgaria, like informatics, the problem is insignificant.

The peaks of the emigration of scientists were in 1991-1992 and 1994-1995, a close correlation with worsening economic and political conditions for work. The total number of economists who have emigrated is estimated at no more than 20. There are a greater number of scientists permanently working at foreign universities, research centers, including international organizations, who have graduated and started their career abroad.

Within certain limits, the "brain drain" has a positive effect on local science. Having Bulgarian scientists abroad creates preconditions for intensifying cooperation with other research centers, for participation in projects, and for the organization of joint conferences and workshops. This is also a prerequisite for an increasing interest in local problems and for broader geographical coverage of research on these problems.

In the future, the "brain drain" is hardly expected to reach a level that might endanger national science. Instead, there are prospects for a more intensive short-term and long-term mobility of Bulgarian economists as a part of the integration in the European research area.

Selected Bibliography

Accelerating Privatization in Bulgaria (1998), Sofia, CED;

Angelov, Ivan et al. (1992-2001): *Bulgarian Economy (Annual Reports from 1992 to 2001),* Sofia, Friedrich Ebert Foundation and IE at BAS;

Annual Reports for the State of the Bulgarian Economy (1991-2000), Sofia, Agency for Economic Analyses and Forecasts (Agentzia za ikonomicheski analizi i prognozi);

Antonov, Ventsislav (1997): "On the Characterization of Economic Structural Change: Adaptivity and the Cyclical Pattern of Industrial Productivity", in: *Ikonomicheska misal* (Economic Thought), No. 5, 13-26;

Avramov, Roumen (2000): *Bulgaria's Economic 20th Century*, Sofia, CLS edition;

Avramov, Roumen and Antonov, Ventsislav (1994): *The Transition,* Sofia, Agency for Economic Analyses and Forecasts (Agentzia za ikonomicheski analizi i prognozi);

Avramov, Roumen and Sgard, J. (1996): "Bulgaria: From Enterprise Indiscipline to Financial Crisis", in: *MOCT-MOST*, 6, No. 4, 71-102;

Baytchinska, Krassimira et al. (eds.) (1998): *The Social Sciences and the Social Change in Bulgaria*, Sofia, Prof. Marin Drinov Publishing House;

Beleva, Iskra (2001): *Employment and Unemployment Policy in Bulgaria*, Sofia, Prof. Marin Drinov Publishing House;

Beleva, Iskra and Tzanov, Vassil (2001): "Labor market flexibility and employment security – Bulgaria", in: *Employment paper*, ILO, No. 30, Geneva;

Chobanova, Rossitsa (1996): "Foreign Direct Investment and Technology Transfer: Overview of Trends", in: *Foreign Direct Investment in Central and Eastern Europe. The Case of Bulgaria*, Rotterdam;

Chobanova, Rossitsa (1999): "Barriers to Innovation in Bulgaria", in: *Technology Transfer: From Invention to Innovation*, Inzelt, A. and Hilton, Jane (eds.), Kluwer Academic Publishers;

Danchev, Aleksi (1999): "Adapting to Climate Change in Bulgaria: An Economic Approach", in: *Environmental Change, Adaptation and Security*, Kluwer Academic Press;

Dimitrov, Alexander (1994): "The Bulgarian Economy in Transition: Growth, Factors and Specific Conditions", in: *V.R.F. Series*, No. 228, 1-93;

Dimitrov, Mitko (ed.) (1997): *State Enterprise Restructuring in Bulgaria, Romania and Albania*, Sofia, Gorex Press;

Dimitrov, Mitko and Todorov, Kiril (eds.) (1996): *Industrial Organization and Entrepreneurship in Transition*, Sofia, Informa Intellect;

Dimitrov, Mitko, Andreff, Wladimir and Csaba, László (eds.) (1999): *Economies in Transition and the Variety of Capitalisms (Features, Changes, Convergence),* Sofia, Gorex Press;

Djankov, Simeon and Hoekman, B. (1996): "Trade Reorientation and Post-Reform Productivity Growth in Bulgarian Enterprises", in: *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, No. 1707;

Dobrinsky, Rumen (1994): "The Problem of Bad Loans and Enterprise Indebtedness in Bulgaria", in: *MOCT-MOST*, No. 4, 37-58;

Estrin, Saul, Dimitrov, Mitko and Richet, Xavier (1998): "State Enterprise Restructuring in Bulgaria, Albania and Romania", in: *Economic Analysis*, 1, No. 3, 239-255;

Ganev, Georgi and Stamenova, Svetlana (2000): *Political and Economic Orientations of the Bulgarians Ten Years After the Beginning of the Systematic Change. Analyses of Survey Results,* Sofia, CEP and GMF;

Helmenstein, Ch. (ed.) (1998): *Capital Markets in Bulgaria: Problems and Approaches to Their Development,* Institute of Advanced Studies, Edward Elgar;

Houbenova-Delisivkova, Tatiana (1994): "Liberalization and Transformation in Bulgaria", in: *Privatization, Liberalization and Destruction: Recreating The Market in Central And Eastern Europe*, Csaba, László (ed.), London, Dartmouth, 217-233;

Houbenova-Delisivkova, Tatiana (ed.) (1996): *Accession of Bulgaria to the European Union*, Sofia, Stoilov;

Jones, D. C. and Miller, J. (eds.) (1997): *The Bulgarian Economy: Lessons from Reform during Early Transition*, London, Ashgate;

Keremidchiev, Spartak (1999): "Privatization and Economic Performance in Central and Eastern Europe", in: *Lessons to be Learnt from Western Europe*, London, Edward Elgar;

Kirova, Alla and Stoyanova, Kapka (1999): "Family Benefits for Children" in: *Bulgaria. National Survey,* Paris, Adecri/ Partex, 39;

Kostov, Ivan and Christov, Lubomir (1981): "A Comparative Research of Economic Growth", in: *Ikonomicheska misal* (Economic Thought), No. 1, 12-25;
Kostov, Ivan (1984): "On the Theory and Methodology of the Quality of Economic Growth", in: *Ikonomicheska misal* (Economic Thought), No. 5, 30-43;
Kunev, Metodi and Savov, Stoyadin (1993): "The High Economic Education", in: *Economy*, No. 10, 26-27;
Loukanova, Pobeda (1998): "Bulgaria – The Painful Beginning of Transition", in: *Kaigai Jijo-Area Studies*, Takushoku University, Tokyo, No. 32, 179-184;
Mateev, Evgeni (1987): *Structure and management of the economic system*, Sofia, Nauka i Izkustvo, 595;
Minassian, Garabed (1994): "The Bulgarian Economy In Transition: Is There Anything Wrong With Macroeconomic Policy?", in: *Europe-Asia Studies*, 46, No. 2, 337-351;
Minassian, Garabed (1998): "The Road to the Economic Disaster in Bulgaria", in: *Europe-Asia Studies*, 50, No. 2, 331-349;
Minassian, Garabed (1999): "Bulgarian Economy Facing XXI Century", in: *Central and Eastern Europe on Its Way to European Union*, *Simulation Studies Based on Macromodels*, Corbis, R. and Welfe, W. (eds.), Peter Lang;
Minassian, Garabed and Totev, Stoyan (1996): "The Bulgarian Economy in Transition. Regional Aftereffects. Possibilities for Structural and Regional Redevelopment", in: *Eastern European Economics*, 49-92;
Minassian, Garabed, Nenova, Mariela and Iotsov, Viktor (1998): *The Currency Board in Bulgaria*, Sofia, Gorex Press;
Mintchev, Vesselin (1999): "Les echanges de biens industriels entre la Bulgarie et l'Union europeene. 1990-1995", in: *Revue d'etudes comparatives Est-Ouest*, 30, No. 4, 123-152;
Mintchev, Vesselin (1999): "The External Migration and External Migration Policy in Bulgaria", in: *South East Europe Review*, 2, No. 3, 123-151;
Nenova, Mariela and Kanavese, Alfredo (1996): "Behavior of the State Enterprises and Inflation", in: *Economic Studies Series, Sofia*, Agency for Economic Analyses and Forecasts;
Nenovsky, Nikolay (1998): *The Demand for Money in the Transforming Economies*, Sofia, Prof. Marin Drinov Publishing House;
Nikolov, Ivan (1968): *Cybernetics and economics*, Sofia, Nauka i Izkustvo;
Peev, Evgeni (1995): "Separation of Ownership and Control in Transition: The Case of Bulgaria", in: *Europe-Asia Studies*, 47, No. 5, 859-875;
Peev, Evgeni and Hare, Paul (1995): "Corporatization and Control in a Transition Economy", in: *Economic Systems*, 19, No. 4, 265-283;
Petkov, Liudmil (1996): "Directions for Development of the Agricultural Economic Science", in: *Ikonomicheska misal* (Economic Thought), No. 4, 31-39;
Petrakos, George and Totev, Stoyan (eds.) (2000): *The Development of the Balkan Region*, London, Ashgate;
Petrov, Georgi (1969): *Market relations and pricing in socialism*, Sofia, Nauka i Izkustvo;
Popov, Nikola and Miloshevski, Angel (1979): *Market relations in socialism*, Sofia, Nauka i Izkustvo;
Rangelova, Rossitsa (1995): "Divergent and Convergent Processes in Integrating Europe: Where Are the Balkans?" in: *Integration and Disintegration in European Economies*, Dallago, B. and Pegoretti, G. (eds.), Dartmouth, 63-180;
Rangelova, Rossitsa (1996): "Small Firms and New Technologies: The Case of Bulgaria", in: *New Technology-Based Firms in the 1990s*, Oakey, Ray (ed.), London, Paul Chapman Publishing;
Rangelova, Rossitsa and Bartlett, Will (1997): "Small Firms and Economic Transformation in Bulgaria", in: *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 9, 319-333;
Shapkarev, Petar et al. (1999): "One hundred years from the birth of academician Ivan Stefanov (1899-1999)", Sofia, Prof. Marin Drinov Publishing House;
Smatrakalev, George (1996): "Investment Policy and the Privatization in Bulgaria", in: *Privatization and Foreign Investments in Eastern Europe*, Westport, Praeger Publishers;
Smatrakalev, George (1998): "Tax Avoidance and Tax – Walking on the Edge", in: *The Ethics of Tax Evasion*, McGee, Robert (ed.), New York, Dumont Institute;
SMEs and competitiveness (2001): Sofia, CED;
Stanchev, Krassen (2000): *Creating Competitive Clusters*, IME-OSF, OSF Publishing House;
Tchipev, Plamen, Backhaus, Jürgen and Stephen, Frank H. (1998): *Mass Privatization Schemes in Central and Eastern European Countries. Implication on Corporate Governance*, Sofia, Gorex Press;
The Economics of Sustainable Agriculture. American and Bulgarian Perspectives (1993), Washington, D.C., National Academy Press;

Todorov, Kiril (1993): "Strategien für ein wettbewerbsgerechtes Verhalten der öffentlichen Industrieunternehmen Bulgariens auf dem Weg von der Plan- zur Marktwirtschaft", in: *Verwaltung und Fortbildung*, No. 3, 161-177;

Todorov, Kiril (1994): "Between Ikar's Flight and Heron's Boat: "The Choice of the Bulgarian Entrepreneur"", in: *SMEs: Internationalization, Networks and Strategy*, Veciana, Jose (ed.), Avebury, 525-540;

Todorov, Kiril (1996): "The dynamic entrepreneurs: The locomotives of the East European economies in transition", in: *Significance and Survival of SMEs in a Different Business Environment* Pleitner, H.J. (ed.), Swiss Research Institute of Small Business and Entrepreneurship at the University of St. Gallen, 585-595;

Totev, Stoyan and Petrakos, George (2000): "Economic Structure and Change in the Balkan Region: Implication for Integration, Transition and Economic Cooperation", in: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24, No. 1, 95-113;

Trifonov, Trifon (2000): "In Search for the Lost Influence of the Pre-War Bulgarian Neoclassicism on the Contemporary Corporate Economics", in: *Ikonomicheska misal* (Economic Thought), No. 2, 3-25;

Tzanov, Vassil (1996): "The Economic Science and the Study of the Social Problems", in: Economic Thought, No. 4, 24-30;

Tzanov, Vassil (1998): "For a Negotiated Alternative to Tax-Based Incomes Policy in Bulgaria" in: *Paying the Price. The Wage Crisis in Central and Eastern Europe*, Vaughan-Whitehead, Daniel (ed.), ILO studies series, Macmillan Press, 101-139;

Vladimirova, Katia and Rangelova, Rossitsa (1998): "Institutions and Regional Labor Markets in Bulgaria", in: *Institutions and Regional Labor Markets in Europe, Perspectives on Europe. Contemporary Interdisciplinary Research*, van der Laan, L. and Ruesga, S. M. (eds.), Ashgate;

Zloch–Christy, Iliana (ed.) (1996): *Bulgaria in a time of change (Economic and Political Dimensions)*, London, Avebury.

Table 1 Main research orientations of the Institute of Economics at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Strategy for Economic Development	Strategic and middle term aspects of Bulgarian economic development.
	Industrial and agricultural policy. Structural development of the sectors.
	Analyzing changes in the influence of economic development factors.
	Taxation and financial problems.
	Harmonization and measurement of macroeconomic indicators in accordance with the standards of the European Union.
	Development of a national science policy and strategy in with those of the European Union.
Competitive-ness of the Bulgarian Economy	Factors defining international competitiveness.
	Evaluation of competitiveness, determination of priority economic spheres, defining economic policy – national and sector studies.
	Economic problems of national innovation system – investment strategy and policy.
	Evaluation of the firms' development status, possibilities for effective progress.
	Firm policy for innovation and competitiveness. Creation of a new firm's market strategies responding to the European market's requirements.
Restructuring of Enterprises	Attracting foreign investments.
	The new role of the SMEs in the economic development.
	Establishment of economic institutional structures and synchronizing their functions with those of the European Union.
	Development of corporate governance in accordance with European Union criteria.
	Public monopolies – their role, development, problems, and perspectives.
Social Policy and Employ-ment	Strategies and policies to improve the living standard and overcome poverty and unemployment.
	New strategies, policies, and practices concerning risk groups. Minorities – social and economic dimensions.
	Labor market adjustments – national and regional level.
	Development and adaptation of the labor market concerning people's free movement. Migration processes.
	Investing in the human factor – education and training. The role of the state and of social partnership.
Agriculture and Agricul-tural Policy	Creation of a modern and competitive agricultural sector.
	Creation of market and technological infrastructure for the agricultural sector.
	Achieving the European standards of production of and trade in agricultural goods.
	Harmonization of agricultural policy and institutions to the Common Agricultural Policy of the European Union.
Regional Policy and the Environ-ment	Sustainable development of agriculture and rural regions.
	Development of regional and structural policy in accordance with the European Union's system. Divergence/convergence problems.
	Cross-border cooperation in the process of integration in European structures.
	Southeastern European countries' integration and cooperation processes.
	Harmonization of ecological norms and legislation with those of the European Union.
EU Integra-tion and Foreign Economic Policy	Development of convergence criteria and Bulgaria's opportunities to respond to them.
	Evaluation of the progress of the associated countries.
	Financial and currencies problems of EU accession.
	Bulgaria's trade relations with the countries of the European Union – effectiveness and stability.
	Harmonization of Bulgaria's trade regime with those of the European Union.

František Turnovec

Economics - Czech Republic[1]

Discussant: Jiří Havel

Introduction

Until the 1989 "Velvet Revolution", Czechoslovakia was one of the most conservative socialist countries. Even compared to other former socialist countries in Central Europe, the Czechoslovak economy was exceptional in etatization, with only 4% of GDP produced by the private sector (and 10% produced by the cooperative sector) in 1989. After a promising discussion in the 1960s and then the defeat of the Prague Spring at the end of the 1960s, no significant experiments with the liberalization of the economic and political system were implemented in the 1970s and 1980s, and the rigid party nomenclature running the country had to live with the legacy of post-1968 normalization, when the more liberal segments of the Communist Party and of the Czechoslovak political and intellectual establishment were eliminated, expelled from the country, or isolated and persecuted for two long decades.

Together with the rapid change in the political system and a radical economic reform, the transformation of the system of education and of research infrastructure started at the very beginning of the 1990s. In this paper, I try to trace interfaces between the past and present of Czech economic thought and identify its place in world economic thought.

The first section of this paper describes the roots: the birth of Czech economic science in the second half of the 19th century, a short period of development of economic thought in independent Czechoslovakia after World War I, the first period of discontinuity and of domination by dogmatic Stalinism at the end of the 1940s and the beginning of the 1950s, the attempts to cultivate the economic doctrine of socialism in the 1960s, the second period of discontinuity in the 1970s, and a painful effort to overcome taboos in the 1980s. In the second section, I try to characterize the turning point in the development of the discipline at the beginning of the 1990s and changes in the infrastructure of economic research and education after 1993. The third section deals with continuity and discontinuity in the theoretical and methodological orientation of economic science in the country. The fourth section tries to evaluate the major theoretical and practical efforts of Czech economists in the first half of the 1990s, when the economic transition was designed. In the fifth section, I try to provide empirical evidence of the performance of Czech economists on the domestic and international academic market. The last section briefly outlines the prospects for development in the 21st century. Some factual information is provided in tables.

An objective evaluation of events by somebody who was a part of them is almost impossible. The final evaluation of the past requires more temporal distance from the events. My view may be incomplete and some names and events may be missing. Nevertheless, I hope this text sufficiently illustrates two conclusions: first, a totalitarian regime can cut intellectuals and the academic community off from contacts with the international community and for some time even suppress some segments of research and the free exchange of ideas; but no political suppression can fully eliminate independent economic thinking (as was convincingly demonstrated in Havel et al., 1997); and second, in the emerging democratic environment of the 1990s, the Czech economic community succeeded in a relatively short time in returning to world academic standards.[1]

1 The author is grateful to Jiří Havel, Jiří Hlaváček, Milan Sojka, and Vera Sparschuh for valuable comments and information and to Dana Kyselková for assistance in data processing. The results of the author's research project "Microeconomics of education and evaluation of research performance at universities", supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic, were used.

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

The development of Czech economic thought[2] passed through several stages in different political environments.

The first stage began in the middle of the 19th century and finished in the years of the First World War. Its dominant feature was the integration of the Czech Lands in a specific economic and cultural entity within the Austro-Hungarian monarchy when political power was centralized in Habsburg Vienna and when the interests of the Czech nation were promoted only slowly and with difficulties. It was represented by three personalities and by three different approaches.[3]

František Ladislav Chleborád (1839-1911) wrote the first Czech book on economics, in which he explained the major theoretical concepts of his time, *Soustava národního hospodářství politického* (The System of Political National Economy), 1869. Chleborád declared himself a follower of the American economist Henry Charles Carey and the German economist Friedrich List. In his book, he categorically rejected socialism, both Marxist and utopian. His social and moral enthusiasm for the economic advance of the Czech nation outweighed specialized theoretical reflections.

The pure scientific approach was realized by *Josef Kaisl* (1854-1901). The interests of this highly erudite economist linked practical political activity (he was a Czech deputy of the Austrian Imperial Council in Vienna and for a short time a Minister of Finance in the Austrian government) with his profession of lecturer at Prague University. His main works were *Národní hospodářství* (National Economy), 1883, and *Finanční věda* (Financial Science), 1892 (also published in German and Italian). He concentrated on the sphere of financial science and was a prominent follower of the historical school in economic science.

The Austrian subjective school of the theory of marginal utility found its prominent interpreter in Albín Bráf (1851-1912). Albín Bráf pursued mainly his university activities at the Faculty of Law of Charles University in Prague (although he was for a short time a Minister of Agriculture in the Austrian government). His complete university lectures, texts, and essays were published in *Spisy Albína Bráfa* (The Writings of Albín Bráf), 1913-1915. He drew his knowledge mainly from the German theorists Adolf Wagner and Albert Schäffle and from Carl Menger of the Austrian school. He was critical of the English classics and categorically rejected Karl Marx. His methodology was eclectic and he simply accepted the knowledge he regarded as useful. On the other hand, he could be regarded as a Nestor and the teacher of the whole generation of Czech economists who were active later in independent Czechoslovakia.

The birth of Czech economic thought in the second half of the 19th century did not bring a significant original contribution to economic science; it was rather a mediation of the achievements of world economic thought to the Czech elites under conditions of emerging capitalism in the Czech Lands.[4]

The founding of Czechoslovakia in 1918 created a new situation favorable to the further development of Czech economic thought. This came at a time when new concepts appeared in world economic thought that also strongly influenced Czech economists – the culmination of the Austrian school in the works of Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich August Hayek, and Joseph Schumpeter; the shift in financial theory in the works of Irving Fisher and Gustav Cassel; and the new revolutionary approaches of John Maynard Keynes and others. On the other hand, economic science responded to the economic events of the 1920s and 1930s and was influenced by the practical problems that arose in the new situation of creating a national economy.

It is possible to trace three major tendencies in the development of Czech economic thought in pre-war Czechoslovakia (Vencovský, 1997).

The neo-liberal stream was represented by Alois Rašín (1867-1923), an outstanding politician and the first Minister of Finance of independent Czechoslovakia. His currency reform and fiscal policy were based on the principles of a balanced state budget with minimal budget incomes and expenditures and the gold standard in monetary policy. Rašín presented his theoretical views in the book *Národní hospodářství* (National Economy), 1922.

The second tendency was represented by Karel Engliš (1880-1961), probably the most original Czech economic thinker. He was the author of what is called the teleological theory of national economy (from Greek "telos", aim or goal), based on the idea that the cognition and understanding of all economic processes should reflect the purposefulness, intentionality, and choice of aims and means in the behavior of all economic subjects. He described his system of economics in many works, the main extensive monograph being *Soustava národního hospodářství* (The System of National Economy), 1938 (also published in English). Engliš's scientific activity was associated with the newly established Masaryk University in Brno (he was one of its founders in 1919 and its first Rector) and Charles University in Prague (he was its last Rector before the communist takeover in 1948). He was also an outstanding practitioner, a Minister of Finance in six pre-war governments, and Governor of the National Czechoslovak Bank from 1934-1939.

The third tendency, the Keynesian stream in Czech economic thought, was represented by Josef Macek (1887-1972). In response to the Great Depression, Macek said that the state budget should be one of the most important means to start production and should substitute for the shortage of private investments. His major and comprehensive work is *Sociální ekonomika* (Social Economics), published in five volumes from 1945-1948.

In November 1939, the Czech universities were closed by the occupying power and scientific life was fully paralyzed. After a short period from 1945-1948, the leading Czech economists (Karel Engliš and Josef Macek as the most prominent, and many others) were persecuted and any economic ideas that contradicted the Stalinist version of political economy were abolished. Economic science was completely subordinated to the political needs of the new ruling establishment. A period of discontinuity started in 1948.

No theoretical Marxist economics were represented in Czech economic thought in the pre-communist period. The only Marxist who taught economics at a university (the Higher School for Political and Social Sciences) before February 1948 was Pavel Hrubý (1914-1994), but he fell victim to the purges not much later than his "bourgeois" colleagues. The main textbooks used at the time were Stalin's "Questions in Leninism", "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR", and translations of Russian textbooks.

There were a few qualified economists who supported the Communist Party policy. Most of them belonged to the pre-war leftists who emigrated to the United Kingdom and came back to Czechoslovakia in 1945: Ludvík Frejka (1904-1952), Josef Goldmann (1912-1984), Bedřich Levčík (1915), and Eugen Löbl (1907-1987). All of them were persecuted in the 1950s (Frejka was executed in 1952, Löbl arrested and condemned to a life sentence in 1952, Levčík dismissed from his position, and Goldmann arrested in 1952). Because of a shortage of qualified and loyal economists among reliable Communist Party members, all the decisive posts in economic education and research had been filled by mostly young people educated in accordance with Stalinist doctrine, many of them at universities in the Soviet Union. But most of them later became prominent critics of dogmatic Stalinist doctrine.

The development of economic discussion in Czechoslovakia was always closely related to the political atmosphere in the USSR. The first round of debate started after Stalin's death in the mid-1950s. The reform proposals at that time did not exceed the framework of traditional Marxist political economy, focusing on "improving" the planning mechanisms. The second round of discussion started at the beginning of the 1960s, partly as a response to an economic crisis in Czechoslovakia in the early 1960s, partly under the influence of discussions in the USSR (Nemchinov, Novozhilov, Kantorovic, Aganbegjan, Liberman, Lisickin) and in other Soviet bloc countries. The general framework of the discussion can be characterized as a "market socialism doctrine" with some elements of Keynesianism; attacking the state property form; and preferring a collective or group property design for the socialist economy, decentralization, and the employment of economic interests in a "socialist market mechanism". The most prominent economist of this period was Ota Šik (1919), whose book *Ekonomika, zájmy, politika* (Economics, Interests, Politics), 1962, opened critical discussions about the official economic doctrine. Josef

Goldmann, Karel Kouba, Otakar Turek, Bohumil Komenda, Čestmír Kožušník, Bedřich Levčík, and Jiří Kosta were among the active participants in the intense discussions in 1965-1968.[5] While the leading reformers did not reject Marxist doctrine in principle, discussion in the second half of the 1960s also brought a new line of thought based on mainstream Western economics, represented by the first studies by Václav Klaus (1941) and Lubomír Mlčoch (1944).

It was an irony of history that most of the reform proposals generated by this discussion were fully implemented (for a restricted time) only after the defeat of the Prague Spring in 1968; and their measurable positive effects contributed to the stabilization of the Gustáv Husák normalization regime at the beginning of the 1970s.

While the period of the 1970s and 1980s can be considered the second discontinuity interval in the development of Czech economic thought (the first being 1948-1956), the development is not fully comparable to the 1950s.

Most of the actors in the 1960s discussions had to leave the universities and research institutions; some of them, anticipating the purges, left the country. Blacklists efficiently prevented most reform economists from publishing at all. Economics was in a special situation, along with other social sciences and the humanities. Considered ideologically sensitive, the social sciences were under the direct supervision of the Communist Party nomenclature (for example, each district committee of the Communist Party in districts with institutions of higher education had a position of Secretary for Higher Education). Scientific and pedagogical degrees were subject to approval by district party committees. In the 1970s and 1980s, an obligatory part of dissertations in economics was a chapter of "Criticism of bourgeois economic theories", in which specific denunciation of home "revisionists" was greatly appreciated. There was a numerus clausus on non-Party members' employment as university teachers, and an academic career was almost unthinkable without Communist Party affiliation. International contacts and mobility were practically restricted to COMECON and less-developed countries and were strictly controlled by the Party nomenclature and secret police. Thus, the situation of economic science in communist Czechoslovakia was even more complicated than in some other CEE countries (especially than in the more liberal Hungary and Poland). Restrictions and repressions segmented the Czech economic community into three different groups: official, unofficial, and exile (Havel et al., 1997).

Promotion rules strongly influenced the research orientation of the "official" segment of Czechoslovak economists. The main research topics, supported by inefficient state research programs, were "Automation of management systems of socialist enterprises" and "Tools and instruments of the centrally planned economy", at best trying to square the circle to find a combination of centralization and decentralization in economic behavior that could be acceptable to Party nomenclature, at worst merely repeating ideological fictions about "the best of all possible worlds" represented by "real socialism". Even loyal or "factual" studies without any critical components but containing facts and figures throwing light on negative trends in the economy were not recommended for publication, but classified as "secret" or "for internal use only" (e.g. macroeconomic studies by Josef Goldmann). The only place where standard modern economics was taught alongside the political economy of socialism was the Graduate School of the Institute of Economics of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (Havel et al., 1997). The group of younger economists related mostly to the Institute of Economics (Miroslav Toms, Mojmír Hájek, Antonín Kotulan, Václav Klaus, Karel Dyba, Jan Klacek, and Tomáš Ježek) contributed to the enriching of economic knowledge by applying analytical apparatus from the neoclassical theoretical background. Even some titles of Western economic classics were translated into the Czech language (Arrow, Allen); a more significant part of the relevant literature came to the country in Russian translations; and Western journals and books were generally accessible in scientific libraries.

It is interesting that the only part of economic science that never lost contact with international development was operations research and econometrics: on the one hand, highly formalized mathematical methodology was beyond the understanding of ideological supervisors; on the other hand, the philosophy of "the theory of the optimal functioning of socialist economy", imported from Moscow, was successfully used by mathematically oriented economists to justify some intellectually interesting programs of quantitative economic research. This orientation allowed faculties of mathematics and physics to involve themselves informally in economic research and education; and some economic disciplines were presented as part of mathematics (mathematical programming, game theory, econometrics). The Laboratory of Mathematical Economics (Ekonomicko-matematická laboratoř) of the Institute of Economics, headed in the 1970s and 1980s by Jiří Bouška; the Department of Econometrics at the School of Economics in Prague (VŠE), headed by Bedřich Korda until 1968, when he left the country, then for several years by Jaromír Walter and from the 1970s until now by Miroslav Maňas; and the Department of Informatics and Operations Research at the Faculty of Mathematics and Physics of the Charles University in Prague headed by Milan Vlach were the centers of professional, although rather formal, economic thinking within the limits set by difficult circumstances.[6] *Ekonomicko-matematický obzor* (Econometric Review), a professional journal with a relatively liberal editorial policy and edited by the Laboratory of Mathematical Economics, provided opportunities for mathematically oriented economists to publish in both Czech and English.[7] Among the authors were also foreign mathematically oriented economists. The Czech and Slovak authors (Jiří Beck, Jiří Bouška, Martin Černý, Tomáš Gál, Dagmar Glückaufová, Jaroslav Habr, Milan Hamala, Michal Chobot, Miroslav Maňas, Vladimír Mlynarovič, Radomír Očenášek, Jozef Sojka, Vladimír Strnad, Antonín Ter-Manuelianc, František Turnovec, Jaromír Vepřek, Milan Vlach, Jaromír Walter, Karel Zimmermann, and others) belonged to the community of economists and mathematicians who did not participate in apologetic exercises of official mainstream economic doctrine.

Some of the economists who had to leave their profession continued their work as a hobby (Vladimír Kadlec, Karel Kouba, Otakar Turek, Zdislav Šulc, Rudolf Zukal, and others). Their papers were usually distributed in small numbers of copies as "samizdat", and some of them were published under the names of those who were not blacklisted. There was always some interface between "official" and "unofficial" economists.[8]

There were practically no contacts between the Czech economists active in Czechoslovakia (both official and unofficial) and Czech economists who left the country in two waves after 1948 and 1968. The most prominent person in exile was undoubtedly Ota Šik, who received a professorship at St. Gallen University in Switzerland. Bedřich Levčík became the Director of the Vienna Institute of International Economic Comparisons (WIIW), where Petr Havlík and Zdenek Lukáš are still working. Jiří Skolka became famous for his activity in the International Input-Output Association and in the prestigious Austrian Institute for Economic Research (WIFO) . Jiří Sláma and Pavel Štiller worked at the Osteuropa-Institut in Munich, Jiří Kosta was a professor at J. W. Goethe University in Frankfurt and Tomáš Gál at the Fernuniversität in Hagen t. The University of Reading in the UK hosted Luděk Rychetník; Jan Krejčí stayed at the University of Lancaster; Pavel Pelikán taught at the University of Stockholm; and Bedřich Korda instructed at the University of Edmonton. The largest group of economists were active at universities in the US: Josef Brada, Jaroslav Hejda, Lubomír Hejl, Karel Kánský, Jan Kmenta, Oldřich Kýn, George Staller, Jan Svejnar, Alex Wynnyczuk, Milan Zelený, and others. Among economists in exile, Jaroslav Vaněk gained particular prominence in theoretical economics (the concept of the labor-managed economy) and Jan Kmenta as one of the leading econometricians.

Ideological control was somewhat reduced in the 1980s. The crisis of the regime was reflected by a more pragmatic segment of the political establishment.[9] Attempts at minor reforms opened some space for economic discussion. A new research institute was established within the Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Forecasting, headed by Valtr Komárek. The Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences, later with the Institute of Forecasting, gathered together an interesting collection of researchers representing a rather broad spectrum of neo-liberal, neo-Keynesian, and unorthodox Marxist currents (Oldřich Dědek, Karel Dyba, Vladimír Dlouhý, Mojmír Hájek, Jiří

Hlaváček, Miroslav Hrnčíř, Kamil Janáček, Tomáš Ježek, Václav Klaus, Antonín Kotulán, Karel Kouba, Václav Kupka, Jan Mládek, Lubomír Mlčoch, Alena Nešporová, Miroslav Ransdorf, Vladimír Rudlovčák, Miroslav Toms, Dušan Tříska, Otakar Turek, Luděk Urban, Růžena Vintrová, and Jaroslav Vostatek).[10] The major research output was the long-term prognosis to 2010, reflecting negative macroeconomic trends and advocating deeper economic and political reforms. In another more radical study, "Dominant features of the new socio-economic development program for Czechoslovakia", finished before November 1989, reform principles of mixed ownership, transformation of enterprises into joint stock companies, forms of self-management with other options of privatization, price liberalization, foreign trade liberalization, and the creation of money and capital markets were considered. But it was too late to reform the regime, which lost any ability to adjust to a new development.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

From a mid- and long-term perspective, the main problem was to introduce new topics and re-establish academic standards in economic research. A characteristic feature of economic research in Czechoslovakia was isolation from world standards in presenting research output. With a few exceptions, related mostly to operations research and econometrics, the publication of results was oriented exclusively toward Czech (and Slovak) economic journals publishing in the Czech language and subject to undemanding reviewing procedures.[11] To overcome isolation and the undemanding provincial character of economic science, it was necessary to enter the international academic market.

The main positive development of the 1980s was the transfer and "translation" of world economic thought into the Czech environment. Only after 1989 did any restrictions and forms of censorship disappear – for the first time since 1948. A full range of topics and methodological approaches were opened to Czech economists.[12]

Czech economists from exile played a very important role in the revival of economics as a science. They were helpful in providing the missing economic literature, in ambitious projects of reforms of economic education and research, in offering scholarships and fellowships for Czech students, teachers, and researchers, and in fund-raising to support development projects in research and education. Jan Svejnar played an exceptional role, initiating a new graduate (PhD) school in theoretical and applied economics at Charles University (the Center for Economic Research and Graduate Education) and participating for eight years as the Director of the newly established Economics Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic in restructuring economic research. Josef Brada, Zdeněk Drábek, Karel Kánský, Jan Kmenta, Jiří Kosta, Oldřich Kýn, Luděk Urban, Luděk Rychetník, Jiří Sláma, George Staller, Milan Zelený and others actively participated in academic and advisory activities.

The new elite appeared from one day to the next, comprising several groups of researchers related to the reform activities of the Economics Institute and the Institute of Forecasting in the 1980s, together with some university economists, "underground" economists, exile economists, and even some more enlightened members of the old establishment (Marie Bohatá, Vladimír Benáček, Oldřich Dědek, Vladimír Dlouhý, Karel Dyba, Jan Hanousek, Jiří Havel, Jiří Hlaváček, Vratislav Izák, Kamil Janáček, Tomáš Ježek, Jiří Jonáš, Jan Klacek, Václav Klaus, Valtr Komárek, Antonín Kotulán, Karel Kouba, Michal Mejstřík, Pavel Mertlík, Jan Mládek, Lubomír Mlčoch, Milan Sojka, Miroslav Ševčík, Zdislav Šulc, Jan Švejnar, Josef Tošovský, Dušan Tříska, Zdeněk Tůma, Luděk Urban, Josef Zieleniec, Milan Žák, and others). Some of them (Marie Bohatá, Oldřich Dědek, Vladimír Dlouhý, Karel Dyba, Jiří Havel, Kamil Janáček, Jiří Jonáš, Jan Klacek, Václav Klaus, Valtr Komárek, Pavel Mertlík, Jan Mládek, Zdeněk Tůma, and Josef Zieleniec) left academic economics and economic research during the 1990s to join government offices, the banking sector, or international institutions, mostly forever. In the mid-1990s the first PhD students (Radim Boháček, Michaela Erbenová, Tomáš Holub, Evžen Kočenda, Josef Kotrba, René

Levínský, Lubomír Lízal, Daniel Münich, Daniel Narwa, Ondřej Schneider, Miroslav Singer, Peter Silárszky, Karel Soukeník, Kresimir Zigic, and others) graduated from the American and European universities and the prestigious Czech PhD schools, and the formation of the elite in economics returned to a standard process of gaining a reputation through professional research activities, rather than by active participation in the political process or on the merits of a past "reform" reputation.

Institutional reform of the system of higher education, including economic education, was the priority agenda after 1989. The easier part of reform was re-establishing the basic attributes of university education: academic freedom and university self-administration, legally guaranteed by the new act on higher education approved in 1990. This act allowed the creation of new regional universities and new faculties at existing universities and eliminated the Prague and Bratislava Schools of Economics' monopoly on economic education.

A new, 1998 act on higher education transformed the state universities into public institutions, and private institutions of higher education with state accreditation were allowed.[13] High demand for economists increased the number of students dramatically.

The more difficult part of the reform – the restructuring of study curricula – required more time, but significant changes here are observable. New prestigious programs appeared: one example of a very successful initiative to transform economic education is the Center for Economic Research and Graduate Education (CERGE) of Charles University, an international PhD program in theoretical and applied economics initiated in 1991 by the American economist of Czech origin, Jan Svejnar, with the support of Charles University in Prague, Pittsburgh University, USAID, and European Union programs.[14] A new Bachelor's and Master's program was developed at the Institute of Economic Studies of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague, with a high proportion of courses taught in English (about 30%) and intensive international exchange of students.[15]

The original idea of reforming research institutions – to return research fully to the universities – failed for various subjective reasons: the Academy of Sciences survived, although in reduced and more democratic form. The change significantly reduced the infrastructure of economic research.[16] The Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences was dissolved in 1993, and the new Economics Institute was established (under the leadership of Jan Svejnar) on a rather different design: it now remains more a department of economics on the model of a good American university, accenting researchers' individual projects that end in publications in prestigious journals and that increase their individual market value. There are no continuous monitoring of the Czech economy, high-quality prognostic activities, independent reflection on economic policies, or alternative strategies for the country's economic development. As a significant contribution to the economic community, the new Economics Institute has an excellent library, organizes meetings with interesting foreign professors, and supports the PhD program CERGE.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

The main tendencies in economic thinking with the roots in the past established themselves after 1989.

The most influential during the first half of the 1990s were neo-liberal theories (Vladimír Dlouhý, Tomáš Ježek, Václav Klaus, Dušan Tříska), which significantly influenced the economic transformation project. They reflected the main orientation of the radical reform supporters during the discussions at the end of the 1980s and the (at least rhetorical) political affinity with Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher. Historical tradition links this stream to the legacy of Karel Engliš.

Neo-Keynesian approaches (Vratislav Izák, Jan Klacek, Pavel Mertlík, Milan Sojka) became more visible in later stages of economic transition, reflecting problems with implementing neo-liberal ideas in the transformation process. Politically, these approaches are close to the Social-Democratic orientation. Historical tradition links this stream to Josef Macek.

We can speak also of post-Marxist economic thinking (Jiří Dolejš, Miroslav Ransdorf and other people related to the Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia), having some historical links to Miroslav Toms' efforts in the 1970s and 1980s.

Most economists can be considered "mainstreamers", not raising hot ideological questions and pragmatically dealing with "technical" problems of economic mechanism, e.g. financial economics (Michal Mejstřík), international trade (Vladimír Benáček), and economic integration (Luděk Urban, František Turnovec). As a specific discipline studying the transformation of the socialist economy into the standard market economy, the economics of transition combines many partial approaches and empirical studies (Jan Svejnar).

New topics with no pre-war traditions were also introduced in economic education and research after 1989, such as institutional economics (Lubomír Mlčoch), constitutional economics (Karel Kouba), industrial organization (Kresimir Zigic), and public choice (František Turnovec).

Quantitative disciplines have a traditional position in economic research and education. The shift from operations research to theoretical and applied econometrics can be observed (Jan Hanousek, Jan Ámos Víšek). Operations research and theoretical and applied game theory survived in a somewhat reduced form (Miroslav Maňas, Jaroslav Ramík, Karel Zimmermann). Most of the former operations researchers converted relatively smoothly to microeconomics or joined the analytical and executive divisions in banking sector.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Economic research at the beginning of the 1990s faced several difficult problems. The demand for new concepts to implement rapid transition from the centrally planned economy to a standard market economy led to rather chaotic discussions, lacking traditional academic attributes, on the steps to be taken in transformation. In a sense, this is understandable: the state had enormous power and responsibility for unprecedented economic reforms. There was no time for deep analyses and careful evaluation of options. Part of the economic community became directly involved in everyday politics in high governmental offices and in the parliaments. The invasion of outside economic advisors of various ranks and qualities was part of the game and supported the impression that a straightforward interpretation of simple neoclassical diagrams was a "scientific way" of solving economic problems.

Immediately after November 1989, the dispute over radical systemic economic reforms took priority on the agenda in the Czech economic community. Two basic scenarios were discussed. Reformers of the 1960s, whose views and ideas since then had developed in a more market-oriented direction, dominated one group of economists, headed by František Vlasák, at that time the Deputy Prime Minister of the Czech Republic. The second team, headed by Václav Klaus, at that time the Minister of Finance of Federal Czechoslovakia, and also represented by Tomáš Ježek and Dušan Tříska, had a clear neo-liberal background. Both teams agreed on the first steps: rapid macroeconomic stabilization, price liberalization, foreign trade liberalization, and a rapid switch to convertible currency. The significant differences appeared in proposals for further steps. While Vlasák's team advocated a de-etatization of state-owned companies and their restructuring, to be followed later by the process of privatization on the basis of individual projects, the Klaus people brought into the discussion a program of large-scale privatization from the very beginning (with the project of a voucher privatization game as a significant element), with later restructuring mediated by the capital market. Timing and the role of government were also points of disagreement between the two teams.

The transformation scenario adopted by the Federal Parliament of Czechoslovakia in 1990 included elements of both concepts, with a preference given to a fast, large-scale privatization at the start of the reforms.

The objective of this paper is not to evaluate the Czech economic transformation,[17] but rather to observe the impact of the hectic development of economic discussions and implementation of their results at the beginning of the 1990s on the development of Czech economic thought. The transformation dispute had its roots in the past, in reform attempts in the 1960s, in the frustrating experience of the 1970s, and in the slowly developing discussions of the 1980s. But in the opinion of the author, its influence on the development of economic science in Czech society was not very fruitful. Under the surface of seeming economic dispute, one of the characteristic features of the forty years of post-war Czech economic thought appeared again: the ideologization of economics, elements of fundamentalism substituting for careful economic analysis, apologetic elements, and the invasion of political interests pretending to be economic truths.

To support research and development, the Parliament of the Czech Republic established in 1993 the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic (GACR) as an independent institution whose task was to promote progress across the whole range of scientific and technological development in the Czech Republic. The function of the GACR is to provide, on the basis of public competition, financial support for research and development projects submitted by individuals and organizations. The basic funding is provided by the state budget (the Agency has a separate chapter in the state budget). The Parliament elects the GACR's supervisory board. Projects can be submitted in five areas; economics is included in the area of human and social sciences. The total annual budget of the GACR is about 1 billion Czech crowns (about 300 million US dollars). The average support for one project in economics is about 1.3 mil. Czech crowns (40,000 US dollars), usually over three years. The rejection rate is about 70%. Every year, the Agency supports 45 to 60 projects in economics.

Support for fundamental research is also provided by the Grant Agency of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, which is open to public competition (i.e. not only to projects submitted by the institutes and employees of the Academy).

There are closed research support schemes at individual institutions, e.g. the Grant Agency of the Charles University, which supports only projects submitted by employees and students of the Charles University.

Smaller individual projects are supported by Hlavka Foundation, a private institution focused on research in economics, but in general the culture of private funding of research activities has not developed yet in the Czech Republic.

5. Public space and academic debates

Professional journals played an important role in economic debates before and after 1989:

Politická ekonomie (Political Economy) was founded in 1952, was published by the Institute of Economics of Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences as a monthly from 1952-1991, and has been published by the School of Economics in Prague as a bimonthly since 1992. Papers are published mostly in the Czech and Slovak languages and occasionally also in English. It is the only Czech economic journal covering the fundamental economic research documented in Social Science Citation Index and EconLit Index.

Prague Economic Papers was founded in 1992; it is published by the Prague School of Economics as a quarterly and focuses on economic theory and economic policy. It is monitored by EconLit Index. Papers are published exclusively in English. Before 1992, it was published twice a year under the title Czechoslovak Economic Papers.

Finance a úvěr (Finance and Credit) was founded in 1951, was published by the Ministry of Finance until 1996, and has been published bimonthly by the Faculty of Social Sciences of Charles University in Prague in cooperation with the Czech National Bank and the Ministry of Finance since 1997. It focuses on financial economics and is monitored by the Social Science Citation Index and EconLit Index. Papers are published in the Czech and Slovak languages.

Ekonomicko-matematický obzor (Econometric Review) was founded in 1965, was published as a quarterly by the Institute of Economics of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences until 1991, and was monitored by Science Citation Index. In 1992, it merged with *Politická ekonomie*. It focused on mathematical economics and operations research. Papers were published mostly in Czech and Slovak, but with the possibility to publish also in English, Russian, German, and French.

Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Oeconomica is published twice a year by Charles University in Prague. Papers are in Czech and English and focus on fundamental research in economics.

Acta Oeconomica Pragensia is published by the Prague School of Economics. Papers are in Czech and English and focus on general economics.

In 1992, shortly before the division of Czechoslovakia, a successful new project for a truly international journal was launched: the *Central European Journal of Operations Research*. Founded in 1992 under the title *Czechoslovak Journal for Operations Research* (its first editor was František Turnovec) as a professional journal of Czech and Slovak Operations Research Society, it was published by the Bratislava School of Economics; since 1994, as the *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, in cooperation by the Czech, Slovak, and Austrian Societies for Operations Research; and since 2000 quarterly by Physica-Verlag under the title *Central European Journal of Operations Research*. It is monitored by EconLit, JEL on CD, Mathematical Reviews Database, Social Science Research Network, Statistical Theory and Methods Abstracts, and International Abstracts in Operations Research. Papers are published exclusively in English.

Space for academic debate is provided by the Czech Economic Society (headed by Jan Frait from 2001 on), which organizes regular seminars and conferences (the first conference of the Czech Economic Society with international participation took place in 2000; the second is planned for 2002). Smaller specialized societies, like the Czech Society for Operations Research and the Czech Econometric Society, participate in international activities.

The data on the publication activities of the Czech economic community provided in Tables 1-5 illustrate the process of the internationalization of Czech economic research. We use the data from the database of the Government Committee for Research (GCR), whose ambition is to collect information about all publications by Czech researchers (not only economists). Under the classification used by the Committee, there are two branches of economic science: General Economics (GE) and Applied Statistics and Operations Research (ASOR). The data on journal publications, chapters in books, and book monographs in these two branches for the years 1993-2000 were retrieved from this database.[18] Only papers in journals having ISSN registration and chapters in books and book monographs having ISBN registration were considered. All publications were subdivided by the publishers: of all publications, papers in journals listed in the *Journal of Economic Literature* (JEL) database and book chapters and book monographs followed by JEL and Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) were retrieved (classified publications). Within each group, an additional classification was the publisher's location: classified journals published in the Czech Republic and classified journals published in the West;[19] classified books published by prestigious Czech academic publishers and books published by "Western" publishers.[20] Another classification used was the language of publication: publications in English, in other world languages, and in Czech and Slovak.

While the GCR database may be incomplete,[21] using the time series provides some general characteristics of the development in the field.

In Tables 1, 2, and 3, we provide information (time series 1993-2000) on the types of publications (ISSN journals; ISBN chapters and monographs), separated by GE and ASOR. In Table 4 we summarize the results; in Table 5 we provide relative indicators. One can observe a general tendency to publish in English and not only a quantitative growth in the number of publications (culminating in 1998, reflecting the post-privatization debate), but also the growth of publications in non-Czech journals and publishing houses.[22]

6. Views on further development

International support and cooperation contributed significantly to restructuring Czech economic research and education. The USAID agency (together with the University of Pittsburgh) helpfully supported the development of postgraduate education at CERGE at Charles University. There were two major vehicles of assistance within the Phare Programme of the Commission of the European Communities: Action for Cooperation in Economics (ACE) Programme and Tempus Programme. The ACE Programme in particular appeared to be a very efficient vehicle of establishing long-term international links in research activities and of promoting international academic standards.

Entering the 21st century, economic science and education in the Czech Republic have recovered from diseases of the totalitarian period and provincialism and are prepared to compete on the European academic market.

---

1 Writing this paper, I benefited from the outstanding comprehensive study by Havel, Klacek, Kosta, and Šulc (1997), the guidebook on the history, problems, failures, and efforts of the Czech economic community during the difficult years of 1945-1990.

2 By Czech economic thought, I mean the ideas of the people who declared themselves to be related to Czech society. Such outstanding personalities as Carl Menger (who studied several months in Prague), Friedrich von Wieser (who was a teacher at the German part of the Charles University in Prague), Eugen von Böhm-Bawerk (who was born in Brno), and Joseph Schumpeter (born in Moravia) had territorial relations to the Czech Lands (Bohemia and Moravia).

3 In this part of the paper, I use the evaluation of František Vencovský, 1997.

4 Apart from Chleborád, Kaizl, and Bráf, the partial approaches dealing with selected subjects of economic theory prevailed. This includes the critical analysis of Marxism in the work of Tomáš G. Masaryk (1850-1937), the first President of Czechoslovakia, Sociální otázka (The Social Question), 1898.

5 Together with Ota Šik, Josef Goldmann was the most famous Czech economist abroad. During the Second World War, he worked with Michał Kalecki in London. Shortly after the war, he played a major role in designing the successful two-year plan of post-war reconstruction; he was arrested and sentenced in the 1950s and rehabilitated in the 1960s, and then he joined the Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences in Prague, where he educated a group of younger economists (Havel, 2002).

6 Bedřich Korda, Jaroslav Habr, and Jaromír Walter are credited with introducing modern economic methodology of operations research and econometrics into Czech economic education and research in the second half of the 1950s.

7 Published quarterly from 1965 until 1991, editors Jiří Bouška (1965-1970), Jaromír Vepřek (1971-1990), and Jiří Hlaváček (1990-1991).

8 For an interesting piece of evidence about the "unofficial" segment of economic science and its interface with the "official" one, see (Šulc, 2000).

9 It is interesting that, in the 1980s, some elements of the new thinking had support from Lubomír Štrougal, Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia from 1970 until 1988 and a member of the top Communist Party establishment.

10 The most prominent economist from this group was Miroslav Toms (1944-1988), a gifted Marxist economist who was trying to bridge the gap between Marxism and modern economic theory.

11 As far as I know, only one Czech economist residing and working in the Czech Republic published in a top international economic journal before 1990: Miroslav Maňas, in *Econometrica* (1972).

12 Some monographs and textbooks by top Western economists were available even before 1989, e.g. the first Czech translation of Samuelson's popular textbook was available as internal material of the Economic Institute of the Academy of Sciences at the end of the 1960s, the Czech translation of Arrow's famous book *Social Choice and Individual Values* was published in 1971, translations of R. G. D. Allen's books were published in the 1970s (Mathematical Economics in 1971 and Macroeconomic Theory in 1975), J. Robinson's *Exercises in Economic Analysis* were published in 1975, and some of the basic (especially methodological) texts were available in Russian translation; but the systematic effort to remedy the deficit in world economic literature available in the Czech language started immediately at the beginning of the 1990s (a new translation of Paul Samuelson and William Nordhaus' textbook, basic texts by Gary Becker, Milton Friedman, Friedrich von Hayek, János Kornai, John Rawls, Joseph Stiglitz, Hal Varian, and others).

13 In 1989, only six faculties were accredited for economic education; in 2000, it was eighteen faculties at public universities and nine at private institutions of higher education (see tables).

14 For more about this initiative, see (Darvas, 1997, and Turnovec, 1997).

[15] About 30 students from almost all European Union member states come each year to spend one or two semesters at the Institute in the SOCRATES and ERASMUS programs.

[16] At the end of the 1990s, there were three economic research institutes in the structure of the Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Economics (Ekonomický ústav), and the Institute of Forecasting (Prognostický ústav) in Prague, along with the Social-Economic Institute (Ústav sociálně-ekonomický) in Ústí nad Labem; in 1992, the Academy of Sciences decided to abolish these three institutes and establish instead one new Economics Institute (Národohospodářský ústav) in Prague. Other "non-academic" institutions of economic research also disappeared during the 1990s: the Central Institute of National Economic Research (Ústřední ústav národohospodářského výzkumu), the Research Institute of the Ministry of Finance (Výzkumný ústav financí), the Institute of Economic Policy (Institut hospodářské politiky) VŠE, the Institute of Economic Sciences (Institut ekonomických věd) at Charles University, and the Economic Institute (Institut ekonomie) of the Czech National Bank. The country had about one thousand economic researchers twelve years ago; now it has only several dozens (Havel, 2002).

[17] An extensive discussion of the topic in Czech and world economic publications is greatly influenced by the personal role of the authors in the whole process and the necessary distance in time is lacking.

[18] The GCR and the central database of publications were not introduced until 1993, after the division of Czechoslovakia and the establishment of the Czech Republic.

[19] Three Czech economic journals are included in international databases: Politická ekonomie (Political Economy), Finance a úvěr (Finance and Credit), and Prague Economic Papers. By "West", we mean EU countries, the USA, and Japan.

[20] Only two Czech classified publishers were considered: The Academia Press, the publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic; and The Karolinum Press, the publishing house of the Charles University in Prague.

[21] The system of updating the database is not perfect, the motivation for researchers to keep their records complete is weak, and some publications related to quantitative economics might be included under mathematical branches of the database; there is also some time lag in recording new publications.

[22] The papers of Czech economists appeared in top international journals, such as *American Economic Review*, *European Economic Review*, *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, *European Journal of Political Economy*, *Economics of Transition*, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, *European Journal of Finance*, *European Journal of Operational Research*, *Applied Financial Economics*, *Journal of European Integration*, *Central European Journal for Operations Research*, etc.

References

České vzdělání a Evropa (Czech Education and Europe) (1999), Prague, Sdružení pro vzdělávací politiku;

Darvas, Peter (1997): "Institutional Innovations in Higher Education in Central Europe: An Agenda for Research, Exchange and Cooperation", in: *Europe of Universities*, Jensen, J. (ed.), ISES Discussion Papers No. 3, Budapest, 84-100;

Havel, Jiří (2002): *Czech Economists after Velvet Revolution*, Manuscript;

Havel, Jiří, Klacek, Jan, Kosta, Jiří and Šulc, Zdislav (1998): "Economics and System Change in Czechoslovakia 1945-1992", in: *Economic Thought in Communist and Post-Communist Europe*, Wagener, Hans-Jürgen (ed.), London and New York, Routledge;

Hendrichová, J. (ed.) (1999): Lidské zdroje v České republice 1999 (Human Resources in the Czech Republic 1999), Prague, Ústav pro informace ve vzdělávání & Národní vzdělávací fond;

Jensen, Jody (ed.) (1997): *Europe of Universities*, ISES Discussion Papers No. 3, Budapest;

Klíčové údaje o školství v Evropské unii (Key Data on Education in the European Union), Ústav pro informace ve vzdělávání, Prague, 1998;

Mlčoch, Lubomír, Sojka, Milan and Machonin, Pavel (2000): *Economic and Social Changes in Czech Society after 1989*, Prague, Charles University in Prague, The Karolinum Press;

Statistická ročenka školství 1998/1999 (Statistical Yearbook of Education 1998/1999) (1999), Prague, Ústav pro informace ve vzdělávání;

Statistická ročenka školství 1998, Soubor ekonomických ukazatel (Statistical Yearbook of Education 1998, Economic Indicators) (1999), Prague, Ústav pro informace ve vzdělávání;

Šulc, Zdislav (2000): *Psáno inkognito. Doba v zrcadle samizdatu 1968-1989* (Written Inkognito. An Era in the Mirror of Samizdat 1968-1989), Prague, Institute for Contemporary History of Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic;

Turnovec, František (1997): "Implementing Top International Standards in the Central European Systems of Education", in: *Europe of Universities*, Jensen, J. (ed.), ISES Discussion Papers No. 3, 52-56;
Urban, Luděk (2002): "Testimony of Economic Thought Under Normalization", in: *Economic Papers*, Vol. 11, No. 1, Prague, 87-89;
Večerník, Jiří and Matějů, Petr (eds.) (2000): *Ten Years of Rebuilding Capitalism, Czech Society after 1998*, Prague, Academia;
Vencovský, František (1997): *Dějiny českého ekonomického myšlení do roku 1948* (A History of Czech Economic Thought Up to 1948), Brno, Masarykova univerzita.

Table 1 Publications: Papers in ISSN Journals

General Economics								
	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Total	98	193	248	334	600	915	459	450
CZ Politicka ekonomie	7	23	30	14	25	38	23	23
CZ – Prague Economic Papers	-	2	8	4	11	14	11	4
CZ – Finance a Uver	10	19	22	12	14	23	13	11
Western journals	5	1	1	-	1	17	25	15
Published in English	2	18	28	49	170	88	86	37
Published in other foreign languages	3	-	2	2	2	23	1	8
Applied Statistics and Operations Research								
Chapters in books, whole database	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Total	21	41	43	75	73	180	135	67
CZ Politicka ekonomie	1	6	1	3	-	6	6	4
Prague Economic Papers	1	-	-	3	-	-	1	1
Finance a Uver	3	-	2	-	-	2	-	-
Western journals	2	1	-	-	3	36	42	6
Published in English	3	11	23	26	39	98	93	36
Published in other foreign languages	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	1

Table 2 Publications: Chapters in ISBN Books

General Economics								
Chapters in books, whole database	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Total	-	-	-	6	14	27	99	141
CZ Karolinum	-	-	-	-	-	4	1	2
Academia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Western publishers	-	-	-	-	-	3	12	7
Published in English	-	-	-	4	-	22	16	24
Published in other foreign languages	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	14
Applied Statistics and Operations Research								
Chapters in books, whole database	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Total	-	-	-	-	2	13	13	25
CZ Karolinum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Academia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Western publishers	-	-	-	-	-	11	1	3
Published in English	-	-	-	-	-	9	2	11
Published in other foreign languages	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-

Table 3 Publications: ISBN Book Monographs

General Economics								
Books (monographs), whole database	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Total	15	39	28	44	114	94	40	65
CZ Karolinum	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	1
Academia	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
Western publishers	4	2	4	2	1	3	2	-
Published in English	-	3	5	1	17	7	1	2
Published in other foreign languages	4	1	-	1	-	1	1	-
Applied Statistics and Operations Research								
Books (monographs), whole database	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Total	-	6	1	7	8	9	9	10
CZ Karolinum	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
Academia	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Western publishers	-	-	-	1	-	2	2	-
Published in English	-	-	-	1	-	5	5	-
Published in other foreign languages	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 4 Publications: Summary of Absolute Indicators

	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	00	total	% of total
Papers in ISSN journals	119	234	291	409	673	1095	594	517	3932	100
Including										
JEL database journals	29	52	63	36	54	136	121	60	551	14.01
Non-Czech JEL journals	7	2	1	0	4	53	67	21	155	3.94
In English	5	29	51	75	209	186	179	73	807	20.52
Chapters in books				6	16	40	112	166	340	100
Including										
JEL database publishers						18	13	10	41	12.06
Non-Czech JEL Publishers						14	13	10	37	10.88
In English				4		31	18	35	88	25.88
Book monographs	15	45	29	51	122	103	49	75	489	100
Including										
JEL database publishers	4	2	4	3	10	6	4	1	34	6.95
Non-Czech JEL publishers	4	2	4	3	1	5	4		23	4.70
Published in English		3	5	2	17	12	6	2	47	9.61

Table 5 Publications: Summary of Relative Indicators

	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	00	total
All publications	134	279	320	466	811	1238	755	758	4761
Including									
Classified publications	33	54	67	39	64	160	138	71	626
Non-Czech publishers	11	4	5	3	5	72	84	31	215
In English	5	32	56	81	226	229	203	110	942
% of classified publications	24.63	19.35	20.94	8.37	7.89	12.92	18.28	9.37	13.15
Including									
% of non-Czech publishers	8.21	1.43	1.56	0.64	0.62	5.82	11.13	4.09	4.52
% of publications in English	3.73	11.47	17.50	17.38	27.87	18.50	26.89	14.51	19.79
Yearly performance,% of the total 93-00	2.81	5.86	6.72	9.79	17.03	26.00	15.86	15.92	100

Tiia Püss

Economics – Estonia

Discussant: Alari Purju

Introduction

The foundations of the current national organization of research and development in Estonia were laid during the reform of science and higher education that started in 1990. The objective of the reform was to use organizational measures to promote the competitiveness of Estonian science in the open world. These included: legislation regulating research and development activities; the arrangement of the financing system for research and the network of research institutions; and the reconciliation of research trends with the changes in the national economy and social sphere and with the needs and possibilities of the state. Special attention was focused on making cooperation between research institutions and universities more effective and on integrating research institutions with universities.

In 1990, the Estonian Science Council was established as a strategic counselor of the government on issues of research and development; three national foundations were also founded to mediate the funding of research and development. In 1993, the Estonian Science Council was reorganized as the Research and Development Council, with the Prime Minister presiding. In 1994, the Parliament passed the Law on the Organization of Research and, on March 26, 1997, its amended version – the Organization of Research and Development Act, which fixed the new structure, the fundamentals of organization and financing, and state supervision of the research and development system. This Act also stipulated the reorganization of the Estonian Academy of Sciences (Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia) and changed the institutes of the Academy into independent research institutions, which from 1996-1998 were mostly integrated in universities. The Act was specified and amended on three occasions (Dec. 10, 1998; Jan. 21, 1999; March 14, 2001).

Economic research is practiced mainly in 4 academic institutions:

- The Estonian Institute of Economics at Tallinn Technical University (Tallinna Tehnikaülikooli Eesti Majanduse Instituut) (the former Institute of Economics of the Estonian Academy of Sciences) (EIE – TTU);
- The Faculty of Economics and Business Administration of the University of Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli Majandusteaduskond) (FEBA – UT);
- The Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences of the Estonian Agricultural University (Eesti Pőllumajandusülikooli Majandus- ja Sotsiaalteaduskond) (FESS - EAU);
- The Faculty of Economics and Business Administration of Tallinn Technical University (Tallinna Tehnikaülikooli Majandusteaduskond) (FEBA – TTU).

This study covers the activities of all these institutions and the situation and changes in economics in Estonia in the transition period of 1990-2000. Apart from these institutions, the Bank of Estonia (Eesti Pank) and all commercial banks, as well as various private consultation firms, have established macro-economic analysis departments, but this report does not discuss their activity.

Institutional participation in and contributions to economic research in the former Soviet Union until the year 1990 were variable, because universities' first priority was education and they almost completely lacked institutions engaged in research. Teaching professors and postgraduate students, as a rule, were engaged in research. The Institute of Economics of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences was fully oriented toward research and was the leading economic research center in Estonia, in terms of both the number of researchers and the volume and quality of research. Since teachers at public universities also did research before 1990, e.g. in preparing for their academic degrees and in supervising students, all public universities also continued research after 1990. The new research funding system (research grants) and opportunities to participate in international research projects also contributed to this. The numerous private schools of higher education do not as a rule conduct research and are therefore not discussed in this report.

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation and change of elites since 1990

The *Estonian Institute of Economics at Tallinn Technical University* is the legal successor to the Institute of Economics of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, which was founded in 1947. In connection with the reorganization of science in the Republic of Estonia, in 1995 the Institute was renamed the Estonian Institute of Economics in the domain of the Estonian Ministry of Education and, in December 1997, the Estonian Institute of Economics at TTU.

According to the statutes, the Estonian Institute of Economics at TTU is a research and development institution at Tallinn Technical University that performs independent tasks, and has its own statutes, balance, budget, bank accounts, and seal. The Institute is an autonomous academic research and development institution whose task is to promote economics through fundamental and applied research. The Estonian Institute of Economics has had the leading role in conducting and coordinating economic research in Estonia over time. In the 1960s, the Institute was the first economic research center in Estonia to use mathematical methods in economic research. This period is remembered as the beginning of research dealing with the prognostication of Estonian national economic development, as well as for introducing input-output tables on the national economy.

In 1980, the Estonian branch of the Central Institute of Mathematical Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences was merged with the Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences, which expanded the range of subjects connected with the prognostication of economic development.

The Institute of Economics of the Estonian Academy of Sciences was a center training research personnel in Estonia. Until 1990, it had a special council awarding doctoral degrees in two specialties: "Economics of the national economy, planning and organization of management" and "Implementation of mathematical methods in economic research". Since the reorganization of science in the newly independent Estonia, the research personnel have been trained at the respective faculties of universities.

The Institute underwent major changes in the first years of restored independence, when a number of researchers went into politics or to work for government institutions. For example, a new scientific research center – the macroeconomic research department – was set up at the Bank of Estonia on the basis of one research group of the Institute. These changes resulted in a dramatic decrease in personnel and changes in the Institute's research subjects.

At the beginning of 1991, in connection with the tasks ensuing from the transition to a market economy, the subjects of research of the Institute of Economics were changed and the structure improved. The composition of the Institute was as follows:

- a department of macroeconomics,
- a department of the main branches of the economy,
- a department of economic and administrative reform,
- a department of natural resources and environmental economics.

Fast changes in the economy and the need to rapidly adjust economic research trends to demand led to major structural changes. In 1994, the Research Council of the Institute resolved to take up work without any structural units. Considering the needs of particular research projects, working groups were to be formed to work through problems and conduct this particular research. Starting in 1998, all finance of research has been subject-based, and research groups have been formed accordingly.

In the years 1995-1997, the Estonian Institute of Economics had the following research groups investigating the following major research areas:

- the social development and social policy group (social development and social policy in Estonia in the period of transition);

- the economic integration group (adaptation of the Estonian economy to European integration processes);
- the institutional changes group (formation of market mechanisms and institutions);
- the economics of natural and energy resources group (economic problems in the use of local natural resources and the development of the fuel-energy complex).

Two research groups were formed to pursue two principal areas of research approved for the Institute for the years 1998-2000:

- the natural and energy resource economics group (socio-economic evaluation of the Estonian natural resource potential and the use of energy resources: theory and application options);
- the economic theory and institutional development group (the theory and practice of harmonizing the social and market economy institutions in Estonia's accession to the European Union).

Today, the Estonian Institute of Economics has 24 employees, 15 of them research personnel.

The independent *Faculty of Economics of the University of Tartu* started operation on January 1, 1938 (Krinal, 1999: 39). In the post-war Soviet Union, the prevailing idea was that the administration of the economy was mere technical work implementing the Communist Party's strategic directives. This ideology was especially damaging to academic economic education and research. The liquidation of the faculty of economics after the war also threw away the advantages of continuous development of economics at the UT. Instruction in economics was not re-established at the UT until 1954, and even then only on a very small scale and in conjunction with the Faculty of Law. In the second half of the 1960s, proceeding from this extremely unfavorable starting position, people still managed to induce the UT's faculty of economics to provide higher academic education and develop research on the level required of a university. All the opportunities offered at that time were made use of. The specialty of economic cybernetics (mathematical economics) was introduced in 1967, and a *curriculum* was adopted whose orientation and content met the requirements for a classical university education in economics. In 1968, the independent Faculty of Economics was re-established.

Following the changes in the political and economic situation in the second half of the 1980s, the need to reform economic education and research soon became evident, and there was also a chance to do it. In 1987, the staff started revising curricula and updating the content of disciplines taught at the Faculty of Economics. Anticipating new prospects for opening and developing the Estonian economy, the specialty of international economics was introduced at the UT's Faculty of Economics two years later. Shaping the new content and form of core study was the first result that involved the whole faculty after the curriculum of the faculty of economics was revised and adjusted to conform to new requirements. Those admitted in 1991 to the faculty of economics for bachelor's, master's, and doctorate studies already started their studies on the basis of new curricula.

By the beginning of 1992, based on the results of several years of discussions, a scheme for majoring in economics in the higher stage of bachelor's studies was developed. Accordingly, preparatory work (preparing study materials in the necessary subjects) for particular fields of specialization started, and in September 1993, the actual implementation of the higher stage of the curriculum for bachelor's studies began. It is the only university in Estonia that provides every student with an opportunity to major in two narrower specialties in the framework of the curriculum. Together with the revised curricula, a new system for master's and doctorate study was also introduced at the Faculty of Economics. Here too, from the very beginning, the aim has been to treat both macroeconomic and microeconomic matters within one specialty of Economics, with the possibility to major either in economics or business administration. At first, master's and doctor's degrees in economics were awarded, but in accordance with the Statues of Scientific Degrees of the University of Tartu approved in 1994, the names of degrees are in Latin: *magister artium* and *doctor philosophia*, respectively. From 1995 on, graduates of core study have also been awarded a scientific degree of *baccalaureus artium*.

A greater change in curricula took place in 1995 (Report, 2000). When it turned out in 1994 that subjects of economics (as opposed to business administration) were not sufficiently popular within a unified specialty of Economics, thus endangering the development of economics, the Faculty decided to apply the classic German model. Since Autumn 1995, the university has offered a bachelor's degree in two separate majors in economics and business economics. Also in 1995, the Faculty of Economics added courses of study leading to a diploma or master's degree in business administration with an applied orientation.

The Faculty of Economics and Business Administration consists of three institutes:

- the Institute of Management and Marketing,
- the Institute of Finance and Accounting, and
- the Institute of Economics.

The staff of the FEBA UT includes 72 people, 42 of whom are engaged in teaching and 6 in research.

The history of the founding of the *Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences of the Estonian Agricultural University* (FESS – EAU) goes as far back as 1951, when the Estonian Agricultural Academy was founded (Self, 2000). From the first year, the Department of Agricultural Economics and Organization was founded to teach economic subjects to the students of all agricultural specialties. All present institutes and the faculty itself grew from this first department. As the teaching load grew and a deeper specialization within the framework of one existing department developed, the process of creating a new, separate department continued. In 1966, the Department of Agricultural Accounting and Statistics was founded, which in turn gave rise to the Department of Mathematical Economics in 1967. The presence of two specialties and the improving qualification of the teaching staff (many of whom had successfully defended their candidate degrees) prepared the ground for the separation of economic specialties from the Faculty of Agronomy. There was a rule that at least five departments were required to form a faculty, so the two missing departments were invited from a number of cross-academy departments.

The independent Faculty of Economics was opened in 1969. During its 30 years of existence, the faculty's organizational structure has undergone several changes, as have the names of its subdivisions and teaching staff. These changes were connected to the 1988-1995 reforms of higher agricultural education and to the latest developments. The faculties were reorganized and renamed as institutes in 1992-1994. The Faculty of Economics turned into the Institute of Economics and was renamed the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences.

The history of scientific research in the faculty can be divided between two different politico-economic systems. The division line falls at the end of the 1980s. Until Estonia's restored independence (1991), research in agricultural economics was concentrated mainly at the Estonian Institute of Agrarian Economics (Saku). This institution conducted research connected to the *ad hoc* orders of the Ministry of Agriculture. Long-term research topics were financed neither by Saku nor by the Estonian Agricultural Academy. In the Faculty of Economics, the Ministry financed mainly research on transportation problems (milk transportation, concentrated feed transportation, and peat transportation) with the aim of optimizing transportation routes in the republic. Despite the absence of financing, staff carried out research while bearing full teaching loads and defending their candidate degrees. Long-term agricultural research in the Soviet times was considered unnecessary, because decisions about long-term developments were solely political and based mainly on Communist Party directives.

In independent Estonia, a situation developed in which agricultural research was considered unnecessary, and, of course, there was a lack of resources as well. The practical reorganization of the agricultural sector was started without proper analysis and without consulting agricultural scientists. This explains a number of mistakes made while carrying out agricultural, property, and land reforms.

Starting in 1993, target-financed projects and ESF grants have provided some support to agrarian economic research in the Republic of Estonia. The first topics financed were connected to the agricultural reform and its efficiency. Starting in 1995, research began on rural life and agricultural development under the new conditions. A special issue has been Estonian agriculture's problems of competitiveness. From 1997 on, EU accession and integration problems have been added. Funds for agricultural research grew in the first years of financing, but have been withdrawn again in recent years.

The Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences of EAU consists of 4 institutes:

- the Institute of Agricultural Economics and Marketing,
- the Institute of Rural Sociology and Cooperation,
- the Institute of Informatics, and
- the Institute of Accounting and Finance.

The staff of the FESS EAU includes 42 people, 28 of whom are engaged in teaching. Research personnel consists of 1 person. The main fields of research are: agricultural reform and its efficiency; land reform and its consequences; the competitiveness of Estonian agriculture; problems of integration in the EU; investments and financing agriculture; cooperation in agriculture and in rural areas; agricultural marketing; problems of agricultural accounting; rural development and rural entrepreneurship; the attitudes of rural people; and Estonian rural society in development.

The *Faculty of Economics and Business Administration of Tallinn Technical University* (FEBA – TTU) was established in 1940 to train specialists in business administration and industrial economics in Tallinn (Tallinn, 2000). In its first years, the Faculty had chairs of Finance and Banking and of the Economics of Industry and Trade. The total number of students, including those enrolled as first-year students and those transferred from the University of Tartu, was over 600. During World War II, the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration ceased to exist. It was reopened in 1944. New chairs were added (Statistics, Accounting, etc.). From the end of World War II to the mid-1950s, 660 specialists graduated the Faculty in finance and the economics of industry and trade.

In 1954, in cooperation with engineering faculties, the Faculty started to train production managers – economic engineers. In 1954-1960, there was no independent faculty of economics and business administration. Engineer/economists were trained at the Faculty of Engineering until 1957. The first economic engineers of the machine-building industry, who not only studied economics and business disciplines but also gained theoretical and practical knowledge about the relevant industry, graduated in 1957. In 1959, the training of accountants for industry began. From 1960 on, the development accelerated, and now there is already an independent Faculty of Economics and Business Administration. Research units – groups for research on the economics of higher schools and a laboratory for work and management – were established.

In 1990, TTU started an extensive academic reform. Today, the Faculty consists of 4 institutes:

- the Institute of Business Administration,
- the Institute of Accounting,
- the Institute of National Economy, and
- the Institute of Territorial Economy.

The staff of the FEBA TTU includes 114 people, with 89 people in academic positions (teaching staff), including 7 researchers.

The main fields of research are: theory and application of micro- and macroeconomics; development of mathematical methods in economics and their application; financial economics and banking; applications of statistical and econometric models; theory and applications of economic accounting; innovation and economic policy; and labor management.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

Social sciences were in complete isolation in the Soviet Union. All academic literature was published only in Russian and often had a strong ideological flavor. Only selected universities in

Moscow had access to foreign literature. Information on the developments of economic thought and important scientific problems was practically missing in Estonia. Access to new journal articles was basically nonexistent. Financial resources for books and journal subscriptions were very scarce. The deficiencies were alleviated to some extent by gifts from other countries and by literature scholars bought from abroad themselves. The situation started to improve in the mid-1990s when the universities started to subscribe to international economic journals. A problem is the lack of pre-1991 journal issues. It is hard to understand the causes of important paradigm shifts in economic thought without knowing earlier literature. This makes it difficult to grasp and predict the patterns of development of economic science.

Great difficulties arose when new areas of research based on the concepts of a market economy were established, because information was scarce and full of gaps. It was not known which research topics had great potential and which were already far advanced. There was the danger of getting involved in areas in which problem set-ups and directions of research had become so specific that it would have been very hard to contribute on an international level without being familiar with earlier literature. The situation started to improve when our scientists started to participate in international research groups, sharing their experience with their colleagues in Estonia afterward.

In Soviet times, contacts with economists from other countries were extremely limited. After regaining independence, the relatively good contacts with economists from the former Soviet Union (Russia, Ukraine, Latvia, and Lithuania) discontinued. The situation was new for researchers and teachers in Estonia as well as in other countries of the former Soviet Union. In addition, financial difficulties emerged, making it practically impossible to organize traditional scientific conferences. Scarce financial resources had to be spent on integration with Western science and the Western academic community. Still, there were very few academic contacts with the West at the beginning of transition. In the beginning, cooperation with the West consisted only in inviting visiting lecturers. The visitors mostly had to finance this themselves. Cooperative research projects were extremely rare. The main obstacle was that our scientists were occupied with reorganizing teaching and were also unprepared to study new phenomena of a market economy. Another obstacle was the language problem, because in Soviet times, Russian was the language of science and people's knowledge of English or German was limited. Paradoxically, the main obstacle to scholarly communication with Russia at present is the younger generation of economists' inadequate knowledge of Russian.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

In transition to a market economy, the nature of the object of research – economic processes – changed significantly. Previous knowledge of the object – the planned economy – lost most of its use, and one had to start studying anew the essentials of economic processes in a market economy. This took several years. Instead of the Marxist economic model, one had to start using contemporary macroeconomic models. An analogous reorientation took place in the field of business administration. Earlier, research topics of business administration were applied to problems of different branches of the planned economy. Traditional areas of research in the time of the Soviet Union and in the first years of transition were trade, finance, mathematical methods, models in economics, and, since the 1990s, international economics. Economists lacked basic knowledge of disciplines that describe the behavior of firms operating in a market-economy environment, such as corporate finance, management, accounting, etc. Scientists who had already specialized in empirical methods and statistics in Soviet times were in a somewhat better situation, but they, too, had to apply familiar methods of analysis to a new object.

As the economic system and its treatment changed, economic terminology changed as well. The whole system of economic terminology needed to be revised. Estonian terminology was nonexistent or insufficient in many areas of economics. It was also necessary to adopt methodological changes, and completely new concepts emerged, such as marginal analysis, opportunity costs, general equilibrium, welfare economics, etc.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

In the first years of restored independence, changes also occurred in economic research topics. Until 1989, research was mostly coordinated by the Soviet Union Academy of Sciences, where Estonia also participated in fundamental research. But from 1990 on, research primarily aimed at solving tasks the Republic of Estonia faced in transition to a market economy and at elaborating relevant economic theory standpoints. Conventionally, the period since 1990 can be divided into two:

Research in 1991-1995 covered mainly theoretical and applied aspects of the transition to a market economy:

- The major macroeconomic subjects since 1996 have been the search for solutions to issues related to EU accession.

Some particular subjects of research in 1991-1995 were:

- Analysis, forecast, and economic policy development trends of the Estonian national economy; comparative research with developed capitalist countries.
- Research on the long-term use of natural resources and the elaboration of strategy to use nature to ensure ecological equilibrium. Production efficiency, competitiveness, and outlooks of further development.
- Economic and legal problems in transition economies and administrative reform. An economic regulation mechanism on the way to a market economy.

The main subjects of research in 1996-2001 were:

- The economic, legal, and socio-political basis of European integration.
- Strategies of socio-economic development in Estonia in preparation for accession to the European Union.
- Modeling the economic processes of and informational support for the decision-making process.
- Socio-economic evaluation of the potential of Estonian natural resources and energy resources.
- Reconstruction of the Estonian economy through banking and investment policy. Financial structure management in the situation of opening financial markets.
- The restructuring of agriculture (agricultural reform and agricultural reform principles).
- Improvement of the quality of produce and of the efficiency of production.
- Seeking and researching alternative activities in the rural sector (rural tourism, berry growing, ecological produce etc.). Ecological problems, various financial sources and financial management of agricultural firm.

An important step in creating a completely new environment for the financing of research was taken in 1990 when the Estonian government established the Estonian Science Foundation (ESF, Eesti Teadusfond) as an independent non-profit agency (Eesti, 1996). The main aims of the ESF are to assemble and distribute state budget allotments to support research and development in the form of competitive research grants to individuals and research groups. The ESF is also responsible for organizing expertises of research grants.

The fundamentals of new principles of financing research were laid down in the Law on the Organization of Research (1994). This law divides the state budget allocations into three parts (Eesti, 1998: 5). The ESF funded research activities through target financing and grants. Expenditures for maintaining research infrastructure (maintenance of buildings and minimum administrative costs of research institutions) had to be covered by the owner of the institution, i.e., the relevant ministry, local authority, or physical person. The ESF Council developed the principles of target financing. Basically, the money was given to research institutions for specific research projects. The new system was introduced in 1996, but in reality, the system was not fully launched until 1998.

Expenditures on research and development in Estonia were between 0.6 and 0.7% of GDP (GERD/GDP) in 1993-1996 and then started to fall. State budget resources accounted for ca. 75% of this, resources from enterprises ca. 10%. Compared with the pre-independence period and with the EU countries, the importance of the latter in financing research is modest. The reasons for this are a sharp decline in industry and agriculture in Estonia along with changes in the organization of research, which have led to a situation in which enterprises and institutions do not have sufficient means to commission research. The share of foreign sources of finance has risen over the years, reaching a maximum in 1997. In 2000, the state budget financing of research diminished significantly; research retained the level of 0.5% of GDP only thanks to the earnings from international projects (see Table 1).

The distribution of target financing between the fields of science was relatively unfavorable for social sciences in 1996, when they received altogether around 9.8 percent of the total budget. The share of allocations from the whole of state financing (both target financing and grants) to economics has been decreasing, compared with other sciences. Priority in financing in Estonia is given to chemical and molecular biology and biological and geological sciences.

To maintain the continuity of research during the transition period, it was decided to retain certain basic funds for the institutions doing fundamental research and gradually to introduce the financing of research grants. The share of grants in overall financing grew from 5% in the first two years to 31.4% in 1996 and reached nearly 90% in 1999. Target financing of research projects was shifted from the ESF to the Ministry of Education, where the Center of Competence was formed to evaluate proposed research projects. In the beginning of the implementation of the grants system in the ESF, the number of grants awarded was relatively large – around 40,000 EEK per year. But the average size was very small. The number of grants has gradually decreased. At the same time, the average size of grants has increased. One of the basic criteria in awarding grants —academic quality – has been regarded as more relevant. The ESF issues grants once a year. The duration of the projects can be up to four years. When the project is completed, the grantee must present a final report, which the expert commissions evaluate. The final reports of research projects are forwarded to the archive of the relevant institution.

The basic feature of the period 1992-1996 was the rapid growth of grant money allocated by the ESF. It increased from 3 million to 58 million EEK. Since 1997, the growth of grant money slowed down and, since 1999, has stagnated completely. Since 1999, no remarkable change in financing has happened; and in economics, ESF allocated funding has even been reduced.

Table 2 and 3 indicate that the share of state target financing of economics has decreased in particular, and earnings from contractual research have increased. This means that interest in economic research has increased. The number of international projects (Phare ACE, UNDP, ILO, etc.) has decreased in recent years because Estonia is regarded as a well-developed transitional country that no longer needs significant help.

5. Public space and academic debates

The problems related to publications have been one of the general problems of research. It must be noted, however, that in the late 1990s, a significant shift from popular-scientific to research articles took place. As for qualitative shifts, articles in pre-reviewed journals make up a very small share of all publications – 19% (see Table 4). But there are positive tendencies as well. The number of articles published in pre-reviewed journals doubled from 1996 to 2000. The journals are not top journals, but the increased number of these articles is certainly an evidence of qualitative changes.

Consider that publication in pre-reviewed journals is a long process that may take up to two years. Therefore, many articles written as a result of current research are now in the review process. The increasing number of presentations at conferences abroad gives hope of more publications in the near future. In 1997, the share of presentations made abroad was 39% of all conference presentations; in 1999, it was 49%. This shows that the researchers' work is reaching an internationally acceptable level, but they lack experience in bringing it into conformity with technical requirements.

One of the most important problems in publishing is the absence of local scientific journals. The only Estonian journal that is accepted as scientific is *Akadeemia*, which is a non-economic, pre-reviewed, generally humanities-oriented journal. *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Sciences. Humanities and Social Sciences*, which was the only journal publishing economic articles in Estonia, terminated publication in 1997. Specific academic economic periodicals are practically nonexistent.

Starting in 1986, the Estonian Institute of Economics has been issuing a series of preprints of the results of major research projects. Depending on the addressees of research results, the preprints are issued either in Estonian or some foreign language (mainly English), which considerably extends their distribution. So far, 60 preprints have been published.

To improve publication opportunities and to prepare articles for international publications, the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration of TU started to publish faculty working papers. Five papers were published in 2000. Also, *The Baltic Journal of Economics*, an economic journal founded at the initiative of Euro-Faculty, is now published in Tartu. The journal is pre-reviewed, but until now, only two issues have been published. This is due to several technical and organizational problems that impede the regular publishing of the journal. Hopefully, cooperation between faculty and Euro-Faculty will improve the situation.

Important changes have also taken place in publishing collective monographs. On the one hand, writing collective monographs and articles shares information on the subjects researched from the different viewpoints of different authors, and, on the other hand, includes researchers from other research institutions. In recent years, the Estonian Institute of Economics has published 5 collective monographs whose authors, aside from my own employees, are researchers from Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, the UK, Germany, and the USA.

In 1998, FEBA of TU started a new research publication series in addition to textbooks. So far, five collective monographs have been published in this series. The writing of these monographs has played an important role in supporting cooperation between faculty members. Very useful is also that many master's and doctoral students were involved in the process of preparing these monographs. Cooperation with leading professors was surely a very useful experience and helped to develop the article-writing skills of young scientists.

If we analyze the dynamics of the publications, we see a remarkable growth in international publications. The progress in publications is obvious: in the beginning (1996-1997), we witnessed a shift from popular-journalistic articles to serious research publications in Estonia. Now, more and more of our authors are publishing their papers abroad, but the majority are proceedings of conferences or joint working papers published abroad. Increasing international collaboration and joint research projects in which the leading country in the project publishes a joint monograph have certainly had a positive impact on publication abroad.

In the first years of transition, the number of *conferences* held in Estonia decreased. Between 1987 and 1990, as subjects related to the improvement of economic mechanisms became very topical across the USSR, the Estonian Institute of Economics, in cooperation with the Institute of Economics and the Institute of Mathematical Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences, organized several international and all-Union conferences where the number of participants exceeded 200. The most of important were:

- the international conference on complex analyses and the evaluation of scientific-technical organizations (1987);
- the international symposium "Acceleration strategy and reformation of the economic mechanisms in the Soviet Union and Hungary" (1987);

- the All-Union Conference on Problems of the Management of the Economy of a Republic (1989); and
- the international conference “Methods of research and comparative analysis of economic mechanisms in Eastern European countries” (1990).

After regaining independence and in connection with the development of new subjects of research, previous contacts with USSR research institutions ceased and contacts with research institutions in Western and Central European countries grew closer. Especially close contacts were established with the Nordic countries, primarily with Finland. An international joint conference was held in 1991: *Finland – Estonia: a socio-economic comparison*. In 1992, the Estonian Institute of Economics participated in the organization of a local government conference of Nordic countries. In 1993, an international conference was held in Helsinki: *The key issues of the development of the Estonian economy*.

The intensification of international contacts with Western European research institutions and the launching of joint projects (mainly PHARE and ACE research projects) have led to a rapid increase in the number of international workshops and conferences in recent years. Before 1989, the Estonian Institute of Economics was the main institution engaged in economic research, but then the reorganization of research activity and changes in financing shifted research more into the economic faculties of universities. So universities are organizing ever more workshops and conferences. In recent years, Estonian research institutions have organized nine major international economic research conferences per year. In addition to these, commercial undertakings, banks, and conference centers have also held practically oriented conferences.

The Chair of Economic Policy of UT organizes an international conference every year where economic-theoretical and political problems of countries in transition and development perspectives for economic education are discussed. Such annual conferences have been organized for eight years now with the cooperation of the Faculty of Economics of Tallinn Technical University. Participants are mostly from Estonia and Germany, but other Eastern European countries are also represented. Every year, a book of conference proceedings is published. The conference papers were first pre-reviewed by an anonymous referee in 2000. The topics of the last conference were the effectiveness of the economic policy of the Republic of Estonia and the European Union. Table 5 contains an overview of the international conferences and workshops in the field of economics organization in Estonia.

After regaining independence, new possibilities emerged for active international collaboration. *International cooperation* mainly takes three forms: collaboration agreements, international joint projects, and the training of students, teachers and researchers.

Participation in international research and development projects is important for raising the level of academic education and research. In the early 1990s, international aid programs at universities were mainly concerned with reorganizing teaching and developing new curricula and textbooks. Since the mid-1990s, the focus has been on international cooperation projects in which teachers and students can do research together with partners from foreign universities and research institutions.

One objective of international research and technological development projects is the analysis and scientific generalization of transition and integration processes and the treatment of Estonia’s economic and social problems in an international context. The cooperation projects have examined the role of foreign investments and multinational enterprises in restructuring and internationalizing the economy and in the labor markets of transition economies, the changes in labor policy and their impact on the process of integrating into the EU, theoretical and practical problems related to the eastward enlargement of the EU, the role of regional integration in globalization processes, possibilities of modeling the transition processes and the development of methods of research on them, and many other problems related to transition and integration processes. The projects have also explored the possibilities of cooperative development, market research, the development of banking, related problems and risks, etc.

Solving the theoretical and applied economic and social problems on a good international level and the synergetic generation and development of new ideas for future cooperation have been the main result of international cooperation projects. The results of cooperation projects are important to Estonian economists as well as to partners from other countries. Cooperation between Estonian economists and economists from countries with developed market economies facilitates better understanding and generalization of the specifics of transition processes. It is possible to test the robustness of economic theory's predictions in extreme situations, which transition from one economic system to another undoubtedly is. Cooperation projects accelerate innovative processes, enlarge markets, and create better conditions for cooperation between economists and businessmen from countries with different socio-economic and political backgrounds.

International cooperation projects have helped researchers acquire important experience in presenting the results of their research works in accordance with international standards. As a result of international cooperation projects, several scientific articles have been published in pre-reviewed journals. Also, the results of international research and development projects have been presented at international scientific conferences and seminars.

Quite a substantial share of international cooperation is in the form of collaboration agreements. The Estonian Institute of Economics already had mutual collaboration agreements with the leading research institutions of the Soviet Union and also with the Institute of Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Global Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Central European University, the Institute of System Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Economic Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences, the University of York (Canada), etc. before 1990. In the first years of restored independence, cooperation intensified particularly with the Finnish research institutions, the Research Institute of the Finnish Economy (ETLA) and the Finnish Institute of National Economy (VATT), as well as with the Center for International Economic Growth (ICEG), with whom we have conducted many joint research projects and written a number of publications. Unfortunately, contacts with other Baltic States have diminished and are limited to only some joint projects with a few researchers. Table 6 shows Estonian economists' participation in international research and collaboration projects.

6. Views on further development: mission and trends

Since economic research in Estonia is conducted mainly in academic universities, the outlook for future development must be discussed in two closely interlinked spheres: economic education and economic research.

The economics faculties of national universities have to meet the requirements of *Estonian society*, especially of its economy, to provide economic specialists with a contemporary education, and to conduct economic research of topical issues. Owing to its small size, the Estonian economy is very strongly and extensively integrated in the world economy, and the universities have to conform to *internationally acceptable* requirements of economic education and research.

The high-priority tasks in providing economic education at academic universities, in contrast to specialized universities with applied orientation, is to provide students with academic (universal and general) economic education, training competent specialists who perceive and understand the relations between society and the economy and between global connections and the tasks of the economy. To perform this task, the FEBA of UT and the FEBA of TTU stress comprehensive theoretical education and the development of economic thinking to mold members of society with a broad outlook who will be able to orient themselves in a dynamic, fast-changing environment. It will be relatively easy for specialists with a solid theoretical and general methodological basis to acquire the skills and experience necessary to perform particular work duties.

One of the tasks of the national universities is to train national research staff whose qualifications conform to international standards and who are able to apply their knowledge in other scientific institutions, as well as in governmental institutions. To assure the high quality of research in the FEBA of UT and the FEBA of TTU, one of the most important results is the establishment of properly working master programs in economics (MA) and business administration (MBA). Their success has brought remarkable positive changes in doctoral studies, as well. After a long standstill, the first PhD degrees were obtained in 2000, and after a couple of years, the preparation of the next generation of researchers with modern qualifications will be in a completely new situation.

Until 1990, as a rule, the teaching staffs of economic departments had obtained their basic education in the Soviet period and their contemporary economic education by upgrading themselves in universities abroad (primarily in programs financed by the US government and realized at the College of Bentley and those financed by the Canadian government and realized at the University of Dalhousie, the University of Leipzig, etc.). A serious problem was that demand for people with contemporary economic education was very high in the labor market in the first years of independence. Since wages remained significantly lower at national universities than in the banking and business sector, it was very hard to attract capable young people to research. Meanwhile, the situation in the labor market has stabilized, and the number of master's and doctor's students has rapidly increased. This allows us to expect that both teaching staff and research staff will grow younger.

The above analysis indicated that Estonian economists have always had close international collaboration contacts with researchers from various countries, particularly in the form of joint projects. These contacts started to produce cooperation projects in the fifth Framework Programmes, ACE and PHARE projects, Nordic Council frameworks, etc. In addition to these, the Estonian Academy of Sciences has concluded contracts for the equivalent exchange of researchers with the Academies of Sciences of 20 countries. Within these, economists, too, can do short-term research abroad, though they have not availed themselves of this opportunity very extensively. Contacts with researchers from the other Baltic States, in previous times very intensive, have unfortunately diminished in the years of independence. Now they are limited to participation in joint projects and to contacts between individual researchers, rather than between institutions.

Preparation for accession to the EU has influenced Estonian economists in their choice of research topics. Important topics now are Estonian development strategies and convergence issues, which should help Estonia catch up to the EU's level of economic development.

References

Eesti teaduse lühianalüüs 1993-1996 (A short analysis of Estonian science in 1993-1996) (1998), Tallinn, Teadus-ja arendusnőukogu (Research and development Council);

Eesti teadus-ja arendustegevuse ülevaade 1996-1999: Struktuur ja suundumused (Overview of research and development in Estonia in 1996-1999: Structure and trends) (2000), Tallinn, Teadus-ja arendusnőukogu (Research and Development Council);

Eesti Teadusfond 1990-1996 (Estonian Science Foundation 1990-1996) (1996), Tallinn;

Evaluation of economic and business administration research institutions of Estonia (2000),

Joint final report, Tallinn, Higher Education Quality Assessment Center of Estonia;

Krinal, Valner (1999): *Tartu Ülikooli majandusteaduskonna minevikust ja tänapäevast* (Past and present of the Faculty of Economics of the University), Tartu, Tartu Ülikool;

Report on accreditation. Self-appraisal. Research 1996-2000 (2000), Tartu, University of Tartu, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration;

Self-evaluation report 1996-1999 (2000), Tartu, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences of Estonian Agricultural University;

Tallinna Tehnikaülikooli majandusteaduskond (2000), Tallinn, Faculty of Economics at Tallinn Technical University;

Teadmistekeskne Eesti. Teadus-ja arendustegevuse strateegia (Knowledge-oriented Estonia. A strategy for research and development) (1998), Tallinn.

Selected Bibliography

Becker, Alfred, Wenzel, Volker, Krysanova, Valentina and Lahmer, Werner (1999): "Regional Analysis of Global Change Impacts: Concepts, Tools and First Results", in: *Environmental Modelling and Assessment*, No. 4, 4, 243-257;

Derrick, Frederick W., Scott, Charles E. and Kolbre, Ene (1999): "Estonian Dwelling Owners Association and Maintenance Policy: The Conflict of Policy Goals and Incentives", in: *Europe-Asia Studies (USA)*, Vol. 51, No. 7, 1285–1294;

Dodgson, John, Villemi, Mall et al. (1996): "Alternative Approaches to the Provision and Financing of Local Transport Services in the Baltic States", in: *ACE Quarterly, Phare,* No. 7, 10-11;

Dodgson, John, Villemi, Mall et al. (1997): "Urban Public Transport in the Baltic States", in: *Transport Reviews*, Vol. 18, No. 2, 153-163;

Eamets, Raul (1999): **"**Gross Flows in Estonian Labour Market and Transition Probabilities across Labour Market States", in: *Baltic Journal of Economics*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 141-184;

Eamets, Raul and Ukrainski, Konstatin (2000): **"**Hidden Unemployment in Estonia: Experience from the Early Years of Transition (1989-1996)", in: *Post-Communist Economies,* Vol. 12, No. 4, 463-484;

Ennuste, Ülo (1995): "A Risk Theoretical Model of Privatization Vouchers", in: *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, Humanities and Social Sciences*, No. 44, 1, 14-20;

Ennuste, Ülo and Ott, Attiat F. (1995): "Privatization of State Enterprises in Estonia: A Public Choice Approach", in: *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, Humanities and Social Sciences*, No. 44, 1, 1-13;

Ennuste, Ülo and Ott, Attiat F. (1996): "Anxiety as a Consequence of Liberalization: An Analysis of Opinion Surveys in Estonia", in: *The Social Science Journal*, No. 33, 2, 149-164;

Fainstein, Grigori (1995): "Modelling of Estonian Exports and Imports", in: *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, Humanities and Social Sciences*, No. 44, 1, 36-50;

Fainstein, Grigori (1997): "Vneshnaya torgovlya v kontekste rynochnyh reform v maloi otkrytoi ekonomike: opyt Estoni" (Foreign Trade in the Context of Market Reforms in a Small Open Economy: The Case of Estonia), in: *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, No. 11, 121-133;

Haldma, Toomas (1997): **"**Design Management Accounting Systems in Estonian Companies: An Empirical Study", in: *Management,* No. 6, 42-45;

Krysanova, Valentina and Müller-Wohlfeil, Dirk-Ingmar (1997): "Modelling Water Balance of the Elbe Basin - a Pilot Application of the HBV Model", in: *Vannet i Norden*, No. 1, 6 – 17;

Krysanova, Valentina, Mueller-Wohlfeil, Dirk-Ingmar and Becker, Alfred (1998): "Development and Test of a Spatially Distributed Hydrological/Water Quality Model for Mesoscale Watersheds", in: *Ecological Modelling*, No. 106 (1-2), 261-289;

Krysanova, Valentina, Wechsung, Frank, Becker, Alfred, Poschenrieder, Werner and Gräfe, Jan (1999): "Mesoscale Ecohydrological Modelling to Analyse Regional Effects of Climate Change", in: *Environmental Modelling and Assessment*, No. 4, 4, 259-271;

Laur, Anton and Tenno, Koidu (1995): "Modelling of Development Scenarios of the Estonian Fuel-energy Complex", in: *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, Humanities and Social Sciences*, No. 44, 1, 21-35;

Paas, Tiiu (1997): **"**Estonia – A Small Open Economy", in: *Journal of Transformating Economies and Societies*, EMERGO, Vol. 4, No. 2, 37-53;

Paas, Tiiu and Varblane, Urmas (1999): "Investment Climate and the Economic Behaviour of Estonian Firms in Condition of Foreign Direct Investment", in: *Journal of Transforming Economies and Societies,* EMERGO, Vol. 6, No. 1, 26-48;

Paas, Tiiu (2000): "Gravity Approach for Modeling International Trade Pattern of Economies in Transition", in: *International Advances in Economic Research*, Vol. 6, No. 4, 633-649;

Päsok, Robert (1996): "Reorganisation of the oil shale mining in Estonia", in: *Oil Shale*, No. 13, 3, 227-238;

Päsok, Robert (1997): "Sustainable phosphate rock mining", in: *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, Engineering,* No. 3/4, 311-313;

Purju, Alari (2000): "The Energy Sector in the Baltic States. Energizing the Northern Dimension of the European Union. The EU Northern Dimension and the Energy Sector in the Baltic States and in Russia", in: *Studies in Industrial Engineering and Management,* Lappeenranta University of Technology, No. 10, 81–134;

Püss, Tiia (1996): "Behutsam in Richtung Sozialstaat", in: *IWD*, No. 24, 6-7;

Rajasalu, Teet (1995): "The Economy at a Turning Point", in: *Nationalities Papers*, Vol. 23, No. 1, 85-102;

Rajasalu, Teet (1995): "Viron talouden kehityksestä", in: *Kansantaloudellinen aikakauskirja*, No. 2, 216-221;

Raus, Toomas and Hanke, Max (1996): "A General Heuristic for Choosing the Regularization Parameter in Ill-posed Problems", in: *SIAM, Journal on Scientific Computing*, Vol. 17, 4, 1117-1133;

Realo, Anu, Allik, Jüri and Vadi, Maaja (1997): "The Hierarchical Structure of Collectivism", in: *Journal of Research in Personality*, No. 31, 93-116;

Reiljan, Ele and Reiljan, Janno (1999): "Book Review", in: *Economic Systems*, Vol. 23, No. 3, 283-285;

Rutz, Wolfgang and Laving, Jüri (1997): "Die Seehäfen Estlands und Ihre Bedeutung für die Estnische Außenwirtschaft", in: *Internationales Verkehrswesen*, No. 10, 494-499;

Saat, Maksim and Meel, Mari (1996): "Window on Eastern Europe: Business and National Culture in Estonia. Business Ethics", in: *A European Review*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Oxford, 109-115;

Scott, Charles E., Derrick, Frederick W. and Kolbre, Ene (1999): "The Challenge of the Commons: Estonian Housing Privatisation", in: *International Advances in Economic Research,* Vol. 5, No. 4, 418–425;

Smallbone, David, Piasecki, Bogdan, Venesaar, Urve, Todorov, Kiril and Labrianidis, Lois (1999): "Internationalisation and SME Development in Transition Economies: An International Comparison", in: *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development,* Vol. 5, No. 4, 363-375;

Sõrg, Mart (1998): "Estonian Currency Board and Economic Performance", in: *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences,* Vol. 1, No. 3, 463-482;

Tenno, Koidu and Laur, Anton (1996): "Model Analysis of Development Strategy for the Estonian Fuel-energy Complex", in: *Oil Shale*, No. 13, 1, 65-72;

Übi, Evald (1998): "An Approximate Solution to Linear and Quadratic Programming Problems by the Method of Least Squares", in: *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Sciences. Physics. Mathematics*, No. 47, 1, 19-28;

Übi, Evald (1998): "On Computing a Stable Least Squares Solution to the Linear Programming Problem", in: *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy Sciences, Physics. Mathematics,* No. 47, 4, 251-259;

Varblane, Urmas (1999): "Trade policy implications from EU membership for Estonia", in: *Baltic Journal of Economics*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 249-267;

Venesaar, Urve (1995): "A Review of Economic and Social Reforms", in: *The Baltic Review,* Winter 1995/1996, 34-35;

Viies, Mare (1995): "Personal Income Distribution and Poverty in Estonia in Transition", in: *ACE Quaterly, PHARE*, No. 3, 13-15;

Wilder, Lisa, Benedict, Mary-Ellen and Viies, Mare (1999): "A Demographic Analysis of Income Distribution in Estonia", in: *Comparative Economic Studies, XXXXI*, No. 1, 96-113.

Table 1 Financing of research and development in Estonia 1992-2000

Year	Total funding		Allocations from the state budget			Resources of enterprises		Foreign sources		Other sources	
	EEK mill.	% GDP	EEK mill.	% from the state budget	% of total costs	EEK mill.	% of total costs	EEK mill.	% of total costs	EEK mill.	% of total costs
1992	101.1		89.1			1.7		9.9		0.4	
1993	133.4	0.62	100.0	2.4	75.0	19.1	14.3	4.3	3.2	10.0	7.5
1994	216.8	0.73	165.3	2.3	76.2	20.8	9.6	15.1	7.0	15.6	7.2
1995	253.0	0.62	180.6	2.0	71.4	32.7	12.9	24.2	9.6	15.5	6.1
1996	305.7	0.58	216.2	2.1	70.7	31.0	10.1	33.0	10.8	25.5	8.3
1997	387.9	0.61	260.2	2.1	67.1	33.0	8.5	55.9	14.4	38.8	10.0
1998	387.2	0.53	291.6	1.9	75.3	32.5	8.4	32.9	8.5	30.2	7.8
1999	435.8	0.57	344.7	2.0	79.1	41.0	9.4	36.6	8.4	13.5	3.1
2000	449.0	0.53	330.9	1.2	73.7	41.9	9.3	53.8	12.0	22.4	5.0

Source: Eesti teadus-ja arendustegevuse ülevaade 1996-1999, Tallinn 2000; Statistical Yearbook of Estonia 2001, ESA.

Table 2 Distribution of target financing and ETF research grants between different sciences in 1998-2000 (from the state budget)

Sciences	1998		1999		2000	
	EEK mill.	%	EEK mill.	%	EEK mill.	%
Exact sciences	28.4	14.8	33.6	14.1	32.0	14.4
Chemical and molecular biology	18.2	9.5	24.0	10.1	22.9	10.3
Bio-geological sciences	23.8	12.5	34.5	14.5	34.6	15.6
Technical sciences	37.0	19.3	48.3	20.3	44.7	20.1
Medical science	27.6	14.4	34.0	14.3	27.6	12.4
Agricultural sciences	22.2	11.6	24.5	10.3	23.4	10.5
Social sciences	15.4	8.1	17.2	7.2	16.4	7.4
of this, economics	8.4	4.4	9.5	4.0	8.6	3.8
Humanities	18.8	9.8	21.9	9.2	20.8	9.3
Total	191.4	100.0	238.0	100.0	222.4	100.0

Source: Eesti teadus-ja arendustegevuse ülevaade 1996 – 1999: struktuur ja suundumused. Tallinn, 2000; Estonian Ministry of Education; Estonian Science Foundation.

Table 3 Economic research financing during the period 1996-2000 (%)

Type of funding	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Financing of target research	58.6	54.2	51.8	49.7	47.6
Grants from ESF	25.3	29.8	34.0	27.5	31.3
Contracts with other institutions	16.1	16.0	14.1	22.8	21.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Annual reports of EIE at TTU; FEBA of UT; FEBA of TTU, FESS of EAU

Table 4 General overview of publications (1996-2000)

Institution	Pre-reviewed articles	Indexed in CC	Other scientific publications	Separate publications (monographs)		Total
				Published in Estonia	Published abroad	
EIE at TTU	113	7	74	22	8	224
FEBA of UT	71		648	23	2	744
FEBA of TTU	161	5	195	84	11	456
FESS of EAU	43		162	22	2	229
Total	388	12	1079	151	23	1653

Source: Annual Reports of EIE at TTU, FEBA of UT, FEBA of TTU, FESS of EAU

Table 5 Organization of international conferences and seminars

Title of Conference/Seminar	Date and location	Number of participants
Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises in the Countries in Transition: the Examples of the Baltic States and Poland	March 8-10, 1996, Tallinn	34
Cooperation in the Republic of Estonia	March 22-23, 1996, Tartu	124
4th Alfred Müller-Armack Symposion "Soziale Marktwirtschaft – Weg nach Europa"	May 7-12, 1996,Tallinn	70
Privatization in the Baltic States	June 25-26, 1996, Tallinn	26
Topical Problems of the Economic Policy in the Member States of the European Union and the Republic of Estonia	June 28-29, 1996, Tartu	80
Integration of the Baltic States in Europe	Aug. 28 - Sept.2, 1996, Tallinn	42
Economic Performance and Financial Sector Reform in Central and Eastern Europe	Sept. 20-21, 1996, Tallinn	80
Innovation and Changes in Cooperation	Sept. 27-28, 1996, Tartu	83
Cooperative Innovation and Change	Sept. 26-29, 1996, Tartu	120
Internationalization and Inter-Firm Relations	April 24-29, 1997, Tallinn	18

Title of Conference/Seminar	Date and location	Number of participants
Infrastructural Policy as a Factor of Economic Growth	May 15-16, 1997, Tallinn	32
Economic Policy of the Republic of Estonia and Integration in the European Union	June 26-28, 1997, Tartu	60
Agricultural Reforms, Changes, and the Future	July 1-2, 1997, Tartu	83
Strategies for Raising Competitiveness of the Estonian Economy	Dec. 12-13, 1997, Tallinn	47
Business Environment in Transition Economies in the Baltic Area	Feb. 10-11, 1998, Tallinn	26
Education, Training, and Labor Markets in Hungary and Estonia	April 2-4, 1998, Tallinn	16
The 4th Conference on Financial Sector Reform in Central and Eastern Europe	April 24-26, 1998, Tallinn	70
32nd Baltic Conference on Economics "Social and Liberal Economy"	April 25, 1998, Tartu	24
Integration of the Republic of Estonia in the European Union – Goals and Instruments of Economic Policy	June 25–27, 1998, Tartu	45
Rural life, Agriculture, and Informatics	June 26-27 1998, Tartu	77
Internationalization and Businesses' Competitiveness in the Baltic Countries	Sept. 29-30, 1998, Tallinn	18
Transformation of Economic and Political Systems in the Baltic Sea Region	Oct. 23-25, 1998, Tartu	70
Labor Supply and Demand Issues in Estonia and Finland	Dec. 16-17, 1998, Tallinn	23
International Trade, Labor Markets, and Integration	Feb. 22-26, 1999, Tartu	30
Education, Training, and Labor Market Adjustments	May 17-18, 1999, Tallinn	15
Economic Policy of the Republic of Estonia and the European Union	June 25-27, 1999, Tartu	50
The Promotion of Entrepreneurship and the State Contribution: Experience and Estimates	June 1-2, 1999, Tallinn	24
The Tenth Annual Conference of the Congress of Political Economists (COPE)	July 13-18, 1999, Tallinn	80
1st Summer School on International Economics	July 12-16, 1999, Tartu	26
Accounting Perspectives on the Threshold of the 21st Century	Oct. 28-29, 1999, Tartu	80
Transformation of Economic and Political Systems in the Baltic Sea Region	Oct. 29-31, 1999, Tartu	100
2nd Helsinki-Tartu Symposium in Applied Economics with Special Reference to Accession to the EU	Nov. 21-23, 1999, Tartu	30
National Agricultural Policy on the Way to the European Union	Jan. 28-29, 2000, Tartu	64
Impact of Foreign Direct Investment on the International Competitiveness of CEEC Manufacturing and EU Enlargement	May 13-15, 2000, Tartu	24
Current Stage and Development Perspectives of Cost Accounting and Internal Performance Measurement Systems in Estonian Manufacturing Companies (Workshop for practitioners)	June 14, 2000, Tartu June 16, 2000, Tallinn	55
Effectiveness of the Economic Policy of the Republic of Estonia and the European Union	June 29- July 1, 2000, Tartu	90
2nd Summer School on International Economics	July 10-14, 2000, Tartu	28

Table 6 Participation in international research projects

Name of the project	Partners (coordinating institutions)
European Network for Research on Organizations and Changes in Accounting	Manchester University, universities and organizations from 13 countries
Small Business Management and Marketing	Staffordshire University
Banking and Accounting System	University of Latvia
Teaching in Finance and Accounting Disciplines	Sweden, University of Umea
Economic Development of Baltic Sea Region Countries	University of Stockholm
Economic Modeling of Baltics	University of Rotterdam
From Combinates to Enterprises – Industrial Restructuring in the Baltic States	Paris School of Mines, (France)
Social Policy and of Social Welfare in Transition	University of Stockholm
Fifth Framework Programme: The Baltic Sea Area Studies: Northern Dimension of Europe (2000-2003)	Humboldt University of Berlin, University of Copenhagen, University of Vilnius, University of Gdansk, University of Helsinki, University of Latvia
Patterns of Firm Behavior and Institutional Structure in the Transition from Plan to Market Economies: A Comparative Approach	University of Uppsala
Die Institutionellen Grundlagen der Transformation und Wirtschaftspolitik in den MOE-Ländern	Europa Kolleg, Hamburg
Effectiveness of Economic Policy and the European Union	University of Leipzig
The Creation of Basic Conditions for Foreign Investments in the Economies of the Baltic States	Erasmus University Rotterdam, (Netherlands)

Name of the project	Partners (coordinating institutions)
Systems: Competition or Harmonization	Europa Kolleg, Hamburg
Support for the Ministry's Department of Labor and the National Labor Market Board in a Pre-accession Context (1998)	Ministry of Social Affairs, PHARE
Economics Training for Secondary School Teachers (1996)	US National Council on Economic Education (NCEE)
The Impact of Economic Changes on the Living Conditions and Welfare in the Baltic States	University of Copenhagen (Denmark)
Cross-Country Analysis of Employment Policies in Candidate Countries (2000)	European Training Foundation (ETF)
Elaboration of Country Report on Employment and Labor Market Policies in Estonia According to the Attached Outline (1998)	International Labor Organization (ILO)
Transforming the Estonian Economy	ICEG (USA)
Baltic Drainage Basin Project	University of East Anglia (UK)
Central and Eastern Europe in EU Enterprises Strategy of Industrial Restructuring and Relocation	ILO, partners from 11 transition countries
Economic and Social Implications of Exclusion of Transition Economies from the Enlargement of EU	London Business School, SSEES, University of London, University of Perugia
EU Integration-Driven Investment Networking: Outward Foreign Direct Investment in Candidate Countries	Coordinator Ljubljana University, other partners from Prague, Ljubljana, and Vienna universities and Central Banks of Hungary and Poland
Impact of Foreign Direct Investment on the International Competitiveness of CEEC Manufacturing and EU Enlargement	Coordinator Viin, WIIW, Partners from universities of Prague, Ljubljana and Warsaw, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Vienna Institute of Comparative Economic Research and UNCTAD
The Role of Foreign Direct Investments in Employment Changes in Transition Economies	School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London
Die Erweiterung der Europäischen Union und die Transformation in Mittel- und Osteuropa	Coordinator Viadrina University, partners from University of Vienna, University of Viadrina, University of Warsaw
Estonian Monetary Policy in the Framework of Widening Europe	University of Hamburg
Erfolgsfaktoren der Länderentwicklung	University of Leipzig
Estonian economy and European integration	ETLA (Finland)
Foreign Direct Investments and Economic Growth	Stockholm School of Economics
Estonian technology policy and innovation system	ETLA (Finland)
Evaluating the competitiveness of Estonian industry	AG (HLT) (Germany)
Cohesion Report Estonia	RWI Essen (Germany)
Alternative Approaches to the Provision and Financing of Local Public Transport Services in the Baltic States	University of Liverpool (UK)
Correlation Between European Integration and Subregional Cooperation	Institute for World Economics (Hungary)
Foreign capital inflows and macro-economic policies in transition economics	University of Sussex, (UK)
Governance and Economic Performance in Eastern Europe	University of Birmingham (UK)
Management Buy-out and Management Buy-in as a Privatization Instrument	ISG Sozialforschung und Gesellschaftspolitik (BRD)
International Marketing	University of Vaasa
The survival, growth and support needs of manufacturing SMEs in Poland and the Baltic States	Middlesex University, (UK)
Internationalization, inter-firm linkages, and SME development in Central and Eastern Europe	Middlesex University, (UK)
Industrial restructuring and economic recovery in the Baltic Countries – Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia	DIW, BRD
Institution building as an industrial strategy for regional convergence between the CEECs and in the EU	University of Cambridge
Baltic Coast: Economic Valuation as a tool of coastal conservation policies in the Baltic States	European Union for Coastal Conservation (Lithuania)
Foreign Trade Relations, trade regimes, and Foreign Direct Investment	ETLA (Finland)
Locating specific aspects of learning and the transfer of know-how in transition	University St. Kiril and Metodij (Macedonia)
Education, training, and labor markets in transitional economies: the case of Hungary and Estonia	Budapest University of Economic Sciences
The impact of EU foreign direct investment and trade on firm-level restructuring in	Katholieke Universitet Leuven, Ireland

Name of the project	Partners (coordinating institutions)
Central and Eastern Europe	
Database Eastern Europe: institutions, expert's and literature Connected with EU Accession of Estonia	The Vienna Institute for Comparative Studies
Agribusiness, communication, and rural development	Nordic Agricultural College
Cross-border cooperation, Baltic Sea Region joint projects with INTERREG cooperation on countryside business	Häme Polytechnic (Finland) Stockholm Institute of Environment (Sweden)
CEESA – The Central and Eastern European Countries Sustainable Agriculture	Humboldt University (Germany) Helsinki University (Finland) Newcastle University
Agricultural development in Estonia – options under EU accession	German Development Institute (Berlin) – Dr. H. Brandt and 5 researchers
Local Elite in Post-Communist Countries	London School of Economics and Political Science
Parliaments in Post-Communist Countries of Eastern and Central Europe	University of Greensboro (North Carolina, USA)
Democratization in Central and Eastern European Countries	European Institute of Sussex in collaboration with the European Commission and European Council of Ministers
Elite in the Baltic Countries	University of Oslo (Norway)
Cooperation and Rural Development in Reindependent Estonia	Finnish Academy of Science
European integration, regional specialization, and localization of industrial activities in integrating countries	University of Bonn (Germany)
Company Adjustment and Restructuring During Economic Transformation in Central and Eastern Europe	Institute of Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Competitiveness of the Estonian Food Industry from the Perspective of Integration in the EU	Scandinavian Institute for Administrative Research
Labor Markets and International Trade in the Baltic Economies	Erasmus University Rotterdam (Netherlands)
Baltic States Joining the EU: The Impact of Harmonization of Agricultural and Trade Policies on Baltic Agriculture	Agricultural Economics Research Institute (Netherlands)
Coping with Financial Reform in Emerging Market Economies: Analytical Tools	University of Wales College of Cardiff (UK)
Statistical Performance Indicators for Keeping Watch over Public Procurement	Aristotelion University of Thessaloniki (Greece)
Trade, Growth, and Integration: Modeling the Accession Countries	National Institute of Economics and Social Research (UK)
The Macroeconomic and Microeconomic Implications of Currency Boards in Transition Economies	International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (Austria)
Foreign Banks and Economic Transition	University of Groningen (Netherlands)
Alternatives of Exchange Rate Regime in Advanced Transition Economies	Financial Research Ltd. (Hungary)

László Csaba

Economics - Hungary[1]

The following pages attempt to survey major trends, without aspiring to full coverage of a subject that would require a monograph. In structuring the present country study, I strictly follow the thematic orientations that have evolved from the series of preparatory meetings and try to address those issues that the present project sees as focal.

Presenting an overview is difficult because systemic and analytical collecting of bibliographical data ceased to exist, and available databases are selective and largely influenced by coincidental factors. Core publishers have radically diminished their academically oriented activities in Hungary and have re-oriented their supply toward how-to-do books, textbooks, and translations of various sorts. It is hard to find monographs written by living Hungarian academics, i.e., books (other than policy commentaries) still made available by professional academic publishers and *not* falling into any of the above categories.

Meanwhile, new small and medium-sized publishing houses have emerged, and they do venture, on occasion, to print something that looks or actually is academic. A considerable part of the output of the post-transition period has been published in collective volumes abroad, whose systematic and analytical coverage is not available in any of the big libraries or databases.[1]

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Hungary has had a long tradition of economic thinking dating back to the mid-1700s (with Gergely Berzeviczy) that tended to follow world trends, mediated by *Austrian* tendencies. This tradition was strongly influenced by practical experiences such as war, inadequate tax collection, crises, etc. (for an overview, cf Hetényi, 2000). This explains the crucial role of *public* finances, problems *of taxation*, market protection, avoidance of public debt, the focus on equitable *distribution*, and the limits to *state activities* in reaching these ideals.

While Hungary was constitutionally independent, it was politically and economically part of the Austrian Empire, employing an independent customs tariff from 1867 on. It is hardly by chance that in this period, as well as in the inter-war period of economic nationalism, the issue of the *optimal mix of free trade* (provided basically by the large imperial-regional market) *and market protection* (based on the infant industry argument) played a key role. This debate was influenced not only by the ideas of Friedrich List, but also by the fact that the political undercurrent of supporting and strengthening Hungarian statehood contradicted efficiency considerations (cf also Niederhauser, 2001).

This has led some observers (Mátyás, Antal, 2000) to underscore the statist tradition and the constant unwillingness to follow *laissez faire* by all school-molding personalities, as exemplified by Gyula Kautz and Béla Földes, the dominant professors of the 1863-1945 period at the Budapest University (Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetem). Others, however, highlight broader academia's relatively long adherence to traditional liberalism also in the inter-war period. Then only military industrialization and national euphoria, followed by a return of some lost territories in 1938-40 (following the first and second Vienna Decision of Great Powers) and the resultant developmental tasks, crowded out liberalism in favor of generally the state-led concepts (Lengyel, László 1994).

Thus those of the young generation of the 1930s and '40s who survived the war and the political purges of 1944-49 and also refrained from emigration tended to be adherents of a managed economy (*gelenkte Wirtschaft*) of one sort or another. This statement holds for the small

1 The author would like to thank Július Horváth and János M. Kovács for their useful comments on the first draft and Alf Vanags, Morten Hansen, and Tadeusz Kowalik for theirs on the second draft.

number of non-Marxists who survived the political waves and avoided the marginalization that had been the fate of the school-molding personalities of the inter-war period, such as Ákos Navratil, Farkas Heller, István Varga, József Judik, and Ede Theiss. These people were not involved in policymaking during World War II; thus these purges are not comparable to the Nuremberg Tribunal activities. The "cleansing" affected all social sciences, the entire state administration, and the judiciary, and judgment on the basis of individual merit was an exception, not the rule.

It is important to underscore that pre-war traditions and insights could thus have a limited impact at best, due to the complete purge of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and of the universities in 1946-49. The newly established[2] Karl Marx University of Economics (KMUE)/(Marx Károly Közgazdaságtudományi Egyetem, MKKE) was launched under one of the staunchest Stalinist ideologues, László Rudas having returned from Moscow[3]. The Institute of Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Magyar Tudomanyos Akademia Kozgazdasagtudomanyi Intezete, MTA) was established by (and for the followers of) Imre Nagy, the reformed communist party leader, and this institute remained a stronghold of reformist-revisionist thinking up until the mid-1980s[4]. The presence of non-Marxists was fragmentary and ad hoc, mostly in the working groups on economic reform and in some privileged places such as the Institutes of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. But even here, personal loyalty or luck, rather than academic excellence, shaped survival possibilities.

Having prescribed the official language, the dogmas, and the intellectual framework for analyses, Marxism became a defining component for intellectual development in the period 1949-79. Most of those who became radically opposed to the régime came from either Communist families or went through at least a temporary but intense flirtation with Marxism as a youthful enthusiasm. This resulted not only from the Communist Party's monopoly on truth and information, but also from the upbringing and convictions of the new elite. Well-known exceptions only underscore the rule.

One of the true paradoxes of Hungarian economic thought is therefore how little true Marxism, as a seriously taken ideological framework, shaped *research output* in the period under scrutiny[5]. There is no need to rehash extensive surveys and documentations of the theoretical evolution of the period (cf Berend, 1988; Antal, 1998; Szamuely and Csaba, 1998). The bottom line is that, with the disenchantment following the crushing of the 1956 revolution and even more following the derailment of the experiment with "socialism with a human face" in 1968 in Prague, *pragmatism* and pronounced non-ideological orientations *prevailed* over the continuing language of party secretaries. True, language does put severe limitations on what could be studied and communicated and how.

This notwithstanding, Hungarian economic research tended to be *empiricist*, increasingly *formal*[6] and *integrated* in the international profession. The latter was associated with the continuing cultural liberalization, which permitted longer study trips abroad, regular visits by foreign scholars to Hungary, and last but not at all least, *regular publications of Western economics and thought*. This began with a Hungarian edition of Keynes' *General Theory* in 1965 and continued with the publication of collections of Economics Nobel Prize winners, such as Friedman, Tobin, Hicks, and Shultz, not to mention numerous collective volumes. Publications of such books as Max Weber's classic works, Karl Polányi, Alexander Gerschenkron, and many others have created what was called at the time a second dimension of publicity.

From 1955 on, the university curriculum again included[7] an extensive, though critical, presentation of major Western contemporary economic schools (Mátyás, Antal, 1991). These posed a constant challenge to upcoming generations to make use of the sources opened up by publishing activities. Relatively unconstrained access to libraries permitted relatively broad groups of economists to regularly familiarize themselves and keep up with Western theories. In the more applied fields, from finance to management and marketing, reference to Western concepts became the standard as a base for understanding the bits and pieces.

The influence of Western economics was thus constantly much *broader* and *deeper* than direct reference to academic writings might suggest. Especially during the 1980s, a multidimensional radicalization was followed by *convergence to Western standards*. In the teaching practice of the Budapest University of Economics (Budapesti Közgazdaságtudományi Egyetem, BUES), political economy courses were discontinued in 1986 and replaced by standard macro- and microeconomic education. Symbolically, the school dropped the reference to Karl Marx from its name (though its ideological tolerance and pluralism had been observable even before). These changes were all the more impressive when we consider that traditional screening procedures excluded critical minds from teaching positions in higher education. Such thinkers found employment with the HAS or institutes of applied research and could publish their ideas, but not teach them. The obstacles were *not* abolished until 1990.

Step by step, economics had become radicalized. On *one* level (documented in Szamuely and Csaba, 1998), proposals to introduce *capital markets*, *convertibility*, and *private property* were openly formulated, sometimes even in policy documents. On *another* level, formalized training expanded, and a growing number of students were able to continue their graduate studies in the West. *Third,* traditional empirical-sociological analyses of the behavior of institutions and corporations alike became increasingly critical, showing the hopelessness of the situation under the given constraints. Studies of the irregular economy, of finances, and of foreign trade should be noted in particular. *Fourth*, the formation of opposition movements and, later, parties allowed the formation of independent policy platforms, unconstrained by ideological bias or considerations of political expedience, which always loomed over the official reform projects.

Interestingly, while oppositionals had once been at the forefront of demonstrating the unfeasibility of the Marxist economic project (Kis, Márkus, and Bence, 1972)[8], political movements *added little* to what was already available at the time of their conception. As a retrospective analysis (Laki, 2000) demonstrated in detail, the prevalent concepts were ideas of self-management, a “Third Way”, and a big state sector complemented by competing small business in services. Even if conservatives were talking of the *soziale Marktwirtschaft*, they did not really mean it (Lányi, 1996). Their message was to dissociate themselves from “unbridled capitalism”, an idea feared by many, following the bad news that followed the first months of shock therapy in Poland (i.e., of high inflation, layoffs, etc.).

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

It would be hard to speak of a 1990 *Neuanfang* in the life of Hungarian economics. Previously covert ideological differences have come out in the open and previously suppressed right-wing political convictions can now be aired. These, however, have added little, if any value to the professional debate. Since Hungary’s revolution was truly a negotiated one (Tőkés, 1997), any search for such a Rubicon as the collapse of the Berlin Wall or the demolition of the Czechoslovak or Rumanian communist dictatorships in November-December 1989 would be in vain. On the one hand, some fundamental policies and institutional reforms, such as the liberalization of foreign trade, privatization, and the re-opening of the stock exchange, were already launched by the outgoing Németh administration. On the other hand, the country was so deeply in debt that there was little room for the new elite to experiment. With the exception of some odd émigrés, no one advocated radically dissimilar economic policies (cf the documentation in Székely and Newbery, 1993; Csaba, 1992). There were, of course, *differences* in regard to speed, sequence, distributional consequences, and the like, but *not in the fundamentals* of the underlying strategy.

Relatively limited and gradual changes in teaching could also be observed. While the approximation to Western standards in microeconomics has intensified, progress in macroeconomics has been slow. Orientation toward an outdated Keynesian-Kaleckian concept prevailed for over a decade even at the market-leading Budapest University of Economics and Public Administration (Budapesti Közgazdaságtudományi és Államigazgatási Egyetem, BUESPA). Several standard Western textbooks have, however, been translated (as early as 1987 in the case of the Samuelson-Nordhaus volumes), but their *application* in teaching practice *remained limited, if it existed at all*, ever since.

International economics continued to be dominated by the previous radical Neo-Marxist approaches, reflected in most core textbooks. These tended to be complemented by a growing body of descriptive material on the European Union, its policies, its functioning and Hungary's practices of adjusting legal arrangements and sectoral policies to these.

Industrial organization and business management tended to dominate over economics in the curricula of the newly established faculties. More university and college degrees have been awarded than ever before, raising serious concerns over quality – an issue not confined to the economics and business faculties (Polónyi and Timár, 2001). To give but one figure: the number of economics graduates was one thousand in 1989; it increased by a factor of eleven by 2001.

Most of the new faculties have been built on inherited political economy departments or former Marxism-Leninism institutes. This implies that, although several universities hired former oppositionals and other people, primarily from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, who had been critical of the *ancien régime,* a fundamental re-orientation of the economics discipline toward standard Western parameters still proved to be the exception rather than the rule, as far as macroeconomics is concerned. The old habit, not unusual in Western Europe, that each department uses its own textbook, seem to have prevailed in the majority of cases.

Given that the change of circumstances required many people to master introductory courses and teach these to a great number of students, *new faculties rarely have proven to be fountains of original new research*. Their presence is felt only poorly, if at all, in the academic journals, and except for publishing their own textbooks with their home publishers, they rarely penetrate to international markets. [9]

The change of elites has thus been *gradual and incremental*, accelerated by switchovers to politics and business, a feature quite common also in the United States and elsewhere. Negotiated revolution in Hungary allowed for limited changes, with no purges, lustration or the like. Leading ideologues of the *ancien régime* could enjoy renewed tenures and late retirements in a large number of cases (even without converting into national-conservative activists).

Taking the examples of Budapest universities, the late Rudolf Andorka, the Rector of BUESPA in 1991-97, himself a victim of persecutions, placed great emphasis on avoiding purges. The Budapest Technical University (Budapesti Műszaki és Gazdaságtudományi Egyetem), expanding its activity in teaching economics and management, had serious difficulties luring academic excellence, even to serious positions. It succeeded in re-employing losers of BUESPA's various power twists and turns, but much less in creating a supply response of new, previously untested talent to conquer the pages of leading national and international academic journals.

One of the big surprises of the post-1989 period has been the very *limited presence of private capital and private initiative* in general. In part, this has been due to the lacunae in tax legislation in Hungary. They render donations to charity foundations less than lucrative, limiting their size to ridiculously low amounts[10] (measured against the actual consolidated costs of running any academic institution on a regular basis). Legislation on non-profit activities has been rudimentary, slow, and inadequate to funding needs (Kuti, 1996). This holds not only for teaching, but all across the potential range of civic activity, from health care to looking after homeless people.

Another defining feature of the overall landscape has been the lack of a well-to-do and civilized middle class oriented toward cultural values. Sociological analyses have shown middle classes to be the main losers of transformation[11]. Moreover, the new middle class is more of a traditional *Besitzbürgertum* than a *Bildungsbürgertum*, which is hardly surprising in view of the well-known trends in income rearrangements. Last but not least, foreign capital and foreign donor organizations have taken an equally skeptical view of investment opportunities in this field.

As a consequence, *private* universities and *private* research institutions have *remained the exception*, not new rule-makers. On a large scale, only Central European University, funded chiefly by the donation of a single private person, and the Pázmány (Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem) and Károli Universities (Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem), funded by the Roman Catholic and Reformed Calvinist Churches, respectively, were able to take root with a longer-term perspective. It is true that management courses and business schools abound, but few of them could be accredited by the state on the base of their merit; and their academic performance is not measurable.

In the field of research, for similar reasons, no major progress can be observed. While institutions of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences had to be merged and "consolidated", i.e., downsized, they survive basically through self-financing, i.e., on case-by-case project financing through their members. Applied economics research institutions, such as Financial Research Inc. (Pénzügykutató Rt), Kopint-Datorg Economic Research, and GKI Economic Research Institute (Gazdaságkutató Intézet) have been increasingly (almost exclusively) pushed toward *business consultancy*, with some of the long-time members still devoting some of their time and energy to research as a private hobby. Cooperation with Western institutions was helpful as bridging solutions to individual headaches, but *not for creating a new structure* to fund research. Other new institutions, such as the Institute for Economic Growth (Növekedéskutató Intézet) and the TREND Forecast Group (TREND-PROGNÓZIS Kft), are thinly-veiled party think-tanks, employing a couple of analysts, and – naturally – not proving terribly ambitious for measurable academic achievement.

Case-by-case funding seems to have been instrumental in *shaping research orientations and publishing venues* – an issue we shall discuss below. The trivial consequence is, of course, a decline in fundamental research and a strong orientation toward practically relevant/financable projects.

Interestingly, but understandably, *repatriation has not been* a *significant* source of gaining new knowledge and new people. Rehabilitation of émigrés already began in the 1970s, with Hungarians who had gained fame abroad being invited and celebrated by the home audience, including officialdom. Lord Thomas Balogh, Lord Nicholas Káldor (not, however Lord Peter Bauer), and the chief of the Council of Economic Advisors in the Ford administration, William Fellner, Béla Balassa of Johns Hopkins (and an influential figure shaping the World Bank paradigm on development), and many others have already found their ways to the local audience.[12]

Among those who did *not* return prior to 1989, we find hardly anyone with an important scientific or other professional contribution. The typical career path is that of Baron Alexandre Lámfalussy, who declined to abandon a professional path culminating in the Presidency of the European Monetary Institute merely to be nominated the Governor of the National Bank of Hungary in 1990 (reconfirmed in: *Világgazdaság,* Sept. 24, 2001)[13]. Thus, while contributing occasional advice to the government, successful people tended to remain where they were. On the other hand, the business community did profit from the return of some expats. Given the previous openness of the country, this issue has not been as important as in some other countries, like Estonia.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

Pre-war traditions could hardly be revived in Hungarian economics. *First,* the great advance of economics as a science, the breakthrough of formalization through Samuelson's revolution, has entirely rewritten what is today the mainstream of the profession. *Second*, very few representatives of the pre-1949 period survived in any shape to even theoretically nurture students of their own. *Third*, those who did survive the Stalinist period have in fact been *absorbed by reform economics*, i.e., that branch of applied research that aimed at improving the performance of the command economy by incorporating some market elements.

This was true of such once celebrated and influential non-Marxists as Jenő Wilcsek, head of the Institute for Financial Research in the 1960s, József Bognár, Director of the Institute for World

Economy (Világgazdasági Kutató Intézet) from 1967-87, and István Varga, founder and Director of the Institute for Economic Research from 1930-49 (Magyar Gazdaságkutató Intézet) and Chairman of the Committee for Economic Reform from 1956-57, to name a few. An exception to this rule is the Academy member Béla Csikós-Nagy, who has remained critical of the "overdose of monetarism" in Hungarian policy-making and who basically retains the conceptual framework of the managed economy of the 1930s (Csikós-Nagy, 1997). Building on this concept, he also developed a power-based explanation of the price system in the global economy (Csikós-Nagy and Elek, 1995).

If we abstract from this, traditional Hungarian economics has become absorbed as a *core component in reform economics*, trying to use economic levers to attain policy goals.[14] The more the history of reform economics moved away from the state-managed economy to one based on the free market and private property, the more the *surpassing* of the managed-economy concept proved *inherent* and *organic*. The professional consensus in favor of capital markets, which emerged after a series of experiments to find substitutes for it, suggested that the very idea invariably failed (as documented convincingly in Tardos, 1986; Antal and Várhegyi, 1987). This *defined a point of no return* for the post-1989 period, as well.

East-West asymmetries thus evolved in several planes. *First,* relatively few researchers could directly join in the mainstream debates on economic theory. This had to do with the orientation and representation of Hungarian research. The only exception to this general rule has been János Kornai, who is in a category of his own. Given his manifold interests and background, which relate to formalized economics just as much as to empirical research and institutional analysis, his books were published by Western publishers already decades before transition (as *Overcentralization* (Kornai, 1959) *Anti-Equilibrium* (Kornai, 1972), and *Economics of Shortage* (Kornai, 1980) amply demonstrated). His articles appeared in all leading academic journals, from *Econometrica* to *American Economic Review*. However, it would be hard to classify his output in standardized categories – maybe precisely this building of bridges between separate worlds is one of the attractions of his analyses.

Second, in the more formalized approaches, Hungarian contributions tended to be made in the *methodological dimension* (Kőrösi et al., 1992; Mátyás, László 1999; Bródy, 1969b; Mátyás, László 1997; Valentiny and Lee, 2000). Traditional representatives of the formalized approaches also made significant contributions to pension-reform modeling (Augusztinovics, 2001; Augusztinovics, 2000; Simonovits, 2001), GDP measurement (Bródy, 1969/b, 1995), and the analysis of long-term cycles in economic development (Bródy, 1999). More recently, important contributions have been made to mainstream theory as well. The article of József Sákovics (with de Fraja, 2001) applies Nash's game-theoretical approach to the formation of equilibrium price on the market. Contesting the previous critical view in the literature, Sákovics demonstrates that decentralized trade may lead to a Walrasian outcome, if entry is exogenous. András Simonovits (1999) has contributed to the theories of long-term cycles and of overlapping generations.

Third, traditional *empirically oriented* research remained strong, if not defining, during the 1990s. Monographic analyses of Hungarian privatization by Mihályi (1998) as well as by Antal-Mokos (1998), adopting a microeconomic perspective, and the two volumes by Voszka (1995,1997) are representatives of this school. Analyses of why small businesses do not develop into Microsoft's or Xerox-type success stories (Laki, 1998; Csaba, 1998), as well as theoretical (Inotai, 1989) and empirical analyses of the impacts of foreign direct investment (Hamar, 1995; Hunya, 1999; Mihályi, 2001; Szekeres, 2001) and of the enforcement of contracts (Papanek, 1999) are, in fact, a continuation of the field research that used to be a strong point of Hungarian analyses.

Fourth, new orientations have emerged with the need to redefine traditional, production-oriented, and market-unfriendly approaches to farming, in the context of globalization and ongoing reforms within the European Union (Fertő, 1999). This approach cautions against mechanistic extrapolation of EEC practices of the 1960s and 1970s onto the new, acceding countries. It also highlights the limited efficiency of these policies in attaining the social and economic goals that used to legitimate their existence.

Globalization itself has become a subject of a controversy that obviously exceeds the limits of the economics profession.[15] Academic contributors to this debate (Király, Csontos and László, G. 1997; Lányi, 1997; 2001; Pete, 1999; Csikós-Nagy, 1999; Antal, 2000; Inotai, 2001) have highlighted the continued relevance of standard economic concepts in explaining new phenomena. Meanwhile, they helped clarify the existence and functioning of new structures and networks in the contemporary world economy. These controversies have contributed to the *convergence* of domestic and international debates in terms of *timing*, *subjects*, and *conclusions* alike.

Mirroring the changing choice of topics and methodologies in leading US journals, reflections on the *borderline between macro- and microeconomics* have also surfaced in Hungary. The study of *business networks* (Kocsis, 1998), the analysis of learning firms and new trends in *industrial organization* (Szabó and Kocsis, 2000), and the study of the *theory of markets* (Bruszt and Stark, 1998, Bruszt, 2000; Török; 2001) are all indications of keeping pace with contemporary Western analytic currents. Studying the limited role of institutional investors (Karsai, 2001) and of corporate alliances replacing the rat race (Buzárdy and Tari, 2001) and analysis of the non-profit sector (Kuti, 1996) and of state reorganization/organization rendering the difference between macro and micro relative (Szabó, 2000b) round out the picture. This list is far from exhaustive, and I have intentionally avoided reference to my own narrower specialty, international economic relations.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

This truly very selective overview of issues may demonstrate that *transition was not the sole or even decisive focus* of economic inquiry in Hungary in the 1990s. This notwithstanding, a long-term observer and critic of the profession (Kovács, 1999: 322) has found the comparative advantage of this trend of thought precisely in its ability to analyze hybrid or confused states or processes. This means that evolution has been path-dependent, with the ambiguities stemming from more or less distant past events and experiences. This point is neatly demonstrated in the recent overview by András Nagy (2001), which presents an Olsonian view of systemic change and highlights the continuity in monopolistic and redistributive structures during all rearrangements.

Interestingly, this is the point where transformation studies come in, both by themselves and as processes extending researchers' interest to previously uncultivated areas. It is hardly by chance that monographs by János Kornai (1990, 1996) played a pioneering role in the international debate on systemic change. Some, but not very large numbers of monographs have been produced on the subject, such as Köves (1992), Csaba (1995), and Greskovits (1998), but their number is actually less than could have been expected from a once-leading reforming country. Collective volumes, such as Csaba (1994), Gáspár (1997), Bokros and Dethier (1998), and Halpern and Wyplosz (1999), are numerous but obviously hard to classify. They testify to the high level of actually accomplished *convergence* to Western *standards* of both formulation and publishing practice.[16]

Also typical of the situation and reflecting limited funding and institutional constraints, the bulk of the books published today tend to be collections of previously published ad hoc analyses by various authors, textbooks, historic overviews, or simply series of essays expressing more or less structured reflections on the subject. Generalizations on transition and on economics, sometimes quite sweeping, abound[17], but their substantiation through literature reviews, impact factor analyses, monographs, and other conventional sources of scientific inquiry are surprisingly rare, and the number of new entrants to this market is, even more surprisingly, even lower.

One contribution going beyond day-to-day policy debates was the monograph of János Kornai (1997) on the *reform of the health care* system, calling for partial marketization in order to infuse new capital in the sector. The *Festschrift* for Augusztinovics (Király, Száz, and Simonovits, 2000) contains mostly sectoral analyses and modeling papers on the *pension system*, while the *Festschrift* for Lányi (Laki, Pete and Vince, 1999) contains mostly reflective and insightful analyses on the *international economy*. In both volumes, interdisciplinary approaches and quantitative analyses can be observed in peaceful coexistence.

In most of the literature it is hard to spot an unambiguous theoretical orientation. *Eclecticism* has always characterized Hungarian researchers, maybe because of the need for ideological compromises and to make their findings politically more acceptable. This is clear not only in studying fuzzy states, where it is probably inevitable to some degree, but in the more traditional fields of analysis as well.

Some of the contributions on *long-term growth* potential and the options related to it, such as Darvas and Simon (2000) and Simon, György (2001), have a clear neoclassical orientation and a concomitant message on the limits to governmental aspirations to foster growth via short-term activism, but other conventional approaches are less clear-cut. The monograph by Tibor Erdős (1998) on *inflation* and that by Éva Várhegyi (1997) on *bank privatization* take a *middle ground* between the customary theoretical extremes, similarly to the early contribution by Tardos (1992) to the international privatization debates. Thus, it would be hard to pin down a theoretical mainstream in Hungarian analyses in economics, if not the middle-of-the-road position and a fair degree of theoretical agnosticism, neatly reflected in a major contribution on exchange rate policy (Szapáry and Jakab, 1998) and in one on the efficiency-enhancing qualities of privatization (Major, 1999). This seems to be the typical view of the European Union (Inotai, 1998), stressing both the favorable and the less favorable components of the process of accession, including social costs and costs of enlargement proper (Inotai, 1999; Nagy, 1999; Szemlér, 2000).

In sum, it would be hard to find anything that would qualify as trailblazing methodological or theoretical novelties on the global scale. However, previous provincialism and methodological insufficiency have also subdued. The *substance and the style of discussion have converged to Western standards*. Subjects and interpretation, as well as points of emphasis, however, continue to have a certain *couleur locale,* and perhaps rightly so. This is reflected, *inter alia*, in the fact that transition economics has taken a prominent place in mainstream journals, most recently in (Kornai, 2001).

The intriguing question that emerges at this point is whether we can speak of a *Hungarian school of economics*. For the present and the future, it is hard not to share the skepticism of János Vincze (1996), who refers to the level of abstraction and the methodological universalism inherent in the modern analytical methods of economics as a separate scientific discipline and its self-interpretation (or self-imposed limits). On the other hand, looking back to the period since the 1930s, it is hard not to see the presence of a school in the sense of *shared approaches, visions, and even weaknesses*. This shared view is pragmatic, one concerned with the studious analysis of empirical reality, including corporate behavior and observation of the state administration's *modus operandi*, and reflecting on Hungary character as a small open economy. The latter implies limitations on any sort of ability to plan and on administrative control. On the other hand, there is also a degree of distrust in the invisible hand and a call for public policies to correct market failures.

To the extent that the economic school around Kelecki and Lange and around Brus and later Balcerowicz can be called the Polish economic school, the school represented and synthesized first and foremost by the predominant oeuvre of János Kornai can be called the Hungarian economic school. The critical reformist trend, established by such 1956 figures as Márton Tardos and András Nagy, and the empiricist tradition represented by László Antal, Kamilla Lányi, Mihály Laki, and many others add up to a clear *move* away from the managed economy concept of the 1930s towards the *one world consensus* currently shaping economic discourses in OECD countries (including, of course, the conceptual ambiguities inherent in any such consensual and policy-oriented approach). Thus, *neoinstitutionalism* (i.e., combining the neoclassical paradigm with the study of collective action and institutions) seems to have been the goal of the six-decade journey.

The special Hungarian road has, in fact, entered one branch of mainstream thinking – as represented by the European Economic Association and the Econometric Society – in that younger and more formally trained scholars are directly joining the international discourses. On the other hand, the features of eclecticism, pragmatism, and the search for middle-of-the-road solutions also seem to remain an important feature of the general way of thinking.[18] Obviously, it is not hard to find adherents to Keynesian, neoclassical, and even neo-Marxist schools, as in any other country. Still, the *couleur locale* obviously remains, currently increasingly as an *additional* feature of general approaches[19], while remnants of the past continue to influence public and policy discourse for obvious reasons.

5. Public space and academic debates

From what has been presented in the preceding sections, it follows that scarce and selective funding and changes in its pattern have become fundamental in re-arranging thematic orientation and access to markets, especially international markets. In a typical case, a Hungarian researcher becomes a *part of an international team*. In some cases, he himself organizes one and finds resources to publish the findings. As a consequence the presence of Hungarian (as well as Czech, Polish, and other transition country) citizens has *increased* in the international markets. Likewise, it is becoming quite rare to find a book that would qualify as "Hungarian economic literature", because, since the 1960s, the typical volume has increasingly been *multi-author, multinational*, and published by an *international publisher* (e.g. Clarke, 1989; Vajda and Simai, 1971) or by a national publisher, but in English for the world markets. The latter applies, alas, to a growing extent to German, French, Italian research and publishers. Consequently it is increasingly difficult to make any general statements on Hungarian or Polish (etc.) economics. Journals as well as books are increasingly international, as documented in the references appended to this survey.

At the end of the day, only the citation index and the number of reviews reflect the impact of our output. The distance to policy-making has grown, which is a welcome development in terms of independence, but unfavorable in terms of funding and creating conditions for market access.

What we have described also implies that the US standard of measuring performance by the *number of articles published in first-rate journals on pure theory* is *not* a *proper standard for evaluation* of actual accomplishments in the field.[20]

Most of the research output is produced in the framework of internationally funded research projects, where peer review takes place through the selection of authors, through research workshops, and frequently through the publishers' ex post external refereeing of the materials. In other words, lacking the above infrastructure, *most of the output could never have come about*. And conversely, quality management is in the best interest of project coordinators and publishers. Thus, in the majority of cases, there are simply no free (not pre-committed) articles produced directly for the free markets.

This circumstance does *not* lead to the deterioration of quality, since substandard output is rejected by publishers and/or by unfavorable echo from reviewers. On the other hand, a century of experience shows that books have a lifespan of ten-plus years, while articles survive only three to four years at best. This point is easy to document via impact factor and citation index analysis in any discipline, including economics. The conclusion is that judging solely on the basis of journal articles, especially in leading theoretical journals, provides a seriously and *systematically distorted view* of the particular subject matter under scrutiny.

It is important to recall that *truly trailblazing studies* in the field have *resulted in and from international cooperation*, often on the global scale. The authoritative volume on welfare state reform (Nelson, Tilly, and Walker, 1999) and a more recent volume on the political economy of redefining the state (Kornai, Haggard, and Kaufman, 2001) could never have been produced without the type of institutional and funding infrastructure described above. An insightful analysis of the banking reforms in transition countries (Bonin, Mizsei, Székely, and Wachtel, 1998), a multi-country study of privatization experience in the region (Major, 1999), a study of competition policy (Török, 1998), and one of adjustment to external disturbances (Bara and Csaba, 2000) are all cases in point. Almost none of the monographs quoted in the present survey of literature could have been produced without reliance on some sort of international cooperation and funding. For collective volumes, this goes without saying, and it remains the rule for individual articles, as well. Papers written out of sheer scientific or civic enthusiasm constitute a minuscule fraction.

This state of affairs explains the *small and declining proportion of purely theoretical* pieces and of fundamental research. From the viewpoint of theory of science, this should be a *warning sign to authorities*, since efficient adaptation and imitation does *presuppose some fundamental research* and the resultant ability to independently replicate some of the original research. It is equally a warning sign that much of the quoted output is a result of people– retired professors and emeritus researchers, as well as employees of the state administration – spending longer research stays abroad. In other words, much of the scientific production referred to is an *externality, from the point of view of current Hungarian public funding of economics research*. To put it differently, domestic and foreign project financing has been dominant in triggering the output over and above the regular budgets earmarked for R+D and university education, respectively.

In the broader intellectual life, transition has resulted in a multiplication of journals and intellectual workshops of various sorts, but stagnation and contraction has become the rule in academia. While old, established journals (without exception) fight for their survival, *no new foundation has proved to be a market success*. At the onset of transition, each institution launched its own publications or journal, often in English. The impact of the majority of these proved negligible, and so they disappeared. While the dominance of Anglo-Saxon global journals and publishers seems natural in all the disciplines, it is questionable whether there were really absolutely no demand for regional publishers and journals, as there was for regional stock exchanges and other regional markets. On the other hand, this state of affairs is likely to reinforce and cement the *unhealthy concentration* of truly academic activity *in the capital city*, thus perpetuating the laggard status of new regional establishments, despite their formal upgrading to university status.

Leading journals have therefore suffered under multiple pressures. *First*, a large proportion of new intellectual output is being pre-committed for publishers, mostly international ones. *Second*, the remaining output needs to be directed to top journals, not of the region, but of the globe, or at least of the European Union (EU). *Third*, the academic community normally does not reward publication in local languages, or only to a very limited degree. Thus the incentive to translate, let alone to adapt, scientific output has become a matter or patriotism.

In Hungary, the English language quarterly *Acta Oeconomica* was able to survive and invite high-quality contributions, mostly but not exclusively from the region. As time passes, it is becoming increasingly international. Its focus remains on transition, but its openness to various methods has also remained.

Among the Hungarian-language publications, *Közgazdasági Szemle* (Economic Review) traditionally offers the widest publicity to an academic. Publishing there has remained, to some degree, a point of reference for academic appreciation. It has sustained its broad, all-encompassing orientation, and thus the quality of papers is very uneven. *Szigma*, the journal on mathematical economics, by contrast, maintains high standards but is not very widely cited outside the circle of its contributors. *Külgazdaság* (External Economics) is a forum for policy-oriented research and international economics. Its strength is its constant orientation toward empirical research. It also regularly publishes leading articles from transition economics research in Hungarian and thus can be very useful in drafting up-to-date, high-standard curricula in Hungarian.

Given the broad interest that economic issues and especially policy debates command, there is almost no interdisciplinary journal that would not welcome contributions from economists. So the tradition of *publishing some of the policy papers* in *non-academic journals or even newspapers* *has continued*. As a result, no one can claim with a clear conscience to possess a complete overview of the market.

The *feedback of world supply* to Hungarian audiences has proceeded much more efficiently. Publishers started with the items previously not included in the Nobel Prize winner series, like Friedrich August von Hayek or James Buchanan. Regrettably, the publisher discontinued this series in the mid-1990s.

Captive audiences seem to minimize risk, so publishers in Hungary have also shown diligence in acquiring anything that is or can potentially be a *textbook.* These include such bestsellers as *Public Sector Economics* by Joe Stiglitz (published in Hungarian in 2001) and the intermediate level *Microeconomics* of Hal Varian (published in 1996), which is to be followed by the advanced-level version (in 2002). In addition to the currently thriving translation business, some good-quality textbooks on standard economics by Hungarian authors have also been published, supported by university and college promises to use the books in the curricula. These include the *Macroeconomics* introduction by András Simon (1999), *Mathematical Economics* by Ernő Zalai (2001) and András Simonovits (1998), and the *Introduction to Comparative Economics* edited by Zoltán Bara and Katalin Szabó (2000).

It is worth recalling that academic independence/university autonomy implies, *inter alia*, the possibility and acceptable risk of relying on homegrown textbooks, irrespective of the availability of a different text that outside observers may consider superior. *Macroeconomics* by Gregory Mankiw, for instance, has not proven to be a bestseller, nor did the bulky *Monetary Economics* volume or Meir Kohn replace the four volumes BUESPA used on the same subject matter. Attempts to re-introduce the uniformity of the communist period are, of course, doomed to failure.

One of the fundamental components determining the high degree of uncertainty in the area is the *predominantly business orientation of students and faculties alike*.[21] Typically, the leading economics institution, BUESPA, has been reducing the role of theoretical and international courses in its most recent rearrangement of the curriculum. In other faculties I am familiar with, the unilateral business orientation is even stronger, and this is likely to backfire soon. The labor market is known to prefer people with a broad general education for longer-term employment, whereas narrowly specialized or low-skilled people may easily be crowded out at an early stage of their career.

The exponentially growing reliance on the *Internet* helps overcome many of the problems university and graduate students face due to the underfunding of libraries. However, the same financial constraints also limit the number and types of databases that can practically be made available to students and faculty alike.

Hungarian economists have traditionally been active in the *international arena*; the late József Bognár was a member of the Club of Rome and, together with Béla Csikós-Nagy, a formative personality of the International Economic Association. The IEA used to serve as a major bridge between East and West; its conferences drew top-level attendance, especially in the 1970s and 1980s; and the selected papers from conference proceedings have regularly been published as a series by Palgrave (ex-MacMillan), a leading British publishing house. András Bródy, as editor of *Economic Systems Research* (a Carfax journal), has played an important role in the formalized branch. János Kornai, who already published in *Econometrica* in the 1960s (Kornai and Lipták, 1965) and in other leading theoretical journals in the 1970s (Kornai and Simonovits, 1977), was elected President of the Econometric Society in 1978 and President of the equally mainstream-oriented and -dominated European Economic Association in 1987 and also delivered the keynote Ely Lecture of the American Economic Association in 1992 (Kornai, 1992). Iván T. Berend, President of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1986-90 and currently Professor for Russian and European Studies at UCLA, was Vice President of the International Association of Economic Historians from 1986-94. Hungarians have been prominent among the members of the European Association for Comparative Economic Studies. Attila Chikán, the current Rector of BUESPA, has been President of the European Federation of Industrial and Production Management Associations since 1997 and First Vice President of the World Federation for Sourcing and Management since 1998.

This impressive record contrasts with the *minimal if at all measurable performance of domestic professional associations* of various sorts. The Hungarian Economic Association has long been dominated by active and outgoing politicians (its current chairman served twice as Minister of Finance – in 1987-89 and 1996-98 – and has been elected as the Socialist Party's nominee for the premiership in April 2002; former presidents included the Chairman of the Price Board, the Minister for Planning, etc.). Before transition, the HEA used to publish a very critical analytical quarterly, *Gazdaság* (Economy), obtainable by member subscription only, though it was also available in big libraries. Many innovative articles were published there (as documented in Szamuely and Csaba, 1998), but it was still discontinued in 1990.[22] HEA conventions are conceived and practiced as primarily social and regional events with some policy flavor, *not as academic forums*. Interestingly, no competing group of civil society has emerged, despite the exponential growth in the number of economics and business graduates and postgrad or second-degree holders.

6. Views on further development

International cooperation is *likely to grow further* in importance for the evolution of economics in Hungary. Already at the *undergraduate level*, students have the opportunity to study a semester or two abroad, and they do so in masses. This will be an incentive not only to learn languages properly, but also to keep up with the *standards* and *methodologies* applied in Western centers of excellence. This is likely to enhance interest in good-quality teaching across the board.

Outside the EU, which is likely to remain the defining institutional variable, a pattern of *project-based* cooperation is likely to continue. Multilateral components may grow in importance if the subject matter mandates a comparative perspective, as issues of migration and the environment do. Likewise, some aspects may lead donors to demand a *comparative approach*, since interest in Hungarian or Estonian banking alone, torn out of context, is likely to be too small to make it financially interesting.

It is important to see, however, that the favorable features mentioned above apply more to *business, management, finance, and other policy-related fields*, whereas *academic* economics is likely to suffer from continued underfunding and the resultant bloodletting and adverse selection.

Cooperation is likely to revolve around EU-selected and -animated projects, which are often[23] forward-looking (i.e., help overcome provincialism and seclusion). In some other cases, this may result in strange outcomes, since some of the neighboring countries may fall outside of the frame of such cooperation. To mention just one case, the economics of crime and of border controls are surely issues to which Ukrainian colleagues could meaningfully contribute. But they have no chance, as long funding is EU-dependent and, as such, accession-focused.

Public sector research is ridiculously low in Hungary. Thanks to the reorganization of funding, its share climbed to 0.84 per cent of GDP by 2000 (about a third of the German proportion, or one-tenth of it in absolute terms). This is likely to remain a problem, since the conditions for more private involvement, in the form of nonprofit foundations, are not being brought about. As long as the state dominates universities, *funding* is likely to follow *student numbers*, *not excellence*. This is known to lead to deterioration of quality and neglect of research, a core component in securing high-quality education. So it is easy to visualize vicious cycle scenarios.

The democratization of university and college education means the extension of this level of schooling to 50 per cent of the cohort by 2006, without adequate support measures to ensure physical infrastructure and without footing the wage bill needed for quality management. This is likely to sustain the *neglect of research* in favor of immediate education/teaching, a key component in the *vicious cycle phenomenon*. Studying EU practices is more instructive than helpful in this respect, as is the approximation of practices to those of German/Italian/French/

British public universities, in what those responsible eloquently dub the "Bologna process". This produces large quantities of poorly skilled people, while research universities and other postgraduate centers of excellence continue to be "forgotten" by those deciding on funding and new establishments.

Even more of a problem, it seems, has been that research in the public sphere is increasingly *government dominated*, i.e., allocated by bodies directly responsibility to politicians and bureaucrats, rather than to the academic community. Public money increasingly tends to target *immediate policy concerns* or sectoral targets of clients of those in charge. Such forward-looking forms as the National Scientific Research Fund, allocated by scientists themselves, have been gradually bleeding to death in recent years. Thus, even what remains in the public sphere for research is likely to be earmarked for other purposes than purely research or academic activities, which again is an important component of the vicious cycle hypothesis.

The problem of the *brain drain* is already severe and is exacerbated by the shortsighted management of the PhD generation. While the gap between the public and private sectors, between business and research earnings has widened to unmanageable proportions, the senior faculty mostly views PhD students as cheap slave labor. On the one hand, the young person with some scientific ambition is paid miserably; on the other, the traditional compensation for this poor pay – freedom – is also taken away. These young people are the ones who are shouldering much of the burden of populist policies of "opening the gates". Thus, unlike earlier cohorts, they cannot expect to have better qualifications or significantly better quality human capital when they join the labor market.

Such a situation leads able young people to disappear from universities and even more so from pure research. This holds *a fortiori* for the truly academic orientations, like theoretical economics. If these people stick to their priorities, they *must* emigrate (as the personal career paths of Sákovics, Valentiny, Székely, or Kovács, among the references, illustrate).

Given the relatively small number of people involved, it would seem a relatively simple fiscal exercise to substantially reorient expenditures of the Hungarian budget and actually solve this problem. Otherwise the problem, clearly indicated by the overaged staff of the Institutes of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and most faculties' lack of PhD students who have published their *second* impressive article, is likely to perpetuate itself. With the fourth freedom – freedom of movement – gradually realized in the EU, there will be no way to stop people from accepting jobs that are paid 12-20 times better, on average, than at home.

---

1 This information stems not only from my own observation, but also from my colleagues, Dr. Mária Szlatky, head librarian, and Mr. Vit Lukas, acquisition librarian at the library of CEU, which is one of the more extensive collections. *Hungarika – Irodalmi Szemle* (Review of Hungarian Literature*)*, a publication of the Széchenyi Library that theoretically collects all pieces by Hungarian authors in all fields, appears with considerable delay and suffers from the shortcomings mentioned above, primarily from coincidental reporting/coverage. When the President of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences entrusted a similar task to the present author in 1999, the Library of the Academy flatly declined even to attempt to present a summary overview, and electronic databases are compiled in a mechanical fashion (for example, cataloguing identical authors by different name, if the publication is in a foreign language). The final report of the Section of Economics and Law to the President of HAS emerged as a consolidated list of publications by persons with sufficiently high ranks at universities and in HAS; it was thus never published, since it lacked any attempt at analytical assessment. Szentes and Zalai (2001) is an essay that does assess, but without documentation (like all other reports in the same series).

2 The Faculty of Economics enjoyed full independence within the Royal Hungarian University of Sciences between 1920 and 1934; then it was merged with the Regent József Technical University. But the KMUE was deliberately founded to break with its predecessors. More on this in Rosta (2001).

3 Muscovites considered everyone but themselves, even local Communists and veterans of the Spanish Civil War (1936-39), to be traitors, and thus already started purging these in 1945, with the trial of Pál Demény, a leading figure of local underground Communists. KMUE was to become the HR arsenal *(Kaderschmiede)* of the new guard, loyal above all to Moscow.

4 Then, many members joined politics, some retired, and others adopted different (academic or business) orientations.

5 Except for Bródy (1969a) and Zalai (1988), no serious academic attempt has surfaced to interpret Marx. No anti-revisionist books appeared in the 1960s and 1970s; the hallmarks of the period were direct applications of the Solow model (Erdõs, 1972 and 1989), critical growth-accounting (Jánossy, 1965), and applications of the Chenery-Kuznets model (Kádár, 1984).

6 Formalism does not necessarily mean adopting the mainstream approach. In Hungary, the trailblazing monographs, like those of Bródy (1969a), Augusztinovics (1979), and Zalai (1988), attempted to integrate Marxism and the new language. Kornai (1972) earned world fame (as reflected in the work's publication in a dozen languages) with his *critique* of the mainstream, expressed in standard economic terms.

7 The pre-war curriculum also contained a broad overview of economic thought; its qualities are reflected in a recent reprint edition published by BUESPA (Heller, 1943/2001). Antal Máyás, the defining figure of the curriculum and of the official history of thought, started his career in 1942 as an assistant of Heller and never joined the Communist Party. In a way, he represented historic continuity with all of its pluses and minuses.

8 The monograph, dubbed *Anti-Capital* by contemporaries, circulated as a mimeo and led to the only major political purge of the so-called Lukács school of philosophers and sociologists in the Kádár period after 1957. While everyone wishing to earn a diploma, MA, or PhD was obliged to condemn it in exams, the book was not published until 1992, after the collapse of communism in Hungary, though parts of it were published by *Magyar Füzetek*, a Paris-based emigré journal for *connaisseurs*.

9 A partial exception being the University of Veszprém, with Major (1999) and Major (ed. 1999). The only "trouble" is that the author is a typical representative of the middle generation that grew up in the Institute of Economics of the HAS in Budapest, not from the new foundations.

10 According to the tax law of 2000, a maximum of 50 thousand Fts (200 Euro) was deductible for charity donations.

11 The regular Household Panels of the TÁRKI Institute for Social Research, which publish their reports annually, have repeatedly documented this point with rich empirical material.

12 This included publishing some of their works in Hungarian, both as books and as journal articles.

13 Similar stories apply to André Kosztolány, the one-time "Pope of the Stock Exchange", and to Princeton professor Richard Quandt.

14 In this vein, Kornai (1986) describes them as naive reformers who earnestly believe the bureaucratic system can be improved. But this belief stemmed from disenchantment with markets, not from positive postulates about planning.

15 The only book in English on globalization to date is published by a critical social scientist (Szalai, 1999).

16 The first ideational history of transition studies (Greskovits, 2000: 40-41) highlights the risks of "going global" early and explains, *inter alia*, several failed forecasts on the process.

17 This could be observed in two self-reflective series of contributions: in 1996-1997 in *Közgazdasági Szemle*, titled "Between east and west", and in 1999-2000 in *BUKSZ* (Budapest Review of Books), titled "Hungarian economics on the world market".

18 According to the most recent self-interpretation of the HAS, written by two leading professors of BUESPA (Szentes and Zalai, 2001: 11), adherents of the mainstream still constitute a distinct minority both in *teaching* and in *research.* This is in line with our critical findings on teaching, but not in terms of measurable output (cf references).

19 So similarly in the ironic contribution of András Nagy (1996).

20 It is, of course, one important measure, acknowledged also by BUESPA, which has produced no less than three reprint volumes (Berács and Chikán, 1999; Temesi and Zalai, 1999; Lengyel and Rostoványi, 2001) from its faculty's output in refereed English language journals.

21 The three-volume reprint series of BUESPA cited above also took business management as its first title. Business orientation predominates among the subjects of BA, MA, and even PhD theses, and this holds *a fortiori* for the new faculties, where up to 95 percent of the output falls within this category.

22 For the time being, a reprint journal is published under the same name once a year, without, however, the openly critical flavor of the original.

23 This is not always the case. For instance, the critical policy paper by Andor (2000) blaming neoliberalism for every ill in Hungary could hardly be published without – misleadingly – having the European Union in its title.

References

Andor, László (2000): *Hungary on the Road to the EU: Transition in Blue*, Westport, CT and London, Praeger Publishers;

Antal, László (1998): "Mi maradt a reformközgazdaságtanból?" (What is left of reform economics?), in: *Gazdaság a rendszerváltozásban* (An economy in transition), Budapest, Financial Research Inc. and Perfekt Publishing House, 25-45;

Antal, László (2000): "A karaván halad" (And the caravan moves on), in: *Racionalitás és méltányosság* (Rationality and equity), Király, Júlia, Simonovits, András and Száz, János (eds.), Budapest, Közgazdasági Szemle Foundation, 365-87;

Antal, László and Várhegyi, Éva (1987): *Tőkeáramlás Magyarországon* (Capital allocation in Hungary), Budapest, Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó;

Antal-Mokos, Zoltán (1998): *Privatisation, Politics and Economic Performance in Hungary*, Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press;

Augusztinovics, Mária (1979): *Népgazdasági modellek a távlati tervezésben* (Macroeconomic models in long-term planning), Budapest, Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó;

Augusztinovics, Mária (2000): The dynamics of retirement savings – Theory and reality, in: *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics,* Vol. 11. No. 1-2, 111-129;

Augusztinovics, Mária (ed.) (2001): *Körkép reform után. Tanulmányok a nyugdíjrendszerről* (A post-reform overview: Studies on the pension system), Budapest, Közgazdasági Szemle Foundation;

Bara, Zoltán and Csaba, László (eds.) (2000): *Small Economies' Adjustment to Global Tendencies*, Budapest, Aula Publishing House for the European Association for Comparative Economic Studies;

Bara, Zoltán and Szabó, Katalin (eds.) (2000): *Gazdasági intézmények, országok, rendszerek. Bevezetés az összehasonlítható gazdaságtanba* (Economic institutions, countries, systems. An introduction to comparative economics) (reprinted in 2001 and 2002), Budapest, Aula Kiadó;

Berács, József and Chikán, Attila (eds.) (1999): *Managing Business in Hungary*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó;

Berend, T. Iván (1988): *The Hungarian Economic Reform*, *1953-88*, Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press;

Bokros, Lajos and Dethier, Jean-Jacques (eds.) (1998): *Public Finance during Transition. The Experience of Hungary*, Washington, D.C, a World Bank publication;

Bonin, John, Mizsei, Kálmán, Székely, P. István and Wachtel, Paul (1998): *Banking in Transition Economies*: *Developing Market-Oriented Banking Sectors in Eastern Europe*, Cheltenham (U.K.) and Northampton, Mass. (USA), Edward Elgar;

Bródy, András (1969/a): *Érték és újratermelés. Kísérlet a marxi értékelmélet és újratermelési elmélet matematikai modelljének megfogalmazására* (Value and reproduction. An attempt at mathematical modeling of Marxist theory of value and reproduction), Budapest, Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó;

Bródy, András (1969/b): "The rate of economic growth in Hungary in 1924-1965", in: *Is the Business Cycle Obsolete?*, Bronfenbrenner, Martin (ed.), New York, John Wiley, 312-327;

Bródy, András (1995): "The Hungarian GDP as measured by proxies" (Appraisal of the short-cut method by F. Jánossy), in: *Acta Oeconomica*, Vol. 47, No. 1-2, 69-94;

Bródy, András (1997-99): "A kétszáz éves ciklus és az Egyesült Államok, I-II" (The two-hundred-year cycle and the USA, I-II), in: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, Vol. 43, No. 2, 113-123 and Vol. 45, No. 1, 35-45;

Bruszt, László (2000): "Constructing markets: The case of Russia and the Czech Republic", in: *Democratic and Capitalist Transitions in Eastern Europe*, Dobry, Michel (ed.), Dordrecht-Boston-London, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 197-220;

Bruszt, László and Stark, David (1998): *Postsocialist Pathways*, Cambridge and N.Y., Cambridge University Press;

Buzárdy, Zoltán and Tari, Ernő (2001): "Stratégiai szövetségek a hazánkban működő nagy- és középvállalatok körében" (Strategic alliances among medium-sized and large corporations operating in Hungary), in: *Vezetéstudomány*, Vol. 32, No. 1, 38-47;

Clarke, Roger (ed.) (1989): *Hungary - The Second Decade of Economic Reform*, London and Chicago, Longman and St. James' Press;

Csaba, László (1992): "Macroeconomic policy in Hungary: Poetry versus reality", in: *Soviet Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 6, 947-965;

Csaba, László (1995): *The Capitalist Revolution in Eastern Europe*, Aldershot (U.K.) and Brookfield (US), Edward Elgar;

Csaba, László (ed.) (1994): *Privatization, Liberalization and Destruction: Recreating the Market in Central and Eastern Europe*, Aldershot (UK) and Brookfield (USA), Dartmouth Publishing Co.;

Csaba, László (ed.) (1998): *The Hungarian Small Business in Comparative Perspective*, Washington and Budapest, a joint publication of USAID and the Foundation for Economic Research;

Csikós-Nagy, Béla (1997): "A monetáris politika kritikai elemzése" (A critical analysis of monetary policy in Hungary), in: *Külgazdaság,* Vol. 41, No. 3, 68-75;

Csikós-Nagy, Béla (1999): "Közgazdaságtan a globalizálódó világban" (Economics in a globalizing world), in: *Magyar Tudomány*, Vol. 44, No. 9;

Csikós-Nagy, Béla and Elek, Péter S. (1995): *Power and Price*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó;

Darvas, Zsolt and Simon, András (2000): "Capital stock and economic development in Hungary", in: *The Economics of Transition*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 197-224;

Erdős, Tibor (1972): *A gazdasági növekedés a fejlett tőkésországokban* (Economic growth in advanced capitalist countries), Budapest, Kossuth and Közgazdasági és Jogi;

Erdős**,** Tibor (1989): *Growth Rate and Growth Path*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó;

Erdős, Tibor (1998): *Infláció* (Inflation), Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó;

Fertő, Imre (1999): *Az agrárpolitika modelljei* (Models of agrarian policy), Budapest, Osiris Kiadó;

Gáspár, Pál (ed.) (1997): *Macroeconomic Issues of Recovery in Transition Economies*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó;

Greskovits, Béla (1998): *The Political Economy of Protest and Patience: Latin America and Eastern Europe Compared*, Budapest and New York, Central European University Press;

Greskovits, Béla (2000): "Rival views of postcommunist market society: The path dependence of transitology", in: *Democratic and Capitalist Transitions in Eastern Europe*, Dobry, Michel (ed.), Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 19-48;

Halpern, László and Wyplosz**,** Charles (eds.) (1999): *Hungary – Towards a Market Economy*, London, Centre for Economic Policy Research;

Hamar, Judit (1995): "Tendenciaváltozások a közvetlen tőkebefektetések nemzetközi áramlásában. Elmélet és gyakorlat" (Changing trends in the flow of foreign direct investments. Theory and evidence), in: *Külgazdaság,* Vol. 39, No. 7-8, 49-68;

Heller, Farkas (2001): *A közgazdasági elméletek története* (History of economic thought) – reprint of the original 1943 edition, Budapest, AULA Publishing House;

Hetényi, István (2000): Nemzetgazdasági eszmék Magyarországon (Macroeconomic ideas in Hungary) – Keynote address to the millennia scientific conference of the Committee on Finances of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, 23 May;

Hunya, Gábor (1999): "Central European manufacturing: Catching up through FDI", in: *Economies in Transition and the Varieties of Capitalism*, Dimitrov, Mitko, Andreff, Wladimir and Csaba, László (eds.), Sofia, Gorex Press for the European Association for Comparative Economic Studies, 303-323;

Inotai**,** András (1989): *A mûködőtőke a világgazdaságban* (FDI in the world economy), Budapest, a joint publication of Kossuth and Közgazdasági és Jogi;

Inotai, András (1998): *On the Way. Hungary and the European Union*, Budapest, CET Belvárosi Kiadó és Kereskedelmi Bt;

Inotai, András (1999): "The economy of an enlarged Europe: An eastern and central European state's view", in: *The Enlargement of the European Union*, Curzon-Price, Victoria, Landau, Alice and Whitman, Richard G. (eds.), London, Routledge, 81-92;

Inotai, András (2001): "Gondolatok a globalizációról" (Reflections on globalization), in: *A globalizáció kihívásai és Magyarország* (Challenges of globalization and Hungary), Földes, György and Inotai, András (eds.), Budapest, Napvilág Kiadó, 11-72;

Jánossy**,** Ferenc (1965): *Das Ende des Wirtschaftswunders?*, Marburg, Metropolis Verlag;

Kádár, Béla (1984): *Structural Changes in the World Economy*, New York, St. Martin's Press;

Karsai, Judit (2001): "Jó tulajdonosok-e az intézményi befektetők?" (Are institutional investors really good owners?, in: *Külgazdaság,* Vol. 45, No. 11, 27-49;

Király, Júlia, Csontos, László and László, Géza (1997-98): "The great shivering around the millennium", in: *Acta Oeconomica*, Vol. 49, No. 1-2, 1-34;

Király, Júlia, Száz, János and Simonovits, András (eds.) (2000): *Racionalitás és méltányosság - Tanulmányok Augusztinovics Máriának.* (Rationality and equity - The Augusztinovics Festschrift), Budapest, Közgazdasági Szemle Foundation;
Kis, János, Bence, György and Márkus, György (1972/92): *Hogyan lehetséges kritikai gazdaságtan?* (How is it possible to construct a critical theory of economics?), Budapest, a joint publication of T-Twins and the Lukács Archives;
Kocsis, Éva (1996): *Technológiai korszakhatáron. Rugalmas technológiák – Regionális hálózatok.* (On the eve of a new technological era. Flexible technologies and regional networks), Budapest, National Committee for Technological Development (OMFB);
Köves, András (1992): *Central and Eastern Europe in Transition: The International Dimension*, Boulder (Col), Westview Press;
Kornai, János (1959): *Overcentralization of Economic Administration*, Oxford, Oxford University Press;
Kornai, János (1971): *Anti-Equilibrium*, Amsterdam, North Holland (second revised edition in 1991);
Kornai, János (1980): *Economics of Shortage*, Amsterdam, North Holland;
Kornai, János (1986): "The Hungarian reform process: Visions, hopes and the reality", in: *The Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 24, No. 4, 1687-1737;
Kornai, János (1990): *The Road to a Free Economy*, New York, W.W. Norton and Sons;
Kornai, János (1992): "The postsocialist transition and the state: Reflections on Hungarian fiscal problems", in: *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 82, No. 2-3, 1-15;
Kornai, János (1996): *Struggle and Hope*, Cheltenham (U.K.) and Northampton, Mass. (USA), Edward Elgar;
Kornai, János (1997): *Az egészségügy reformjáról* (On reforming health care), Budapest, Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó;
Kornai, János (2001): "Hardening the budget constraint: The experience of postsocialist countries", in: *European Economic Review*, Vol. 45, No. 9, 1573-1600;
Kornai, János and Lipták, Tamás (1965): "Two level planning", in: *Econometrica*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 141-169;
Kornai, János and Simonovits, András (1977): "Decentralised control problems in Neumann economies", in: *Journal of Economic Theory*, Vol. 14, No. 1, 44-67;
Kornai, János, Haggard, Stephan and Kaufman, Robert (eds.) (2001): *Reforming the State: Fiscal and Welfare Reforms in Post-Socialist Countries*, Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press;
Kőrösi, Gábor, Mátyás, László and Székely, István P. (1992): *Practical Econometrics*, Aldershot (U.K.), Avebury;
Kovács**,** János M. (1999): "Praising and hybrids: Notes on economic thought ten years after", in: *Eastern European Politics and Societies*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 313-323;
Kuti, Éva (1996): *The Nonprofit Sector in Hungary*, Manchester, Manchester University Press;
Laki**,** Mihály (1998): *Kisvállalkozás a szocializmus után* (Small business in post-socialism), Budapest, Published by Közgazdasági Szemle Foundation;
Laki, Mihály (2000): "Az ellenzéki pártok gazdasági elképzelései 1989-ben" (Economic views of opposition parties in 1989), in: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, Vol. 47, No. 3, 230-249;
Laki, Mihály, Pete, Péter and Vince, Péter (eds.) (1999): *Mindannyiunkban van valami közös. Tanulmányok Lányi Kamilla születésnapjára*. (All of us share something in common. The Lányi Festschrift), Budapest, published jointly by the Foundation for Economic Research and the Research Centre on Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences;
Lányi, Kamilla (1996): "Szociális piacgazdaság - nálunk, most?" (Social market economy – in Hungary, now?), in: *2000*, Vol. 8, No. 4., 8-17;
Lányi, Kamilla (1997): "A globális konvergencia változatai - Washington és Maastricht, I-II" (Varieties for global convergence: The Washington Consensus and the Maastricht criteria, I-II), in: *Külgazdaság*, Vol. 41, No. 11, 5-29 (part I) and Vol. 41, No. 12, 4-18. (part II);
Lányi, Kamilla (2001): "Vázlat a globalizációnak nevezett jelenségkör értelmezéséről" (An essay interpreting globalization), in: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, Vol. 48, No. 6, 498-519;
Lengyel, György and Rostoványi**,** Zsolt (eds.) (2001): *The Small Transformation*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó;
Lengyel, László (1994): „Két gazdász portréja" (A portrait of two economists), in: *Korunkba zárva* (Imprisoned in our age), Lengyel, László, Budapest, jointly published by the literary monthly *2000* and the Financial Research Inc, 119-158;
Major, Iván (1999): "The transforming enterprise: Company performance after privatisation in Hungary between 1987 and 1997", in: *Comparative Economic Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 2-3, 61-110;

Major, Iván, (ed.) (1999): *Privatisation and Economic Performance in Central and Eastern Europe: Lessons to be Learned from Western Europe*, Cheltenham (U.K.) and Northampton, Mass. (USA), Edward Elgar;
Mátyás, Antal (1991): *The History of Non-Marxist Economic Thought*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó;
Mátyás, Antal (2000): „A magyar közgazdaságtan oktatásának fölzárkózása a nemzetközi színvonalhoz Kautz Gyula és Földes Béla munkássága nyomán" (Introducing international standards of teaching economics in Hungary through the oeuvre of Gy. Kautz and B. Földes), in: *Emlékkönyv Buzády Jenő 85. születésnapja alkalmából* (A Festschrift for the 85th birthday of J. Buzády), Buza, János (ed.), published by the Centre for Research on East Central Europe attached to the Department of Economic History of BUESPA, 303-317;
Mátyás, László (1997): "Proper econometric specification of the gravity model", in: *The World Economy*, Vol. 20, No. 3, 363-368;
Mátyás, László (ed.) (1999): *Generalised Methods of Moments Estimation*, Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press;
Mihályi, Péter (1992): *Socialist Investment Cycles*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers;
Mihályi, Péter (1998): *A magyar privatizáció krónikája, 1989-1996* (Chronicle of Hungarian privatization, 1989-96), Budapest, Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó;
Mihályi, Péter (2001): "FDI in Hungary: The postcommunist privatisation story reconsidered", in: *Acta Oeconomica*, Vol. 51, No. 1, 107-130;
Nagy, András (1996): "A déja vu-tól a what's new-ig" (From déja vu to what's new in economics), in: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, Vol. 43, No. 4. 335-342;
Nagy, András (1999): "Lessons drawn from the EU accession of three southern European states and its effect on their foreign trade", in: *Acta Oeconomica*, Vol. 50. No. 3-4, 385-412;
Nagy, András (2001): "Az intézmények átalakulása és a fejlett gazdaságok utolérése" (Restructuring institutions and catching up with advanced economies), in: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, Vol. 48, No. 11, 920-949;
Nelson, Joan, Tilly, Charles and Walker, Lee (eds.) (1999): *Transforming Post-Communist Political Economies*, Washington, The National Academy Press;
Niederhauser, Emil (2001): „Habsburg monarchia vagy önállóság?" (Staying within the Habsburg monarchy or striving for full independence?), in: *Közgyûlési előadások – 2000*, Vol. 4, Glatz, Ferenc (ed.), Budapest, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 293-309;
Papanek, Gábor (ed.) (1999): *Jogbiztonság a magyar gazdasági életben* (The Rule Of Law In The Hungarian Economy), Budapest, Fílium Kiadó;
Pete, Péter (1996): *Monetáris makroökonómia* (Monetary macroeconomics), Budapest, Osiris Kiadó;
Pete, Péter (1999): "Some thoughts about 'the world ruled by money' – The increased role of the financial system", in: *Acta Oeconomica*, Vol. 50, No. 3-4, 239-255;
Polónyi, István and Timár, János (2001): *Tudásgyár vagy papírgyár? (*Manufacturers of knowledge – or of certificates?), Budapest, Új Mandátum Kiadó;
Rosta, Miklós (2001): "Küzdelem egy önálló közgazdasági egyetemért" (A fight for an independent economics university), in: *Magyar Tudomány*, Vol. 46, No. 8, 997-1006;
Sákovics, József and de Fraja, Gianni (2001): "Walras retrouvé: Decentralised trading mechanism and the competitive price", in: *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 109, No. 4, 842-863;
Simon, András (1999): *Útmutató a makroökonómiához* (A guide to macroeconomics), Budapest, Osiris Kiadó;
Simon, György (2001): "Növekedési mechanizmus - Növekedési model" (Growth mechanism and the model of growth), in: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, Vol. 48, No. 3, 185-202;
Simonovits, András (1998): *Matematikai módszerek a dinamikus modellezésben* (Mathematical methods in dynamic modelling), Budapest, Kerszöv Jogi és Üzleti Kiadó Kft;
Simonovits, András (1999): "Are there cycles in realistic overlapping cohort models?", in: *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 261-275;
Simonovits, András (2001): "New results in pension modeling", in: *Acta Oeconomica*, Vol. 51, No. 2, 173-200;
Szabó, Katalin (2000): "A személyes tömegtermelés" (Mass production tailored to personal needs.), in: *Külgazdaság,* Vol. 44, No. 9, 35-49;
Szabó, Katalin and Kocsis, Éva (2000): *A posztmodern vállalat* (The post-modern firm), Budapest, Published by the Ministry of Education;
Szalai, Erzsébet (1999): *Post-Socialism and Globalisation*, Budapest, Új Mandátum Kiadó;

Szamuely, László and Csaba, László (1998): "Economics and systemic changes in Hungary, 1945-1996", in: *Economic Thought in Communist and Post-Communist Europe*, Wagener, Hans-Jürgen (ed.), London and New York, Routledge, 158-212;

Szapáry, György and Jakab, Zoltán (1998): "Exchange rate policy in transition economies: The case of Hungary", in: *The Journal of Comparative Economics*, Vol. 26, No. 4, 691-717;

Székely, P. István and Newbery, David M. (eds.) (1993): *Hungary – an Economy in Transition*, Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press;

Szekeres, Valéria (2001): "Foreign capital and economic development in Hungary", in: *Acta Oeconomica*, Vol. 51, No. 3, 363-384;

Szemlér, Tamás (2000): „Alternativen der Finanzierung der Osterweiterung aufgrund der Agenda 2000", in: *Erweiterung und Vertiefung der Europaeischen Union*, Hasse, Rolf; Schenk, Karl-Ernst; Wass von Czege, Andreas (eds.), Baden-Baden, Nomos Verlag, 115-126;

Szentes, Tamás and Zalai, Ernő (2001): *Gazdaságtudományok* (Economic sciences), in: "Science Policy in Hungary – Part II. Evolution of Disciplines", Glatz, Ferenc (ed.), published by the HAS;

Tardos, Márton (1986): "Conditions for developing a capital market in Hungary", in: *Acta Oeconomica*, Vol. 36, No. 102, 67-69;

Tardos, Márton (1992): "Principles of privatization", in: *The Journal of International and Comparative Economics*, Vol. 1, No. 2., 1-14;

Temesi, József and Zalai, Ernő (eds.) (1999): *Back to a Market Economy*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó;

Tőkés, Rudolf (1997): *Hungary's Negotiated Revolution*, Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press;

Török, Ádám (1998): *Verseny a versenyképességért*? (Competition – for competitiveness?), Budapest, published by the Task Force on European Integration under the Office of the Prime Minister;

Török, Ádám (2001): "Piacgazdasági érettség többféleképpen? Néhány alapfogalom értelmezése és alkalmazása a világgazdaság három nagy régiójában" (Multiple market maturities? Interpreting and applying some fundamental categories to the three big regions of the world economy), in: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, Vol. 48, No. 9, 707-725;

Vajda, Imre and Simai, Mihály (eds.) (1971): *Foreign Trade under Central Planning*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press;

Valentiny, Ákos and Lee, In Ho (2000): "Noisy contagion without mutation", in: *The Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 67, No. 1, 47-57;

Várhegyi, Éva (1998): *Bankok versenyben* (Competing banks), Budapest, published jointly by Perfekt Ltd. and Financial Research, Inc.;

Vincze, János (1996): "Van-e "magyar út" az elméleti közgazdaságtanban?" (Is there a special Hungarian way in theoretical economics?), in: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, Vol. 43. No. 4, 331-335;

Voszka, Éva (1995): *Az agyaglábakon álló óriás* (A giant with clay feet), Budapest, published jointly by Perfekt, Ltd. and Financial Research, Inc.;

Voszka, Éva (1997): *A dinoszauruszok esélyei* (Chances for dinosaurs – with a statistical supplement by I. Major), Budapest, published jointly by Perfekt, Ltd. and Financial Research, Inc.;

Voszka, Éva (2001): "Privatizáció helyett újraelosztás. Az állami vagyon sorsa 1998 és 2001 között" (Instead of privatization – redistribution. The fate of state property between 1998 and 2001), in: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, Vol. 48, No. 9, 726-744;

Zalai, Ernő (1988): *Munkaérték és sajátérték* (Labor theory of value and immanent value), Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó;

Zalai, Ernő (2001): *Matematikai közgazdaságtan* (Mathematical economics), Budapest, Kerszöv Jogi és Üzleti Kiadó Bt.

Raita Karnite

Economics – Latvia

Discussant: Morten Hansen

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Introduction

Science and research have long-lasting traditions in Latvia. Analysts trace the first remarkable events in science back to 1775 and the foundation of the Academia Petrina in Mitava, now called Jelgava (Latvia, 1993). However, original scientific ideas in the humanities (history, ethnography, Baltic languages) emerged earlier. In 1985, the famous Latvian scientist, academician, and current President of the Latvian Academy of Sciences, Janis Stradins, divided the process of the development of science and research in Latvia into three typical periods:

- activities of individual scientists (until 1862),
- mainly educational (university) science organization (until 1946),
- mainly organization of research institutes – after the establishing of the Academy of Science of Latvia (Sovetskaya, 1985: 463).

Intense trade development (important West and East trade routes went through Latvia) and the early (12th-century) arrival of the Roman Catholic Church in the Baltic region allowed European culture to flow into Latvia to a very great extent and facilitated the development of education and science in Latvia (Anspaks, 1997: 5).

Scientific works in economics appeared later, based on earlier research achievements in the natural and other sciences. At the end of the 16th century, the medical doctor and stargazer Zachary Stopius (1535-1593, 94) compiled an encyclopedia, "Livlandishe Oekonomie". This document is considered the first scientific publication in economics in Latvia. In 1645, based on this encyclopedia, pastor Salomo Hubert (?-1653) produced Latvia's first manual on agriculture "Stratagema oeconomicum…", which was translated into Russian by Mihail Lomonosov in 1747 (Sovetskaya, 1985: 463).

On the basis of research on Latvia's natural resources and on a cartographic abstract of almost all its territory, August Hupel, a clergyman, geographer, and historian, produced a comprehensive systemic review of the history, geography, and economics of the Baltic region ("Topographische Nachrichten von Lief- und Ehstland", 1774-1782).

In the 17th and 18th centuries, the professorial and teaching staff of local educational institutions, the Riga Academic Gymnasium and Academia Petrina, steeped themselves in studies of particular problems. They usually worked alone or in voluntary association. A perfect example is Mitava (Jelgava), the capital city of Courland, the Western part of Latvia, whose Academia Petrina developed as the center of scientific activities.

In the second half of the 18th century, Jelgava and Riga became centers for publishing scientific books, mainly in German. Important scientific essays by Immanuel Kant, Johann Gottfried Herder, and Mihail Lomonosov were published in Jelgava and Riga. Some essays by Johann Georg Eizen, Heinrich Johann Jannau, Garlieb Helwig Merkel (a typical representative of the Enlightenment period in Latvia), Carl Philip Snell, and others examined problems of Latvian economy and history. This period saw the first publications in Latvian, among them *Lielās gudrības grāmata* (The book of the great wisdom), published by Gothard (Gottfried) Friedrich Stender in 1774.

Courland's Association of Literature and Art was founded in 1815. This institution operating in cooperation with the Academia Petrina, which at this time was transformed into Courland's Gymnasium, may be considered the first regional academy of sciences in the Baltic Region.

In the first half of the 19th century, several professional unions and associations of scientists were established in Latvia, but there is no data on any association of economists.

The majority of scientists in Latvia were not Latvians, but many Latvian scientists were recruited or left to study outside Latvia in Derpte (nowadays Tartu) in Estonia, St. Petersburg and Moscow in Russia, Harkov and Kiev in Ukraine, and elsewhere. A local Latvian intelligentsia did not appear until as late as the turn of the 19th to the 20th century.

Intense economic development in the early period of capitalism promoted the development of education and science even more. The foundation of Riga Polytechnic School in 1862 (renamed the Riga Polytechnic Institute in 1896) marks the establishing of the first organized groups of scientists, but their main purpose was to teach in universities. They also worked to solve topical technical problems (Akademiya, 1986: 5). The establishment of the Riga Polytechnic Institute greatly facilitated the expansion of research in engineering, biology, and chemistry.

The end of the 19th century marked an increase in the significance of the social sciences. The activities of the *jaunlatvieši* (New Latvians) Juris Alunans, Krisjanis Barons, Kaspars Biezbardis, Atis Kronvalds, Andrejs Spagis, Krisjanis Valdemars, and Krogzemju Mikus (Auseklis) played an important role in the development of the humanities and social sciences. Since the main purpose of *jaunlatvieši* was to stand up for Latvian national values, they could not ignore economics. For instance, Krisjanis Valdemars was famous for his activities promoting seafaring in Latvia.

Economic aspects become even more important in the late 19th century, when Latvia's democratic intelligentsia created a movement called *jaunstrāvnieki* (New Current), which was based on social democratic ideas and the writings of Karl Marx. Representatives of this group – Peteris Stucka, Janis Plieksans (famous as the poet Rainis), Fricis Rozins, Pauls Dauge, and Janis Jansons (Brauns) – emphasized the idea of fair economic and distribution relations, equality, and social rights. Later, *jaunstravnieki* disseminated and provided education in Marxist ideas in Latvia.

The first Soviet period in Latvia (1919) brought important developments in education and science. The Latvian University (founded in 1919 on the basis of Riga Polytechnic Institute) was established to contribute to the fast recovery of the Latvian economy. The change in power at the end of 1919 encouraged even more development in education and science. The rapid development of Latvian University promoted research in Baltic philology, medicine, chemistry, biology, and agriculture, as well as economics.

Distinguished Latvian economists of the pre-war period included:

- Jānis Kārklinš (born in 1877), Dr. oec., a professor and vice-chancellor of Latvian University, helped establish the Faculty of Economy and Law Sciences of Latvian University. Research fields: commerce (Karklins, 1931), development of Latvian shipping business (Es, 1975: 245);
- Matīss Arons (born in 1858), a journalist and folk teacher, worked with several newspapers. Field of activity: general economics, history of economic thought (Arons, 1908) (*Latviešu konversācijas vārdnīca I*, 1927–1928: 1454);
- Fricis Menders (born in 1885), a certified lawyer, politician, and journalist, studied economics and law at the Universities of Vienna and Bern (graduated with Dr. juris utriusque degree), and at the sociological institute in Brussels. Research field: socialism (Menders, 1931) (*Latviešu konversācijas vārdnīca XIII*, 1935-1936: 26599);
- Kārlis Balodis, an economist and professor at Latvian University. Research fields: economics, statistics (Balodis, 1921; *Es viņu pazīstu. Latviešu biogrāfiskā vārdnīca*, 1975:51-52);
- Eduards Balodis (born in 1880), Dr. oec., a professor of Latvian University, Faculty of Economics and Law. Research field: general economics (Balodis, 1935; *Es viņu pazīstu. Latviešu biogrāfiskā vārdnīca*, 1975: 49);

- Kārlis Puriņš (born in 1883), Dr. oec., a senator in the Latvian Saeima (Parliament), Administrative Department, and professor at Latvian University. Research field: finances (Purins, 1926/1927; *Es viņu pazīstu. Latviešu biogrāfiskā vārdnīca*, 1975: 398);
- Alberts Zalts (born in 1897), Cand. oec., the editor of *Ekonomists* and *Latvian Economic Review*. Research fields: economic crisis, economic geography (Zalts, 1931; Zalts, 1932; *Es viņu pazīstu. Latviešu biogrāfiskā vārdnīca*, 1975: 541);
- Arnolds Aizsilnieks (born in 1898), an agronomist, cooperator, and senior assistant professor at Latvian University. Research fields: history of Latvian national economy (Aizsilnieks, 1968);
- Eizens Ostvalds. Research fields: economics of forestry and others.

The first attempt to establish the Latvian Academy of Sciences, the main scientific organization authorized for the promotion and coordination of science and research activities in Latvia, was made in 1919 (under the first Soviet power), but actually it was not established until February 1946. The establishing of the Latvian Academy of Sciences was not on the agenda during the first period of independence (1919-1940), but the development of universities was strongly promoted.

In 1939, agricultural disciplines were transferred from Latvian University to Latvian Agriculture Academy (Jelgava). This period is significant for the first effort to establish independent scientific institutes – the Institute of History (1936) and the Institute of Natural Resources (1939) – but the impact of these institutes was insignificant.

The Latvian science community has always interacted with science communities in neighboring countries – Estonia (Tartu), Russia (Moscow, St. Petersburg), Ukraine (Kiev, Harkov), and Western Europe.

After World War II, the network of scientific institutions was greatly expanded. The Soviet power perceived science as the major factor fueling development. Immediately after World War II, it took measures to establish a powerful science system on the pattern of the Soviet Union's. 17 scientific institutes, among them the Institute of Economics, were established at the end of 1946, during the first scientific session of the Latvian Academy of Sciences. The structure of the Academy institutes' network has changed several times – some new institutes and institutions (laboratories, design offices, observatory, and atomic pile) were established and some other institutes were subordinated to state institutions or merged.

In 1940, there were 1,128 so-called "scientific workers" in Latvia; in 1960, 3,348; in 1971, 9,216. In 1971, 2.2% of all scientific workers had a doctorate, 29.5% were candidates of science, and 68.3% were without a scientific degree. Of all persons employed in science, 0.5% were academicians, 1.4% professors. In 1971, there were 101 research institutions, 32 of them research institutes. Of all persons employed in science, 680 (7.4%) were employed in economics, compared with 112 (3.3%) in 1960. Of those employed in economics in 1971, 7 were doctors of economic science, and 166 candidates of economic science (Kulturnoye, 1972: 113-122).

In 1986, the Latvian Academy of Sciences comprised 15 scientific institutions, organized in 3 departments, 3 experimental factories, and 6 special design offices. As of January 1, 1986, 7,623 persons were employed in the Academy of Science, 1,670 them qualified scientists: 116 doctors, 954 candidates of science (pre-doctoral qualification). The Academy of Sciences consisted of 24 academicians and 28 corresponding members (Akademiya, 1986: 14).

At the end of 1990, 75 research institutions carried out research in Latvia, 15 of them in the network of the Academy of Sciences (including the Institute of Economics) and 38 from sector institutions (including two with an economics profile). The total number of specialists employed in research was 17,733, of whom 402 (2.2%) had a doctorate and 3,308 (18.6%) had the candidate of science qualification. Women comprised 47% of those employed in research, 16% of the doctors, and 35.6% of the candidates of science. Of all those employed in research, 6.3% worked in economic research (Latvijas, 1991: 184).

At the end of 1990, the Academy of Sciences consisted of 78 academicians and corresponding members and employed 1,770 scientific workers, of whom 150 were doctors and 966 candidates of science (Latvijas, 1991: 185).

Economic research institutes were fairly large, with staffs of several hundreds persons. As statistics show, an average 7.5% of the equipment employed in research institutions was comparable with the world standards, 21.2% was not comparable, and 71.3% was not assessed in these terms. The worst situation was in research institutes (correspondingly 7.1%, 12.7%, and 80.2%), the best in universities (32.4%, 34%, and 33.6%) (Latvijas, 1990: 158). In 2001, the total number of scientists had decreased to 4,000 persons (Kristapsons, 2001).

The spectrum of Marxism-Leninism

After World War II, when Latvia was forcibly incorporated in the USSR, the organization, leadership, and development of Latvian education and research were subordinated to the authoritarian Soviet education and research system. Marxism-Leninism, clearly the only legal ideology, was the background of economic education and science in Latvia before 1990.

As the World Bank study found, during the post-war period, in universities specialized in either natural or social and human sciences, about 20% of the teaching content was ideology – the history of the Communist Party, philosophy, and Marxism-Leninism (Latvia, 1993: 177).

Marxism-Leninism was a mandatory subject for anyone trying to complete a scientific degree. No matter what field the applicant chose for a scientific career, he had to pass so-called “exams for candidate minimum”, including exams on the dialectic and historical materialism developed from the Marxist-Leninist ideology; for economic disciplines, exams on the history of the Communist Party and political economy were also required. References to Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, and Vladimir Lenin, as well as to Party documents and the speeches of current political leaders, were mandatory elements in the preamble to every research paper. This requirement could be fulfilled in a routine manner; since there was no requirement that the citations selected had to be relevant to the research topic.

Marxist-Leninist theory could not be criticized, so it was not subjected to creative investigation and development. International cooperation in economics was restricted to within the borders of the Soviet Union. Publishing research results in foreign academic journals was practically impossible. Every published word was censored (including abstracts of doctoral theses), and a special institution – Glavlit (Central Department of Literature – Galvenā literatūras pārvalde) – was maintained for this purpose. Every piece of statistical data had to have clear reference and was carefully checked for compliance with the interests of the Soviet state. Data could not indicate negative trends or problems, except these recognized by the Communist Party.

Despite unfavorable conditions, researchers tried to illuminate threats or weaknesses of existing trends or of new decisions in the Soviet economy. For instance, researchers at the Institute of Economics, Latvian Academy of Sciences managed to eliminate baseless massive allocations of industrial enterprises in Latvia.

The research topics investigated by economic research in Latvia before 1990 covered fields such as: the fundamentals of the (socialistic) economy, the political economy of socialism, the history of economic thought, the history of national economy, the critics of “bourgeois economic theories”, the efficiency of the socialistic economy (methodological problems), employment and work productivity, the allocation of productive capacities, productive work organization, socialist competition, and sector development.

Latvia was famous for research in the application of mathematical methods in various fields of economics, especially in macroeconomic (financial) forecasting and agriculture. Several computer systems for planning were implemented.

Latvia was a pioneer in the implementation of agro-industrial complexes in the Baltics. In general, Baltic countries were famous for analytic research and advanced proposals that were courageous for the time. The reason was doubtless that economic development in the Baltic countries was advanced by USSR standards. On the other hand, Latvian researchers were much more controlled and were much more likely to become dissidents.

All the theories formerly taught (except mathematics modeling) lost their foundations after Latvia's turn to the market economy.

Pre-war traditions

Before World War II, academic research was carried out exclusively at universities. Education was an important aspect of socio-economic development, and education and health care statistics were always placed at the beginning of every pre-war statistical report. The main institution carrying out education and research in economics was Latvian University in Riga.

Latvian University was opened for studies on September 28, 1919. Ten years later, in 1929, the university had a Faculty of Architecture, a Faculty of Engineering, a Faculty of Mechanics, a Chemical Faculty, a Faculty of Agriculture, a Medical Faculty, a Veterinary Medical Faculty, a Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, a Faculty of Economics, a Faculty of Philology and Philosophy, and a Theological Faculty (Latvijas, 1929).

The main topics in the field of economics were economic policy and business skills. The number of graduates was not large – about 10-15 students per year. Unfortunately, there are no statistics on research, but it can be assumed that the leading teaching staff was also the leading research potential.

In the academic year 1939/40, 1,978 students and 5 auditors were registered at the Faculty of Economics and Law at Latvian University, of whom 987 students and 1 auditor studied economics. The Faculty employed 46 lecturers, of whom 7 were professors, 7 extraordinary professors, 8 docents, and 22 assistants and other teaching staff (Latvijas, 1940). The Faculty of Economics and Law was the largest faculty at the university. The total number of graduates from the Faculty of Economics and Law in 1939 was 1,724, of whom 544 were graduates in economics. Among them were 425 men and 119 women (Latvijas, 1940).

Of the 1,978 students, 1,824 (92%) were Latvians, 8 Germans, 36 Russians, 93 Jews, 8 Poles, 2 Estonians, 5 Lithuanians, and 2 persons of other nationalities.

The Agriculture Academy in Jelgava prepared specialists in agriculture and forestry. The total number of students in 1939/40 was 785; the teaching staff comprised 69 persons, of whom 11 were professors, 8 extraordinary professors, 22 docents, and 28 other teaching staff. Supposedly, the Agriculture Academy also provided basic knowledge in agricultural economics (Latvijas, 1940), among other disciplines.

For the obvious reason that, in pre-war Latvia, the national economy was based on market principles, Western traditions of higher education and research in economics dominated in both content and performance.

It goes without saying that, after Soviet occupation, the educational and research system in Latvia was substantially changed. As described earlier, science was partially transferred from universities to special research institutes, concentrated in the system of the Academy of Science, which was directly subordinated to the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Science activities, as well as preparation of scientific staff, were planned within frameworks of the socio-economic development plan on the national and all-Union levels.

The impact of Western theories

During the Soviet period, Western theories were accessible to a limited circle of people who were employed in "secret" or "closed" research topics (among them topics in critical fields of the Soviet economy).

Still, specialists could learn about Western theories and classical economic theories in an indirect way – via criticism and explanations of the weaknesses of such theories in comparison with the strength of Marxist-Leninist theories. Experience with mixed economies (for instance, in

Central European countries) was also transferred in this way – through criticism or description written by Soviet economists.

By contrast, Western theories in fields of mathematical economics (cybernetics, mathematical modeling, statistical analysis, econometrics) were available for relevant specialists. This is why these specialists, along with some requalified specialists from the natural sciences, were the first advocates of the transformation of the socialistic economy.

Research publications of pre-war economists (Latvian, Russian, and other) were illegal, taken out of libraries, and deposited in the secret inventories of libraries or destroyed. They were used to illuminate the advantages of socialism over "dread" capitalism.

Oppositional activities

Oppositional activities before the 1980s were weak. Research in institutes and publications were strictly controlled. Any statement or conclusion that contradicted the spirit of socialistic thinking could lead to a layoff from the research institute, with very poor prospects of finding a good occupation afterward. Managers of institutes and chiefs of departments were easily replaced if their political stance was discredited.

Reliable historical sources on opposition activities in economic science in Latvia are not yet documented in publications. It is as if the history of Latvian economic science stopped in 1940. Unfortunately, even bystanders prefer to maintain silence about historical events of the post-war period. Still, there must be enough documents in the archives.

In the 1980s, perestroika warmed up the climate for economic research, and there were more criticism, analysis, and adventurous proposals to improve the economy and introduce market elements (for instance, private work in cooperatives). Still, it is difficult to identify individuals who offered strong opposition.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

Change of paradigms

In a country that radically changes its political and economic system, a change of paradigms is unavoidable. On the way from the socialist planned economy to a liberal and market-driven one, all institutional systems were reorganized; this process required fundamental knowledge and good examples. The transition was more revolution than evolution, and the socialist system's theoretical background and economic thought did not provide enough knowledge.

Both of the global changes of paradigms – the implementation of democracy and the implementation of a market economy – also have economic components. Within these two paradigms, there are lots of variant ideas on constructing new systems. Economists in Latvia are not fully agreed on which paradigms to choose.

Academics (science professionals, academicians, senior university staff) are much less radical supporters of massive transitions, striving for solutions that soften transformation and eliminate negative social impacts. By contrast, the middle and younger generations of academically educated specialists – high-level personnel in state institutions, in many cases coming from academic science or looking for academic affiliation – support radical reforms.

Whatever the knowledge of local economists was, the guidance of international organizations (the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the European Commission) played a decisive role in forming new paradigms in Latvia. But the input from international organizations was restricted to theoretical models and examples from other countries, as well as technical assistance in the implementation of ideas they supported. Decisions were the responsibility of local politicians and state managers.

The change of elites

The change of elites had several causes:

- ideological – some leaders of universities, the Academy of Science, and economic institutes (leading researchers) were communists forced to resign after 1990,
- financial – dramatic funding cuts put researchers in bad financial situations, while the transforming economy offered them numerous better job prospects in business or state institutions,
- practical – the newly established Latvian state needed good specialists in state institutions, and many leading researchers took high positions in parliament and the government,
- organizational – some former institutes were closed administratively or due to poor economic conditions and unstoppable losses in staff.

The staff of economic research institutions is typically composed of people older than 45 and younger than 25. Researchers between the ages of 25 and 45 are exceptions in economic science.

Today, the economic elite comprises advanced researchers in research institutes and new leaders; specialists in economics or other specialists who have been requalified in economics, working in government positions; teaching staff at universities; foreign citizens of Latvian descent who contributed to policy-making in Latvia, who either still work abroad or who have moved to Latvia, some of whom have established their own research or educational institutions in Latvia.

New institutional structures

Before 1990, economic research was incorporated in a unified research system, divided into three categories:

- the Latvian Academy of Sciences (LAS) (Latvijas Zinātņu akadēmija), a network of 15 research institutes. Economic research was represented by the Institute of Economics LAS (LZA Ekonomikas institūts), founded in 1946,
- higher education establishments. Economic research was carried out at the University of Latvia (Latvijas Universitāte), Riga Polytechnical Institute (Rīgas Politehniskais institūts), the Agriculture Academy in Jelgava (Latvijas Lauksaimniecības akadēmija), and to some extent also in Daugavpils Pedogogical Institute (Daugavpils Pedagoģiskais institūts; Daugavpils is a city located in southeastern Latvia, some 250 km from Riga),
- several sector research institutes belonging to ministries, state institutions, and enterprises.

There were also research entities in state enterprises.

Universities did not play a major role in economic research. One of reasons was the heavy teaching load expected of staff (about 25 hours of instruction per week). Almost all research was funded from the state budget (via the Academy of Sciences) and the State Plan research institute. Academic research institutes were also eligible for ministry funding on a contract basis.

Since 1990, the Latvian science system has gone through the most radical changes. Cut out from the united science system of a large country at the beginning of 1990s, it was somehow transformed into the research system of a small state and integrated in the united European space.

The reform period in Latvian science dates back to 1990 with the foundation of the Latvian Council of Science (Latvijas Zinātnes Padome). The Association of Scientists (Zinātnieku savienība), established in 1988, elaborated the ideology of changes.

In 1992, at the request of the Latvian Council of Science, the Danish Research Council organized an international evaluation of Latvia's research system. 19 expert panels appointed by the Danish council visited Latvia in the period June-October 1992. Economics had a separate panel that examined 14 economic research institutions. All these institutions were state-owned. Some of them still exist, some have been closed or reorganized, and some new institutions have appeared.

Management and regulatory organizations and institutions operating on the national, regional, and supranational level

The Ministry of Education, Culture and Science of the Republic of Latvia is the main management organization in the field. The ministry is responsible for strategic and methodological issues concerning all levels of education, academic and applied research, drafting and implementing laws, and funding education and research. The Latvian Saeima (Parliament) has a Deputy Commission on Education, Science, and Culture. Education is the primary interest of this commission. Ministries promote research by providing funding for applied research that is necessary for their own operation.

In the early 1990s, the Academy of Science was transformed from a Soviet-type organization (association of research institutes) to a European-type organization. It is now a personal academy consisting of individual elected members. It operates on the basis of its Charter and is financed from the state budget. The LAC is no longer authorized to directly manage scientific affairs in the country, but it has the right to evaluate practically everything in economics and science.

Similar functions are delegated to the Latvian Academy of Agricultural and Forestry Sciences (LAAFC) (Latvijas Lauksaimniecības un meža zinātņu akadēmija), which was founded within the walls of the Latvian Agriculture University (Latvijas Lauksaimniecības akadēmija) in 1992. The Latvian Council of Science (LCS) was founded in accordance with the decision of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Latvia in July 1990. The Republic of Latvia Law on Scientific Activity determines the competence, obligations, membership, and rights of the LCS. The LCS is a semi-governmental body, a collegiate institution of scientists that comprises 140 scientists elected by academic staff by secret ballot for a three-year period. The Council itself consists of 20 members with representatives from the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, the Latvian Academy of Sciences, the Board of Rectors (Rektoru padome) of the higher education institutions, the Latvian Academy of Agricultural and Forestry Sciences, the Latvian Association of Scientists, and Expert Commissions (currently 14, elected from 14 research disciplines). Scientists actively involved in the respective fields choose members of Expert Commissions. The LCS experts, in turn, select the members of the Council itself, a chairperson and a deputy chairperson, and other LCS officers. The Council's tasks include the advancement, evaluation, financing, and coordination of scientific research in Latvia. Jointly with the Ministry of Education and Research of Latvia, the LCS prepares the draft of the republic's science budget for the current year and elaborates projects for decisions and laws aimed at the development and organization of science in Latvia. It also awards to institutions of higher education and state research centers the rights to form the promotion boards. The LCS finances specific projects, not institutions.

In the Republic of Latvia, scientists' qualification are confirmed by promotion – conferment of a scientific degree for an individual's original research whose results are valued as an important contribution in the field. The Council of Higher Education (CHE) (Augstākās izglītības padome) was formed in 1996. The Council consists of outstanding persons elected from the academic staff and deals with strategic and methodological issues of higher education.

Legislation concerning academic education, science, and research

The Saeima adopted the law "On Scientific Activity" on November 10, 1992 (amended in 1996 and 1998). The law changed the status of research institutes from units subordinate to the Academy of Science to independent research units.

In 1992, the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science worked out its concept for the development of technological centers in Latvia, and two first centers were established. The Saeima adopted the law "On Higher Education Institutions" on November 2, 1995. There are several Cabinet of Ministers Regulations that are important for research activities: "On state-ordered research projects", the Statutes of the State Commission of scientific qualification, "On state research programs", "On the arrangements and criteria for awarding scientific degrees", "On the Latvian Council of Science", and "On state scientists emeritus".

The Latvian Parliament adopted the "National Concept of Higher Education and Research Development" in Spring 1998. This was a summary of strategic statements intended to ensure a constantly growing role for research in the society and national economy up to 2010. The Concept recommended increasing research funding from the state budget to at least 0.8% of the GDP by 2001, but this recommendation, like many others, was ignored. The Concept also set priorities for research development: information technology, material sciences, forestry and timber technology, organic synthesis, biotechnology, biomedicine and pharmacy, and Lettonics (national humanities). Economics was not listed as an important field.

The Ministry of Education, Culture and Science has also identified the priority research directions in frameworks of European Commission research programs: information technology and telematics, life sciences and biotechnology (biomedicine, drug design, and biotechnology), new materials and technologies, and ecology and environmental protection. Again, economics is not among the priorities.

The Concept envisages the development of state research centers in research areas that may be established on the basis of current research institutes (singly or by merging several institutes). It was planned that the state would have to insure the maintenance of infrastructure in such centers. With this perspective, 11 academic institutes founded the first state research center, the Center of Material Science. But the expected financial system was never implemented, because the state was neither able nor willing to provide stable financing for research. To improve the quality of higher education, a new position of State Professor was introduced for educational staff.

At the end of 2001, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science worked out a draft document called the "Program for the development of higher education and science 2002-2010", a sort of guideline for the development of science in that time period. The document develops the idea that all research must be integrated in universities. It envisages that, about 2010, most of the science budget must be allocated to universities and only a small part to state research centers, which are expected to carry out high-quality fundamental research. Current academic institutes that up to now were independent legal entities affiliated with universities (mainly the University of Latvia) are expected to transform into sub-entities of university departments. Leaders of institutes say these changes in the status of academic institutes, the excessive concentration of financial resources in a limited number of universities, and the expected vagueness in distribution of funds between teaching and research activities are the most serious threat to their existence after 1990.

Education

The 1993 World Bank study concluded: "Important fields of study in a market economy either do not exist or are oriented in the wrong direction. Programs improperly oriented include economics, business, law, agriculture, and several fields of technology. Economics and management, in particular, need a complete overhaul. Moreover, owing to Latvia's isolation from outside development, university teaching and scientific research have become seriously outdated. Lacking ready access to professional networks and literature, many teachers and researchers have fallen well behind developments achieved by their colleagues in the West. Staff, teaching programs, libraries and textbooks, and laboratory equipment are not as up-to-date as they need to be in a competitive market economy." (Latvia, 1993: 181)

Having in mind the specificity of economic science and its political content, economic education needed to be completely changed. Today, numerous institutions, including main universities and high schools, offer study programs in business and economics, among them:

in Riga:

- the University of Latvia (Latvijas Universitāte),
- Riga Technical University (Rīgas Tehniskā universitāte),
- the Stockholm School of Economics in Riga (Rīgas Ekonomikas augstskola),
- the School of Business Administration "Turiba" (Biznesa augstskola: "Turība"),

- the Medical Academy of Latvia/Riga Stradina University (European Integration Institute) (Latvijas Medicīnas akadēmija/Rīgas Stradiņa universitāte (Eiropas integrācijas institūts)),
- the Banking College of Higher Education (Banku augstskola),
- the Institute of Social Technology (Sociālo tehnoloģiju augstskola),
- Riga International College of Economics and Business Administration (Rīgas Starptautiskā ekonomikas un biznesa administrācijas augstskola),
- the Higher Education Institution for Economics and Culture (Ekonomikas un kultūras augstskola),
- the Business Institute RIMPAK Livonia (Biznesa institūts RIMPAK Livonija),
- Riga Business School (within RTU) (RTU Rīgas Biznesa institūts),
- Baltic Russian Institute (Baltijas Krievu institūts),
- Riga Institute of International Economics (Rīgas starptautiskās ekonomikas institūts)

outside Riga:

- Latvia University of Agriculture (Latvijas Lauksaimniecības universitāte) in Jelgava (central Latvia),
- Vidzeme College of Higher Education (Vidzemes Augstskola) in Valmiera (central Latvia),
- Liepaja Pedagogical Higher School (Liepājas Pedagoģijas akadēmija) in Liepaja (western Latvia),
- Ventspils College (Ventspils Augstskola) (Western Latvia),
- Daugavpils Pedagogical University (Daugavpils Pedagoģiskā universitāte) in Daugavpils (Eastern Latvia),
- Rezekne Higher School (Rēzeknes Augstskola) (eastern Latvia).

Economic subjects are included in the programs of 16 out of 34 institutions of higher education. Teaching quality and study orientation in these institutions vary, but all of them consider themselves academic institutions. Study programs include developing basic research skills (course papers, bachelor thesis), but students do not get practice in research institutes. Receiving very low study stipends, almost all students, including full-time students, take employment during their studies.

Of all students (8,950) at the beginning of the school year 1999/2000, 47.6% studied social sciences, business, and law. This includes 40.7% of the full-time students, 63.5% of the evening students, and 55.7% of the correspondence students. If these proportions remain unchanged at the end of their studies, this sector will graduate about 5,700 students per year (Education, 2001).

Not all graduates choose economic research as their occupation, mainly because income opportunities in research are not competitive on the labor market. Employment in universities offers better income perspectives, and research here might be organized on the basis of the university. Unfortunately, the heavy teaching load hampers research in universities.[1]

Research institutions

Today, research is carried out in:

- the universities and institutions of higher education listed above;
- a large number of small research institutes within the University of Latvia (the Institutes of National Economy, Accounting, Finances, European Integration, and the Center for European and Transition Studies) – but their main field is teaching;
- one sector institute (the Institute of Agricultural Economics);
- the Institute of Economics, Latvian Academy of Sciences;
- several private institutes and consultant companies, including the Baltic International Center for Economic Policy Studies (BICEPS).

The list of institutes and their names and ownership are still changing; new institutes appear and others disappear. Local and foreign auditing and consultant companies and state institutions (Latvian Development Agency, the Bank of Latvia, Department of Macroeconomic Analysis of the Ministry of Finance) also carry out applied research.

Financing

The main sources of financing for economic research are: the state science budget – state research grants and state research programs (administered by the Latvian Council of Science); research funding for ministries (applied research) – administered by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science; the market-related research program – administered by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science; the privatization fund of the Ministry of Economics; Cultural Capital Fund (very limited resources); local government budgets; local private companies; the Soros Foundation (very limited resources) and other foreign-owned foundations in Latvia; international organizations, programs, and funds; EU programs, direct contacts with EC Directorates; and foreign universities, funds, programs, and companies. Local expenditure for research is the lowest in Europe (Kristapsons, 2001: 14). In 2002, the financing of science from the state budget is a modest 0.2% of GDP (Stradins, 2001). Less than 3% of the science budget goes to research in economics and law.

Rehabilitation, repatriation, new departures

There is no reliable information about rehabilitation, repatriation, and new departures. There is one example of real rehabilitation – the director of the Institute of Economics of the Academy of Science, Pauls Dzerve, was publicly recognized long after he was laid off from the Institute and died. Some Latvian economists have returned to Latvia fully or partly. They have based their academic careers in universities and self-established private research institutions (companies) or business schools. Some economists have been elected members of the current Latvian Academy of Sciences.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

The revival and adaptation of pre-war traditions is relevant to economic research only to the extent that they are introduced in the overall science system in Latvia (i.e., the change in the status of Academy of Science and institutes). These are rather Western (supposedly modern) traditions or experimental trials that are being implemented in economic research in Latvia. Research institutes, whether independent or parts of universities, have no basic financing, a situation unique in the world. Unlike the pre-war situation, when science was intensively supported, today the conditions for fundamental research in economics are insufficient in Latvia.

New East-West asymmetries

The change of paradigms in economics has also led to a substantial shift in partners. Scientific contacts with partners in the CIS no longer exist, mainly for financial reasons.[2] In contrast, cooperation with EU research institutions within EU programs (Phare, ACE, and others) contributed to economic research in Latvia financially and in content. Knowledge-intensive cooperation programs, Latvian researchers' visits abroad, and the dissemination of publications were essential for the rapid acquisition of basic Western economic theories and practice.

There does not seem to be comprehensive data about the participation of Latvian researchers in foreign research programs. The Institute of Economics alone, with its 20-member staff, has participated in about 20 international cooperation projects since 1994. EuroFaculty is also a good example of long-term and pan-Baltic cooperation between the Baltic and the West, creating new study programs, new research programs, and new contacts. The Stockholm School of Economics in Riga is another example. Today, Latvia is a full member of the 5th Framework European research program. Unfortunately, this program has no place for economic research.

New approaches

Up to now, economic research in Latvia has been neither sufficiently innovative nor academic. Still, some advanced researchers provide competitive research findings and ideas (in demographics, macroeconomics). These researchers are equal partners in international research projects. Most research is likely to be brief analysis or even simple description of the current situation or, at best, applied research. There are no examples of new theories or new approaches proposed by Latvian economists. The reason is the lack of fundamental research. The complete absence of basic research in all areas of economics was noted by the Danish expertise in 1992: "In the current situation of economic and social crisis, it is inevitable that economic research is considered primarily from the point of view of the needs of Latvian society, rather than from the purely scientific point of view. The transition of society implies massive needs for research and teaching in economics, but at the very same time the ensuing pressure on the state budget inflicts severe financial hardships on institutions. Staffs have been cut, and because of uncompetitive salaries there is a spontaneous brain drain of young and competent researchers." (Latvian, 1992: 621) The expertise also stated that "there is overwhelming emphasis on highly applied and short-term research projects".

The situation has not improved. The main reason for the poor performance in fundamental research is the lack of research staff, caused by still insufficient and unstable financing of economic research in general and dramatic lack of funding for fundamental research. It has been assumed that all economic research, including that financed by state grants, must manifest practical application. Also, Latvian researchers' dependent role in international research projects, where they are suppliers of information and facts rather than contributors to theoretical conclusions, hampers the development of fundamental research. An academic field is not established in a short time. It is necessarily a long-term process requiring institution building as well as human capital accumulation, both taking place in an environment of good will and understanding on the part of those who foot at least part of the bill, namely the government. It is my opinion that the development of the first two is unavoidably slow, while the third one has been regrettably slow.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Transition as a major or exclusive object of study

Thematic orientation in economic research is determined to a great extent by clients, and it is very much applied research that is being financed in Latvia. Indeed, transition is a major object of study in Latvia. Research covers such areas as privatization, public finances, agricultural economics, statistical methods of national accounting, demography, and economic forecasting (the last was shifted from the science sector to the Ministry of Economics and the Ministry of Finance when important researchers left research to work in state management. Serious research on transition has also been carried out in cooperation with foreign partners within EU programs or contracted by EU institutions or other international partners. The result, supposedly, was used to prepare advice for Latvia or policy toward the country.

The choice of themes

Researchers in Latvia are free to choose research topics in research funded by the Latvian Council of Science. The Expert Commissions of the Science Council review applications for research relevant to their competence and recommend them for financing. Normally, the number of applications and their total financing needs exceeds the state science budget, and the expert councils choose one of three options – to support the project with the requested amount of funding, to support the project with reduced funding (most initial financing is a half or more of the requested sum), or to reject the project.

Ministries initiate research topics in applied research, and their applications are discussed and approved by the Cabinet of Ministers. Researchers are free in their choice of themes when applying for funding in the "market-related research" program or Cultural Capital Fund, but these themes must be in line with the objectives of the program and fund. All other financial sources organize thematic calls.

Although fundamental research is poor in Latvia, the number of doctoral theses in economics is increasing and their academic quality improving. Fundamental research is carried out as a hobby separate from the scientist's money-earning research or job. The topics of economic research in Latvia are quite multifarious and do not differ from research topics popular in any other transition country. Recently, research topics have been shifting from core transition topics to economic growth, sector development issues, social issues, the economics of innovation, and EU integration. Generally speaking, thematic orientation does not impact the institutional structure of research. It is economic conditions that forces research institutions to change ownership or affiliation.

Private vs. public funding

There are no reliable statistics describing the real structure of the funding of economic research, but probably the share of private and local government funding is not high. Private funding focuses instead on the products of marketing or consultant companies. Larger private companies, especially banks, have economic departments that are supposed to carry out economic research needed by the company. Still, growing competition forces companies to increase their knowledge about the overall economic situation and market. Companies need reliable forecasts of economic development, as well as interpretations of global and local trends outside their core business. For this purpose, companies and also advanced local governments approach research institutes and finance special research projects that answer their interest. Some companies (Grindex, Aldaris) help fund academic awards issued by the Latvian Academy of Sciences.

The majority of economic research institutes are state-owned and affiliated with universities. There are also some small private institutes. The Institute of Economics of the Latvian Academy of Sciences is the first example of public-private partnership. The owners of this institute include the Latvian state (20% of equity capital), the Latvian Academy of Sciences, the Latvijas Finieris wood-processing company, two private sociologist companies (Baltic Data House and Baltic Social Research Center), two private higher schools (Turiba and the International Institute of Practical Psychology), the Latvian Intelligentsia Union, the Latvian Telecommunication Association, two agricultural farms, and private research economists.

5. Public space and academic debates

Debated themes, problems, methods

Conferences and seminars are organized to disseminate research results on a regular basis. The debated themes include the transition to the market economy in general, macroeconomic development, privatization, public finances, monetary and finance policy, sector development, labor market issues, social development, and other topics. Almost all of them are considered in the light of European integration. The largest forum of Latvian academic thought is the World Congress of Latvian Scientists. The first Congress was organized in 1991, the second in August 2001, both in Riga. The first Congress brought together more than 1,000 participants, of whom 800 were local and 200 of Latvian origin, living and working in foreign countries.

Principal academic journals

Two important publications should be mentioned. The academic journal *Zinātņu akadēmijas vēstis* (Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences) serves the needs of academic research in two sections: (A) social and human science and (B) natural science. The social and human science section comprises philosophy and philology, history, sociology, and also economics. The majority of articles in this journal come from the humanities sector (language, Latvian literature, and history).

In 1997, in cooperation with the Academy of Sciences and private persons, Latvian University established the journal *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*. The main mission of this journal – published only in English – is to provide foreign readers with information on academic research in Latvia. Publications are grouped in thematic issues (four per year) and reflect academic research as well as the situation in very different spheres of human life in Latvia (demography, history, social problems, agriculture, education, and also economics).

The Baltic Journal of Economics has made some effort to bring together research articles from all three Baltic states. Recently, the Baltic International Center for Economic Policy Studies (BICEPS) and the Stockholm Institute of Transition Economics (SITE) have started jointly producing the academic publication *Baltic Economic Trends.* The thematic part of the issue includes reports by Latvian and foreign researchers on the economies of the Baltic countries. Each issue includes a general report on economic developments in the three Baltic countries.

Universities and institutions of higher education are producing large numbers of serial publications, for example *Latvijas universitātes zinātniskie raeksti* (Proceedings of the University of Latvia), etc.

Depending on its financial resources, the Institute of Economics, Latvian Academy of Sciences publishes the journal *Activities of Institute of Economics* (bilingual) and, on a regular basis since 1997, a serial *Apcerējumi par Latvijas iedzīvotājem* (Articles about the residents of Latvia) in Latvian, with abstracts in English.

The economics and law sciences experts' commission of the LCS publishes an annual journal, *LZP Ekonomikas un juridiskās zinātnes galvenie pētījumu virzieni* (The main directions of research in economics and law sciences in 1994-1996 by the Latvian Council of Science). A total of 6 issues have been published.

The UNDP Latvia publishes the annual *Latvia. Human Development Report* (bilingual). The Latvian economy is also reflected in some local and pan-Baltic business publications, including *Baltic Review* (Vilnius), *Revue Baltique* (Vilnius), *Review Baltic* (Tallinn), *Journal of Baltic Studies* (AABS, ASV), and the local business press.

Selection of publications in world languages

As the economics and law sciences experts' commission reports, more than 400 books and articles and a great number of analytical papers and policy papers w published in 2000 in the framework of state-financed grants in economics, demography and management sciences, and law sciences.

The number of publications by Latvian researchers in world languages, mainly in English, is quite large for a small community. These publications include the results of international cooperation projects; reports on international conferences with participation by Latvian economists; expert reports or comments in regular surveys by European banks or public institutions (associations or other sources); and special thematic publications prepared in cooperation with Latvian researchers.

New manuals, databases

Latvian research institutions participate in international databases as country co-coordinators. There is no information on internationally significant databases organized by Latvian researchers. Every research institution keeps several databases for local needs.

6. Views on further development

International cooperation (East-West, East-East links, bilateral vs. multilateral links, institutional, informal, and project-based cooperation)

International cooperation will play an important role in the development of economic research in Latvia. East-West cooperation is likely to be more intensive than East-East links for years. Latvian relations with CIS countries have not been properly investigated up to now; it is difficult to find funding for such research. Development patterns in Latvia and the CIS countries differ. Latvia has frequently performed well in specific fields, but it lacks the capacity to engage in active research cooperation.

A very promising field of research is Latvia's cooperation with the Central European countries. Up to now, scientific cooperation between Latvia and Central European countries has taken place in EU projects, but these projects were comparative research, not research on interrelation between countries. For Latvia, multilateral links are more promising, because they provide more experience and information. Latvia is a small country, and it might be difficult to find partners and motivation for bilateral cooperation. All sorts of cooperation are accessible and have been applied now. There is neither a strong canon nor administrative regulations in this field. Latvian research institutes and universities participate and presumably will continue to participate in networks and cooperation projects.

The impact of accession

There is a saying in Latvia that while the country is preparing for integration in the EU, science has already been integrated in the EU. Latvian researchers, including economists, participate as full members in EU programs. There are no factors in connection with EU accession that could adversely affect the development of economic research in Latvia.

The problem of the "brain drain"

The problem of the brain drain is still important. It has two aspects – the withdrawal of advanced specialists from research institutes and universities, and the withdrawal of potential researchers from Latvia. It is likely that some graduates would like to work in research, but economic conditions are not satisfactory. Research institutions employ specialists on a project basis and do not have sufficient resources for the preparation phase (the selection of a core research topic and preparation for an academic career – basic research, publications, formalities and funding of writing a thesis, etc.) that every novice researcher needs. The biggest danger to Latvian science is the concentration on short-term projects that economic conditions and financing impose on research.

Conclusion

Describing the paucity of Latvian economic literature, Arnolds Aizsilnieks wrote in the introduction to his famous book *History of the Latvian National Economy 1914-1945*: "Few cultural nations have so few written thoughts in the field of economics. Even translation from the work of other nations is limited. All this indicates that the broader society has little interest in theoretical concepts in economics or in economic policy. Economics is precisely what affects each and everyone's personal interests, but people in Latvia consider economics something strange and interesting only to narrow specialists. Unfortunately, this situation did not improve after 1935.[3] (Aizsilnieks, 1968). The situation got even worse after 1990.

Still, once the economic situation in Latvia improves, the situation in science must also improve. This truth is only a half-truth in Latvia, since although public finances are increasing due to strong economic growth, the science budget remains unchanged. Within the science budget, the financing of natural sciences dominates. It is expected that economics in particular will have to be financed by ministries and state institutions, as well as business enterprises. This approach fragments economic research dramatically.

Scientists themselves have initiated and implemented several essential reforms (mainly institutional) in higher education and science in order to modernize Latvian science and keep it operating. The results were apparently good in the mid-1990s and led the European Commission to give a surprisingly high evaluation for the Latvian R&D sector. In Agenda 2000, the Commission declared that Latvian science and its R&D system are developing satisfactorily and have gained capacity and an organizational setting suitable for integration in the unified EU science and research area.

These conclusions are perhaps too optimistic about economics. The lack of academic research in economics is cause for serious doubt whether there is any economic science in Latvia today. Latvian economists participate actively in local and international research programs, but only some of their research findings or papers are truly academic products published in highly reputed international publications.

Without relevant economic research, the national economy is developing on a trial-and-error pattern. There is also an obvious disproportion between the declared goal of developing Latvia into a high-tech country and the long-term "dietary" regime of every field of natural and social science.

The European Commission has repeatedly noted the situation of Latvian science. The Commission remarked in its last *Progress Report* (Strasbourg, November 13, 2001) that it is important to increase GDP expenditure for R&D, if Latvia wishes to integrate in the European science area.

The overall conclusion from this research is that serious efforts must be made to revitalize economic science (or at least high-quality economic research) to the level required for effective economic development.

---

1 Morten Hansen observed that "transparency is not the first word that springs to mind when describing economics education" in Latvia. In his comments on this paper, Morten Hansen expresses his concern that "institutions are changing, and it is fair to add concerns over lack of standards and possible corruption in some places. In addition, high tuition fees are a looming specter over the whole education business. It remains to be seen how many from e.g. the poorer rural areas will be left out."

2 One can only agree with Morten Hansen, who suggests that "Latvian researchers should use their comparative advantage in language skills to renew cooperation with the East".

3 Author's translation.

References

Aizsilnieks, Arnolds (1968): *Latvijas saimniecības vēsture 1914-1945* (History of Latvian National Economy 1914–1945), Sundbyberg, Sweden, Ab Dubvo Tryckery;

Akademiya Nauk Latviyskoy SSR v 1946-1986 (Academy of Science of Latvia SSR in 1946-1986) (1986), Riga, Zinatne;

Anspaks, Janis (1997): "The establishment of pedagogical ideas in Latvia from the very beginning until 1940", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, 17, No. 4, Riga, University of Latvia, 4 - 48;

Arons, Matiss (1908): *Ievads tautsaimniecībā* (Leading course in economics), Riga, Riga Latvian Society;

Balodis, Eduards (1935): *Latviešu sabiedriski-saimnieciskie veidojumi tautiskās atmodas laikmetā* (Latvian socio-economic figurations in the period of national wake), Riga, Latvian Association of Co-operative Publishers;

Balodis, Kārlis (1921): *Ievads tautsaimniecībā* (Leading course in economics), Riga, Kulturas Balss;

Education institutions in Latvia at the beginning of the school year 2000/2001. Statistical Bulletin (2001), Riga, Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia;

Es viņu pazīstu. Latviešu biogrāfiskā vārdnīca (I know him. Latvian Biographic Dictionary) (1939, 1975), Riga, Archive of Biographic Publisher House;

Karklinš, Jānis (1931): *Mācība par tirdzniecību* (Doctrine of Commerce), Riga, Latvian University;

Kristapsons, Janis (2001) "Latvian science in transformation", in: *2nd World Congress of Latvian Scientists. Congress Proceedings*, Riga;

Kulturnoye stroitelstvo v Latviyskoy SSR. Statisticheskiy sbornik (Cultural building in Latvia SSR: Statistical bulletin) (1972), Riga, Central Statistical Department with the Council of Ministers of Latvia SSR;

Latvia. The Transition to a Market Economy: A World Bank Country study (1993), Washington, D.C., The World Bank, 171 - 185;

Latvian research: An international evaluation (1992), Copenhagen, The Danish Research Council, 621- 671;

Latviešu konversācijas vārdnīca I (Latvian Conversion Dictionary, Volume I) (1927-1928), Riga, A. Gulbis Publishers House;

Latviešu konversācijas vārdnīca XIII (Latvian Conversion Dictionary, Volume XIII) (1935-1936), Riga, A. Gulbis Publishers House;

Latvijas Padomju Socialistiskās Republikas statistiskās tabulas 1940. gadā (Statistical tables of Latvia Soviet Socialistic Republic in 1940) (1940), Riga, Statistical Department of Latvia Soviet Socialistic Republic, 50-52;

Latvijas PSR tautas saimniecība: Statistikas gadagrāmata, 1989 (Economy of Latvia SSR: Statistical Yearbook, 1989) (1990), Riga, State Statistical Committee of Latvia;

Latvijas PSR tautas saimniecība: Statistikas gadagrāmata 1990 (Economy of Latvia SSR: Statistical Yearbook, 1990) (1991), Riga, State Statistical Committee of Latvia;

Latvijas Statistikas gadagrāmata, 1930 (Statistical Yearbook of Latvia, 1930) (1931), Riga, State Statistical Department;

Latvijas Universitāte ilustrācijās (Latvian University in pictures) (1929), Riga, Latvian University;

Menders, Fricis (1931): *Kas ir sociālisms* (What is socialism), Riga;

Puriņš, Kārlis (1926/1927): *Finansu zinātnes kurss* (The course of financial sciences), Riga, Latvian University;

Sovetskaya Latviya. Latviyskaya Sovetskaya Enciklopediya (Soviet Latvia. Latvian Soviet Encyclopaedia) (1985), Riga, Encyclopaedia Principal editorial office, 463-489;

Stradins, Janis (1998): *Latvijas Zinātņu akadēmija: Izcelsme, vēsture, pārvērtības* (Latvian Academy of Sciences – Origin, history, transformation), Riga, Zinatne;

Stradins, Janis (2001): "Some topical problems in development of science in Latvia": The introductory speech at the General Meeting of the Latvian Academy of Sciences, 29 November 2001, in: *Zinatnes Vestnesis*, 229, No. 21, 17 December;

Zalts, Alberts (1931): *Saimniecību ģeogrāfija* (Economic geography), Riga, Valters and Rapa;

Zalts, Alberts (1932): *Izeja no krīzes. Konjunktūras politikas galvenās problēmas* (Way out of crisis. Major problems of conjuncture policy), Riga, Zelta Grauds.

Selected Bibliography

Abele, Druvis (1999): *Privatisation of Government Property in Latvia and Changes in Property Structure,* RRT Working Paper, Sponsored by ICEG, USA, Riga, Institute of Economics, LAS;

Berzins, A. and Zvidrins, P. (2000): "Population development in Latvia", in: *New demographic faces of Europe. The changing population dynamics in countries of Central and Eastern Europe,* Berlin-Heidelberg, Springer-Verlag, 183-197;

Berzins, A., Ezera, L., Greitans, A. and Zvidrins, P. (2000): *Socio-economic status and living arrangements of older persons in Latvia: Country Report*, United Nations, New York and Geneva;

Bikse, Veronika (1998): *Makroekonomikas pamati. Teorija, problēmas, politika* (Basics of Macroeconomics. Theory, Problems, Policies), Riga, University of Latvia;

Brivers, Ivars (2001): *Ekonomikas teorijas vēsture biogrāfijas* (Economic theory in biography), Riga, Banku augstskola;

Cice, Ausma Mara (1995): Chapters in: *Economic and Social Changes in the Baltic States in 1992-1994*, Tallinn, Estonian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Economics;

Cice, Ausma Mara (1996): "The Labour market and unemployment in post-socialist Latvia", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, 10, No. 5, Riga, University of Latvia, 79-97;

Cice, Ausma Mara (1998): "The employment structure in Latvia and forecasts concerning same through the year 2010", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, 21, No. 4, Riga, University of Latvia, 104-124;

Ciemina, Inta and Krastins, Olgerts (1999): "The standard of living of Latvia's residents in the most typical demographic groups", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, 24, No. 3, Riga, University of Latvia, 23-36;

Deksnis, Eduards Bruno (1996): *Eiropas Savienība: Mīti un realitāte* (European Union: Myths and Realities), Riga, Junda;

Deksnis, Eduards Bruno (1998): *Eiropas apvienošanās …: Integrācija un suverenitāte* (European Union …: Integration and Sovereignty*)*, Riga, Baltic Centre for Strategic Studies of LAS;

Didenko, K. and Saulitis, J. (2000): "Conditions and problems in the economic development of Latvia on the eve of the 21th Century", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, 26, No. 1, Riga, University of Latvia, 35-48;

Dovladbekova, Inna (2000): "Problems and trends in development of financial markets in Latvia", in: *Obshestvo i ekonomika*, No. 8, Moscow, 95-117;

Dovladbekova, Inna and Muravskaya, Tatyana (1996): "Institutional and isomorphic tendencies in the (re)-emergence and transformation of social insurance funds in Central and Eastern European countries", Country Reports: Latvia, in: *Journal of Transforming Economies and Societies*, EMERGO, Spring 1996, 68-80;

Dubra, Ellen (1997): *Evolution of institution building as an industrial strategy for regional convergence between the CEECs and the EU*, UK, Cambridge University;

Eglite, Parsla (1997): "Migration. Europe's integration and the labour force brain drain. Latvia", in: *Brain Drain from the Central and Eastern Europe*, European Commission;

Eglite, Parsla (1999): "Population policy in Latvia: Declared and undeclared…", in: *Revue Baltique*, No. 13, Vilnius, 182-195;

Eglite, Parsla (2000): "The Dynamics of Latvia's urban and rural population at the end of the 20th Century", in: *Geographic Proceedings/Folia geographica VIII. Living with Diversity in Latvia*, Riga, Latvian Geographers Union, 36-46;

Greitans, A. (1999): "The acceptance of fertility regulation methods in Latvia and other countries of the Baltic Region: Common and different features", in: *Revue Baltique*, No. 13, Vilnius, 137-148;

Gulans, Peteris (1998): Several chapters in: *New neighbours in Eastern Europe, Economic and Industrial Reform in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia*, Hirschhausen, C. (ed.), Paris, Les Presses de l'Ecole des Mines, 142-160;

Jaunzeme, Malda (2001): *Finansu matemātika* (Mathematics of Finances), Riga, Turiba;

Karnite, Raita (2000): "National Review. Latvia", in: *Transition, Cohesion and Regional Policy in Central and Eastern Europe*, Bachtler, John, Downes, Ruth and Gozelak, Grzegoz (eds.), EPRC Studies in European Policy, University of Strathclyde, Ashgate, 131-142;

Karnite, Raita (2001): "EU Companies in Eastern Europe: Strategic Choices and Labour Effects. Latvia: Assessment of the Situation and Major Trends", in: *CEE Countries in the EU companies' strategies of industrial restructuring and relocation,* Grigor Gradev (ed.), Brussels, European Trade Union Institute (ETUI);

Karnite, Raita (ed.) (2000): *Latvijas integrācija Eiropas Savienībā* (Latvia's integration in the European Union), Riga, Institute of Economics, LAS;

Karnite, Raita and Dovladbekova, Inna (1996): Chapters in: *Direct Foreign Investment in the Baltic States*, van der Hoek, M. Peter and Miltenburg, Hans (eds.), England, Avebury, 29-53;

Karnite, Raita and Solomennikov, Andrei (2001): "Baltic – CIS trade relations in volume, structure, models, conditions and future trends", in: *Ten years of Economic transformation*, *Volume III - Societies and Institutions in Transition*, Kari Liuhto (ed.), Lappeenranta University of Technology, No. 16, 375 – 390;

Karnite, Raita, Cice, Ausma Mara, Klava, Maris and Traubergs, Martin (2000): "Country report", in: *Regions of the Baltic States*, NORDREGIO, Report 2000/2, 130 - 235;

Kassalis, Edgars (1999): "The development and internationalisation of accounting in the Republic of Latvia: The background and problems", in: *Emerging Issues in International Accounting*, Niagara (USA), Niagara University, CIERA;

Keišs, Stanislavs (1996): "The infrastructure of Latvian financial market and its development problems", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, 10, No. 5, Riga, University of Latvia, 20-28;

Keišs, Stanislavs and Kazinovskis, Andris (2001): *Reģionālā administratīvi teritoriālā iedalījuma reformas problēmas Latvijā* (Problems of the regional administrative division reform in Latvia), Riga, Local Government Department;

Krastins, Olgerts (1997): "Returning to History: The last national budget of independent Latvia before World War II", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*: *State and Local Government as promoters of the Economy*, 15, No. 2, Riga, University of Latvia, 111-124;

Latvian Science Council (1994-1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000): *LZP Ekonomikas un juridiskās zinātnes. galvenie pētījumu virzieni* (The main directions of research in economics and law sciences), Riga;

Libermanis, Georgs (1994): *Tirgus, cenas, konkurence* (Market, prices, competition), Riga, Kamene;

Linde, Janis and Vanags, Ilmārs (1999): "Technological and economical aspects of the integrated statistical data processing system", in: *Report on results of work in 1988*, Riga, Institute of Statistics;

Markausa, Ieva Marga (1999): "Changes in Demographic processes in Latvia", in: *Geopolitical patterns of Central and Eastern Europe*, Rzeszów, 439-460;

Pavlina, Iveta (2000): "Child-rearing conditions and factors which influence them in modern Latvian families", in: *Activities of Institute of Economics, Latvian Academy of Sciences in 1999*, Riga, Institute of Economics, Latvian Academy of Sciences, 32-36;

Pocs, Janis and Karnite, Raita (eds.) (1995, 1996, 1997/8, 1999): *Institute of Economics, Latvian Academy of Sciences, activities in XXXX*, Riga, Institute of Economics, LAS;

Pocs, Janis and Pocs, Ugis (2000): "Privatisation in Latvia: Drawing to a close", in: *The Baltic Review*, No. 20, Tallinn;

Porietis, Janis (1992): *Ārvalstu ekonomikas vēsture* (History of foreign economy), Riga, Zinatne;

Skapars, Roberts (1995): *Mikroekonomika* (Microeconomics), Riga, University of Latvia;

Sprogis, Andris and Vitola, Irija (1997): "Opportunities for beef production in Latvia during the transformation period from the year 2000 to the year 2005", in: *Options for national agricultural policies of the EU associated countries*, Finland, 5-97;

Steinbuka, Inna (ed.) (1999): *Latvia on the verge of the 20th century*, Riga, Jana seta, 152;

Thorborg, Marina amd Zariņa, Inna (eds.) (2000): *Gender Equality in Latvia at the Threshold of the New Milenium*, Riga, Institute of Economics, LAS;

Vanags, Edvīns and Vilka, Inga (2000): "Local Government in Latvia. Decentralisation: Experiments and Reforms", in: *Local governments in Central and Eastern Europe*, Vol. 1, Horvath, Tomas M. (ed.), Budapest, Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative, 115-164;

Vanags, Edvins and Vilka, Inga (2000): "Territorial statistics and regional development in Latvia", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*: *Latvian Economy at the turn of Centuries*, 26, No. 1, Riga, University of Latvia, 17 – 34;

Zarina, Inna Bronislava (ed.) (1999): *Time use by gender in Latvia*, Riga, Latvian Women Studies and Information Centre;

Zarina, Inna Bronislava and Pavlina, Iveta (1999): "Time spent on child care in Latvia", in: *Revue Baltique*, Vilnius, No. 13, 111-119;

Zelgalvis, Elmārs (2000): "Currency exchange rate impact on development of economics", in: *Proceedings of Kauna's University*, Vol. 14, Kaunas, 251-261;

Zvidrins, Peteris and Ezera, Ligita (1999): "Dynamics and differentiation of cohabitation in Latvia", in: *Revue Baltique*, No. 13, 71-81.

Linas Čekanavičius

Economics – Lithuania

Discussant: Alf Vanags

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

There is little to be said about Lithuanian pre-war economists' input to the world's history of economic thought. Even the keenest researcher would hardly be able to track down any names of Lithuanian economists, let alone schools of economic thought originating in Lithuania and mentioned in some world encyclopaedia or reference book on "who is who in pre-war world economics". Pre-war Lithuania was a provincial part of Europe, in the eyes of the mainstream of world economics development. This comes as no surprise if one considers that Lithuania regained independence in 1918 after some 120 years of annexation by the Russian Empire, marked by the forced closure of Vilnius University, then the only university in Lithuania, and the official prohibition of Lithuanian script for about 40 years. Thus, studies of economics in Lithuania in the 1920s had to start virtually from scratch; there was a marked absence of Lithuanian terminology and textbooks on the subject, as well as of training of economists at the university level. (Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas did not launch studies of economics until 1924). Nevertheless, Lithuania had its own prominent economists (even if their prominence was merely local) who managed to establish their schools of disciples and to pave the way for what can be called pre-war Lithuanian traditions in economics. The most visible names were Vladas Jurgutis (finance), Albinas Rimka (statistics), and Domas Cesevičius (macroeconomics). Their ideas were greatly influenced by German economic thought – probably because they were the product of German universities. For instance, Jurgutis studied economics in Munich in 1910 and became the follower of Luji Brentano and the German historical school. Rimka was a pupil of the German statistician Georg Mayer from 1923-1924, and Cesevičius studied in Germany from 1928-1934. But in the later years of the pre-war period, this dominance of the German school in Lithuanian economic thought was diluted by Anglo-American ideas, brought to the country by some Lithuanian economists who obtained their education at American universities or went to the London School of Economics (LSE). Dzidas Budrys, who studied at LSE and was influenced by the ideas of Irving Fischer, and Feliksas Kemėžis, who graduated in U.S. and adhered to the school of institutionalism, deserve mention.

Jurgutis, Rimka, Cesevičius, and their followers performed a crucial task in bringing modern economic ideas to Lithuanian academia and practice (e.g. they took the leading role in establishing the system of finances, statistics, and monetary policy in the newly independent Lithuania in the mid-1920s and early 1930s), as well as "Lithuanizing" economic terms and concepts. They also initiated the first Lithuanian economic journals – *Tautos ūkis* (National Economy), published from 1930-1940, and *Ekonomika* (Economics), published from 1935-1940. While the bulk of the work done was educational and applied, rather than theoretically innovative, the growing numbers of studies in finances and statistics were probably approaching the "critical mass" to spill over the borders of merely national impact.

However, these developments ceased with World War II and the subsequent Soviet occupation. The latter forced radical changes in the paradigms: Marxism-Leninism became the sole legal way of doing economics in Lithuania. There was virtually no continuation of the pre-war traditions *sensu stricto* – they were publicly labeled "bourgeois science" and referred to mostly in various "critiques". However, it is interesting that these "critiques of economics in the bourgeois period" were sometimes used as an excuse to revive and describe the traditions of pre-war

Lithuanian economic thought, and this "shadow promotion" grew in strength toward the end of Soviet rule.

During the whole Soviet period, the straitjacket of Marxism-Leninism severely constrained the development of Lithuanian economic thought. It is no overstatement that this "general line" ideology was *omnipresent*, in that all economists had to pay some tribute to Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, or Vladimir Lenin, plus – quite often – to the latest documents of the Communist Party or its leaders' speeches. However, this compulsory reflection did not actually mean *uniformity* in incorporating Marxism-Leninism in economic writings. One can distinguish at least three different levels of presence of Marxism-Leninism in Lithuanian economic thought of the Soviet period:

1. The dogmatic trend. The characteristic feature of this direction was its explicit treatment of the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin as a kind of "Holy Scripture" of economics against which all theoretical ideas and practical steps had to be checked and verified for compatibility. Dogmatic writings and discussions on "what (Marx or Engels or Lenin) said and what he meant" are a subdivision of this direction. Obviously, most of the ideological constraints of Marxism-Leninism on economics were formed and established within this trend, making it the most counterproductive. However, there is a "silver lining" even in this darkest cloud: in order to scourge and tear apart "modern bourgeois economic theories" as deviating from the path prescribed by Marxism-Leninism, ideology-driven critics were compelled to reveal what those theories are about – and this provided the rare opportunity for the curious to learn "what's cooking" in Western economic thought.
2. *Constraints* on the science of economics – which manifested themselves both in the necessity to carefully avoid violating basic taboos of Marxism-Leninism (e.g. private enterprise, capital, market pricing, etc.) and in the specifics of the economic terminology used (e.g. the marked absence of the concepts of opportunity costs, consumer surplus, and the like). These Procrustean constraints seriously impeded the development of economic thought and its chances to keep pace with the advance of economics elsewhere in the world.
3. *Lip service* paid to Marxism-Leninism and to Party documents. It was almost a must to pay tribute to the official ideology in one's publications on economics, whether book, dissertation, or article, but in principle it was possible to get away with just a brief reference to Marx, Engels, or Lenin in, for instance, a foreword or introductory remarks. This reference could take the form of some obscure but relevant quotation from the "Holy Scriptures" of these "classics of Marxism-Leninism" – and if none was readily available, then even the general statement that they "deemed the following problem an important one" would usually do.

These ideological constraints were complemented by the jealous protection of the "purity" of Soviet economic thought against the "spoiling" influence of Western theories. In practice, this resulted in what could be called "compound" economics, one mainly "stewing in its own juices". The following seriously inhibited the impact of Western theories on Lithuanian economics:

- *Lack of access to Western economic publications*. Only a very limited number of Western economic journals (e.g. *Econometrica*, *Operations Research*, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, and some individual volumes of other periodicals) were available in Lithuanian libraries, and recently published Western economics books were even rarer. If a Lithuanian economist was keen to keep in touch with Western developments in his profession, he had to visit Moscow libraries, e.g. the library of INION (the Russian abbreviation for the Institute of Scientific Research of Social Sciences). However, access to the stocks of these libraries was restricted; one had to obtain permission to use them. In the last decade of the Soviet regime, the highest-ranking Lithuanian economists were able to order copies of selected papers and articles from the Western journals to be mailed to the aforementioned Institute.
- *Lack of interest in Western theories.* The two key prerequisites for a successful career as an economist in the Soviet Union were official adherence to the "mainstream" doctrines and the applied analysis of the Soviet economy. Since Western theories were hardly compatible with the first and hardly relevant to the second, many Lithuanian economists clearly lacked

incentives to keep in touch with developments in Western economics. This shortage of incentives was amplified by the fact that, during the Soviet period, Lithuanian economists did not have to compete with Western colleagues to earn recognition – all the competition took place this side of the iron curtain. Therefore, one had no reason to feel inferior as an economist if one was ignorant of the advances of Western economic thought. Furthermore, even the inside publications required an official "act of expertise" stating that they did not reveal any secrets that "could be harmful to the interests of the Soviet Union". This and the predictable difficulties of getting your paper published beyond the iron curtain acted as a strong disincentive against entering the world market in economic ideas.

- *Lack of ability to follow the developments of Western economics*. The lack of both possibilities and incentives to keep in touch with Western theories was exacerbated by (and partly led to) many Lithuanian economists' manifest lack of ability to acquaint themselves with Western economic ideas. There were three main reasons for this. First, since the primary language of science in the Soviet Union was Russian, learning other foreign languages was neglected. This resulted in a severe lack of ability to operate in the English language – which is by default the "*lingua franca*" of contemporary economics – thus rendering even those scarce Western publications available in Lithuanian libraries useless to many local economists. Second, since most local economists who received their education in the Soviet period were raised in a "descriptive/instructive" and emphatically non-mathematical tradition, they found it very difficult to understand Western economic articles, most of which included a fair amount of mathematics. Third, as mentioned above, Soviet-type economics had its own vocabulary that differed from that of the West. This was yet another obstacle for the Lithuanian economist trying to grasp the content of Western economic publications.

However, these impediments do not mean that the impact of Western theories on Lithuanian economics before 1989 was absolutely insignificant or, indeed, nonexistent. First, the iron curtain in economics was never completely impenetrable; some books and articles by Western economists were occasionally translated into Russian and published, for example under the label of "foreign economic thought". Second, the aforementioned "critiques of contemporary bourgeois economic thought" also shed some light on what was going on in Western economics, and a skilled reader could easily separate the wheat from the chaff. Third, many Western ideas found their way into Lithuanian economic science via mathematical economics, which was considered ideologically relatively harmless. The reason for such treatment was probably twofold: first, mathematical economics had an established tradition in Soviet economics, developed by quite a few prominent Soviet economists (e.g. Leonid Kantorovich, Viktor Novozhilov, Vasily Nemchinov, Nikolai Petrakov); second, mathematical models and quantitative analysis veiled Western economic ideas' ideological contradiction of official Soviet doctrines.

Still, in the Soviet period, mainstream Lithuanian economics was mostly out of direct touch with Western academic thought; closer contact was sporadic and mostly restricted to the somewhat marginal branch of mathematical economics. This is reflected both in the system of education in economics and in research publications.

The education of economists in the Soviet period rested on the two core courses of Political Economy: one course on the capitalist mode of production, another on the socialist (i.e., command-and-control) economic system. Both were basic indoctrination in Marxism-Leninism, establishing invisible but inviolable ideological fences[1]. Many other economic disciplines were descriptive and even instructional, lacking firmer theoretical backbone. The education of economists was based on the needs of the existing command-and-control system of economy, emphasizing mainly *what* (e.g. what sets of indicators are to be used in the planning of a specific sector) and *how* (e.g. how are they to be constructed and approved), rather than *why*. Analysis of the existing system was shallow as well – probably because going deeper could uproot the shaky theoretical foundations of the official doctrines. Economists' training was too specialized. For instance, in the period of 1969-1991, there were no less than three faculties of economics (the

Faculty of Economic Cybernetics and Finance, the Faculty of Trade, and the Faculty of Industrial Planning) at Vilnius University, which taken together had about a dozen separate study programs. While this mostly instruction-oriented approach was consistent with the demands of the existing system and admittedly sometimes provided students with professional skills that were universal regardless of ideology (e.g. accounting), this lack of analytical orientation in training the economic cadre was reflected in the quality of scientific research.

The situation would have been even worse if not for the school of mathematical economics, which had materialized in education as Economic Cybernetics, its Eastern European alias. While many of the universally compulsory, ideologically colored subjects were inevitably present also in the Economic Cybernetics study program, the "umbrella" of mathematical modeling gave much broader opportunities to acquaint students with Western economic thought. Sometimes this required disguising the original subjects by giving them a different name, e.g. Theory of Growth was taught at Vilnius University under the title "Modeling Economic Dynamics".

Research publications of the Soviet period accurately reflect the state of university education. Even a perfunctory glance at the lists of publications of Lithuanian economists in that period (Laškovas, 1981; Laškovas, 1986) reveals that the great majority were either descriptive or of a "down-to-earth" practical nature. Along with entirely scholastic works on "how to understand Marx and/or Lenin", studies of a historical experience or descriptions of practice in some particular field proliferated. Many publications were devoted to the descriptive analysis of some industry or enterprise – to be followed by some feebly argued advice on "how to improve" that practice. Descriptive or comparative statistics were often employed, but many of the publications clearly lacked any deeper causal (let alone quantitative) analysis.

Browsing through the lists of publications of Lithuanian economists in the Soviet period easily provides evidence of the aforementioned thesis of "stewing in its own juices": perhaps only one percent of all publications were published in Western journals or collections of papers. Characteristically, the great majority of these publications outside the borders of the "ideological compound" belong to the school of mathematical economics. This calls for closer attention to this subset of Lithuanian economists.

As indicated by its very name, mathematical economics comprises both mathematics and economics, i.e., it applies mathematical methods to model economic systems. Two separate schools of mathematical economics emerged in Lithuania, their accents on mathematics or on its economic applications respectively.

One of them, led by Eduardas Vilkas (a mathematician by background), was mainly concerned with developing mathematical modeling *methodology* and analysis techniques suitable for economics. Vilkas and his school produced some important and internationally recognized works in the fields of game theory and general equilibrium.

Another Lithuanian school of mathematical economics, led by Raimundas Rayatskas, has produced some worthy results in the methodology of mathematical modeling (e.g. on how to overcome the switching problem in macroeconomic optimization), but has been mostly concerned with the *application* of known mathematical methods and models to the solution of economic problems. This school widely employed input-output analysis techniques, econometrics, and various optimization models to model the economy on the national, regional, and enterprise levels.

Many prominent economists in both of these schools were actually graduates in mathematics rather than economics. Taking into account that these two schools produced the majority of publications that found their way to Western economic journals, the aforementioned "peculiarity" of their background is eloquent testimony to the general level of education of economists in Soviet-period Lithuania.

Three institutions played leading roles in Lithuanian economics in the Soviet period:

- The Institute of Economics of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences (Lietuvos Mokslų akademijos Ekonomikos institutas).

- the Institute of Economic Planning and Research (Liaudies ūkio planavimo ir ekonomikos mokslinio tyrimo institutas, LŪPEMTI) of the State Planning Committee of Lithuania. This institute served as a think tank to the State Planning Committee and at the same time was a stronghold of the aforementioned Rayatskas school of mathematical economists. This lucky combination meant that a substantial share of their applied research had an actual influence on the analysis and formation of economic policy in Lithuania,
- Vilnius University (Vilniaus universitetas) – at that time, the only institute of higher education in Lithuania where "pure" economists were trained,
- a fair share of economic publications is to be credited to the Vilnius Institute of Engineering and Building (Vilniaus inžinierinis statybos institutas), the Research Institute of Agriculture (Žemės ūkio mokslinių tyrimų institutas), the Lithuanian Academy of Agriculture (Lietuvos žemės ūkio akademija), and others.

The principal outlets for economics publications in Lithuania were:

- *Ekonomika* (Economics), a journal published jointly by the institutions of higher education,
- *Modelirovanije ekonomicheskych system* (Modeling of Economic Systems) – a collection of papers, regularly published in Russian by the Lithuanian Institute of the Economic Planning and Research.

These regular local outlets were supplemented by numerous occasionally published collections of papers at various academic institutions. Popular or propagandistic publications on economic issues were welcome in the monthly Lithuanian magazine *Liaudies ūkis* (People's Economy).

More ambitious Lithuanian economists sought ways to get published on the "all-Union" level, which was considered more prestigious and more likely to put one in the limelight. Papers by Lithuanian economists used to appear in such journals as *Voprosy ekonomik* (Questions of Economics), *Izvestija AN SSSR* (News of the Academic of Sciences of the USSR), and *Ekonomika i matematicheskyje metody* (Economics and Mathematical Methods). The latter bimonthly journal in particular was considered prestigious, at least among mathematical economists. Its status was exemplified by the fact that some of its publications were selected by Western research institutions for publication in English (in *Matekon*, a journal of translations of Russian and Eastern European mathematical economics published in New York) or in German (in *Zentralblatt für Mathematik*, published in West Berlin).

Another notable feature of the time was the "reiterative reproduction" of publication in slightly modified versions (either in Russian or Lithuanian) in various journals, collections of papers, or – an especially popular method – collections of conference theses. What counted (and, actually, still does) for one's academic career was mainly the *number* of publications – and the result was huge numbers and volumes of "science" produced each year. The overwhelming majority (it is safe to say at least 96%) of it was "indigenous publications" published within the Soviet Union, some of the rest in the COMECON countries, and probably just about one percent in Western journals and collections of papers.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

The crumbling of the Soviet system and regained independence brought radical changes to both the paradigms and the environment of economic thought. The disappearance of ideological constraints was welcome, and many Lithuanian economists hastened to disavow their allegiance to Marxism[2], but it was quite a different issue to decide exactly *what* economic paradigm to adhere to now.

This uncertainty was quite understandable: most Lithuanian economists had only a vague idea of the paradigms dominating in Western economics. Furthermore, being raised on Soviet-style "political economy", they usually had no prior knowledge of the fundamentals of Western economics: microeconomics and macroeconomics.

From the very beginning of the change of paradigms, one of the visible trends in post-Soviet Lithuanian economics was ultra-liberalism in the style of Friedrich Hayek and Ludwig von Mises, or rather liberal rhetoric. This complete negation of any positive role of the state in the market economy accompanied the first wave of vigorous development of private business in Lithuania. While later business practice and libertarian economic ideas both settled down, the legacy of this ultra-liberal thinking is still a distinct subdivision in Lithuanian economics.

However, these gaps gradually started to fill in. The universities abolished the teaching of "political economy", which was initially substituted by somewhat hazily defined courses like "Basics of Economic Theory" (generally in the tradition of Paul Samuelson's textbook of the 1970s), later to be transformed into two separate courses: Microeconomics and Macroeconomics. Selected Western books on the latter subjects were translated into Lithuanian. In the light of the limited or nonexistent ability of many Lithuanian academics to read English texts, the importance of these translations for the change in economic mentality in Lithuania cannot be overestimated. With the fall of the iron curtain, many possibilities for contacts, academic exchanges, and cooperation with the international research community opened up and rapidly multiplied. Various Western assistance programs contributed to this, *inter alias*: EC, PHARE, and TEMPUS programs, the Soros Foundation (Open Society Fund – Lithuania), the Civic Education Project, the long-term pan-Baltic EuroFaculty project, the Baltic Economic Management Training Project (financed by CIDA – Canadian International Development Agency), and others.

Thanks to these programs, many Lithuanian economists of various ages and research interests – those who spoke English, German, or French – were able to go to Western universities and research centers and to acquaint themselves *in situ* with the developments of Western economic thought. A number of younger researchers got the chance to enter and complete Masters or PhD courses in economics or business administration in American or European universities.

One of the most visible changes in the structure of the economic sciences in Lithuania during the last decade has been the formation of a distinct business administration and management trend that soon set itself apart from economics *sensu stricto*. The huge demand for entrepreneurs and economists that arose in the transition period caused the mushrooming of study programs in Business Administration and Economics at Lithuanian universities. By now, virtually every institution of higher education in Lithuania offers some program in Business Administration, and a number of them have also established programs of studies in Economics up to the Masters or even PhD level. In many cases, the curriculum design and establishment of these study programs were direct outputs of Western assistance via the projects mentioned above (e.g. TEMPUS).

These developments were accompanied by the gradual Westernization of the core curricula of studies offered in both Economics and Business Administration. The titles of many subjects offered in these study programs match those taught at Western universities. Sadly enough, these reforms swept away the program of studies in mathematical economics (the same one that had to be titled "economic cybernetics" under the Soviets). Paradoxically, this happened when the importance of mathematics for economics had dawned on many local economists (one didn't have to go far in reading any Western economic journal to encounter at least *some* mathematics, e.g. first-order derivatives). The reason given for abolishing mathematical economics as a separate study program was quite plausible: from now on *all* economics had to be mathematized to the respectively appropriate degree. Unfortunately, that never happened, because many local teachers were unable to do mathematics.

However, these positive reforms were neither as deep nor as comprehensive as one would wish. In many cases, changes in the study programs were of a cosmetic nature, Western titles masking the low-quality contents of the course. The "new" economics is still done, but the new programs of economic studies are still served mostly by the same old staff. It is a sad truth that, in post-Soviet Lithuanian faculties and other academic institutions, formal academic titles and seniority are often regarded as superior to scholarly achievement. Thus the change of elites in economics was insignificant, since the old-timers firmly held their privileged positions by virtue of degrees and titles secured in the past[3], while the emerging new generation of economists (often educated in the West), faced with too thorny a path in academia and too succulent career temptations outside it, did not particularly aspire to overtake them.

On the other hand, faculties of academic institutions themselves suffered many painful losses of bright minds both to the government and to the private business sector. This internal brain drain was caused by new, previously unknown career opportunities in politics, the diplomatic corps, or business and was strongly stimulated by the obvious disparity of salaries between these sectors and academia. The clear insufficiency of academic salaries to provide a decent living forced many faculty members who still remained in academia to have second and sometimes even third full-time jobs elsewhere. These demanding occupations effectively deprive many university teachers and researchers of both time and verve to keep up with developments in their field of economics, let alone to carry out intensive research or expand their knowledge into entirely new fields. Thus, many of them became a kind of hangers-on who rush into their classes, deliver outdated material to the students, occasionally write some shallow paper, and collect their meager pay (which many regard as merely a job security payment).

This does not mean that economics in Lithuania is completely stagnating and no changes whatsoever took place in the elite ranks of Lithuanian economists. Luckily, Lithuania had its share of talented and ambitious young economists, some of them with MA, M.S.C., or PhD degrees obtained at Western universities, who not only opted to return to Lithuania but also decided to make their way in the world of Lithuanian economics. Some of them joined local universities, and others managed to find relatively well-paid jobs as analysts in local think tanks (some of the latter are referred to below).

Political and economic changes and new winds in the economic paradigms brought about new institutional structures as well. Departments of economics or business administration were established at nearly every Lithuanian university. The Lithuanian Institute of Economic Planning and Research was disbanded, together with its mother institution, the State Planning Committee. A new research institution was created in its place – the Institute of Economics and Privatization (which was closed in 2000).

The following institutions in Lithuania offer university degrees in economics and/or business administration:

- the Faculty of Economics (Ekonomikos fakultetas), Vilnius University, Vilnius,
- the International Business School (Tarptautinio verslo mokykla), Vilnius University, Vilnius,
- the Faculty of Business Management, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University (Vilniaus Gedimino technikos universiteto Verslo vadybos fakultetas), Vilnius,
- the Faculty of Economics and Management, Vytautas Magnus University (Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto Ekonomikos ir vadybos fakultetas), Kaunas,
- the Faculty of Social Sciences, Kaunas University of Technology (Kauno technologijos universiteto Socialinių mokslų fakultetas), Kaunas,
- the Faculty of Economics and Management, Kaunas University of Technology (Kauno technologijos universiteto Ekonomikos ir administravimo fakultetas), Kaunas,
- the International School of Management, Kaunas (established jointly with the Norwegian School of Management, Oslo),
- the Kaunas Faculty of Humanities of Vilnius University (Vilniaus universiteto Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas), Kaunas,
- the Faculty of Social Sciences, Klaipėda University (Klaipėdos universiteto Socialinių mokslų fakultetas), Klaipėda,
- the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Šiauliai (Šiaulių universiteto Socialinių mokslų fakultetas), Šiauliai.

Outside the universities, the following institutions are actively involved in economic research:

- the Institute of Economics (Ekonomikos institutas), located in Vilnius,

- the Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics (Lietuvos žemės ūkio ekonomikos institutas), Vilnius,
- the Monetary Policy Department of the Bank of Lithuania (Lietuvos banko Pinigų politikos departamentas), especially its divisions of macroeconomics and forecasting, statistics, and the analysis of money. The ambitious and well-educated leaders of this analytic think tank have managed to assemble what is probably the most qualified and productive team of economic researchers in Lithuania. The main bulk of their research concentrates on compatible general equilibrium (CGE) modeling and econometric analysis of macroeconomic processes,
- the Lithuanian Department of Statistics (Lietuvos statistikos departamentas) – Statistics Lithuania,
- the Economic Research Team of Vilnius Bank (Vilniaus banko analitikų grupė), which regularly produces the excellent analytical survey of the Lithuanian macroeconomic situation and trends,
- the Lithuanian Banking, Insurance and Finance Institute (Lietuvos bankininkystės, draudimo ir finansų institutas), Vilnius,
- the Lithuanian Institute of the Free Market Economy (Lietuvos laisvosios rinkos institutas), a private nonprofit institution with a strictly liberal style of economic thinking.

There are also a number of private consulting firms that conduct-contracted studies of economic development and various issues related to economic policy. The Economic Research Center (Ekonominių tyrimų centras) can be considered their progenitor.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

The restoration of independent statehood in the 1990s inspired an upsurge of interest in pre-war traditions of economic thought, which had been deemed politically incorrect under the Soviet regime. Despite enthusiastic calls from some Lithuanian economists to follow in the footsteps of prominent pre-war Lithuanian economists like Jurgutis, Rimka, Cesevičius, and others, the revival of pre-war traditions never took place. There were several reasons for this. First, as stated above, Lithuanian pre-war economists could hardly claim to have established their own schools of thought. Most of their academic work was the training of the first generations of Lithuanian economists, and they also took a leading role in building up the economic system of the newly emerged state of Lithuania. While there were some similarities between regaining independence at the beginning of the 20th century and at the end of it, nevertheless these situations were too different to justify copying and applying the recipes of the pre-war economists in modern Lithuania. Second, world economics has advanced tremendously as a science in the 50 years that elapsed since the Soviets forcibly arrested the traditions developing in the profession in Lithuania, and it would have been irrational to take up the thread of Lithuanian pre-war economists as if time had stood still. Thus, the revival of pre-war traditions is basically confined to reflections on the historical developments of economic thought in Lithuania.

East-West asymmetries are still clearly visible in several areas. First, the level of schooling of economists at Lithuanian universities is still below international academic standards. Second, freedom of academic thought did not bring an immediate jump in the quality of economic research.

The main obstacle to more rapid and positive changes in the quality of economics research in Lithuania is the lack of knowledge of the fundamental subjects of Western economics: microeconomics, macroeconomics, and at least basic econometrics. Furthermore, browsing economic publications of the last few years rouses a strong suspicion that economics is still not understood as an empirical social science that requires formulation and empirical testing of hypotheses, rather than engagement in abstract or descriptive talks about the object of study. This apparently widespread misconception of economics is mainly responsible for the obvious fact that, despite a decade of open access to Western academic outlets, very few papers by Lithuanian economists have made their way to acknowledged Western journals (see Table 1 and the selected bibliography). And of those that did, the majority were authored by the faculty of mathematics and statistics, rather than by academics working in departments of economics or social sciences.

The following factors contribute to the persistence of this *status quo* in Lithuanian economics:

- Woefully inadequate remuneration for academic work forces academic economists to look for an additional job as a source of supplementary income and effectively discourages promising potential researchers from joining academia.
- Academic reform is slow because faculties are reluctant to adopt major changes that might affect their vested interests.
- Poor library facilities lack access to the world's databases on economics, recently published books, and subscriptions to the major economic journals.
- The majority of Lithuanian economists lack quantitative analysis skills and a considerable number lack English language skills.

So it is no wonder that, in official annual reports on scientific achievements, faculties of economics and business administration (and, indeed, faculties of social sciences in general) take particular pride in textbooks and monographs[4] published in Lithuanian[5]. While the majority of these books are far from being the product of first-rate research work, they should nevertheless be regarded with approval – as a kind of bricks in the pavement on which the new generation of Lithuanian economists will walk. The numerous local textbooks for various fields of economics are complemented by translations of internationally acclaimed works, such as Hal Varian's text on intermediate microeconomics (translated and published in 1999).

The bulk of publications on economics in local scientific journals are of the *survey type* – expounding some particular problem, defining the tasks that must be performed for its solution and, (sometimes) describing methods that could be used for the latter purpose. Such publications are easily recognized by their titles, which contain such keywords as "role of…", "problems of…", "methods of...", "review of…", and the like. If statistics is part of such papers, it is generally used for illustrative or comparative purposes as evidence of "what" and "how", and attempts at deeper quantitative analysis are extremely rare[6].

This does not mean that no economics research meeting Western standards is done in Lithuania. A certain number of works published in the local scientific journals (e.g. *Ekonomika*, *Pinigų studijos* (Monetary studies) or in the outlets of the Lithuanian Department of Statistics fully conform to the core requirement of contemporary economic research, i.e., the formulation and empirical testing of hypotheses. Many of these publications employ econometrics or other methods of quantitative analysis and modeling.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

The list of topics that are researched by academic institutions is quite broad, ranging from research on historical developments in economic science in Lithuania to the application of up-to-date IT methods in business. Naturally enough, various aspects of the transition process, mostly in the context of Lithuania's experience, are major objects of study, as can be easily deduced from the titles of the main research areas given in the annual reports of the universities, e.g.: "The Lithuanian Road to the Market Economy", "Lithuanian Economic Policy in the Process of Integration in the European Economic System", "Social and Economic Problems of Lithuania", "Economic Problems of Lithuania's Integration in the EU", "Socio-Economic Consequences of Lithuanian Integration in the EU", "Supply-Side Strategy for Productivity, Competitiveness, and Convergence Between the CEECs and the EU", "The Impact of Lithuanian Integration in the EU: analysis of five industrial sectors", and the like. Most of the research carried out in the framework of these rather broad topics is descriptive, trend-revealing (based on the available statistics), or comparative (Lithuanian experience versus that of other countries).

Other research themes include management improvement problems, the state's role in the economy, the development of the Lithuanian finance system, marketing theory and practice, econometric modeling of stock exchange markets in the Baltics, the economics of social security, environmental economics and policy, the strategy and tactics of enterprises, and regional economics and policy, to name but a few. The diversity of research is evidenced by the fact that many of the books containing original research results now published in Lithuania, as well as journals on economic issues, tend to be eclectic collections of papers.

This also explains why it is hard to discern any impact of thematic orientations on institutional structures. So far, most research institutions deliberately avoid distinct specialization to maintain flexibility and adaptability to the needs of the research market.

Most economic research carried out at academic institutions is funded from the state budget as part of the state subsidy to public universities and state institutes. Currently, 1/3 of the total state subsidy to science and studies is earmarked for scientific research. It is allocated to public research institutions in accordance with their academic merit – as assessed by the s.c. "coefficient of scientific productivity level", which considers the institution's level of scientific output as well as the number of researchers it employs. State funding is often supplemented by research grants from the EU (in the framework of ACE, PHARE, and EC Fifth Framework programs), USAID, UNDP, and other sources. The Bank of Lithuania and Vilnius Bank pay their respective research teams. As an independent, privately funded think tank, the Lithuanian Institute of the Free Market Economy lives from the money earned from private clients and international research grants. The same applies to the various economic consulting firms.

5. Public space and academic debates

It is hardly surprising that the main theme of academic debates during the last decade has been the transition process – the predominant topic being *what* economic reforms should be performed *when* and *how*. The themes debated thus varied in accordance with the issue at hand: at the beginning of the decade, there were some discussions of the pace of reforms (the gradual vs. the shock therapy approach), later succeeded by issues of the privatization model, monetary policy (e.g. the currency board approach), and macroeconomic stability. The turn of the century was marked by the debate on the expediency of private pension funds. Most of these debates were politically tinged and not substantiated by research results, which is probably why they were conducted mostly in daily or weekly newspapers (not necessarily of an economic nature), as well as on TV and radio. As it happened, these public media debates procreated a particular breed of local economists – the limelight or talk show economists. Because they seem to have "tenure" as experts on TV and radio talk shows and because they regularly "preach" on current economic issues in the press, precisely *these* economists comprise the profession's elite in the eyes of the general public.

Debates on theoretical approaches and research methods are almost completely absent in Lithuania's academic press. This is probably because of the small size of the scientific community in economics: nearly everyone can find his own comfortable niche. Hence the probability of stepping on someone's toes, which might lead to heated debate, is rather low.

The principal Lithuanian academic journals on economic issues are the following:

- *Pinigų Studijos* (Monetary Studies), a quarterly published by the Bank of Lithuania. Short summaries of papers published in the latest issue are found on the website http://www.lbank.lt/ps983.htm,
- *Ekonomika* (Economics), published twice a year by Vilnius University,
- *Ekonomika ir vadyba* (Economics and Management), published by the Kaunas Faculty of Humanities of Vilnius University,
- *Inžinierinė ekonomika* (Engineering Economics), a quarterly published by Kaunas Technological University,

- *Lietuvos makroekonomikos apžvalga* (Lithuanian Macroeconomic Review), published regularly in both English and Lithuanian by the economic research team of the commercial Vilnius Bank (Vilniaus bankas). An Internet copy of this publication can be found at http://www.vb.lt,
- *Lietuvos ekonomikos apžvalga* (Survey of the Lithuanian Economy). Published twice a year jointly by the Ministry of Economyand Department of Statistics.

In addition to these academic journals, the two other regular publications of economic research results are:

- *Lietuvos makroekonomikos apžvalga* (Lithuanian Macroeconomic Review), regularly published in both English and Lithuanian by the economic research team of the commercial Vilnius Bank (Vilniaus bankas). Shaped along the lines of the publications of the Economist Intelligence Unit, this review provides a thorough and detailed analysis of current economic and political developments in Lithuania, including short-term forecasts. An Internet copy can be found at the Vilnius Bank website http://www.vb.lt,
- *Lietuvos ekonomikos apžvalga* (Survey of the Lithuanian Economy) – a collection of papers on the issues of the Lithuanian economy, reform, and EU integration developments published twice a year jointly by the Ministry of Economy and Department of Statistics,
- The *Baltic Journal of Economics*, published irregularly since 1997 under the auspices of the EuroFaculty international project of social science reforms in the Baltics, is another outlet for publications by local economists.

The principal database on Lithuanian economic development is found at the Department of Statistics, which publishes a bilingual Lithuanian-English quarterly statistical report titled *Lietuvos ekonominė ir socialinė plėtra* (Economic and Social Development in Lithuania). A short selection of publications by Lithuanian economists in world languages is given in the selected bibliography.[7]

6. Views on further development

The Lithuanian economy and Lithuanian economics are both on the path of transition and European integration. The two processes are closely related: the development of economic sciences is the obvious prerequisite to the development of economic policy-making and management skills. Two main directions in the development of economics in Lithuania can be distinguished: education and research. The first concerns the reform of study curricula in economics and business administration, and the second refers to the quality of research and Lithuanian economists' potential to perform it.

In both directions, Lithuania has received substantial assistance from the West. This support includes the conveyance of know-how in teaching and research, the development of local library facilities, and IT technologies. Participation in common research projects with Western and Eastern partners under the auspices of ACE, PHARE, and the EC Fifth Framework programs provides a significant opportunity for Lithuanian academics to learn and to share knowledge.

The main vehicle of education reform is the long-term project of EuroFaculty, created by the Council of the Baltic Sea States. EuroFaculty aims to reform the curriculum in social sciences at the three leading Baltic universities – Vilnius University Technical University of Vilnius Gediminas, Tartu University, and the University of Latvia – on the undergraduate and graduate level, upgrading it to internationally accepted standards. The end of the project is envisaged for the year 2005, and there is good reason to believe that EuroFaculty targets in economics will be achieved.

EuroFaculty also gave birth to a unique project of East-East cooperation in economics, the *Journal of Baltic Economics*, mentioned above as an example of pan-Baltic collaboration among economists. Another example of such collaboration is the Baltic International Center for Economic

Policy Studies (BICEPS), a small network of Baltic economists with a coordinating center based in Riga. BICEPS recently started publishing a quarterly survey called *Baltic Economic Trends*.
But the ultimate success of these positive developments in education and research and, equally important, the *sustainability* of achievements greatly depend on the following factors:

- the prevention or slowing of the brain drain from local academic institutions and research think tanks to the private and government sector (internal brain drain) and abroad (external brain drain). This depends primarily on the amount of state funding to science and education, on salary policies, and on the overall economic situation in Lithuania,
- finding a solution to the problem of aging social science faculties at the academic institutions. This demands the creation of some scheme of both financial and moral incentives for promising young graduates in economics to stay in academia, i.e., the stimulation of "brain influx".

Internal efforts could be assisted by support from outside, i.e., from the European economics profession. As the situation now stands, economists from Lithuania and the Baltic states in general are virtually absent at any of the major European economic conferences, e.g. the annual meetings of the European Economic Association. This is not the case with participants from the other CEE countries, who have been encouraged by the special terms for attendance for economists from transition countries. Perhaps there is a need for a special "infant industry" status for the economics profession in the Baltics.

---

1 The so-called "Political Economy of Socialism" was actually a fairy tale, presenting a purely utopian model of socialism that had very little to do with or was completely at odds with reality.
2 In some cases, this process took on ironic features: in their zeal as fresh converts, some local professors even went so far as to publicly brand Karl Marx's economic theories "unscientific".
3 Nostrification of academic degrees and titles obtained in the Soviet period was rather formal, and all but a very few manifestly ideological degrees were approved by the academic authorities.
4 Actually, the line between these two categories in Lithuanian economics is rather vague: some of the books that were published as monographs could be justly assigned to the class of textbooks. Many of the latter publications are merely creative adaptations of Western textbooks on economics and business administration.
5 Results of the survey conducted by the Informationszentrum Sozialwissenschaften (IZ) attest to this observation as well.
6 Thus, although in their responses to the IZ questionnaire many economic departments of Lithuanian academic institutions indicate that the quantitative approaches (such as mathematical economics, econometrics) are among the ones they mainly use, surveying their staff publications refutes this claim. Historical approaches, business administration, and international economics are without a doubt much more common theoretical approaches in Lithuania.
7 Selection of publications was done bearing in mind the twofold criteria: to represent those publications of Lithuanian economists that found their way into outside outlets, as well as to reflect the variety of the fields of research.

References

Laškovas, Jonas (1981): *Ekonominės kibernetikos ir finansų fakulteto dėstytojų mokslinių leidinių bibliografija, 1945-1980* (Bibliography of scientific publications of the Faculty of Economic cybernetics and finance, 1945-1980), Vilnius, Lietuvos aukštojo ir specialiojo vidurinio mokslo ministerija ir Vilniaus universitetas;

Laškovas, Jonas (1986): *Ekonominės kibernetikos ir finansų fakulteto dėstytojų mokslinių leidinių bibliografija 1981-1986* (Bibliography of scientific publications of the Faculty of Economic cybernetics and finance, 1981-1986), Vilnius, Lietuvos aukštojo ir specialiojo vidurinio mokslo ministerija ir Vilniaus universitetas.

Selected Bibliography

Baršauskas, P. et al. (2000): "Foreign Direct Investment in Central and Eastern Europe: Influencing Factors and Conditions", in: *Almanach des praktischen Managements in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, Stralsund, Nordic Academy of Informatization, Band 2, 17-22;

Baršauskas, P. et al. (2000): "Impact of Political Risks on Some Economic Issues in CEECs", in: *Almanach des praktischen Managements in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, Stralsund, Nordic Academy of Informatization, Band 2, 12-16;

Čekanavičius, Linas (1998): "Nuclear Power, Pollution and Restructuring", in: *Environmental Transition in Nordic and Baltic Countries,* Aage, H. (ed.), Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 172-186;

Česynienė, Rima (2000): "Labour Market Situation in Lithuania and other Baltic Countries", in: *Baltic Economic Issues*, B. Lesser (ed.), Halifax, 1-13;

Čičinskas, Jonas (1994): "Economic Development in Lithuania after Independence", in: *The Politics of Transition in the Baltic States Democratization and Economic Reform Policies*, Dellenbrant, J. A. and Norgaard, O. (eds.), Umea, Umea University Press, 167–183;

Čičinskas, Jonas (2000): "The Baltic States on the Road Towards Accession to the EU: Circumstances and Implications", in: *German And American Policies Towards the Baltic States*, Arnswald and Wenig (eds.) Baden–Baden, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 47–54;

Čičinskas, Jonas et al. (1995): *Trade Policies and Lithuania's Reintegration into the Global Economy*, IMF Working Paper, International Monetary Fund;

European integration studies centre (1997): *Lithuania's Integration into the European Union: Summary of the study on the status, perspectives and impact*, Vilnius, Naujasis Lankas;

Ginevičius, R., Tvaronavičienė, M. (2000): "A Reform of a Tax System in Lithuania: What Way to Choose?", in: *Almanach des praktischen Management in Mittel- und Osteuropa*, Stralsund, Nordic Academy of Informatization, Band 2, 38–43;

Kairys, J.P., Valerio, N. (1997): "The market for equity options in the 1870s", in: *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 52, No. 4, 1707-172;

Kairys, J.P., Kruza, R. and Kumpins, R. (2000): "Winners and Losers From the Introduction of Continuous Variable Price Trading: Evidence from the Riga Stock Exchange", in: *Journal of Banking & Finance*, Vol. 24, No. 4, 603-624;

Kazlauskienė, Natalija (1999): "Agricultural Privatisation, Land Reform and Farm Restructuring in Central and Eastern Europe", in: *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 26, No. 2, 248-250;

Leipus, R. and Rich, D. (1997): "An Option-based Approach to Analysing Financial Contracts with Multiple Indenture Provisions", in: *Advances in Futures and Options Research*, No. 9, 1–36;

Leipus, Remigijus and Račkauskas, Alfredas (1999): "Security Price Modelling by Binomial Tree", in: *Applicationes Mathematicae*, No. 26, 253–266;

Leipus, Remigijus et al. (2000): "Stationary ARCH Models: Dependence Structure and Central Limit Theorem", in: *Econometric Theory*, No. 16, 3–22;

Mačiulytė, J. (1995): "Agrarian-reform in Lithuania - A 3rd version", in: *Revue D' Etudes Comparatives Est-Ouest*, Vol. 26, No. 3, 177;

Mah, J.S. and Tamulaitis, D. (2000): "A Note on Investment Incentives in the WTO and the Transition Economies", in: *Post-Communist Economies*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 119-130;

Masiulis, Kęstutis (2000): "The Lithuanian Elite: Labyrinths of Economic Values. Streaming Towards Social Stability", in: *Social Studies*, No. 4, 195-215;

Medaiskis, Teodoras (2000): "Country Report Lithuania", in: *Transformation von Systemen sozialer Sicherheit in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Schriftenreihe für Internationales und Vergleichendes Sozialrecht, Band 16, Berlin, Dunker und Humblot, 216-228;

Pukelienė, V. (2000): "Changes in the Structure of Income and Consumption in Lithuania", in: *Selected readings on economies in transition*, Greece, CIHEAM, Vol. 44;

Rudzkis, Rimantas et al. (1996): "Statistical-Mathematical Modelling of Consumer of Goods and Services Price Indices in Lithuania", in: *Ekonomika*, No. 42, 41–70;

Semėnienė, Daiva et al. (1997): "The Lithuanian Pollution Charge System: Evolution and Prospects for the Future", in: *Controlling Pollution in Transition Economies: Theories and Methods*, Bluffstone, R. and Larson, B. (eds.), London, Edward Elgar, 102-127;

Tamošiūnas, Raimundas (1990): "Replica Economies with Congested Public Goods", in: *Mathematical Social Sciences*, Vol. 19, 205-233;

Titarenko, Vadimas (2000): "Recent Development of the Banking Sector in Lithuania", in: *Baltic Economic Issues*, Lesser (ed.), Halifax, 75-80;
Vilkas, Eduardas (1997): "Management-Buy-Out and Management-Buy-In in Lithuania", in: *Management-Buy-Out and Management-Buy-In as a Privatisation Instrument*, Studien der ISG Sozialforschung und Gesellschaftspolitik, No. 17, Köln, 23–81;
Vilkas, Eduardas (1997): *Lithuanian Economy: Transition Crisis and Growth Prospects*, Finnish Statistics;
Vilkas, Eduardas (2000): "Lithuania (Chapter 10)", in: *Transition, Cohesion and Regional Policy in Central and Eastern Europe*, Bachtler, J., Downes, R. and Gorzelak, G. (eds.), Aldersholt, Ashgate Publishers;
Vilpišauskas, Ramūnas (2001): "Economics of the Northern Dimension", in: *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 2, 380-381;
Žilinskas, A. (1999): "Marketing Decisions Under Uncertainty", in: *Interfaces,* Vol. 29, No. 1, 137-138;
Žilinskas, A. (2000): "Multicriteria Decision Aid Methods for the Prediction of Business Failure", in: *Interfaces*, Vol. 30, No. 4, 104-105;
Žilinskas, A. (2000): "Risk Modeling, Assessment and Management", in: *Interfaces*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 138-139.

Table 1 Scientific productivity of faculties of economics and business management of Lithuanian universities*in 1995-1997, 1999

Year	Academic staff (number of professors and researchers)	Scientific production (number of publications)				Scientific productivity (production per capita of academic staff)		
		Books	ISI rated publications	Other international publications	Publications in Lithuanian journals	ISI rated publications	Other international publications	Publications in Lithuanian journals
1995-1997	551.53	18.75	0.50	49.75	168.50	*0.00091*	*0.0902*	*0.30552*
1999	649.33	7.99	0.00	42.67	439.57	*0.00*	*0.0657*	*0.67696*

* Calculations table were based on the available data that in some cases was not precise. Therefore figures in this table are to be regarded as approximate estimations with margin of error in the range of about 10%.

Tadeusz Kowalik

Economics – Poland

Discussant: Andrzej Wojtyna

Introduction

The systemic transformation of a centrally directed economy into a market economy poses a number of new, mostly normative questions. Almost all countries started their endeavor of transition at around the same time, and therefore policies were not based upon the experience of others. Also, the key to systemic changes has lain in the polity, which is in the hands of political rulers. Therefore the narrow definition of economics as a science of the best allocation of scarce resources has been of little use. What is really needed is a larger science called political or social economy. This is an unavoidable conclusion derived from the fact that transformation is a simultaneous process of social, political, and economic changes.

This complexity of change means that our task is much broader than just presenting the state and development of economics as usually understood or taught as micro- and macroeconomics. Economic science is to be seen as one of the factors influencing the systemic transformation. Thus, an analysis of economics from this perspective must inevitably be influenced by the evaluation, not only of what economists do, but also of the stabilization and systemic change programs[1].

In today's Poland, one can hardly find anyone who would share the opinion, still very popular in the West, that "Poland has experienced an unprecedented boom and social progress" ("Time", May 3, 1999). Indeed, one may be impressed by the rather high rate of GDP growth during the last eight to nine years, but I do not see any signs of unprecedented *social* progress. By now it is self-evident that this particular boom went hand in hand with social regression. This is manifested in an exceptionally high rate of unemployment; rapidly increasing poverty and inequalities; reduced real wages for the majority of employees and peasants; a catastrophic situation in housing; and the flouting of social justice in the privatization of the national economy. There are, of course, some winners, but how many of them? Some say about 15%, others even one-third of the population. Even if this is so, the winners' gains do not and cannot balance the sufferings of the much more numerous losers.

During periods of cyclical boom, unemployment may decline slightly, and the number of those who have been marginalized may fall somewhat. But income inequality, mass unemployment, and the marginalization of a large part of the population will probably remain with us for many years as the most characteristic features of the new social order (at least until the next great upheaval). It is increasingly recognized – although perhaps less by economists than by sociologists, social psychologists, and political scientists – that this type of transformation has created an unstable system fraught with deep social conflicts.

In this situation, it seems reasonable not only to describe economics as a discipline in itself (that is, dealing only with the final product of the economists, or even in postulating what should be done), but also to confront their views with the dominant attitudes of society. Hence, we should also be interested in the behavior of economists as a particular professional group, a sub-culture having its own interests, not necessarily compatible with the development of science as such and with society's well being.[2]

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

New tendencies in the 1930s

Until the end of World War I, Poland had been partitioned among the three neighboring empires of Austria, Russia, and Germany. Polish society was deprived of its own government and administration. Thus economists were dispossessed of the most important economic laboratory of monetary and fiscal policy. Only the most liberal among the occupants, the Austrian Empire, permitted Polish politicians and economists to participate in Viennese central power. For example, Leon Biliński became a finance minister and, in this capacity, introduced the so-called Goldkernwährung. Very few Polish universities taught economics, mainly Jagiellonian University in Kraków and Lwów. Among economists, the historical school (or *Kathedersozialisten*) dominated.

In the 1930s, a new group of economists emerged with good mathematical training and knowledge of Anglo-American economics. These were modern neo-classical theorists, mainly with scholarships from the London School of Economics. Oskar Lange was rather an exception. Well prepared in mathematics and statistics, he attempted from the very start to reconcile the most modern neo-classical theory with Marxist economics, which he termed "economic sociology" (Lange, 1935).

At the beginning of the 1930s, Michał Kalecki, the second most eminent Polish economist, started his activity. As a researcher of the Institute of Business Cycles and Prices, he and his close friend Ludwik Landau initiated a systematic investigation of national income (they pioneered it independently from but at the same time as Colin Clark). Between 1936 and 1944, Kalecki lived in England (Cambridge and Oxford), where he was treated as one of Keynes' disciples. Then he worked for the International Labour Organization, ILO (temporarily located in Montreal) and during the years 1946-54 at the UN (New York).

In 1933, Kalecki published a small book, *Próba teorii koniunktury* (An attempt at a theory of the business cycle), which anticipated "the Keynesian revolution" (according to Lawrence Klein, it contained all of Keynes' major theses in the *General theory of employment, interest and money.*) Since we now know from a complete edition of Keynes' *Works* that, around 1933, an extended draft of *General theory* was circulating among Keynes' collaborators and students, we can be certain that both theories were emerging at exactly the same time. However, Kalecki's role in the co-authoring of a theory of demand economics was acknowledged much later because, as Mark Blaug noticed, he was not in the right place and wrote in an exotic language.

Much more fortunate was Oskar Lange, who managed to publish in German and in English from the very beginning of his academic carrier. As early as 1937, he started to teach, for almost a decade, at American universities. By 1936-37, he had already become known as a sharp polemicist against Friedrich A. Hayek and Ludwig Mises, arguing in favor of the economic rationality of socialism. In subsequent years, as a professor at Chicago University, Lange established his place in the history of our discipline by his skillful interpretation of Keynes' theory and its incorporation in the neo-classical framework (he "co-authored" with Hicks and Samuelson the so-called "neo-classical synthesis"). Both these eminent economists returned from the US to Poland (Lange in 1948 and Kalecki in 1955) and had a strong impact on the development of economics in communist Poland.

Soviet Marxism's intermezzo and revisionism

World War II and the German occupation decimated the Polish intellectuals; some of them were murdered and others emigrated for good. This made the Sovietization of Polish culture and science easier during the imposition of the Soviet-type regime. In the early 1950s, the Soviet/Marxist monopoly was almost complete. Not only was Western mainstream academic economics barred;

even access to the publications of Western Marxists, such as Maurice Dobb, Paul Sweezy, and Paul Baran was denied.

One of the most paradoxical facts was that an old socialist, Edward Lipiński, was simultaneously editor-in-chief of the quarterly journal *Ekonomista* and dean at Warsaw University's economics faculty, yet was forbidden to teach economics. That is why he shifted to studying remote historical areas of Polish economic thought, starting with Mikołaj Kopernik. Because of his fame, Oskar Lange was nominated for rector of the Main School of Economics in Warsaw (renamed at that time the Main School of Planning and Statistics); however, he did not teach economics, but the more ideologically neutral statistics. Oddly enough, this eminent personality got a chair of economics in his own country only after political liberalization in 1956. It was a year of political liberalization and the return of the idea of the "Polish road to socialism".

- Poland and Hungary were the first communist countries in which some signs of liberalization appeared shortly after Stalin's death. A paradox of the emergence of revisionism is that its intellectual roots were in the last *pronunciamento* of Yosef Stalin's *Economic problems of socialism in the USSR* (1952). To justify the extension of the market, Oskar Lange and Włodzimierz Brus exploited Stalin's great stress on the objective character of socialist economic laws.
- However, the real and rapid process of liberalization in Poland started after the June 1956 revolt of Poznań workers. In economics, the long process of de-Sovietization comprised two different currents. First, there was the absorption of the publications of Western Marxist economists – Dobb, Sweezy, Baran, Bettelheim, and Napoleoni. Their publications were a basis for teaching the political economy of capitalism. For the first time, the works of Rosa Luxemburg, Rudolf Hilferding, Karl Kautsky, Antonio Labriola, and Antonio Gramsci, as well as some forgotten works of old Russian economists, were also published in Polish.
- More complicated was to absorb what was still called "bourgeois economics". Besides Keynes' "General theory", there were translations of several authors of the more or less Keynesian brand, such as Robinson, Galbraith, Káldor, Domar, Myrdal, Leontief, early Schumpeter, and several authors writing on the Third World. Paul Samuelson's neo-classical synthesis was published in (1959). There was complete freedom in studying and publishing econometrics, cybernetics, and programming. Still forbidden, however, were works openly critical of Soviet socialism, along with those generally pro-Soviet historians whose views were not identical to the official Soviet stance on the Soviet economy, such as Carr, Davis, and Alec Nove. Even foreign editions of Trotskyists, like Deutscher, remained illegal. The works of such libertarian thinkers as Hayek, and Milton Friedman, were also banned.

Officially, Marxist economics was supposed to be taught at the universities, but teachers had quite a large margin of choice to teach freely about Western economic debates. Some economists taught Western academic economics, while paying only lip service to Marxist and, even more so, Soviet concepts.

However, we have to remember that, at least till the end of the 1960s, the critical attitude of the main Polish economists (such as Kalecki, Lange, and, in the younger generation, Brus toward the Soviet system, Soviet Marxism, and Soviet economics was somehow combined with a continued belief in the superiority of existing and theoretical socialism to capitalism. They still regarded themselves as Marxists[3], and sometimes their optimism in this respect was rather desperate. Observing the wrong practice of planners, Kalecki would ask: "What other system could afford such waste?"

The evolution of Oskar Lange's views was more complicated. In 1956, he forbade the publishing in Polish of his classical work on market socialism, because – as he told me – he did not want to support the free-marketers. At the beginning of the 1960s, Lange believed that the socialist economies had a chance to catch up with the most developed economies of the West. Moreover, he even wrote – what today sounds unbelievable – that in the future the United States might find itself a backward country surrounded by a more developed socialist camp. Only a couple of years later, shortly before his death in 1965, he expressed the opinion that sociological factors had caused the stagnation of the Polish economy, which had entered a lasting period of muddling through. He believed that incentives for a revival might come only from outside of Poland.

Oskar Lange's primary merit at that time was that he undertook the task of creating a broad theoretical framework for including non-Marxist economics in a Marxist framework. Namely, his monograph "Political Economy" (initially planned for three volumes) was to be a great synthesis of Marxist and Western mainstream economics. This synthesis was to be based on two pillars: on Marxist historical materialism and on the (neoclassical) principle of rational behavior. His main idea was very clear: Marxism delivers a broad theory of capitalism's evolution, whereas so-called "bourgeois" economics is occupied mainly with current economic problems and contains rather technical tools for managing the economy. Thus, Lange was defending the idea of one unified political economy based on the Marxist foundations of historical materialism. This was a return to his early idea of the compatibility and complementarity of Marxist and "bourgeois" economics operating on different territories (Lange, 1935).

His death in 1965 at the age of 61 prevented him from accomplishing this ambitious work, but he managed to popularize many Western concepts in his other books, where he treated econometrics, cybernetics, and optimal decisions as an auxiliary to political economy.

This idea of treating the bulk of Western academic economics as a set of technicalities was sometimes extended to the concepts of economic reforms. When one of the eminent reform economists, Czesław Bobrowski, argued for the so-called Polish economic model (more or less similar to the Yugoslav one), he wrote that his model was a *technical* variant of socialism. Underestimating the rulers' vigilance, he was assuming that the rulers would more easily swallow it without fear of having engaged in ideological retreat.

Lively debates marked the second half of the 1950s. Warsaw was the unquestionable center of intellectual life in Central and Eastern Europe. We can discern several schools of thinking, grouped mainly around the aforementioned personalities. Besides the Kalecki and Lange schools, there was also a purely neo-classical school (the so-called "(Aleksy) Wakar school"), which argued for a concept of market socialism based on pure neoclassical (pre-Samuelsonian) foundations. Its main product was Janusz Zieliński's book on *Economic calculus in socialism* (1961). I am sure that, if translated into an international language, it would be regarded as one of the best, if not the best, analyses of the pre-war debate on the rationality of the socialist economy.

This period also saw, unique within the communist camp, the first functioning of a governmental advisory body as a separate organization publishing its own reports and recommendations. The Economic Council was founded in 1957 and included more than thirty academic economists, representatives of the trade unions, and some top government and Party functionaries. The Council's main document elaborated a proposal for economic reform, which was ignored by the government but spurred a lively and long theoretical debate.

The most outstanding product of this debate was Włodzimierz Brus' book *General problems of the functioning of a socialist economy* (1961). It was translated into ten or eleven languages and was long treated in several countries as a bible for socialist reformers. The Hungarian reformers (Ners) openly acknowledged that the intellectual source of their "New Economic Mechanism", implemented in 1968, lay in this seminal work. In China, it was published in the mid-1980s, but the English version was known earlier and is still regarded as reform inspiring. It was ignored by the Polish authorities, however, and served only as an academic book. Needless to say, looked at retrospectively (also by Brus himself), his "model of planning with an incorporated market mechanism" proposed a very limited decentralization of decisions. Highly centralized investment decisions and regulated prices remained. The market was treated as one tool in the hands of planners.

From 1956 on, Poland was relatively open to the West. There was a stream of Western visitors. Several young Polish scholars, financed by various foreign foundations and universities, got a chance to study at Western universities, mostly in the United States. The center for Third World postgraduate economic studies was founded at the Main School of Economics (then the "Main School of Planning and Statistics"). The governments of Third World countries invited dozens of Polish economists to work as experts or advisors.

All these facts transformed Warsaw into the strongest, most vibrant academic center in economic sciences in the whole Soviet bloc. Warsaw was sometimes called the "socialist Cambridge". This fact, however, had no impact on economic policy. In the late 1960s, Brus was treated as an enemy and his book as an inspiration for a condemned revisionism. The Polish economy was long the most stagnant in the communist camp, whereas in Hungary we could observe just the opposite situation. The economy of a Kadarist "goulash socialism" was performing quite well, although economic science had not flourished yet. The well-known Sovietologist Alec Nove summed up these different asymmetries: "the worse the state of economics, the better the performance of the economy and *vice versa*". This was later ironically called "Nove's law".

The 1968 wave of anti-Semitism and anti-revisionism (Kalecki called it "Reichskristallnacht for the poor") caused a dismantling of Kalecki's school, and many intellectuals, mostly of Jewish origin, emigrated. Lange died in 1965, Kalecki in 1970, and many other economists, among them Brus, emigrated. The Polish economy became mediocre and much worse than Hungary's, which had started to flourish. Thus, in Poland after 1956, the development of economics and other social sciences were threatened, not so much by Marxism-Leninism, as by the most primitive nationalism.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

From the Warsaw Consensus to the Washington Consensus

The initial systemic changes in Poland created a model of transformation in two different spheres. First, Poland showed how to abolish the communist political system peacefully, and second, it pioneered a hasty transition from a command to a market economy. Both had a great impact on systemic changes in the other countries of the Soviet bloc and to some extent also in Yugoslavia, becoming a standard recipe for the authorities in almost all of post-communist Europe. Poland's pioneering experience justifies a more detailed consideration of the role of economists in their conceptualization, support, and criticism of the main lines of socio-economic change.

The organizers of this research program took the year 1989 as the starting point of the process of systemic change. In Poland, however, changes of this type had started almost ten years earlier. The emergence of an independent ten-million-member social movement, in the shape of the Independent Self-Governed Trade Union "Solidarity" based on the Gdańsk agreement between the government and the strikers, shaped the social and political configuration very deeply. It was the first important step along the path of systemic change in a hitherto "monarchic" system. The agreement and the coexistence of such a mass independent social movement and the Communist power initiated something totally unexpected. Namely, this *"contract sociale"* began the process of a peaceful transformation of actually existing socialism into a market economy. Until then, a common belief was that the communists would never peacefully resign from political power – in Władysław Gomułka's words: "Once we had gained power, we would never give it up."

A "Solidarity" program of a "Self-Governing Republic" (ratified by its Congress in October 1981) postulated several economic reforms that would remain within the general framework of a labor-market socialist economy, not challenging directly either state property or the domination of the Communist Party in the state structure.

The Round Table negotiations and the final Agreement went much further, unequivocally declaring a "contractual" sharing of political power with the opposition. Also in economic matters, this Agreement outlined a much more radical "new economic order" than had been set out in previous programs. It is true that, in line with the thinking of old socialist and right-wing communists, the negotiators agreed to strengthen self-management at the factory level. But several other statements were innovative. They declared:

- the abandonment of administrative planning in favor of steering the economy mainly by economic levers, (a crucial feature of the Hungarian reform of 1968),
- a far-reaching liberalization of prices,
- the possibility of privatizing state firms,
- constitutionally guaranteed equal treatment of different forms of ownership, and even
- creation within two years of the Warsaw Stock Exchange.

Thus, we may justly say that the Round Table Agreement (Salomonowicz, 1989) outlined a really new socio-economic order, conceptually not very far from the Swedish model, which was very popular at that time in Poland. By the way, this order was in accordance with the expertise of a group of economists, written after a study visit in Stockholm in January 1989[4]. It is interesting that among the more than forty economists taking part in negotiations, only a handful, mainly businessmen, argued in favor of a free market model.

However, the Round Table Agreements, based on this act of exceptional wisdom, and the June 1989 parliamentary elections were the last deeds of social and economic change based on a broad consensus in Poland. A couple of months after the elections, the Warsaw Consensus (The Round Table Agreement) abruptly made way for the Washington Consensus. The Solidarity-dominated government prepared the neo-liberal program of stabilization and systemic change (usually called the Balcerowicz Plan or "Big Bang"/"shock therapy"). Afterward, parliament ratified it almost unanimously, even although a great majority still belonged to the post-communist parties. It was not negotiated, however, with the trade unions, not even with TU "Solidarity", which was regarded as the social base of the first post-communist government.

In this respect as well, Poland pioneered and created a model of economic transformation for the other post-communist countries.

Let us come back to the achievements and failures of twelve years of development of the Polish economy, although here is not the proper place for a detailed analysis of this[5]. In the shortest possible form, I see Poland's economic order and economic situation as follows.

I already mentioned that the high rate of GDP growth in the Polish economy did not bring *trickle-down effects*. On the contrary, many indicators show that the social face of the Polish economy is the ugliest amongst the Central European countries. Let two or three facts suffice: Of the 23.5 million people of employment age, only 15 million are now employed. That means that almost a third of all potential employees are not engaged in economic activity. There are more than three million registered unemployed and about one-third who do not register, i.e., more than 40% youth unemployment, young pensioners, and a very high number of disabled people. Only 1/5 of the registered unemployed receive allowances (the lowest rate in Europe). Peasants' income has been halved. Many studies (Beskid, 1998) (Golinowska, 1996a, 1996b) (World Bank 1994, 1995) show that, within a couple of years, the number of people living below the poverty line more than doubled. Between 1990-93, "a real revolution in incomes distribution" took place (Bywalec 1995), unprecedented in Polish peacetime history. No more than 5% of the population receive social welfare assistance, although more than 14% of the population is entitled to social assistance because their disposable income is lower than a minimum fixed by law (Leś, 2001). This is the result of a great contradiction between a large and growing number of people eligible for social assistance and the ability of the state to deliver. A deep contradiction is built-in in the gigantic "neo-liberal welfare state", created under the banner of minimizing the scope of the state.

These facts sufficiently explain why, in Central Europe, Poland has the highest income and earnings Gini coefficient, the highest ratio of the richest to the poorest decil, and the largest margin of people living in poverty. The decisive choices were made in 1989/1990, i.e., during the climax of Reagan's and Thatcher's popularity. Presented to the public as a program of fighting inflation and stabilizing the economy, the Balcerowicz Plan has dramatically impoverished the bulk of the population and shifted incomes from the poor to the new rich.

This form of "primitive accumulation of capital" created the foundations for a new social order. In light of these phenomena, it is fully understandable that, even before the present recession, only 8% of Polish respondents were willing to accept the general direction of the systemic transformation (Czapiński and Panek, 2000: 84).

However, perhaps the greatest illusion, which justified the attempt to jump to a market economy, lay in the conviction that it would lead us to (Western) Europe, which would be worth all the suffering. This illusion was best expressed by one of the most influential politicians of the last twelve years, Bronisław Geremek. He wrote: "I understood the difficulties we faced because of the Balcerowicz Plan, but at the same time I knew that this was the only way to secure for Poland the chance of getting a place in the European economic order. In other words: without renunciation and self-denials, and a very painful renunciation too, we had no chance of overcoming the distance separating us from the threshold of starting the process of integration. I was also aware that we must move very quickly on this, because Europe had frankly no intention of waiting for us" (Geremek, 1992: 121-22).

Of course, the question remains whether "getting a place in the European economic order" requires such sacrifices as mass and long-lasting unemployment and impoverishment for a large part of the society. Perhaps, on the contrary, these sacrifices have separated us from Western (Europe) for many years. It is still not ruled out that Europe will wait for us till we successfully cope with unemployment. It has already created a new *conditionality* for EU accession – the exemption of the Polish labor market from integration in the Union for the next seven years.

But what about social peace and cohesion as preconditions of EU accession? The main social groups now already more or less openly reject the system. Let's listen to the opinion of two sociologists and one politician. "Blue-collar workers are today the only influential social class which has not yet come to terms with the status which the newly-emerging economic system has to offer. What distinguishes this class from the remaining ones is: (a) strong and still rising aspirations to 'start a business of their own', along with even stronger and even more rapidly increasing rejection of the ongoing privatization of state-owned firms; (b) aversion to hired work in private firms and consistent clinging to the public employer whose only acceptable alternative is the model of the employee-owned enterprise or some other form of ownership with significant employee participation" (Adamski, 1999: 181).

In the same collective study, we are told that peasant respondents expressed even sharper criticisms. "Peasants as a group are relatively the least interested in market solutions and most approve of egalitarian ones if we compare them with urban categories of industrial workers (...) They view the process of structural change (...) as something predominantly evil (...) If we consider that the peasants as a social group have always struggled for private ownership, the resentment with which they view privatization comes as something of a surprise (...) they are more attached than any other segment of Polish society to socialist ideas and the social reality of the past. Farmers, as a social group, are also the most pronounced critics of capitalism (...) Even the unemployed differ from the peasants – their appraisals of socialism are less lenient and they are less resentful of capitalism" (Szafraniec and Adamski, 1999: 143-144).

In our last parliamentary elections in Autumn 2001, two of the most important political formations responsible for the conceptualization and implementation of systemic changes, Solidarity Electoral Action (Akcja Wyborcza "Solidarność" - AWS) and the Union of Freedom (Unia Wolności), lost all their seats in parliament. There is no guarantee, however, that a change of power will always take place in a peaceful way.

Up to 1999, employees and peasants acted independently or even in isolation. The first indications of joint action were strikes and road blockades in the first months of 2000. They were organized by the real winner of the parliamentary elections of 2001, "Self-defense" (Samoobrona), which is now the second-largest party in the Sejm. A potential threat for the entire socio-economic order, a threat of rebellion or at least of constant destabilizing class struggle, stems from the fact that the methods and direction of systemic transformations, including ownership privatization, have been implemented against the will of the two basic social classes – workers and peasants. Jacek Kuroń warned a couple of years ago that "when large social groups feel that they have been pushed outside the framework of society, that they are deprived of the chance to share in a normal life, and that the opportunity to fulfill their aspirations has been taken from them, they begin to rebel against such order and may destroy it" (Kuroń, 1997).

The role of economists (economics) in outlining and executing the 1990 program

A fuller answer to this question will be clearer after presenting a map of economic schools and currents in the 1990s. Here I would like to quote some contradictory opinions. The first is from Andrzej Wojtyna, one of the most knowledgeable contemporary economists, who undertook an analysis of the impact of neo-liberal views on the Balcerowicz Plan. He concludes that this Plan was not so much a theoretical concept as "an example of pragmatism" close to the well-known catalogue of recommendations of the Washington Consensus (Wojtyna, 1994: 51). His whole line of reasoning shows that here pragmatism means realism, if not a high degree of economic rationality.

The opposite opinion is that of Joseph Stiglitz, who summarizes his experience as chief economist for the World Bank in these worlds: "I have argued that sustainable development, and sustainable reform, are based on changes in ideas, interests, and coalitions. Let me repeat that *such changes cannot be forced*. Changes in ways of thinking often take time. That is why the approach to reform based on *conditionality* has largely failed. … That is why the Bolshevik approach to changing society – forced changes from a revolutionary vanguard – has failed time and time again. The shock therapy approach to reform was no more successful than the Cultural Revolution (in China – TK) and the Bolshevik Revolution" (Stiglitz, 2001: 30, italics in original text).

We shall leave aside the question of whether Stiglitz would evaluate the Polish case in the same words[6]. What is important here is the general character of Stiglitz's evaluation of systemic changes (in his terminology: reforms). A professional economist of the highest rank, the Nobel Prize Winner for developing pure theory, stresses the importance, not of theory, but of political and sociological (ideas, interests, coalitions) or socio-technical factors (shock therapy enforced by a revolutionary vanguard). Thus, the economists involved in this revolution from above were acting, first of all, as a part of a revolutionary vanguard. Their economics could contribute no more than one of many elements shaping their "socio-economic imagination". For Irena Grosfeld (a Polish émigré), it was clear that economic theory has no answer to the problem of transition. Her dictum was "It is a political question" (Grosfeld, 1992: 75-76)[7].

Political factors played a crucial role, not only in making the most important decisions, but also in the attitude toward the unintended outcome of the shock therapy. Let's recall that the outcome stood in stark contrast to what had been expected. It was assumed that GDP would drop by 3%, but it declined in two years by about 18%; industrial production was to decline by 5%, but it dropped by 25%; 400 thousand people were to be unemployed, but exceeded two million; and unemployment was promised to be temporary, but it is permanent and on a much higher level now. It was also assumed that inflation would be one-digit by the end of 1990, but it only came down to this level seven years later. This all caused the aforementioned "revolution in income distribution". These unexpected results were already clear a couple of months after the implementation of the program, but the authorities did not counteract them. Why not? Perhaps because it was in accordance with their belief that also in modern times the "primitive accumulation of capital" is a necessary stage of capitalist development, leading to a typically capitalist social structure. Once again, this belief was more a remnant of an old ideology than a product of economic thinking.

In conclusion, we cannot say that free market economics created a visible, strong rational background for the shock therapy program. More legitimate, then, is the more modest question whether this current dominated economic thinking in Poland at that time. This problem leads us to the question of a map of research and teaching.

3./4. Thematic orientation and funding: organizations, research and teaching

Passing over to the present-day situation, let's start with a short description of the organizational infrastructure of economic sciences.

According to the latest information (March 2002) from the Ministry of Education, we have seventeen state universities with either one or two economic faculties (economics and management.) In five big cities (Katowice, Krakow, Łódz, Wrocław and Warsaw), there are also so-called Economic Academies, the most famous of which is more then eighty years old (Warsaw): the Main School of Economics. In Lublin, there is a Catholic University with an economics department. Altogether, there are 125 state tertiary schools, teaching about twelve thousand students.

During the last eleven years, 229 private (strictly speaking, non-public) schools on the tertiary level have emerged. All of them together teach slightly less than half a million students. Foundations or private persons created most of them (but cannot own the school). About 50 candidate-schools are waiting for official registration. A majority of them are economics or business schools.

This expansion of the state and non-state schools brought a great jump in the number of students, which more than quadrupled during these years. Only a fraction of these schools, however, already maintain a good academic level. A majority of them have very few staff members, usually poor libraries, and a lack of space and other facilities (Table 1).

Almost one-third of the students belong to what the ISCED UNESCO classifies as business and administration studies; this has been the most rapidly growing group of students.

Almost all older universities are combining teaching with at least some research in economics, management, or demography, whereas in only a very few private schools has research been organized in a systematic way or even started at all. Only recently have these schools been permitted to bid for public research funds on an equal footing with public schools. As far as I know, only the School of Entrepreneurship and Management (Koźmiński's School) has run an interdisciplinary seminar, for a couple of years, on the critical theory of organization, gathering scholars from several schools and universities. Recently, an ambitious research center called TIGER (Transformation, Integration, and Globalization) was created at this school. Since it was created by Grzegorz W. Kołodko, a former deputy prime minister who has a lot of international contacts, this unit has had no problems with funding.

Judged by the publication of research, a few Institutes and Committees of the Polish Academy of Sciences (Polska Akademia Nauk – PAN) play an important role. I shall mention only two:

- In the *Institute of Economic Sciences* (Instytut Nauk Ekonomicznych PAN), the majority of researchers are involved mainly in the investigation of various aspects of transformation. The most representative product of this institute is probably the collective two-volume study *Dynamics of the transformation of the Polish economy* (Belka and Trzeciakowski, 1997). Since 1983, a group of researchers from the Institute of Economic Sciences, in cooperation with the Central Statistical Office, has been investigating the performance and restructuring of the five hundred biggest enterprises. This long-term research has played an important role in pioneering the microeconomics of transformation. The team accumulated rich experience in methods of investigation, which received some foreign acclaim. In recent years, they extended their investigation to SMEs. Several other researchers have studied the international competitiveness of Polish enterprises from the perspective of the European Union accession.
- The *Committee of Futures Studies "Poland 2000 Plus"* (Komitet Prognoz "Polska 2000 Plus") (PAS) organized several research programs combining study of the present and future problems of the Polish economy and society. Two volumes of reports from many experts were

later presented in a synthetic form as the *Strategy for Poland's Development up to the Year 2020* (published in Polish 2000, in English 2001), which involved several debates.

Both these research units employ (or engage in research projects) economists presenting different views and methodological approaches, which is why it cannot be easily included in any school. This group should include the Economic Faculty of Warsaw University, which is strong in teaching and research and employs economists presenting a whole spectrum of views, ranging from the extreme left to the extreme right, from Marxists to Hayekians[8]. But many economists in this group would identify themselves as pragmatists, or simply eclectic.

In the early 1990s, several private research units were created with a clearly neo-liberal profile:

- The Gdańsk group of economists, associated with the Congress of Democratic Liberals, created the dynamic, privately financed Gdańsk Institute for Market Economics (Instytut Badań nad Gospodarką Rynkową - IBnGR), which also has a subsidiary in Warsaw. Their main interest was in privatization, the restructuring of firms, and the functioning of the emerging new system. Recently they have published a collective study on social policy and the pension system (Wójcicka, 1999a; 1999b). The Institute is regarded as a neo-liberal think tank.
- Similar in character is the *Center for Social and Economic Research* (Centrum Analiz Społeczno-Ekonomicznych – CASE), which is as close to politics and politicians as to economic policies (because personalities play an important role.) The views of two persons whose names are closely connected with shock therapy, Leszek Balcerowicz and Marek Dąbrowski, strongly imprint the direction and character of research. The CASE Scientific Council chaired by Balcerowicz includes *inter alia* such eminent personalities as Nicolas Stern, Stanley Fischer, Jeffrey Sachs, and Yegor Gaidar. This already shows that CASE probably enjoys exceptionally high possibilities of fund raising. The present sponsors include the Ford Foundation, Polish and foreign banks, USAID, the Washingtonian Freedom House, the German Marshall Fund, the Warsaw Stock Exchange, Soros Foundations, etc. The Center attracts not only Polish researchers, but also many foreigners and foreign institutions. They are training young economists and giving them scholarships within and outside of the country. CASE has three foreign chapters (in Ukraine, Georgia, and the Kyrgyz Republic). Several affiliated members of CASE are advisors to foreign post-communist governments.
- In 1989, the *Adam Smith Research Center* (Centrum im. Adama Smitha – ASRC) was founded in Warsaw. It identifies itself as "an independent, non-profit, non-partisan institution devoted to the development of a free market economy, a democratic system, and a free and virtuous society". Gathering about 50 scholars, it covers "most of the social sciences and humanities", but the majority of its publications and other activities are in economics and economic policy. On the International Advisory Board are such eminent free-marketeers as Alchian, Buchanan, Giersch, Sorman, and Welisz. "Toward the minimal state" is the title of one of its most programmatic declarations. This is most probably the closest to the Chicago School and, especially in the early years of transformation, has been as militant as the "Chicago boys". In 1992, the Center started a press and radio campaign titled *Myths in the Economy*. The Center started its translation activity by editing Friedman's book *Capitalism and Freedom*. It publishes a semi-annual bulletin, *Koniunktura Gospodarcza Polski*" (Economic Situation in Poland). The Center co-authors the *Economic Freedom of the World, Annual Report*.

All three centers (IBnGR, CASE and ASRC) were created with a manifestly clear message of the Big Bang philosophy and the Washington Consensus. Within these boundaries, they are trying to preserve scholarly objectivity in many special studies. After the shock therapy, they worked on the assumption that the general features of the new socio-economic system were given. Different degrees of maturity are a problem, not a choice, among a variety of existing models of the market economy. In this sense, they do not have problems of independence from sponsors, since they share with these sponsors the same social premises.

A couple of years ago, almost all economists active in these three private research centers created the *Society of Polish Economists* (Towarzystwo Ekonomistów Polskich – TEP), which was to be a neo-liberal organization and an intellectual alternative to the old *Polish Economic Society*, (Polskie Towarzystwo Ekonomiczne – PTE), which has about seven thousand members. Apparently, TEP did not attract the younger generation of economists and is unable to expand beyond one hundred (active) or two hundred (formal) members, although it was founded by such distinguished figures as Marek Dąbrowski, Jan Winiecki, Wacław Wilczyński, and above all Leszek Balcerowicz.

The main research topics for economists in the first years of the Balcerowicz Plan were markets in equilibria, inflation, and the restructuring of enterprises. In the first half of the 1990s, various aspects of transformation and privatization were the main themes of public debate and research. At present, research is overwhelmingly dominated by problems of the Polish economy's international competitiveness and of accession to the European Union. Among the neglected topics I would mention first the lack of research and debate about the general features of the socio-economic system. The great gap between the "actually existing system of capitalism" and the system declared and outlined by the Constitution of the Polish Republic (ratified in 1997 by parliament and in a referendum) has never been publicly discussed. Its statement that our system is to be based on social justice and the principles of a social market economy became empty words. Another badly neglected topic is distributive justice, especially inequalities[9].

In the light of what has been said, it would be futile to try to discern what paradigm was dominant in theoretical economics. In the whole period of great changes, theory was badly neglected. In my opinion, a combination of some theoretical assumption with practical recommendations played the role of a paradigm, although it would be difficult to reconstruct a consistent structure of notions. In my opinion, the well-known J. Williamson's Catalogue, which generalized the Washington Consensus, played the role of a paradigm. The fully-fledged market was presented as the Promised Land and the state as the demon. The state was identified as "suffocating the market through protection, regulation, public property, fiscal profligacy and an ever-increasing and self-serving bureaucracy. Miscalculation of resources, slow productivity growth, consumer perdition through high prices and poor quality products and services were the results." (Erber, 2001:4) A Brazilian economist wrote these words about Brazilian economic policy. We can easily imagine how modest they sound in Poland, which really experienced unprecedented statism not only in the economic field, but in almost all other spheres of social life. The most extreme American free-marketers have found in Poland the most favorable playground. Even graduate students were coming to my country as self-nominated advisors. This role of foreign advisors is illustrated by the composition of the team working on the program of mass privatization. On the list of 21 experts, there were 19 persons who were either foreigners or Polish emigrants. The Minister of Ownership Transformation proudly recollects that in his ministry English was as frequently spoken as Polish (Kuczyński, 1992), and you may be sure that it was the American brand of English.

There was a change of elites, but it did not mean replacing Marxists-Leninist economists and politicians with liberal ones, but social democrats and social liberals with neo-liberals, i.e., the evolutionists and consensualists with the "jumpists" or "big bangers". There was also a generational division. By and large, the first group represented an older generation, which had already experienced a sort of Big Bang during the imposition of the communist system and who were conscious of "*The unbearable burden of history*" (Jedlicki, 1990). The second group, the middle or young generation, was freer from the burden of history.

Let me quote two examples that show a great change of views within the old ruling establishment. As early as December 1988, still under "communist" rule, the parliament ratified two very liberal acts on general economic activity and foreign companies. Both of them were in full accordance with the Washington Consensus. Second, in June 1989, just after the parliamentary election, the Ministry of Finance of the last communist cabinet presented a purely free-market program of reforms not that different from the future Balcerowicz Plan or of the IMF recipes

(Ministry 1989). This was in several points an explicit departure from the Round Table Agreement, though perhaps not favoring the concept of a jump to a new system.

Complementary to the choice of an imitational model for the Polish systemic transformation, our economics became dominated by Anglo-American, mostly American economics. Many textbooks in economics, business, and management have been translated into Polish, and there was a stream of Western economists visiting Poland in an advisory capacity, but also as teachers. Even the textbooks written by the Polish authors usually restrict themselves to following Western textbooks, illustrating their common wisdom with Polish data or facts.

5. The public space: a heterogeneous current

If we assume that the Washington Consensus is the best expression of mainstream economics in Poland's (orthodox) economics, the most articulated alternative and heterogeneous school of economic thinking was presented by the informal club that may be called the "Negotiated Economy Forum". The club gathered political economists, sociologists, and political scientists from the Scandinavian countries along with some Anglo-American economists (political scientist Bob Jessop, U.K, and the economist John Y. Campbell, USA). It also sometimes included German political scientists (Claus Offe, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Walter Streeck). The center of the Club's activity was in the Cracow Academy of Economics and organized personally by Jerzy Hausner. Organizers of conferences, seminars, and the journal mentioned below gathered some two or three dozen scholars who analyzed various economic, social, and political aspects of transformation. Almost all of the aforementioned scholars are members of the European Association of Evolutionary Economics. The first and most programmatic manifestation of their (with some justification I may say – our) general approach was a volume entitled: *Markets, Politics and the Negotiated Economy – Scandinavian and Post-Socialist Perspectives* (Hausner, Jessop and Nielsen, 1991).

For this group of scholars, it was absolutely clear from the very beginning that the economic transformation in post-communist countries involves "the setting up of an *institutional framework* for the market mechanism. The market is more than a mere aggregation of individual exchanges. It is itself a social institution, necessarily supported by a network of other social institutions. This institutional framework includes, among other things, the distribution of property rights; the principles and scope of governmental intervention in economic processes; the extent of local self-management; the creation of organizations which represent the interests of different economic agents and social groups, and procedures to co-ordinate the actions of such organizations … Marketization of the Eastern European economies requires extensive institutional change over a long period." The second premise of this *plurality of models* of the market economy is that "the market economy is embedded in quite different institutional settings in different Western European countries … Various Western 'models' seem to offer different solutions to the problems of a post-socialist future. Germany's 'social market economy', Britain's neo-liberal 'Thatcherism' and the Scandinavian model ('negotiated economy') are among those most frequently referred to in current reform discourses in Eastern Europe." (Hausner, Jessop and Nielsen, 1991: 7-8, italics added) Of course, they were not interested in comparative economics *in abstracto*, but unequivocally opted for a *consensual transformation* (based on negotiations and agreements). And this is the third premise of the workshop[10].

It may sound strange that the only Polish economic journal in English is "*EMERGO, Journal of Transforming Economies and Societies*" and is published, not by the mainstream economists, but the Club described above. Since 1993, the formal publisher of this quarterly journal has been the Cracow University of Economics, on behalf of a non-profit organization called the University Council for Economic and Management Education Transfer (UCEMET). The present editor-in-chief is Victor A. Pestoff, and the Editorial Board is composed of representatives of eight transforming countries, plus Sweden. The most important feature of this international forum is that it combines economic and social problems.

Another heterogeneous circle is (or was?) the *Carl Menger Research Group*, which issued several studies published by the well-known liberal Friedrich Naumann Stiftung[11]. Originally at least, the founders of this research group were to develop ideas of the Austrian school. The first three studies were devoted to the methodological (Leube, 1993) and historical (Hockuba, 1993, Filar 1994) background of this school. Only the fourth study (Wojtyna, 1994) is devoted to problems of Polish transformation in relation to the neo-liberal current. But the Austrian school has been placed outside of neo-liberalism, and in the whole text, only Hayek is mentioned on matters not necessarily typical of this particular school. Later, only one of the three listed Polish members could be regarded as an adamant Friedrich Hayek follower: Zbigniew Hockuba (1995), a professor at Warsaw University and Director of the Institute of Economic Sciences .

As I said above, the Hausner, Jessop, Nielsen, et al. group was the most articulated heterogeneous current. But in Warsaw and several other cities there were and are many economists who did not accept the Washington Consensus and particularly the concept of "jumping" to a new system, which both Jeffrey Sachs and Stanisław Gomułka brought to Poland. At all congresses and statutory conventions of the Polish Economic Association, starting with the one in Autumn 1989, the dominant attitude towards neo-liberal policy has been highly critical. The Warsaw Main School of Economics (MSE) and Łódź University's economic faculty (ŁU), apparently dominated by the neo-liberal current, are exceptions. Both serve as the main source for economic rulers (of 9 finance ministers, 5 were from MSE and 3 from ŁU).

This division between small but powerful and well-organized currents of economists belonging to the neo-liberal school, on the one hand, and many more economists with a social democratic orientation and close to traditional (social) liberalism (which stems from the ideas of John Stuart Mill, J. M. Keynes, and his Cambridge followers like Joan Robinson), on the other, explains why the Polish transformation process has engaged so many American economists.

6. Views on further development: instead of conclusions

I earlier quoted Stiglitz's very harsh words on the revolutionary vanguard's imposition of the new socio-economic system. These are not the surprising words of an embittered person just ousted from the World Bank, but a different expression of his earlier general views on transformation. As early as May 1990, Stiglitz told a Swedish audience: "One of the large costs of the socialist experiment of the past seventy years is that it seemed *to foreclose the exploration of many other roads*. As the former socialist economies set off on this journey, let us hope that they keep in mind not only the narrower set of economic questions that I have raised (…) but the broader set of social ideas that motivated many of the founders of the socialist tradition. Perhaps some of them will *take the less traveled road, and perhaps that will make all the difference, not only for them, but for the rest of us as well."* (Stiglitz, 1994: 279, italics added)[12]

These words raise the question, pertinent for us, the researchers, of how it happened that, after the painful experience of communist or Soviet uniformity, the societies of Eastern and Central Europe have had to repeat the "large costs" that once again "foreclosed the exploration of many of the other roads". What role did Polish economists play in this? Or more generally, what was Poland's pioneering role in this process? Poles were quite proud of this role; do they sound so proud now?

Here I would like to relate my views on (and analysis of) a very stimulating study written by H.-J. Wagener. It opens his seminal volume of comparative study of *Economic Thought in Communist and Post-communist Europe* (1996). In Hans-Jürgen Wagener's eyes, in the 1960s, the Central and Eastern European "stage was set for gradual system transformation". At that time "(t)here was reform thinking inside the socialist system (…) which, had it been taken up by politics, might have propelled the system to more efficient regimes, probably ending in a gradual transition to something very similar to what is now produced by transformation." (Wagener, 1996: 14-15) I doubt it. Gradual transition would most probably have brought, first of all, a diversification of paths of development and led to a variety of systems as different as the Swedish is from the Anglo-American. The second half of the 20th century was a rich time of systemic innovations: the emergence of the Scandinavian model, of *soziale Marktwirtschaft* in West Germany, of social partnership in Austria, and of very specific models in East Asia. Why should we assume that these types of innovations were foreclosed in Eastern and Central Europe?

---

1 In the shortest words, I would summarize my attitude in this way. In my early academic career, I experienced (and accepted) the revolutionary imposition of a communist system, an imposition glaringly against the will of a majority of society. There were some by now well-known deficiencies in the concept of a centrally planned economy, but many pathologies stem precisely from the fact that in Poland, as in other countries of the Soviet block, the communist system was imposed against the will of the majority. From this experience, I drew the following conclusion: no more revolutionary minority imposition of any system, even if this system is supposed to be obviously better than the former one. Jacek Kuroń, an important figure in the first non-communist cabinet, presents the same opinion. He writes, "The Solidarity movement was destroyed by government and administration," and that the ruling elites, "instead of leading a mass movement for social transformation, acted above society. An etatist-technocratic program was implemented over the head of society, and this pushed the majority to the left, all the more radically the more acutely they felt the cost of the fall of Communism." (Kuroń, 1994) Cf also an opinion of the former chief economist of the World Bank Joseph Stiglitz that shock therapy is as successful a way of reforming as the Chinese "Cultural Revolution" or the Bolshevik revolution (2001: 30).

2 In the book *Economics, Culture of a controversial science*, Melvin W. Reder writes: "Like members of other scientific cultures, economists pursue fame and fortune by seeking recognition of their contributions to the ideas that characterize their subject. Therefore I shall assume that economists behave as if the well-being of the ordinary people were a by-product of a quest for the acclaim of their disciplinary peers (...) Once past their dissertations, many – possibly most – economists are intellectual freelancers, available for work on whatever problem offers the best prospect for pecuniary reward. Hope of making an 'important contribution to the field' – if ever it existed – diminishes to the vanishing point. As is generally recognized, research effort follows the funds available for its support. Consequently, in its choice of subject matter, the bulk of economic writing closely follows popular interest" (2000: X).

3 A good example was Włodzimierz Brus, who decided in 1968 to leave the Communist Party and severely criticized the politics and economic policy of the authorities. This was not because he stopped believing in socialism and Marxism, but on the contrary, because he accused the authorities of acting against essential principles of socialism and Marxism.

4 This was a team of nine academic economists sent to Sweden by the governmental Council of Economic Advice. The team wrote, "One can see a far-reaching analogy between the values to which the economic policy of the Swedish Social Democrats is subordinated and the values we are trying to implement in Poland: full employment, wages dependent on work, social security. This is why the Swedish experiences should be studied and some of them may be directly followed in a reforming process and current policy." (Model Szwedzki, 1989: 5)

5 Those interested in my view on this will find it in an essay recently published in English (Kowalik 2001a) or, for this point of view confronted with prevailing opinions of officialdom, see: (Belka, 2001 and Kowalik, 2001b).

6 He seems to think that Polish shock therapy was more successful (or less unsuccessful) than other post-communist countries (Stiglitz, 2000). But this opinion may stem from his limited knowledge of Polish realities.

7 As an economist, Grosfeld accepted property rights theory, but as an advisor at the Polish Ministry of Privatization, she was an ardent proponent of *kuponovka*, which contradicts this theory.

8 Within this Faculty, Stanisław Wellisz (emeritus of Columbia University) created a neo-liberal think tank called the Polish Policy Research Group, gathering some young researchers unified by the same general approach. It has its own logo and research funding, and has published more than a dozen studies analyzing various aspects of transformation.

9 Amartya K. Sen said recently: "I believe that virtually all the problems in the world come from inequality of one kind or another (…) We have to see how we can make it more equitable." (Sen, 2001)

[10] The Wagener book (1996) mentions neither EMERGO, nor the group (not even one name from it), nor the quoted collective works, nor the three other related English volumes (Hausner and Mosur, 1993; Campbell and Owsiak, 1994; Pestoff, 1995), nor the three volumes in Polish strongly related to this Club (Hausner, 1992; Hausner and Marciniak, 1994; Hausner 1995). It is interesting that Hausner's radically anti-neo-liberal views, presented above, did not prevent him from becoming a secretary of state (1996-7) responsible for the implementation of the World Bank-supported semi-Chilean-style pension reform. Now he serves as a minister of labor carrying out an austerity program accepted by the employer's associations and rejected by the two biggest trade unions.

[11] This Foundation itself did not support the Washington Consensus recipe for Central and Eastern Europe. For example, it published a programmatic collection of essays titled *Alternative models of market economy for countries in a process of economic transformation* (Fleck and Ławniczak, 1993), which was either explicitly or implicitly highly critical of the strategy of transformation chosen in Poland. Fleck (1996) treats neo-liberalism as very harmful to continental, modern European liberalism.

[12] Wilkin (1993) addressed these words to the Congress of Polish Economists. He took them from Stiglitz's Wicksell Lectures manuscript (1990: 70), which was later extended into a book (1994). Later, Wilkin published a rare book (1995) considering what sort of capitalism should be built in Poland.

References

Adamski, Władysław W. (1999): "The evolution of acquisitive and threatened interests in the process of ownership transformation", in: *System change and modernization*, Adamski, Władysław W. et al., Warsaw, IFiS Publishers, 197-182;

Belka, Marek (2001*):* "Lessons from Polish transition", in: *Poland into the New Millennium*, Blazyca, George and Rapacki, Ryszard (eds.), Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 13-32;

Belka, Marek and Trzeciakowski, Witold (eds.) (1997): *Dynamika transformacji polskiej gospodarki* (Dynamic of transformation of Polish economy), Warsaw, Poltex;

Beskid Lidia (1998): "Ubóstwo w Polsce" (Poverty in Poland), in: RSSG, *Podział dochodu i nierówności dochodowe*, Raport No. 29, Warsaw, 101-132;

Braudel, Ferdinand (1991): *Historia i trwanie* (History and durability), Warsaw, Czytelnik;

Brus, Włodzimierz (1961): *Ogólne problemy funkcjonowania gospodarki socjalistycznej* (General problems of functioning of of socialist economy), Warsaw, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe;

Bywalec, Czesław (1995): *Poziom życia społeczeństwa polskiego na tle procesów transformacji gospodarczej* (Life standard of Polish society in light of economic transformation processes) (1989-1993), Warszawa, Instytut Nauk Ekonomicznych, mimeographed;

Campbell, John.L. and Owsiak, Stanisław (eds.) (1994): *Fiscal reforms in Post-communist Countries*, Kraków, Cracow Academy of Sciences;

Czapiński, Janusz and Panek, Tomasz (eds.) (2000): *Diagnoza społeczna 2000* (Social diagnosis 2000), Warsaw, unpublished report of survey research;

Erber, Fabio (2001): *Brazilian development in the nineties – Myths, circles and structures*, mimeographed;

Filar, Dariusz (1994): *Liberalizm społeczny Ferdynanda Zweiga* (Social liberalism of Ferdynand Zweig), Warsaw, Friedrich Naumann Stiftung;

Fleck, Hans Georg (1996): *W poszukiwaniu polskiego liberalizmu. O niepowodzeniu realnie istniejącego neoliberalizmu, jego przyczynach i skutkach* (In search of Polish liberalism. On failure of really existent neo-liberalism, its causes and effects), Warsaw, Wydawnictwo Friedricha Naumanna;

Golinowska, Stanisława (ed.) (1996a): *Social policy towards poverty. Comparative approach*, Warsaw, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung;

Golinowska, Stanisława (ed.) (1996b): *Polska bieda. Kryteria. Ocena. Przeciwdziałanie* (Poland's poverty. Criteria. Valuation. Conteracting), Warsaw, Instytut Pracy i Spraw Socjalnych;

Grosfeld, Irena (1992): "Reform economics and western economic theory: Unexploited opportunities", in: *Reform and transformation in Eastern Europe*, Kovacs, J. M. and Tardos, M. (eds.), London - New York, Routledge, 62-79;

Hausner, Jerzy (ed.) (1992): *Studia nad systemem reprezentacji interesów* (Studies on the interest groups representation), Kraków, Akademia Ekonomiczna w Krakowie;

Hausner, Jerzy (ed.) (1995): *Narodziny demokratycznych instytucji* (Emergence of democratic institutions), Kraków, Akademia Ekonomiczna w Krakowie and Fundacja „Polska Praca";

Hausner, Jerzy and Marciniak, Piotr (eds.) (1994): *Od socjalistycznego korporacjonizmu do…?* (From socialist corporatism to...?), Warsaw, Fundacja „Polska Praca";
Hausner, Jerzy and Mosur, Grzegorz (eds.) (1993): *Transformation processes in Eastern Europe*: *Western perspectives and the Polish Experience*, Kraków, Institute of Political Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences;
Hausner, Jerzy, Jessop, Bob and Nielsen, Kurt (eds.) (1991): *Markets, Politics and the Negotiated Economy – Scandinavian and Post-socialist Perspectives*, Kraków, Cracow Academy of Economics;
Hausner, Jerzy, Jessop, Bob and Nielsen, Kurt (eds.) (1995), *Strategic choice and path-dependency in post-socialism, Institutional Dynamics in the transformation process*, Aldershot, Edward Elgar;
Hockuba, Zbigniew (1993): *Carl Menger a szkoła krakowska*, Warsaw, Friedrich Naumann Stiftung;
Hockuba, Zbigniew (1995): *Droga do spontanicznego porządku. Transformacja ekonomiczna w świetle problemu regulacji* (Road to the spontaneous order. The economic transformation in light of regulation problem), Warsaw, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN;
Jedlicki, Jerzy (1990): "A revolution of 1989: The unbearable burden of history", in: *Problems of Communism*, July – August, 39-45;
Kalecki, Michał (1933/1966), *Studies in the theory of business cyc*les, Warsaw-Oxford-New York;
Keynes, John M. (1973): *Works*, Vol. III, London, McMillan;
Kowalik, Tadeusz (2001a): "Why the social democratic option failed: Poland's experience in systemic change", in: *Social democracy in neo-liberal times, the left and economic policy since 1980*, Glyn, Andrew (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 223-252;
Kowalik, Tadeusz (2001b): "The ugly face of Polish success", in: *Poland into the new Millennium*, Blazyca, G. and Rapacki, R. (eds), Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 33-53,
Kuczyński, Waldemar (1992): *Zwierzenia zausznika* (Confessions of a Confidiant), Warsaw, Polska Oficyna Wydawnicza „BGW";
Kuroń Jacek (1994): "Rzeczpospolita dla każdego" (Respublica for everyone), in: *Życie Gospodarcze*, No. 21;
Kuroń, Jacek (1997): „Wykluczeni, wyróżnieni, niewidoczni" (Excluded, elected, invisible), in: *Gazeta Wyborcza Magazyn*, August/22;
Lange, Oskar (1935): Marxian economics and modern economic theory, in: *„Review of Economic Studies"*, No. 3, republished in: *Economic theory and market socialism, Selected essays of Oskar Lange*, Kowalik, Tadeusz (ed.), 1994, Aldershot, Edward Elgar, 3-15;
Lange, Oskar (1936/1937): On the economic theory of socialism, in: *Review of Economic Studies*, No. 1-2, republished in: *Economic theory and market socialism*, *Selected essays of Oskar Lange*, Kowalik, Tadeusz (ed.), 1994, Aldershot, Edward Elgar, 252-299;
Lange, Oskar (1963): *Political economy*, *General problems*,Vol. I, Oxford-Warsaw;
Leś, Ewa (2001): "Rola państwa w walce z ubóstwem. Raport specjalny" (Role of the state in combating poverty. Special Report), in: *Nowe Życie Gospodarcze*, March/17;
Leube, Karl R. (1994): *Begreifen und Verstehen. Uwagi o metodologicznym umiejscowieniu Szkoły Austriackiej ekonomii politycznej wśród nauk społecznych*, Warsaw, Friedrich Nauman Stiftung;
Marer, Paul and Siwiński, Włodzimeirz (eds.)(1988): *Creditworthiness and Reform in Poland. Western and Polish perspectives*, Indiana, Indiana University Press;
Ministerstwo Finansów (1989*)*: *Założenia programu gospodarczego na lata 1989-1992* (Premises of economic program for the years 1989-1992), mimeographed;
Model szwedzki (The Swedish model) (1989): Warszawa, Konsultacyjna Rada Gospodarcza, mimeographed;
Modzelewski, Karol (1993): *Dokąd od komunizmu...?* (Whither from communism... ?) Warsaw, Polska Oficyna Wydawnicza "BGW";
Pestoff, Victor A. (ed.) (1995): *Reforming social services in Central and Eastern Europe – Eleven nations overview*, Kraków, Cracow Academy of Economics;
Reder, M. W. (2000): *Economics, The culture of a controversial science*, Chicago – London, Chicago University Press;
Rzeczpospolita (2001): "100 najlepszych uczelni niepaństwowych (100 best non-state institutions of higher learning)", in: "Rzeczpospolita", April/11;
Salmonowicz, Witold (ed.) (1989): *Porozumienia Okrągłego Stołu* (Round Table Agreements), Olsztyn, NSZZ „Solidarność" region Warmińsko-Mazurski;
Samuelson, Paul (1959): *Zasady analizy ekonomicznej* (Principles of Economic Analysis), Warsaw, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe;

Sen, Amartya K. (2001*)*: "The "Progressive" interview by David Barsamian", in: *The Progressive*, August;
Stiglitz, Joseph (1990): *Whither socialism? Perspectives from the economics of information*, Stockholm, mimeographed;
Stiglitz, Joseph (1994): *Whither socialism?*, Cambridge Mass.- London, The IMT Press;
Stiglitz, Joseph (2000): „Kierunek - wzrost gospodarczy" („Direction – economic growth"), in: *Nowe Życie Gospodarcze*, No. 47,
Stiglitz, Joseph (2001): "Development thinking at the Millennium", in: *Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economics 2000*, Plescovic, Boris and Stern, Nicholas (eds.), Washington D.C., World Bank, 13-37;
Szafraniec, Krystyna and Adamski, Władysław W. (1999): "Polish peasants: Actors of the transformation or clients of the welfare state?*"*, in: *System change and modernization*, Adamski, Władysław W. et al., Warsaw IFiS Publishers, 137-150;
Wagener, Hans-Jürgen (1996): "Between conformity and reform", in: *Economic thought in communist and post-communist Europe*, Wagener, Hans-Jürgen (ed.), London-New York, Routledge, 1-32;
Wilkin, Jerzy (1993): *Czy potrzebna jest nam ekonomia polityczna*? (Do we need political economy?), Paper presented at the Congress of Polish Economists, November/4;
Wilkin, Jerzy (1995): *Jaki kapitalizm?* (What kind of capitalism?), Warsaw, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN;
Wojtyna, Andrzej (1994): *Neoliberalne poglądy we współczesnej polskiej myśli ekonomicznej i ich wpływ na kształt modelu transformacji* (The neo-liberal views in a Polish economic thought and their impact on a shape of the transformation model), Warsaw, Wydawnictwo DiG;
Wóycicka, Irena (ed.) (1999a): *Budżet polityki społecznej* (Social policy budget), Warsaw, Instytut Badań nad Gospodarka Rynkową;
Wóycicka, Irena (ed.) (1999b): *Strategia polityki społecznej 1999-2020* (Strategy for social policy), Warsaw, Instytut Badań nad Gospodarką Rynkową;
Zieliński, Janusz G. (1961): *Rachunek ekonomiczny w socjalizmie* (Economic calculus in socialism), Warsaw.

Table 1 Tertiary education in 1989-2000

Items / years	1988/89	2000/2001
Number of students (thous.)	356	1585
in economics and management	34.9	436.7
Number of univ. and schools	92	310
non-public	0.0	229
Number of teachers (thous.)	59.0	79.9
Numb. of students / one teacher	6.0	9.8
in economics and management	12.5	50.9

Source: Statistical Yearbooks 1999, 2000

Paul Dragos Aligica

Economics – Romania[1]

Discussant: Mircea Teodor Maniu

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation[1]

The spectrum of Marxism-Leninism

In pre-1989 Romanian economics, Marxism-Leninism was the official and unchallenged economic paradigm. One of the specific features of Romanian Marxism-Leninism was its complete dogmatism. Unlike other Soviet satellite countries, where "organizational and conceptual alternatives" to the official line of the Communist Party were explored and advanced within the parameters imposed by the official paradigm, Romania lacked any such attempts (Spulber, 1979). So the Romanian Marxism-Leninism had little or no variation from the Party line, and it is hard to identify a "spectrum" of views and approaches in this respect. Romanian Marxist-Leninist economic thought confined itself to two major objectives closely inspired by the official line: (1) the critique of "bourgeois economic thinking" and of the capitalist system (which in most cases was nothing more than anti-capitalist propaganda) and (2) the search for the proper means to achieve the transition from capitalism to socialism and later to communism.

The two theoretical areas on which Romanian Marxist economists concentrated their efforts were related to these two objectives: the concept of "economic contradiction" and the idea of economic laws specific to each "economic system" or "historical moment". "Economic contradictions" played a pivotal role in the Romanian Marxists' worldview, since the contradictions were seen as the "motive power of social and socio-economic development" (Nechita, 1986). No new contribution to the elaboration of the Hegelian-Marxist dialectical approach implied by the concept was brought up; nevertheless, it was widely claimed that the Romanian Communist Party, through its economists and indeed through the work of Nicolae Ceaușescu, contributed decisively to the "development of the theory and analysis of economic contradictions under contemporary conditions" (Constantinescu, 1973; Nechita, 1986).

The idea of economic contradictions *in socialism* deserves special attention. The basic point was that, far from being contradiction-free, socialism was riddled with contradictions. That was only apparently an unorthodox opinion; these contradictions and the correct modalities of solving them were in fact the source of development and part and parcel of the "dialectics of building up and developing the socialist economy" (Mehedințiu, 1986).

The implication of this idea was that a proper balance had to be maintained between the evolution of the forces of production and the evolution of the relations of production. Given that even in socialism harmony was not automatically achieved, new relations of production had to be discovered to accommodate the more rapid progress of the forces (means) of production (Mehedințiu, 1986).

The application of the concept of "contradiction" was extended also to the global level: thus there is an entire literature on the "contradictions and crises of the contemporary world economy". Its predefined conclusions and associated conceptual apparatus made this literature prone to

---

[1] The author extends his gratitude to Costea Munteanu, Vasile Pilat, and Alexandru Tasnadi, whose interviews were crucial to this project; to Daniel Dăianu for his feedback on the first draft of this text; and to the Russian and East European Institute of Indiana University Bloomington for its support. Special thanks are also extended to Florentina Popescu for the extensive research assistant work she has done for this project. None of these people or institutions is responsible for the content of this article.

identify crises and contradictions everywhere: from the “production apparatus structures” to the “international economic flows” (Dobrotă, 1986: 643), everything was in crises, crises that could be explained only by the “materialistic and historical vision” and by “President Nicolae Ceauşescu's original outlook on the present-day world” (Sută Selejan, 1986).

The second theoretical idea of particular interest to the Romanian Marxist economists was that of special economic laws for each economic system or order. Again, as in the case of “contradictions”, the laws specific to the socialist order were of distinctive interest. The basic point was that there were economic laws proper to the new socialist order. This was correlated to the idea that orthodox economic theory was confined to a specific period of human history, that of the “pre-monopolistic” capitalism of 18th-century England. It is easy to see the implications and functions of such a view: First, it represented a strong ideological weapon against any “capitalist” critique of the system, on the grounds that the capitalists couldn't understand the specific socialist laws at work. Second, it separated the study of the national economy from the study of other (that is capitalist) economies, since the two were allegedly governed by different laws. Given that the capitalist economies and the world economy were studied with the dialectical conceptual instruments of “contradictions” and the “materialistic and historical vision”, it is clear why the level of information and understanding of the market and the global economy in Romanian academic circles was so abysmal after 1989. At any rate, the idea survived 1989 and had a long-lasting career in the post-communist claim that standard theory doesn't apply to Romania in transition and in the call for a new and original economic theory proper to Romania's transition economy.

Pre-war traditions

Romania has a rich tradition of economic thinking. A wide variety of development theories appeared in Romania during the inter-war years, all aiming at the transformation from an underdeveloped peasant society into a modern industrial nation. Among the most influential was the proto-structuralist contribution of Mihail Manoilescu (Love, 1996). Manoilescu's political and economic ideas were widely discussed in Europe and Latin America and laid the foundation for the structuralist theses of Raul Prebisch (Love, 1996). At the end of the 1970s and during the 1980s, Manoilescu's ideas were rediscovered and propagated by the Nicolae Ceauşescu regime's economists, who emphasized Manoilescu's structuralist contribution to Third World economics. As Joseph Love, the preeminent scholar of the history of Romanian economic thought, put it, Manoilescu’s works were not only alleged to be the *fons et origo* of the Latin American school, he was also given credit for the “deteriorating terms of trade” argument now renamed the “Prebisch-Manoilescu effect” – despite the fact that the notion played no role in his work. Thus the Latin American structuralism and dependency theories were appropriated and indigenized to meet the ideological needs of Nicolae Ceauşescu's Romania, a “developing socialist country” whose leader saw it at the ideological forefront of the Third World.

The rehabilitation of Mihail Manoilescu’s theory might now be considered in retrospect the major event in the pre-1989 Romanian economics community. His most influential economics book was translated from German in 1986. Two other economists with inter-war roots were also published (and in fact continued to work during the communist regime), but neither of them had Manoilescu's clout: Victor Jinga and Costin Kirițescu (Jinga, 1975, 1981; Kirițescu, 1964, 1967, 1971, 1981). During communism, the sole feature of the pre-war Romanian school to be preserved was its historical orientation, an orientation shaped at the beginning of the century through the influence of the German Historical School. In this context, the works of Gheorghe Zane and Costin Murgescu can be seen as extensions of that pre-war tradition late into the 1970s and 1980s (Zane, 1986; Murgescu, 1994). Another economist of Romanian origins with roots in the inter-war period, who was at one point the object of a reintegration attempt in communist Romania, was Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen, one of his books having been translated by the end of the 1970s (Georgescu-Roegen, 1979). It is also noteworthy that the communists never really employed or recycled the emerging strong agrarian-peasant tradition inspired by Alexander Chayanov and represented by authors like Virgil Madgearu, in spite of its many leftist and left-of-center elements: instead, an unalloyed Stalinism was preferred as the hard core of the regime's economic paradigm.

Impact of Western theories

Quite unsurprisingly, the impact of Western economic literature was rather limited. Romania never managed to get a set of Romanian translations of the classic economics authors' standard texts. The Romanian Academy initiated a series of translations, but only David Ricardo, Adam Smith, Friedrich List, and John M. Keynes were published before the series was brought to a halt.

For international political reasons (Romania's attempt to enlist in and take a leading role in the non-aligned bloc) and because of the regime's new-found affinity to Manoilescu's work, there was a broad opening toward Third World structuralism, Dependency, and World System paradigms and toward Western literature concerned with the problems of the least-developed countries. As already mentioned, central to this effort was the special attention given to the Romanian inter-war economist, Mihail Manoilescu, whose attempt to refute the Ricardian theory of international trade (the law of comparative advantage) had some international echo at the time and substantially influenced the policies adopted by several South American countries in the 1960s (Nechita, 1993). In addition to the interest in development economics, the Romanians joined other underdeveloped countries' theorists in analyzing asymmetric center-periphery relations and calling for a new international economic order. (Nicolae-Văleanu, 1986; Mecu, 1973; Dijmărescu, Ghibuțiu, Isărescu, 1977). Nevertheless, the level of dissemination and understanding of the key works of these unorthodox schools was rather limited, since the translations of key works like those of Immanuel Wallerstein, Celso Furtado, and other structuralist authors had to wait until after 1989.

Interestingly enough, the Western debate on global ecological, resource, and population problems (including global warming and climate change, resource depletion, and unconventional energy sources in the context of continuous population growth, etc.) had found a strong echo in pre-1989 Romanian economics community. In fact, at one point in the 1980s it seemed that Romanian economists were more involved in dealing with global issues than with any domestic or theoretical problems, which served the regime all too well to be considered a mere accident. The Reports of the Club of Rome (Asociatia Romana pentru Clubul de la Roma) had great impact. The Club's Romanian chapter's active members included and still include some top Romanian decision-makers, like former Prime Minister and National Bank of Romania Governor Mugur Isărescu, who is also Co-President of the Romanian Association for the Club of Rome[2]. These reports were translated and published by the Political Press (Editura Politică) in the collection "Idei Contemporane" (Contemporary Ideas), together with foreign- and Romanian-authored books on the same subject (Botkin et al., 1981; Gabor et al., 1983).

That was in fact an entire industry, since other publishing houses happily jumped in to approach the same problem. (Bari, Şerbănescu, 1981; Tufescu, Tufescu, 1981). Technique Press (Editura Tehnică) initiated another series, titled "Probleme Globale" (Global Issues), in 1984 (and continued it long after 1989). Technique Press' main publications included the yearly Worldwatch Institute Reports coordinated by Lester C. Brown, as well as works by authors like Ion Iliescu and Al Gore dealing with the same array of problems.

It is also interesting to note that, in general, Western leftist academics and scholarly economists were not translated or studi Among Western contemporary writers, only John Kenneth Galbraith managed to find his way to the Romanian public. It is worth mentioning that, in Romania, Alvin Toffler and John Naisbit could still be considered top Western economists in the 1980s.

In spite of the plenitude of "airport economics" and "global problems" literature, there was still a niche within which more scholarly and technical work from the West was absorbed. Due to obvious policy concerns on the practical level, special emphasis was placed on operational research, quantitative techniques, and system dynamics research in relation to the planification of the economy. Party officials did not openly undermine this line of interests as long as it didn't exceed certain limits or touch certain taboos, and this kind of books were translated and published mainly by the Scientific and Encyclopedic Press (Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică) in Bucharest, where authors like Leonid Kantorovich, Oskar Lange, Wassily Leontief, Francois Perroux, and even János Kornai were translated.

A specialized journal was published by the Center of Economic Calculation and Economic Cybernetics (Centrul de Calcul Economic şi Cibernetică Economică) of the Academy of Economic Studies, *Studii şi cercetări de calcul economic şi cibernetică economică*. The topics it tackled included: economic calculation (e.g. "Practical applications of formulae for the calculation of the influences on benefits'), economic cybernetics (e.g. “Monitoring production materials on the computer ELLIOT”), production and work organization, informational systems (e.g. “The automatization of accounting work”), econometrics (e.g. “The sequential control of merchandise quality”), operational researches (e.g. “Notes on general parametrization”), economic sociology, etc. A journal specialized in statistics, *Revista Română de Statistică*, was published by The National Direction of Statistics (Direcţia Naţională de Statistică), then The National Commission of Statistics (currently the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies). In this context, economics could free-ride on the nonideological nature of mathematics, and with the support of the mathematician Grigorie Moisil, authors like Tiberiu Schatteles, Iosif Angel, Dan Grindea, and Virgil Negoiţă managed to get in touch with and disseminate the results of Western developments in operational research, macroeconomic statistics, production, and operation programming.

Oppositional activities

Specific to Romania was the lack of public opposition in the field of economics, whether in terms of criticizing Party policy or of suggesting organizational alternatives within or outside of the system. Excepting a couple of articles published in the mid-1980s and some timid questioning of the plan parameters the Party imposed upon the National Council of Planification, which was run at the time by the economist Tudorel Postolache, nothing of any significance happened. In the last years of communism, antipathy grew toward the strict program of consumption reduction, a reduction partly imposed to enable payment of external debt and partly resulting from the general economic collapse of the regime. But again, this wasn't made public and thus wasn't publicly known until after 1989. Also, in their book *Consemnări economice (Economic Notes)*, Emilian Dobrescu, and Tudorel Postolache (1990) analyzed the crisis of the Romanian economy and emphasized the failure to correlate the provisions of the plan with the evolution of international markets, 1982 being considered the beginning of the crisis. Another example is Constantin Ionete’s 1990 report (Ionete, 1992) centered on the excessive forced savings and diminished consumption of the population, with additional insights on the resource misallocation that was taking place. But as already mentioned, that was in a sense a *post factum* public criticism.

There were in fact only a handful of articles questioning the Party's policies *during the communist period*: In *Revista Economica*, nr. 20, 1985, Daniel Dăianu published an article on the spread of pauperization ("A model of pauperizing growth", republished in his 1992 book) while during the same period he was engaged in the study of reforms and their consequences and was publicizing his views in the journal Teorie si Practica Economica (Dăianu, 1985). Also in 1985, Daniel Dăianu and Vasile Pilat published an article on “The functional problems of socialist economies” (“Probleme ale functionarii economiilor socialiste”) in Revue Roumaine d'Etudes Internationales. It was one of the few Romanian studies to evoke an international echo. After Radio Free Europe discussed the article, the authors had to bear the consequences. Finally, it is also known that studies on the same line by Igor Lemnij were circulating and that they resulted in Lemnij being fired from the Institute for National Economy (Institutul de Economie Nationala).

These were indeed “rudiments of public debate” as Dăianu put it. No real and open debate on either policies or their conceptual and theoretical foundations ever took place (Dăianu, 1999). It is well understood today that economists, like any other Romanian professionals or intellectuals, were under tremendous pressure from both the Party and the Securitate. The sole economic theory journal was banned and its publication stopped in the 1970s after it published a debate on Romania's economic development strategy (among the participants were reformist economists like Igor Lemnij, Vasile Pilat, and Tiberiu Schatteles). Economists were banned or fired if they voiced opinions or tried to criticize even minimally the regime's views or policies (Igor Lemnij, Alex Olteanu, Sorin Covrig); and in some cases milder but no less effective pressure was put on Daniel Dăianu and Vasile Pilat (Dăianu, 1999). Some left the country, while others were marginalized. However, in a small number of places, economists continued to try to keep alive a meaningful economic conversation. In one of his books, in the chapter dealing with this very problem, Daniel Dăianu emphasizes the work done by authors like Aurel Iancu and by the Management Seminar at the Academy of Economic Studies Bucharest (coordinated by Constantin Pintilie), as well as the seminars coordinated by Gheorghe Preda (who eventually emigrated in the 1980s). These and similar places continued to survive during the last decade of the communist regime, becoming the main sources of reformist thought in the 1990s.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

The change of paradigms

After 1989, public discourse on economic affairs did visibly change in Romania, but the degree to which the new vocabulary derived from a deeper paradigm change was rather low. The process of change among the elite did not start until 1989 and is still an ongoing process. So the slow change in the professional and academic elite immediately after 1989 resulted in limited changes of paradigm, apart from their dropping of Marxist themes and language, an easy thing to do, given that in Romania Marxism was never the main research topic, but rather a password for related topics, such as the economics of underdeveloped countries, international relations, etc.

In the view of Costea Munteanu and other reformist economists at the Academy of Economic Studies Bucharest (the main Romanian economics institution and an indicator for any change in Romanian economic science), there was no paradigm change until the mid-1990s. In this interpretation, until then the Academy only went through a shift in language or discourse. Since 1995, there have been increasingly clear signals that a critical mass for real change is ahead, but still far away.

Illustrative of the paradigm change process was the mimetic adoption of Western economic theory from mainstream textbooks, with Paul Samuelson (often in his French translation) the most frequently quoted. Other textbooks often cited were: Gilbert Abraham Frois, *Economie politică* (Political Economy), a French textbook translated by Humanitas, 1994 and Paul Heyne, *Modul economic de gândire* (The Economic Way of Thinking), Ed. Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1991.

The first post-1989 original textbook published by the Academy of Economics is interesting for many reasons, including the great influence the Academy has had on the model type of Romanian economist, due to its large number of students (more than 5,000 students are enrolled this academic year in day courses, half of them receiving state subsidies) and also to the fact that it offers a clear illustration of the muddle specific to the transitional state of the discipline. The first textbook was written by a group from the Economics Department of the Academy of Economic Studies (Dobrotă, 1993). One of its main sources of inspiration was Samuelson's textbook (quoted or mentioned as a reference point in more than half the chapters of the book: the English edition 5 times, the French translation 9 times), but Gilbert Abraham Frois (6 mentions) and Paul Heyne (7 mentions) were also preeminent because they were the first Western textbooks translated and thus more accessible to the AES professors. Michel Didier, *Regulile jocului (Les regles du jeu),* Humanitas, 1994 is mentioned 6 times. Keynes is also quoted 6 times. Among the Romanian inter-war economists, Virgil Madgearu, with his *Curs de Economie politică*, Bucharest, 1944 is among the most quoted. The economic historian Ferdinand Braudel (translated into Romanian in 1988) was mentioned quite often. As late as 1995, the avatars of the textbook of the Economics Department of the Academy of Economic Studies (Catedra de Economie Politică, *Economie Politică*, Ed. Economică, 1995) still draw heavily on Samuelson's, Abraham Frois', and the aforementioned textbooks.[3] For anyone familiar with the Western textbook market, it is obvious that the authors of the text display a rather eclectic and shallow exposure to current economics literature. This reveals that, if a paradigm change is to take place, it still has a long way to go till it becomes manifest at the leading Romanian teaching institution.

Another interesting feature of this transitional period was that Western literature was often used as an authority to support previously held (socialist) ideas. Noteworthy is the continuity of the pervasive influence of the Club of Rome, with many economists and politicians holding views inspired by it. Although the aforementioned series published by Politics Press (Editura Politică) was terminated in 1990, the other major sponsor of that literature, Technique Press (Editura Tehnică), under the influence of its former director President Ion Iliescu, continued its publication policy.

Another element of continuity was that Alvin Toffler had even greater success; all his books were published in several editions, and he is still quoted as a top American economist. Nevertheless, change took place, too: a larger variety of economics or political economy books has been translated and the narrowness and dilettantism of pre-1989 publishing policy in this regard has become in many respects a thing of the past. Key economics books and authors are now available to the Romanian public, although their use in classrooms or in public discourse is rather limited.[4]

The change of elites

As already mentioned, the elite change process started only in 1989 and is still ongoing. The process started in several places, the most visible and ambitious one being organized around the Romanian Institute for Free Initiative (Institutul Român pentru Liberă Inițiativă) and later around the Romanian Society for Economy (Societatea Romana de Economie – SOREC). Despite these efforts, this evolution is by its very nature a lengthy one and the new generation is still in a process of emerging. In interviews, leading reformist economists like Costea Munteanu or Alexandru Tasnadi say we will be able to speak of a real generational change only in 10 to 15 years.

The current economics elite is heterogeneous and fractured. Its scholarly status is difficult to evaluate by Western standards. Members of the elite maintain academic or research affiliations, either as professors at the Academy of Economic Studies of Bucharest or as advisors at the National Bank of Romania . They are also affiliated with research institutes, the Romanian Academy research centers, multinational institutions, and to a lesser degree with other private or public institutions.

The change of the elite was more visible at the policy- and decision-making level; academia has been rather conservative, although, as mentioned before, the change of generations brought some evolution here, too. The National Bank of Romania and ministerial offices were taken over by younger economists, but in many cases these young economists lack proper training and display a rather questionable ability to use "economically correct" jargon without fully understanding its meaning.

New institutional structures

The history of post-1989 institutional evolution in the realm of economics can be reduced to the story of the competition between two institutions or professional societies. Two new professional organizations were established at the beginning of the 1990s.

The General Association of the Economists of Romania (Asociatia Generală a Economistilor din România – AGER), established in 1990 as an umbrella for the older generation economists, considers itself the heir to the inter-war organization of the same name (founded in 1913), whose members included most of the preeminent economists of the time: Virgil Madgearu, Slăvescu, Constantin Taşcă, and Mihail Manoilescu. The Association lacks a scholarly journal. The organization's official publication is a daily economic newspaper, *Economistul* (started in 1990, but issued as a daily only from 1998 on), but it is also associated with *Adevărul Economic*, a weekly newspaper. The organization established its own publishing house, Ed. Economică, specialized in economic literature, mainly Academy of Economic Studies undergraduate textbooks. The leader of this group was the late Nicolae N. Constantinescu.

The other organization, The Romanian Society of Economics, has a liberal orientation and includes the key figure Daniel Dăianu, former chief economist at the Romanian National Bank and, for a short period, Minister of Finance in a coalition government. The organization's main publication is *Oeconomica*, an academic publication with 4-5 issues a year. SOREC has a close relationship to the newly established Center for Economic Policies (Centrul pentru Politici Economice – CEROPE), a center that is rightly seen as its think tank.

Other institutes that contributed to public economic debate and to the efforts toward paradigm change were the Romanian Academic Society (Societatea Academică Româna), a private think tank; the Institute of Liberal Studies (Institutul de Studii Liberale); the Center for Public Policy (Centrul pentru Politici Publice – CEPSCA), a private think tank; the Institute of European Studies (Institutul de Studii Europene) associated with the Babeş-Bolyai University in Cluj; the Center for Social Science Research (Centrul de Cercetare Sociala) – West University, Timişoara; and also the Romanian Center for Comparative and Consensual Economics (Centrul Român pentru Economie Comparată şi Consensuală), whose main figure, Tudorel Postolache, is a member of the Romanian Academy, which deserves mention not so much for its output as for the political leverage it has due to its founder.

Rehabilitations, repatriations, new departures

The number of post-1989 repatriations was extremely limited, and overall they made no difference for the quality of public discourse or the paradigm-change process. In fact, in this respect it is even hard to find relevant examples. The translation of Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen's work, which was started in the 1970s and then abruptly halted, was revitalized, but this hardly counts as a repatriation. An author like Anghel Rugină received great attention initially, but even the less astute understood later that there was something out of order with his economics and the policies he advocated.

On the other hand (and quite illustrative of this situation), authors like Nicolas Spulber, who by all academic and scholarly standards is today the most preeminent economist of Romanian origin, is practically unknown in Romania[5]. Recent efforts have been made to reintegrate him and his work in the Romanian economics community, but there is still a long way to go.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

The revival of the pre-war tradition

In spite of the rich pre-war tradition of economic thought, no serious scholarly attempts to revive it were made in the last ten years. The sole original book on the issue was published by an American (Love, 1996). Thus, if we speak of a revival of the pre-war tradition, then the phenomenon took place not in academia, but in the doctrines of some traditional political parties, although we should not exaggerate the extent and intensity of this phenomenon.

A cursory overview of the relevant literature finds the agrarian economist Virgil Madgearu the most frequently quoted, but Victor Slăvescu, Costin Kiriţescu, and Constantin Teaşcă were also mentioned. It is worth mentioning that the National Bank of Romania sponsored a collection titled

Biblioteca Băncii Naționale (National Bank Library), which was primarily dedicated to the life and work of the inter-war economists and which published books by and on Costin Kirițescu, Mihail Manoilescu, Costin Murgescu, Victor Slăvescu, and Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen. Books by Ştefan Zeletin and Gheorghe Zane were also published.

New East-West asymmetries

During the last ten years, East-West asymmetries continued to exist on at least four levels: (1) on the level of training and scholarly competence; (2) on the level of professionalization; (3) on the level of the economists' policy relevance; and finally (4) on the level of funding. These asymmetries are all likely to diminish over the next decade.

Quantitative vs. qualitative approaches

Up to this point, there were no self-conscious and articulated methodological debates. Work has been done both on quantitative and qualitative lines, with the qualitative one usually much better in both form and content. Although the previous ideological straitjacket normally shouldn't have affected the quantitative methods very much, it seems that there is a strong relationship between the conceptual and theoretical framework and the development of the methods and techniques in the field. The apparent and paradoxical lack of methodological sophistication can have no other explanation than the lack of a proper conceptual background for the application of such methods and techniques.

As for the use of quantitative techniques, most of the studies are limited to describing trends, and they rarely go beyond the level of statistical indicators. There has been no translation of any econometrics textbook, and few Romanian-authored books have been published recently, some exceptions being Zaiț and Nica (1994), Eugen Ştefan Pecican (1994, 1996), and Constantin Zaman (1998). The only book available until theirs was Tiberiu Schatteles, *Metode econometrice moderne* (Modern Econometrics Techniques. A Critical Analysis), published back in 1971. There are nevertheless several centers where work on these line has been done and that have potential in this area, such as the World Economy Institute (Institutul de Economie Mondiala) and the Economic Forecast Institute (Institutul de Prognoza Economica). On the whole, it is safe to say that the community hasn't made a full transition yet from the planification paradigm and a planified economy to the stage of applying quantitative methods in a market-oriented economy.

New approaches

The pre-1989 isolation left a huge space for new approaches. Thus in the Romanian context almost any recent evolution might be considered in some respect a “new approach”. Three of them deserve special note.

First of all, a free market, monetarist, Chicago School approach. It is diffuse, sometimes lacking a clear awareness of its sources and conceptual contours. Nevertheless, it is especially influential on the level of the general mindset of journalists and some policy-makers. In recent years, more than ever, this “school” has been challenged by an eclectic, neo-Keynesian approach whose main sponsor is Daniel Dăianu.

There is also growing interest in the Austrian School of Economics, with Cristian Comanescu having coordinated a private seminar for some years. The members of the seminar recently established the Ludwig von Mises Institute. The influence of the Chicago School and especially the Austrian school are largely due to a series of initiatives at the beginning of the 1990s that were well coordinated by the Institute for Human Studies, of the USA, and by several other foundations and centers belonging to the same network. As a result of this effort (and partly due to the lack of theoretical and philosophical sophistication on the part of the would-be followers of other schools), today the Austrian School is one of the most articulated paradigms in Romanian economics and social theory, in spite of its lack of influence in public discourse and public decision-making.

Finally there is a growing neo-institutionalist influence due not so much to Romanian economists newly gaining conceptual and theoretical sophistication, but more to the influence of the World Bank's increasing identification with this vision and to the congeniality of some institutionalist views with the traditional Romanian economists' mindset, which places the accent on country specificity rather than on general models.

4. Thematic orientations and funding

Transition as a major research theme

In the last ten years, the issues of transition constituted the main research and debate theme. Almost everything of significance published was connected to it. Even economic history books were framed to be related or relevant to transition issues (Murgescu, 2000; Aligică, 2000). All Romanian economists published books on the topic (Constantinescu, 1993; Şerbănescu, 1994; Popescu, Ciucur, 1995; Manolescu et al. 1995; Negrițoiu, 1996; Zaman et al., 1997; Dăianu, 1999; Dobrescu, 1999; Isărescu, Postolache, 2000).

A good example is the Expert Press publishing house collection "Economia României", which featured an entire series of works on transition issues, a series that offers a clear illustration of the situation (Ionete, 1993; Grigorescu, 1993; Croitoru, 1993; Postolache, 1994; Vosganian, 1995; Zamfir, 1995; Ciumara, 1997; Gavrilescu, Giurcă, 2000; Neagu, 2000).

The selection of the theme

Several debates on transition and on strategies of transition were held at the Romanian Academy, sometimes connected with issues of Romania's integration in the European Union (such as ESSEN I and II programs). Special attention was paid to phenomena associated with transition: inflation, unemployment, banks, and investment fund failures. Monetary policy (especially the currency board issue) was also a much debated topic. There also was an incipient debate on industrial policy. But it, like all other similar debates, was halfhearted, lacked a solid conceptual and empirical basis, and had no recognizable impact on the public.

The impact of the themes on the institutional structure

Given this context, it is hard to discern thematic orientations having any pattern of impact on institutional structures. There are no specialized academic journals or viable specialized research institutes apart from the inherited structure of the Romanian Academy Institutes with an Institute dealing with macroeconomic problems, Institute of National Economy (Institutul de Economie Națională), an Institute of Industry Economics (Institutul de Ecomomia Industriei), an Institute of Agricultural Economics (Institutul de Economie Agrară), an Institute for Financial and Monetary Researches (Institutul de Cercetări Financiare şi Monetare "Victor Slăvescu"), an Institute for Quality of Life Research (Institutul de Cercetare a Calității Vieții), an Institute for Prognosis (Institutul de Prognoza Economica), and an Institute for International Economics (Institutul de Economie Mondială). All have a tendency to broaden their research area, which is not a good omen given the current state of the professionalization process.

Public vs. private financing

Funding from internal sources was limited by Western standards, but large compared to the situation of other disciplines in Romania. The result was that the economics community was in many respects "sheltered". Thus, depending less on international funding, it was less open than other disciplines to Western modernization and reform influences.

The financing is predominantly public, and takes the form of grants from the Ministry of Education and Research and of payments from the Romanian government to the state universities

(University of Bucharest, Academy of Economic Studies, etc.) or the Romanian Academy,. International funding through grants from the World Bank, the European Union (The PHARE and other programs), and other US and EU sources was also a major source of support. Private universities received mostly private funding. Political parties (Institute of Liberal Studies), banks, and privately owned firms were also a source of support.

The sources of the NGOs and private research centers are very diverse and volatile. For instance, the sponsors and clients of the Romanian Academic Society during the last four years included the European Commission – the PHARE Program; the World Bank Bucharest; the Institute for Human Sciences SOCO program (financed by the Austrian Federal Chancellery's Fund for Cooperation with CEE and by the Ford Foundation); the Open Society Foundation; Romania the Open Society Institute, Budapest; the Center for Legislative and Constitutional Policy (COLPI), Budapest; the Institute for Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna; the Foundation for the Development of the Civic Society; USAID; the World Learning; NATO; and Freedom House. In the last two years the Romanian Center for Economic Policy (CEROPE) similarly received financial support from the World Bank, the US Agency for International Development (USAID), the IRIS Center Romania, the Bertelsmann Foundation, the Romanian Commercial Bank, the Raiffeisen Financial Advisers, and the Open Society Institute.

Special mention should be made of the Open Society Foundation (Soros), whose activity has been typical for the progress of the discipline. Indeed it is not an exaggeration to say that if any progress has been sustained over a decade, it has been largely due to the Soros Foundation.

5. Public space and academic debates

Debated subjects, problems, and methods. Main academic journals and selection of publications in international languages

As already mentioned, the main theme was the transition process, all phenomena related to it (privatization, restructuring, the sequence privatization/restructuring constituting an ongoing dilemma), and the phenomena accompanying it (inflation, unemployment). Monetary issues occupied a large place in the public debate, inflation being for long periods the main concern, although most interventions were more rhetorical than analytic or pragmatic. All these themes were reflected more in working papers and newspaper and magazine articles than in scholarly journals. The reason is that there are almost no academic journals; *Oeconomica*, the journal of the SOREC, is the only one that approaches the standards. Nevertheless, there are some prospects that some of the traditional journals will reappear (for example, "Revista Economică" at the Academy of Economic Studies). *Oeconomica* has 4-5 issues a year and hosts miscellaneous articles in the area of the transition of the Romanian economy and its integration in the European Union; it is open to theoretical and sociological points of view. Revue Roumaine de Sciences Sociales – serie Economique ceased publication in 1998. A new series was started in 2001 with Vasile Pilat as its new editor. The Journal for Economic Forecasting, edited by Lucian Albu, has also asserted itself as a professional publication.

A recent comeback (after more than five years of interruption) has been *Revista română de economie* (Romanian Journal of Economics), published by the Institute of National Economy (of the Romanian Academy), with monthly issues hosting miscellaneous articles on the Romanian economy, transition, and integration in the European Union[6]. Some working papers, for example the *Probleme economice* series, are published by the Center for Economic Information and Documentation (Centrul pentru Informare si Documentare) CIDE of the Romanian Academy.

New textbooks and databases

After a period of hegemony of the Academy of Economic Studies textbook (discussed above), there has recently been some diversification of the economics textbook market, with more than three published by the members of the Economics Department of Academy of Economic Studies and several others by public and private universities (Dobrotă et al., 1995; Dobrotă, 1997; Ciucur et al., 1999; Iordache, 1999; Angelescu and Stănescu, 1999; Angelescu et al., 2000; Postelnicu, Maniu, et al. 2000). Several macroeconomics textbooks were also published, but written mostly by the same authors (Băcescu M., Băcescu A., 1993, 1998; Fudulu, 1997; Bucur, 1999). The macro textbook by Dornbusch and Fisher was also translated into Romanian. Several microeconomics textbooks have been published meanwhile, too, such as those authored by professors of the Academy of Economic Studies (Zorlentan et al., 1994, Gherasim, 1994), the Polytechnic University, the University of Bucharest (Georgescu, 1995, Fudulu, 1997), the West University of Timişoara (Babăiţă, Duţă, 1996), the University of Târgu Mureş (Georgescu, 2000), etc.

Economics databases are scarce, incomplete, and difficult to access. A potential source is the Academy of Economic Studies Library and the University Central Library, which also has a legislative database.

6. Views on further development

International cooperation

International cooperation grew exponentially over the last ten years. EU programs like PHARE and SOCRATES as well as bilateral programs between Western governments and the Romanian government and between Western institutions and Romanian ones all contributed here. The World Bank and the IMF encouraged and facilitated direct contacts and collaboration between Romanians and foreign experts. Finally, professors from the US and the EU taught courses in Romanian universities in various programs; one of the most efficient of these was the Civic Education Project. As usual, the Open Society Foundation played a major role. It deserves special mention because it encouraged not only East-West cooperation but also East-East cooperation.

The impact of accession

The prospect of accession to the European Union generated a wave of books and doctoral theses on the subject, but the studies of the problem are still in their conceptual and empirical infancy. Several books on integration were published (Dobrescu, 1996; Postolache, 1999), and the European Institute of Romania (Institutul European din România) has an entire database with hundreds of working papers and articles on the topic. This literature is heterogeneous, with many insightful and well-written texts, but on the whole, again, there is still a long way to go to a solid, empirically and conceptually based output.

The impact of research in the public space: the "brain drain" problem

The impact of economic research on public opinion and public decision-making was very limited. There are several reasons for this: (1) the underprofessionalization of the discipline and of the economics community (manifested in the lack of a functioning institutional framework; the lack of a sound empirical and conceptual basis for the studies published; and the inability to write policy-oriented papers); (2) the nonexistence of a viable intellectual infrastructure (think tanks, policy centers) to connect research to decision-making; (3) the mass media's lack of proper economics training and thus understanding of the meaning and relevance of economic debates; (4) public discourse's domination by public intellectuals trained in the humanities and engineering who insist on voicing their opinions on economics and politics; (4) the newly improvised political elite's reluctance to incorporate expert groups or to accept expert advice as part of the decision-making process. All these problems are aggravated by the brain drain. The problem is not so much one of mature economists leaving the country (there are not very many who could meet Western standards), but of students leaving for graduate studies and not returning.

To sum up, Romanian economics and the Romanian economics community are still in a state of transition. Profoundly affected by the pre-1989 situation, Romanian economics struggles to reconstruct a viable infrastructure and institutional basis. Since both human and intellectual capital resources are scarce and since the legacy of the past is so powerful, this task is extremely difficult and unlikely to be achieved in less than a decade.

---

1 This paper is an attempt to survey the most important features and trends defining Romanian economics and the Romanian economics epistemic community during the last two decades. The focus is on the decade before and the decade after the political and economic changes of 1989.

2 Among the members of the Romanian Association for the Club of Rome are two preeminent figures in the Romanian mass media, Dan Voiculescu and Adrian Sârbu, the owners of the two most important media groups; Mircea Malița, a member of the Romanian Academy and co-president of the Association; Adrian Vasilescu, the spokesman of the National Romanian Bank; and many others.

3 A selection of the quotations in the 1995 textbook: P. A. Samuelson, Economics. An Introductory Analysis, McGraw-Hill Book Inc., New York, 1982, 1980 – pp. 36, 264, 265; Utet, Torino, 1969 - p. 386, 1970 - p. 472; L' Economique, Armand Colin, Paris, 1953, 1969, 1968, 1983 - pp. 47, 98, 126, 149, 150, 288, 432; P. A. Samuelson, W. Nordhause, Economics, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 13th edition, 1992 - pp. 26, 395; Gilbert-Abraham Frois, Economie politique, Ed. Economica, Paris, 1988, Humanitas, 1994 - pp. 107, 135, 163, 187, 190, 281, 319, 341, 342, 353, 354, 432; Paul Heyne, Modul economic de gândire, pp. 13, 45, 128, 145, 284, 382, 431, 528; Michel Didier, Regulile jocului - pp. 152, 436, 486, 504, 520; Michel Albert, Capitalism contra capitalism, Ed. Humanitas, 1994 - pp. 60, 432, 437, 486; Fernand Braudel - Jocurile schimbului, vol. I and II, Ed. Meridiane, Bucharest, 1985 - pp. 42, 43, 311, 480).

4 A selection of the translations from 1990 on is illustrative and includes: Ronald McKinnon, *Etapele procesului de liberalizare economică* (Financial Control in the Transition to a Market Economy), Ed. ALL, 1991 (although it appeared early in the transition, its influence was negligible); Mark Blaug, *Teoria economică în retrospectivă (Economic Theory in Retrospect),* Ed. Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1992; Peter Drucker, *Inovația şi sistemul antreprenorial*, Ed. Enciclopedică, 1993; F. A. Hayek, *Drumul către servitute* (The Road to Serfdom), Ed. Humanitas, 1993; Daniel Hausman, *Filosofia științei economice* (Philosophy of Economic Science), Ed. Humanitas, 1993; Max Weber, *Etica protestantă şi spiritul capitalismului*, Ed. Humanitas, 1993; Gary Becker, *Comportamentul uman - o abordare economică* (Human Behavior - An Economic Approach), Ed. ALL, 1994; F. Fukuyama, *Sfârşitul istoriei şi ultimul om* (The End of History and the Last Man), Ed. Paideia, 1994; Milton Friedman, *Capitalism şi libertate* (Capitalism and Freedom), Ed. Enciclopedică, colecția Bibliotecii Băncii Naționale, 1995; James D. Gwartney, Richard L. Stroup, *Economie şi prosperitate. Introducere în teoria şi practica progresului economic* (What Everyone Should Know about Economics and Prosperity), Ed. Alutus-D, Bucharest, 1995; Israel M. Kirzner, *Perspectiva economică* (The Economic Point of View), Ed, ALL, 1996; Gary Becker, *Capitalul uman: o analiză teoretică şi empirică cu referire specială la educație* (Human Capital), Ed. ALL, 1997; Geoffrey Whitehead, *Economia* (Economics), Ed. Sedona, colecția LITEC, Timişoara, 1997; Oliver E. Williamson, Sidney G. Winter, *Natura firmei: origini, evoluție, dezvoltare* (The Nature of the Firm), Ed. Sedona, colecția LITEC, Timişoara, 1997; Ludwig von Mises, *Capitalismul şi duşmanii săi* (Economic Policy), Ed. Nemira, 1998; F. A. Hayek, *Constituția libertății* (The Constitution of Freedom), Institutul European, colecția CIVITAS, 1998; Walter Block, *Pledoarii imposibile* (Defending the Indefensible), Ed. Nemira, 1998; Milton Friedman, Rose Friedman, *Liber să alegi: un punct de vedere personal* (Free to choose), Ed. ALL, 1998; Norman Barry, *Bunăstarea*, Ed. DU STYLE, 1998; Peter F. Drucker, *Societatea postcapitalistă* (The Postcapitalistic Society), Ed. Image, 1999.

[5] Nicolas Spulber: Born January 1, 1915, in Romania, New School for Social Research, PhD 1952. His research and teaching career started at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge; visiting professor, City University of New York; Professor of Economics, Indiana University at Bloomington, 1955-74; Distinguished Professor Emeritus at the same institutions, 1980. Among his publications are The Economics of Communist Eastern Europe, M.I.T. Press, 1957, reprinted, Greenwood Press, 1976; The Soviet Economy: Structure, Principles, Problems, Norton, 1962, revised edition, 1969; Soviet Strategy for Economic Growth, Indiana University Press, 1964; The State and Economic Development in Eastern Europe, Random House, 1966; Socialist Management and Planning: Topics in Comparative Socialist Economics, Indiana University Press, 1971; (co-author) Quantitative Economic Policy and Planning: Theory and Models of Economic Control, Norton, 1976; Organizational Alternatives in Soviet-Type Economics, Cambridge University Press, 1979; The American Economy in the XXIst century, Cambridge University Press, 1997; Redefining the State, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[6] A sample of the topics from the latest issues: No. 1/2000: Gh. Zaman, "Balance sheet of the transition in Romania over the period 1990-1999"; Steliana Sandu, "New theory of economic growth and the requirement of government intervention supporting innovational activity"; Steliana Perț, "Employment - a national priority"; Maria Poenaru, "Human Development"; Diana Preda, "Demoeconomic benchmark and dilemmas in Romania at the beginning of the transition"; Valentina Vasile, "Main features of the labor market in Romania during the first decade of the transition"; Florin Marius Pavelescu, "Character of labor market disequilibria in Romania in the '90s"; Constanța Petcu, "Coordinates and tendencies of consumption in the population "; Marin Popescu, "The transition's impact on agricultural production evolution"; Filon Toderoiu, Camelia Stefanescu, "Agri-food sector, a fragile 'obstacle' of transitional economic decline"; Marioara Iordan, Mihai Regep, Vladimir Calmuschi, "Analysis concerning changes in consumer goods branches; Victor Axenciuc, "Main features of the legislation and institution setting up with economic functions at the beginning of modern national state creation"; Marcela Naneș, Privatization impact on corporate governance".

References and selected bibliography

Adumitrăcesei, I. D., Niculescu, N. G. and Niculescu, Elena (eds.) (1998-1999): *Economie politică: Teorie şi politică economică pentru România* (Economics: Theory and Economic Policy for Romania), Iaşi, Polirom;

Aligică, Dragos Paul (2000): *Structura instituțională şi expansiunea sistemică în economia mondială* (Institutional Structure and Systemic Expansion in the World Economy), Bucharest, ASE;

Angelescu, Coralia and Stănescu, Ileana (1999): *Economie politică: Elemente fundamentale* (Political Economy: Introductory Elements), Bucharest, Oscar Print;

Angelescu, Coralia, Ciucur, Dumitru and Dobrotă, Niță (2000): *Economie* (Economics), Bucharest, Editura Economică;

Băbăiță, Ilie and Duță, Alexandrina (1996): *Introducere în microeconomie*, Timişoara:, Editura de Vest;

Băcescu, Marius and Băcescu, Angelica (1993): *Macroeconomie şi politici macroeconomice*, Bucharest, ALL;

Băcescu, Marius and Băcescu, Angelica (1997): *Macroeconomie aplicată*, Bucharest, ALL;

Băcescu, Marius and Băcescu, Angelica (1998): *Macroeconomie-bazele macroeconomiei*, Bucharest, Editura Economică;

Bari, Ioan and Şerbănescu, Ilie (1981): *Energia…Imperativul reconsiderărilor*, Bucharest, Junimea;

Botkin, J.W., Elmandjra, M. and Malița, M. (1981): *Orizontul fără limite al învățării*, Bucharest, Editura Politică;

Bucur, Ion (1999): *Bazele macroeconomiei*, Bucharest, Editura Economică;

Ciucur, Dumitru, Gavrilă, Ilie and Popescu, Constantin (1999): *Economie: Manual universitar*, Bucharest, Editura Economică;

Ciumara, M (1997): *Economia politică şi interesul național* (The Political Economy and National Interest), Bucharest, Expert;

Ciupagea, Constantin (1994): "An Elasticity Approach to the Analysis of Romanian Foreign Trade Policy during the Years of Transition", in: *Economics of Planning*, Vol. 27, No. 3, 227-50;

Constantinescu, N.N. (1973): *Problema contradicției in economia socialistă* (The problem of Contradictions in the Socialist Economy), Bucharest, Editura Politică;

Constantinescu, N.N. (1976): *Economia protecției mediului natural*, Bucharest, Editura Politică;

Constantinescu, N.N. (1993): *Reforma economică. În folosul cui?* (Economic Reform. To Whose Benefit?), Bucharest, Editura Economică;
Coşea, Mircea (1995): *Jurnal în tranziţie* (Transition Journal), Bucharest, Expert;
Croitoru, Lucian (1993): *Macrostabilizare şi tranziţie* (Macrostabilization and Transition), Bucharest, Expert;
Dăianu, Daniel (1985): "Probleme ale ajustarii balantei de plati" (Problems in the Adjustment of the Payments Balance), in: *Teorie si Practica Economica*, Bucharest, ASE, 24-36;
Dăianu, Daniel (1992): "Transformation and the Legacy of Backwardness: Thoughts from a Romanian Perspective", in: *Economies et Societes*, Vol. 26, No. 4-5, 181-206;
Dăianu, Daniel (1992): *Functionarea economiei si Echilibrul Extern* (The Functioning of the Economy and External Equilibrium), Bucharest, Editura Academiei;
Dăianu, Daniel (1996): "Stabilization and Exchange Rate Policy in Romania", in: Economics of Transition, Vol. 4, No. 1, 229-48;
Dăianu, Daniel (1998): *Transformation as a Real Process*, Aldershot, Ashgate;
Dăianu, Daniel (1999): *Transformarea ca proces real* (Tranformation as a Real Process), Bucharest, IRLI;
Dăianu, Daniel and Pilat, Vasile (1985): "Probleme ale functionarii economiilor socialiste" (Problems in the Functioning of Socialist Economies), in: *Revue Roumaine d'Etudes Internationales*, No. 3, 34-45;
Dijmărescu, E., Ghibuţiu, A. and Isărescu, N.G. (1977): *Datoria externă a ţărilor în curs de dezvoltare şi lichidarea subdezvoltării* (The External Debt of the Developing Countries and Underdevelopment Elimination), Bucharest, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică;
Dobrescu, Emilian (1996): *Integrarea economică* (Economic Integration), Bucharest, Editura Academiei Române;
Dobrescu, Emilian (1999): *Macromodelul economiei în tranziţie* (The Macromodel of the Transition Economy), Bucharest, CIDE;
Dobrescu, Emilian and Postolache, Tudorel (1990): *Consemnări economice* (Economic Notes), Bucharest, Editura Academiei Române;
Dobrotă, Niţă (1986): "Contradicţiile economiei mondiale contemporane" (The Contradictions of the Contemporary World Economy), in: *Tratat de Economie Contemporană (Treatise on Contemporary Economy)*, Vol. I, Bucharest, Editura Politică;
Dobrotă, Niţă (1997): *Economie politică. O tratare unitară a problemelor vitale ale oamenilor*, Editura Economică;
Dobrotă, Niţă, Ciucur, Dumitru and Coşea, Mircea (1995): *Economia politică*, Bucharest, Editura Economică;
Esanu, Christina and Mattas, Konstadinos (1996): "Alterations in Export Patterns through Transforming Policies in Romania", in: *International Advances in Economic Research*, Vol. 2, No. 4, 374-85;
Fudulu, Paul (1997): *Macroeconomie. Postiniţial şi master* (Macroeconomics. Intermediate and Master), Bucharest, Hiroyuki;
Fudulu, Paul (1997): *Microeconomie. Postiniţial şi master* (Microeconomics. Intermediate and Master), Bucharest, Hiroyuki;
Gavrilescu, Dinu and Giurcă, Daniela (2000): *Economie agroalimentară* (Agro-food economics), Bucharest, Expert;
Georgescu, Maria-Ana (2000): *Economie: Introducere în microeconomie*, Târgu-Mureş, Universitatea "Petru Maior";
Georgescu, Nicolae M. (1995): *Microeconomie: Principii şi soluţii* (Microeconomics: Principles and Solutions), Bucharest, Editura Universităţii Bucharest;
Gherasim, Toader (1994): *Microeconomie* (Microeconomics), Vol. I/ II, Bucharest, Editura Economică;
Gore, Al (1994), *Pământul în cumpănă. Ecologia şi spiritul uman*, Editura Tehnică;
Grigorescu, Constantin (ed.) (1993): *Economia României. Nivelul de dezvoltare economico-socială a României în context european – 1989*, Bucharest, Expert;
Iancu, Aurel (1976): *Creşterea economică şi resursele naturale*, Bucharest, Editura Politică;
Iliescu, Ion (1992): *Probleme globale. Creativitate* (Global Problems. Creativity), Editura Tehnică;
Ionete, Constantin (1992): *Criza de sistem a economiei de comandă şi etapa sa explozivă*, Bucharest, Editura Economică;
Iordache, Stelian (ed.) (1999): *Curs de economie politică*, Bucharest, Editura Economică;
Isărescu, M. amd Postolache, T. (2000): *Strategia naţională de dezvoltare economică a României pe termen mediu* (The National Strategy for Romania's Medium Term Development), Bucharest, Centrul Român de Economie Comparată şi Consensuală;

Jinga, Victor (1975): *Principii şi orientări ale comerţului exterior al României* (1859-1916), Cluj-Napoca, Dacia;

Jinga, Victor (1981): *Moneda şi problemele ei contemporane* (Currency and its Contemporary Problems), Cluj-Napoca, Dacia;

Kiriţescu, Costin (1964, 1967, 1971): *Sistemul bănesc al leului şi precursorii lui* (The Leu Monetary System and its Forerunners), Vol. I/ II/ III, Bucharest, Editura Academiei RSR;

Kiriţescu, Costin (1978): *Relaţii financiar monetare internaţionale* (International Financial and Monetary Relations), Bucharest, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică;

Kiriţescu, Costin (1992): *Călător prin secolul XX: Memoriile unui bancher fără bani*, Bucharest, Editura Enciclopedică;

Love, Joseph (1996): *Crafting the Third World: Theorizing Underdevelopment in Rumania and Brazil,* Stanford University Press;

Manoilescu, M. (1993): *Memorii* (Memoir), Vol. I/ II, Bucharest, Editura Enciclopedică;

Manoilescu, Mihail (1986): *Forţele naţionale productive şi comerţul exterior – Teoria protecţionismului şi a schimbului internaţional* (National Productive Forces and Foreign Trade – The Theory of Protectionism and International Exchange), Bucharest, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică;

Manolescu, Gheorghe (1995): *Procese şi politici macroeconomice de tranziţie* (Macroeconomic Processes and Policies in Transition), Bucharest, Editura Economică;

Manolescu, Gheorghe (ed.) (1997): *Politici economice. Concepte, instrumente, experienţe* (Economic Policies. Concepts, Instruments, Experiences), Institutul de Cercetări Financiare şi Monetare "Victor Slăvescu", Bucharest, Editura Economică;

Mecu, Constantin (1973): *Structuri economice în America Latină*, Bucharest, Editura Politică;

Mehedinţiu, M. (1986): "Contradicţiile şi legile economice în socialism" (Contradictions and Economic Laws in Socialism), in: *Tratat de Economie Contemporană* (Treatise on Contemporary Economy), Vol. I, Bucharest, Editura Politică;

Muresan, Maria (1998): *Istoria Economiei* (Economic History), Bucharest, Editura Academiei de Studii Economice;

Murgescu, Bogdan (2000): *România şi Europa: modernizarea ca tentaţie, modernizarea ca ameninţare* (Romania and Europe: Modernization as Temptation, Modernization as Threat), Körber-Stiftung Edition, Bucharest, Alfa;

Murgescu, Costin (1994): *Mersul ideilor economice la români* (The Evolution of Economic Ideas of Romanians), Vol. I/ II, Bucharest, Editura Enciclopedică;

Nechita, Nicolae (1986): "Contradicţiile economice şi dezvoltarea economico-socială contemporană" ("Economic Contradictions and Contemporary Socio-Economic Development"), in: *Tratat de Economie Contemporană* (Treatise on Contemporary Economy), Bucharest, Editura Politică;

Nechita, Vasile (1993): *Mihail Manoilescu – creator de teorie* economică (Mihail Manoilescu – Creator of Economic Theory), Iaşi, Cugetarea;

Negriţoiu, Mişu (1996): *Salt înainte. Dezvoltarea şi investiţiile străine directe* (Jumping Ahead. Foreign Direct Investments and Economic Development), Bucharest, PRO & Expert;

Nicolae-Văleanu, Ivanciu (ed.) (1986): *Subdezvoltarea economică în lumea actuală. Realităţi şi teorii* (Underdevelopment in the Contemporary World. Realities and Theories), Bucharest, Editura Academiei RSR;

Olaru, Corneliu (2000): *Dictionarul Economistilor Romani* (The Dictionary of Romanian Economists), Bucharest, Antet;

Olteanu, I. (1981): *Limitele progresului şi progresul limitelor* (The Progress of Limits and the Limits of Progress), Bucharest, Editura Politică;

Pauna, Catalin and Earle, John (1996): "Incidence and Duration of Unemployment in Romania", in: *European Economic Review*, Vol. 40, No. 3-5, 829-37;

Pecican, Eugen Ştefan (1994): Econometrie (Econometrics), Bucharest, ALL;

Pecican, Eugen Ştefan (1996): *Macroeconometrie. Politici economice guvernamentale şi econometrie* (Macroeconometrics. Economic Policies and Econometrics), Bucharest, Editura Economică;

Popescu, Constantin and Ciucur, Dumitru (1995): *Tranziţia prin criză. Studii econometrice* (Transition through Crisis. Econometric Studies), Bucharest, Eficient;

Postelnicu, Gheorghe, Maniu, Mircea et al. (2000): *Economie Politica* (Political Economy, Advanced Textbook), Cluj University Press, Cluj-Napoca;

Postolache, Tudorel (1994): *L'Economie de la Roumanie dans le XX-ieme siecle*, Bucharest, Expert;

Postolache, Tudorel (1999) : *Un proiect deschis: Discurs asupra* integrării (An Open Project: A Lecture on Integration), Bucharest, Expert;
Roegen, Nicholas-Georgescu (1979): *Legea entropiei şi procesul economic*, Bucharest, Editura Politică;
Roegen, Nicholas-Georgescu (1996-2000): *Omul şi opera* (Man and His Work), six volumes, Bucharest, Expert;
Rugină, Anghel (1993): *Principia Oeconomica*, Bucharest, Editura Academiei Române;
Schatteles, Tiberiu (1971): *Metode econometrice moderne. O analiză critică* (Modern Econometric Methods. A Critical Analysis), Bucharest, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică;
Şerbănescu, Ilie (1994): *Jumătăţile de măsură dublează costurile sociale*, Bucharest, Staff;
Slăvescu, V. (1996): *Note şi însemnări zilnice* (Daily Notes), Vol. I/ II, Bucharest, Editura Enciclopedică;
Spulber, Nicolas (1979): *Organizational Alternatives in Soviet-Type* Bucharest, Cambridge University Press;
Stanciu, Laura (2000): "Free-Standing Companies in the Oil Sector in Romania and Poland before 1948: Typologies and Competencies", in: *Business History*, Vol. 42, No. 4, 27-66;
Stancu, Stelian and Andrei, Tudorel (1997): *Microeconomie: Teorie şi aplicaţii* (Microeconometrics), Bucharest, ALL;
Sută Selejan, Sultana (1986): "Confruntări de idei privind actuala criză economică mondială. Originalitatea concepţiei româneşti cu privire la această criză" ("Confrontation of Ideas on the Present-Day World Crisis. The Originality of the Romanian Outlook on the Crisis"), in: *Tratat de Economie Contemporană* (Treatise on Contemporary Economy), Bucharest, Editura Politică;
Tufescu, V. and Tufescu, M. (1981): *Ecologia şi activitatea umană* (Ecology and Human Activity), Bucharest, Albatros;
Valsan, Calin (2001): "Three Measures of Corporate Restructuring in a Transition Economy: The Case of Newly Privatised Romanian Companies", in: *Post-Communist Economies*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 121-28;
Vosganian, Varujan (1994): *Contradicţii ale tranziţiei la economia de piaţă*, Bucharest, Expert;
Zaiţ, D. and Nica, P. (1994): *Introducere în modelarea econometrică* (Introduction to Econometric Modeling), Iaşi, Editura Universităţii "Al. I. Cuza";
Zaman, Constantin (1998): *Econometrie* (Econometrics), Bucharest, ProDemocraţia;
Zaman, Gheorghe, Ciutacu, Constantin and Vâlceanu, Grigore (eds.) (1997): *Blocaje în economia de tranziţie a României* (Blockages in the Romanian Economy During the Transition Period), FPS, Bucharest, Editura Tehnică;
Zamfir, Cătălin (1995): *Dimensiuni ale sărăciei* (Dimensions of Poverty), Bucharest, Expert;
Zane, Gheorghe (1986): *Studii Economice* (Economic Studies), Bucharest, Editura Academiei RSR;
Zeletin, Ştefan (1992): *Neoliberalismul. Studii asupra istoriei şi politicii burgheziei româneşti* (Neoliberalism. Studies on History and Politics of the Romanian Bourgeoisie), Bucharest, Scripta;
Zorlentan, Tiberiu (ed.) et al. (1994): *Microeconomie* (Microeconomics), Bucharest, ASE.

Július Horváth

Economics – Slovakia[1]

The contribution of Slovak economists to the general development of economic theory seems to be relatively minor, at least if judged on the basis of international encyclopaedias and economists' vocabularies. To a lesser extent, one may arrive at a similar conclusion about Eastern and Central European economists. For example, Blaug (1986) considers only five economists from the region among the one hundred great economists before Keynes. These are Ladislaus von Bortkiewicz (1868-1931), Rosa Luxemburg (1870-1919), Eugen Slutsky (1880-1948), Nikolai Dmitrievich Kondratiev (1892-1931), and Oskar Lange (1904-1965).

Furthermore, Blaug (1985) lists János Kornai as the only Eastern or Central European economist among his one hundred major economists after Keynes. If birthplace counts, then in Blaug's lists we find Irma Adelman (born in 1930) and Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen (1906-1994) born in Romania; Evsey E. Domar (1914-1997), Michał Kalecki (1899-1970), and Jacob Mincer (born in 1922) born in Poland; Alexander Gerschenkron (1904-1978), Simon Kuznets (1901-1985), Wassily Leontief (1906-1999), Abba Lerner (1903-1982), and Jacob Marschak (1898-1977) born in Russia; Nicholas Káldor (1908-1986), Tibor Scitovsky (born in 1910), and János Kornai (born in 1928) from Hungary; Ludwig von Mises (1881-1973) born in today's Ukraine; and Jaroslav Vaněk (born in 1928) born in Czechoslovakia.

Eatwell, Murray, and Newman (1991) provide information on a number of major economists who worked in the region. If we do not consider Michail Bakunin, Nikokai Chernyshevski, Vladimir Lenin, Georgi Plekhanov, Yosef Stalin, and Leo Trotsky, then these include: Oskar Nikolyaevich Anderson (1887-1960), Ladislaus von Bortkiewicz, Nikolai Ivanovich Bukharin (1888-1938), Alexander Vasiljevich Chayanov (1888-1939?), Vladimir Karpovich Dmitriev (1868-1913), Grigorii Alexandrovich Feldman (1884-1958), Michał Kalecki, Leonid Vitalievich Kantorovich (1912-1986), Nikolai Dmitrievich Kondratiev, Alexander Alexandrovich Konüs (born in 1895), Oskar Lange, Mihail Manoilescu (1891-1950), Vasily Sergeevich Nemchinov (1894-1964), Vasily Sergeevich Novozhilov (1892-1970), Evgenii Alexeyevich Preobrazhensky (1886-1937), David Borisovich Ryazanov (1870-1938), Eugen Slutsky, Stanislav Gustavovich Strumilin (1877-1974), Pyotr Berngardovich Struve (1870-1944), Mikhail Ivanovich Tugan-Baranovsky (1865-1919), Evgeny Varga (1879-1964), Nikolai Alekseevich Voznesensky (1903-1950), Wladimir Savelievich Woytinsky (1885-1960), Władysław Marian Zawadzki (1885-1939), and Nikolaj Ivanovich Ziber (1844-1885). But none of them is associated with Slovakia.

One may then assume that Slovak economists, being from a European periphery and working for a certain period under authoritarian rule, can probably be found in the dictionaries of dissenting (non-mainstream) economists. But in a representative dictionary of dissenting economists edited by Arestis and Sawyer (1992), we find no Slovak economist. Again, if birthplace counts, then one finds Thomas Balogh (1905-1985), Paul Alexander Baran (1910-1964), Nikolai Ivanovich Bukharin, Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen, Nicholas Káldor, Rosa Luxemburg, Michał Kalecki, and Alec Nove (1915-1994) coming from the region.

Furthermore, Wagener (1998) considers nineteen eminent East European economists who were active after World War II. These were Fritz Behrens (1909-1980) and Gunther Kohlmey (born in 1913) from the former East Germany; Włodzimierz Brus (born in 1921), Michał Kalecki, Oskar Lange, and Edward Lipiński (1888-1986) from Poland; Josef Goldmann (1912-1984), Václav Klaus (born in 1941), Ota Šik (born in 1919), and Miroslav Toms (1944-1988), Czech nationals from the former Czechoslovakia; Aleksander Bajt (born in 1921) and Branko Horvat (born in 1928) from the former Yugoslavia; Leonid Kantorovich, Vasily Nemchinov, Vasily

1 I thank Mikuláš Luptáčik for helpful discussion and László Csaba, Martin Kahanec, and especially Jarko Fidrmuc for extensive comments on the earlier version of this paper.

Novozhilov, and Nikolai Petrakov (born in 1937) from the former Soviet Union; and János Kornai, Gyorgy Péter (1903-1969), and István Varga (1887-1962) from Hungary. Again, none of them is a Slovak national or a foreign national who has lived in Slovakia.

Furthermore, Havel, Klacek, Kosta, and Šulc (1998), who extensively review economic theorizing in the former socialist Czechoslovakia, mention no Slovak economist, nor do they include among their references any articles or books published in the Slovak language or in Bratislava. If my reading of their paper is correct, then the only high-ranking Slovak economists they mention are Eugen Löbl, who was imprisoned in the early 1950s, and Jozef Kučerák, who organized a reading course based on the Samuelson-Nordhaus textbook for young Slovak economists.[1]

In these various prestigious and competent listings, no mention is made of any economist from Slovakia. Thus, as a first approximation, one may say that there seems to be no significant Slovak economist and thus no significant contribution by Slovak nationals to the development of economic theory. This also means no specific Slovak school of economic theory, like those observable in some smaller nations, for example Sweden or the Netherlands.

However, as I show in this text, the state of economic theory in Slovakia can be seen in a more positive way. There have always been able economists in Slovakia; most of the time their analytical and pedagogical abilities made their work a contribution to the understanding of economic matters in Slovakia. And since we do not want to erode our own historical consciousness, the story of the development of this stock of knowledge and opinions deserves to be told.

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Czechoslovakia, as founded in 1918, consisted of two quite different parts: the more developed Czech Lands with an industrial tradition stemming from the 19th century and the less developed, agriculturally oriented Slovakia. During the first twenty years of the Czechoslovak state (1918-1938), the level of development in Slovakia improved, but Slovakia's share in the total industrial production and in the total income of Czechoslovakia increased only slightly. During the socialist period, some basic indicators of output and consumption per capita in Slovakia achieved a level close to the Czech Lands.[2] This economic growth was also reflected in the increased quality of human capital and research.

A Concise Encyclopedia of Slovakia and the Slovaks mentions two important economists active before 1918. One was Michal Baluďanský (1769-1847), the author of eight volumes on national economy, who studied at universities in Vienna and Budapest and in 1804 became a professor in St. Petersburg, where he was a rector of the university in 1819-21. The encyclopedia, titled in Russian *Enciklopeditcheskij Slovar* and published in 1891 in Saint Petersburg, spells his name Michail Andrejevich Balugjanskij and calls him a Carpatho-Russian born in Hungary. The second economist is Kornel Stodola (1866-1946), who was an important businessman, political figure, and prolific writer on economic subjects (see Strhan and Daniel, 1994).

A Representative Biographical Lexicon of Slovakia also mentions two economists active before 1918. These are Gregor František Berzevici (1763-1822) and, again, Kornel Stodola. Berzevici (spelled Berzeviczy Gergely in Hungarian) published one of the first economic studies in the region under the title *De commercio et industria Hungariae* in 1797. His main political economy work was not published until 1902, under the title *Oeconomia Publico Politica*. See Maťovčík (1999: 35-36). Lisý, Petričová, and Čaplánova (1999: 308) also mention Berzeviczy as an important economist in their chapter on the development of economic thinking in Slovakia, and they consider Milan Hodža (1878-1944) the most important representative of Slovak economic thinking in the pre-1918 period. Petričová (1996) reviews those representatives of the Slovak national movement who dealt with economic issues and problems. These include Samuel Tešedík (1742-1820), Jozef Ignác Bajza (1755-1836), Juraj Fándly (1751-1811), Ľudovít Štúr (1815-1856),

B. Vrchovský (1812-1865), Peter Kellner-Hostinský (1823-1853), Samuel Jurkovič (1796-1873), and Daniel Lichard (1818-1882). In addition to other, already mentioned personalities, Lisý (1996) considers Anton Bielek (1857-1911), Peter Kompiš (1859-1929), and Fedor Houdek (1877-1953).

After 1918, when the Czechoslovak Republic was founded, this picture slowly changed. During the first Czechoslovak Republic, Czech national economists achieved greater prominence than the Slovak ones, as the examples of Karel Engliš, Alois Rašín, Albín Bráf, and Josef Macek best document. Czech economists (like Cyril Čechrák, A. Basch) held important teaching positions at Comenius University after its founding in 1919, see Korček (1996: 42).

This period saw the emergence of the first group of Slovak economists who can be considered to represent the beginnings of Slovak economic thinking. They include Imrich Karvaš (1903-1981), Rudolf Briška (1908-1971), Július Pázmán (1907-1982), and Peter Zaťko (1903-1978). Some of these economists played a controversial role during the period of 1939-1945. Before the country's breakup in the Second World War, some other economists had emigrated from Slovakia, and at least one of them, Ervin Hexner, had achieved a prominent position in the USA.

Pure and applied economic theory went through impressive developments after the Second World War. But to a large extent, the communist revolution isolated the community of Czech-Slovak economists from these trends. Economists reacted in different ways to this "exogenous shock". Some economists left the country (Macek), some did not return (Hexner), some did not continue to publish (Engliš, Karvaš), but most of the younger generation of economists accepted the requirements of the new era. There was also an emigration of economists after 1948 and after 1968, of whom Gregor Lazarčik and Mikuláš Luptáčik were probably the most eminent.

There were a large number of talented economists in Slovakia during the socialist period (1948-1989). They were mostly professors at the High School of Economics (Vysoká Škola Ekonomická), after 1989 renamed the University of Economics (Ekonomická Univerzita) in Bratislava, and at other schools and research institutions, and/or they worked as advisors to government. Some of them were reformists, some followed strictly the Communist Party line, and some of them were pure scholars. Clearly, the group that consisted of reformers, counter-reformers, and policy-makers was much larger than the group of pure scholars. Most of them were well read and very interested in their work. They contributed to the increasing understanding of economic matters in Slovakia, but they also put economic theory on an unproductive path. Under socialism there were clearly institutions that provided disincentives to originality or simply to productive research activity. Socialist institutions provided few incentives or rewards for increasing the stock of knowledge about Slovak or more general economic matters.

Most of the professional discussion in Slovakia in the period 1948-1989 was conducted in the jargon of Marxist social theory. This was the tribal language or a veil under which from time to time interesting intellectual contributions were made. I am aware that, from the position of general economic theory, most of the contributions made under socialism in all socialist countries were minor, and this is also the case in Slovakia. As Wagener (1998: 24) writes, "looked at from the point of view of the universal history of economic theory, economics under communism has not produced any spectacular new insights, theorems, laws or controversies which have to be memorized by all students of economics like, for example, the Cambridge controversy, Say's law, the Coase theorem or the Heckscher-Ohlin theory." This statement seems to hold also for contributions concerning socialist theory or radical political economy.

I divide these discussions and contributions into two principal streams. The first current of discussions deals with the relationship between the (central) plan and the market, which in the Slovak context to a large extent is discussion on the specifics of Slovakia in the Czechoslovak economy. The second current is represented in the literature, which maintained contact with modern economic theory, especially in the subfields of econometrics and operation research.

The first current is the discussion about the relationship between the plan and the market. As in any socialist country, this discussion reflected policy and political views inside the Communist Party as well as in the economic community. In Czechoslovakia, these discussions were concentrated in Prague, in the 1960s as well as later in the 1980s. Discussing the reform debate of the 1960s, Adam (1993) divides the participating economists into four groups according to their views on the relationship between the plan and the market. He reviews the views of Czech economists from Jaroslav Vejvoda through Ota Šik and Karel Kouba to Oldřich Kýn, i.e., from the most orthodox conservative to radical liberal, in the jargon of the 1960s. Concerning the Slovak discussion, he writes: "Marketisation of the economy had more enthusiastic adherents in the Czech lands than in Slovakia. In the latter, there was some concern that the market might hamper further equating of the economic level in Slovakia with that in the Czech lands. In their outline of the further development of the reform, Slovak economists maintained that 'economic evening out in Slovakia will be more complicated in a management model based on market relations', and therefore suggested a series of measures to ensure further equalization." (Náčrt ďalšieho, 1969: 52). One can accept the view that the Slovak economists were rather passive in the direct discussion about the relationship between the plan and the market. Rather, in the Slovak economic discussion, the issue of misallocation of resources under central planning appeared in the context of the centralized decision-making process, which – the argument ran – hurt Slovak economic interests. In this spirit, a series of papers appeared that dealt in a self-constrained way with the issue of the Slovak economy's specific position in Czechoslovakia. Authors of such papers included Turčan (1955), Kočtúch (1964), Pavlenda (1965), Džuban, Kočtúch, and Pračko (1966), Pračko (1968), Briatka (1969), Lipták (1969), and Bálek (1982).

The second current in Slovak economic thinking maintained contact with the advancements of economic theory in the Western countries. Here, considerable advancement was achieved in econometrics, operation research, and the mathematical foundations of modern economic theory. One example is an official university textbook on dynamic modeling edited by Adam Laščiak (1985); the co-authors include Miroslav Maňas, Jaroslav Samek, Josef Lauber, Juraj Trnovský, and Miroslav Hysko. This book contains a sophisticated treatment of mathematics for graduate macroeconomics and optimization, as well as a review of various macroeconomic and sectoral models used in the Czechoslovak Republic during the socialist period. There is also a textbook in a similar spirit on optimal programming, also edited by Laščiak (1983); the co-authors include Jozef Sojka, Ladislav Unčovský, Ján Šimkovic, Roman Hušek, Miroslav Maňas, Michal Chobot, Eduard Hozlár, and Vladimír Ulašin; and the book includes monographs by Jozef Sojka (1970) and Ladislav Unčovský (1985). However, the impact of these books on the general public and on policy-making was minor.

This second current also includes the work of Štefan Heretik, Ľudovít Korček, Ján Iša, Drahomír Šíbl, Monika Šestáková, and others who were involved in one way or another in what was called the "critique of bourgeois economic theory". To some extent, this "critique" played a positive role in transporting the work of Western economists to Slovakia; Heretik (1988) is a good example of this work. However, the university curriculum did little to present major contemporary Western economic thought. It was taught superficially and thus did not help to raise the level of the young generation of economists who studied Western economic thinking under the pretext of its critique.

Economic research lacked empirical orientation. This tendency remains in Slovak economic theory making, even after the breakup of the socialist regime. One of the reasons may be that the communist regime did not particularly encourage searching for facts; but also, the Slovak economy was a part of the larger Czechoslovak economy, and some data were simply not available on the level of individual republics. This low level of empirically oriented research also meant that economic policy decisions were made in a vacuum.

Noteworthy translations were made of Smith, Ricardo, Weber, and Schumpeter. However, to my knowledge, no basic or intermediate undergraduate Western textbooks were translated into the Slovak language during the socialist period. There was also no translation of economists active after the Second World War.

Economists in Slovakia were typically not dissidents during the socialist period. Even in the Czech Lands, most dissidents emerged from non-economist circles. Unlike in Prague, economists in Slovakia did not form discussion clubs around leading personalities. In an interview, Mikloš gave a good description of this situation: "In the Czech Republic there was a strong group of economists around (future Czech Prime Minister Václav) Klaus, (Tomáš) Ježek, and others, who held meetings and taught themselves; … Slovakia, on the other hand, lacked that kind of community, and the general level of economic sciences was considerably lower." (2001: 4) Some Slovak economists – those who lived in Prague during the 1980s – participated in these Prague discussion circles.[3]

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

As in the socialist period, also after the fall of the socialist regime more economists were politically oriented than preferred to be independent, pure scholars. We see rarely whole careers devoted wholly to science, and also we rarely see independent views in policy discussions. There is a general absence of pure theoretical interest. Large numbers of economists devote a substantial share of their career to political obligations, for example Rudolf Filkus, František Hajnovič, Pavel Hoffman, Hvezdoň Kočtúch, Jozef Kučerák, Jozef Markuš, Ivan Mikloš, and Brigita Schmögnerová.

The change of elites

Slovak economic theory making is characterized principally by discontinuity.[4] To the extent that an academic discipline develops in the cooperation between older and younger generations, in the Slovak context this development has been principally interrupted. A generation of economists who matured before socialism may have provided the first pillars of high-standard economic education and economic theory making, but this group of economists did not continue their academic careers after the socialist revolution. The generation of economists who matured during the socialist period did not create a Slovak economic school and some (most) of their intellectual endeavor lost its value at the beginning of the 1990s after the collapse of socialist order. Thus, we witness a peculiar situation: in the 1950s and to some extent also in the early 1970s and early 1990s, a young generation of economists rose to high government and academic position because their older competitors had been compromised by the previous regime.

There has been some change in the economists in the government elite, but much less in the academic environment. One cannot create a new generation of academic economists in a short period of time. Some full and associate professors appointed under the socialist period still prefer "a peaceful life". That is probably quite natural; the problem is rather that this is institutionally possible. At the end of this paper, we present lists of publications in internationally refereed journals. Judging by this standard, Slovak economists who work abroad are under more pressure to publish.

The issue of the change of elite touches on a specific Slovak matter, i.e., the longstanding interest of Slovak economics and ideological circles in the question of ownership. In mainstream economic theory, ownership is not a crucial issue. To a certain extent, it does not matter who owns the capital; what matters is the market structure, incentives, institutions, policies, etc. After 1918, when Czechoslovakia was founded, the weaker position of Vienna and Budapest influenced ownership structures in what had become Czechoslovakia. Slovakia's backwardness was clearly felt also in the ownership structure.[5] Creating a Slovak bourgeois class was an issue especially after 1992. Attempts to privatize under Mečiar's government may have intended to keep the proportion of foreign ownership low and create a Slovak national bourgeoisie close to the representatives of the political elite. As a result of these efforts under the Mečiar government, there was a substantial increase in the interconnection of political and economic power, in non-transparent privatization contracts designed to strip enterprises of assets, and in cronyism. Consequently, in the period after Mečiar, this naïve aim was abandoned, and privatization proceeded along more conventional lines.

New institutional structures[6]

Universities and colleges

Undergraduate programs in economics typically cover ten semesters at colleges and universities. The educational program usually starts with a bachelor's program lasting six semesters, followed by a four-semester master's program. The graduates of the master's program earn an academic degree, either "engineer" or "magister". These degrees allow the graduates to continue in a doctoral program. The level of graduate education in economics in Slovakia is still relatively low. Most talented students leave Slovakia and prefer to study in foreign countries, especially in Prague (CERGE-EI), Budapest (CEU), and then in various institutions worldwide. Basically, there is no thorough graduate training in economics in Slovakia. One attempt – and only on the master's level – was the Professional Program in Applied Economics (PPAE) at the Academia Istropolitana and, after the government closed that, at the Academia Istropolitana Nova. But, for financial reasons, this program will probably suspend its activities.

The University of Economics[7] in Bratislava is the major institution of undergraduate education in economics and business administration. The university staff includes more than one thousand employees (approximately half of them members of faculty) and around nine thousand students in the three-year bachelor's programs and two-year master's programs. The University of Economics in Bratislava consists of six colleges: the College of National Economy; the College of Economic Informatics; the College of Commerce; the College of Business Management; the College of Business Management located in Kosice, and the newly established College of International Relations.

Fidrmuc (1998) argues that, at the University of Economics, the level of education is quite low in the area of economic theory. Following the reforms in 1989, the relatively extensive education in Marxist political economic theory and related topics was cut off. Teaching in microeconomics is approximating Western standards much faster than in macroeconomics. To a large extent, young faculty members have to take additional jobs to have the standard of living they expect and, as a consequence, are less interested in research.

The University of Economics plays an important role as a business school and partially also as a center for training economists. Although standards are definitely improving compared to the socialist period, one is still surprised by the inflated number of professors and associated professors, some of whom were never particularly exposed to competitive pressures.[8] The drive for excellence seems missing and does not seem to be institutionally supported.

A more elite economics education is provided at Comenius University in Bratislava. The Faculty of Mathematics and Physics initiated an undergraduate program of economics and financial mathematics, while the education of business administration started in 1991 at the newly created Faculty of Management. In 1993, the Institute of Applied Mathematics of the College of Mathematics and Physics, Comenius University started a master's program in Economics and Financial Mathematics. The first graduates finished their studies in 1999. In an effort to improve the quality of its lecturers, Comenius University started cooperation with the Pittsburgh University in 1997. As an element of this cooperation, the University of Pittsburgh invited lecturers of the Institute of Applied Mathematics to participate in the first four semesters of the PhD program in Pittsburgh, majoring in economics and finance. Some of them decided to graduate in a master's program in economics at Pittsburgh University, and later some obtained a doctoral degree at Pittsburgh University.

Several other universities provide economics education. These include the Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, the Agricultural University in Nitra, the University of Trenčín, the

University of Žilina, the Faculty of Business Management of the Bratislava University of Economics in Košice, and the Technical University in Košice. Many of these faculties were not created or expanded until the 1990s. According to Fidrmuc (1998), these colleges admitted about a third of all new students of economic sciences in Slovakia for the academic year 1998/1999.

Research institutes

The Institute of Slovak and World Economics is a successor to the Institute of Legal and Economic Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, which was founded in 1949. In 1956, this institute was reorganized in several steps as the Institute of Economics of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. In 1991, subsidies from the state budget were drastically reduced, which led the Institute to shift its orientation more toward applied research. In the first years of the economic reforms, a relatively high number of researchers decided to leave, either for the banking sector or to start a political career. This Institute consists of the following departments: Macroeconomics Theory and Regulation; Microeconomics Theory and the Business Sector; World Economics; and the Department of Economic-Mathematical Analysis. Pure and applied research is financed mainly through projects from the Scientific Grant Agency of Slovakia through government projects, PHARE projects, and Unido projects. The Institute publishes the monthly journal *Ekonomický Časopis* and also provides graduate education in economics in the framework of the Slovak Academy of Sciences.

Another institute conducting economic research is the Institute for Forecasting of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. Its major predilections since 1990 are similar to those in the Institute of Slovak and World Economics.

The Institute of Informatics and Statistics (Infostat) specializes in econometric and statistical analyses and forecasts of macroeconomic tendencies. Infostat was established by an agreement between Czechoslovakia and the development program of the United Nations. Infostat is a subordinate agency of the Slovak Statistical Office and employs approximately 140 researchers and administrative staff. The short-term forecast for the Slovak economy is the widely known product of this institute. These forecasts are based on an econometric model of the Slovak economy developed by Ján Haluška and Michal Olexa.

A number of nongovernmental institutions – think tanks that observe and analyze economic, political, and social development – were established in Slovakia in the 1990s. These groups have intense contacts with foreign research institutes and universities. A group of economists and social scientists with liberal values established the Center for Economic and Social Analysis, better known as M.E.S.A.10. Many of its members served in key positions in the executive and legislative bodies in the first years of economic reforms, and some are in such positions in the current government. M.E.S.A.10 issues monthly reports on the development of the Slovak economy. The research studies of M.E.S.A.10 are widely used by various international and domestic observers.

The Center for Economic Development, founded in 1993, is a nonprofit and nongovernmental organization. It provides alternative independent monthly analyses of the Slovak economy.

Academia Istropolitana in Bratislava was originally intended to be a university-type institution. Since this concept encountered some legal barriers, a group of scholars tried to create an elite graduate training school. Finally, Academia Istropolitana was founded through intergovernmental agreements with support from various governments and foundations and was partially financed by the state budget. In 1994, Academia Istropolitana started the Professional Program in Applied Economics. The problems of the legal status of Academia Istropolitana increased, which led some scholars (among others, Alena Brunovská, Kevin Sontheimer, and Andreas Wörgötter) to found Academia Istropolitana Nova as an independent graduate institution in October 1996. The Professional Program in Applied Economics (PPAE) was organized in cooperation with the University of Technology in Vienna (Bernhard Böhm) and the University of Pittsburgh (Kevin Sontheimer). The generous grant from the Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs helped finance this program. PPAE had students from more than ten countries, and some of them continue currently in doctoral programs in Tilburg, Louisiana, Calgary, and Pittsburgh. Its lecturers included economists from the Technical University of Vienna, Central European University in Budapest, Charles University in Prague, Comenius University in Bratislava, the University of Bonn, the University of Pittsburgh, and the Slovak Academy of Sciences.

Rehabilitation, repatriation, new departures

Some Slovak economists who were active during the 1918-1945 period have been rehabilitated, for example at the University of Economics. Professors who were persecuted after 1948 and after 1968 were also rehabilitated.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

In economic theory, the return to pre-war traditions is a difficult issue. Modern economics is much different from the economics of the 1920s or 1930s, so not much of pre-war traditions could be revived. On the other hand, modern Slovak economic thinking, like some Slovak economists in the 1920-1930s, concentrates on the problem of the small open economy with its own peculiar characteristics, and in this sense there is some continuity with pre-war traditions.

There are some new East-West asymmetries; for example, research in pure theory of economics is not typically done in Slovakia. But there are exceptions, especially among the mathematically oriented economists, as Horniaček (1996) documents. Toward the end of the 1990s, there was a move toward a more empirical research, especially in issues of economic policy-making. An excellent example is Marčincin and Beblavý (2000); co-authors include Martin Barto, Miroslav Beblavý, Lucia Haulíková, Marek Jakoby, Tomáš Kmet, Martina Lubyová, Anton Marčincin, Karol Morvay, Andrej Salner, Ján Tóth, and Daniela Zemanovičová. There is also an increasing trend to look beyond the official statistical data, and researchers are scrutinizing government statistical data. There is definitely a beneficial trend to use the terminology of modern economic theory. As in most other transition economies, the style of discussion has greatly converged with the Western style.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Some crucial questions for the future development of economic theory in Slovakia require deeper analysis. This analysis should include the issue of the costs of research and the connection between the quality of the output and its costs. It also should include a decision about the priorities of research and about developing appropriate procedures to evaluate departments at universities and research institutes. Probably some commission of international experts should be asked to evaluate the level of the Slovak economic research, as was done for example in Sweden (see Engwall, 1992).

Private capital contributes almost nothing to financing economic education in Slovakia. Tax legislation is not encouraging the private funding of education. Foreign donors play a much more important part in transferring funds to economic education. Foreign donors also support some of the elite research institutions. Some research is carried out in the framework of projects supported and funded by the European Commission.

After the division of Czechoslovakia, the share of state support for universities declined. Fidrmuc (1998:4) writes, "Many interview partners complained about the financial situation of the universities. For example, the Faculty of Management of the Comenius University writes: 'Budgets can cover neither the basic needs of the universities nor the realization of developing programs. .... Inefficient supporting of the universities from the budget negatively influences educational process as well as research and development'".

Salaries at universities are lower than salaries for comparable positions in the private sector, banking, and a significant part of the state and municipal administration. This is especially true for assistant professor positions. University graduates are therefore typically not interested in staying or in studying in doctoral programs. Many faculty members have two or three jobs. This significantly restricts the possibilities for academic research and for closer supervision of students.

5. Public space and academic debates

There were two principal discussions in the Slovak economics community during the 1990s. First, there was a discussion about the character of the transition process: gradualism versus shock therapy and the issue of Slovak specifics in the former Czechoslovak Republic. Second, since Slovakia gained its independence, discussion has continued on the character of further development and the proper macroeconomic policy.

In Czechoslovakia after the breakup of the socialist system, the view of the Czech liberals (Klaus, Ježek, Zelienec, and others) came to predominate. This school won the discussion and the political competition against its main opponents: the 1968 reformers, those who put more emphasis on structural and sectoral policies, and those economists who emphasized Slovak specifics.

Criticism of the liberal views was fierce. Interestingly, however, the discussion never went into the details of liberalization policy, but focused instead on the consequences of liberal policies as well as on the general economic orientation of Slovakia within the Czechoslovak Republic and later on the orientation of the independent Slovak Republic. There was no competition with liberal views in the early 1990s, since no group of economists in Slovakia had any prepared scheme of transformation. On the other hand, since the transformation hit certain Slovak regions and industries heavily, the anti-liberal forces – quite rightly – began to pinpoint the consequences of the transformation. But their critique was not coherent, since it is not clear today nor was it clear in any period of the 1990s what option Slovakia had except to introduce the liberal reforms of the early 1990s.

In the post-socialist period, I identify in Slovakia two major lines of economic thinking, which run parallel to political divisions in the country. The first group emphasizes some specific Slovak way of doing economics, in contrast to the federal liberal reforms introduced in Czechoslovakia. While neither group is homogenous, the first group consists of economists like Hvezdoň Kočtúch, Mikuláš Sedlák, Jozef Košnár, Rudolf Filkus, Adam Laščiak, Jaroslav Husár, Jozef Markuš, and Viktor Pavlenda. This group of economists has been more or less opposed to the liberal reforms of 1989-1992. They have advocated more gradual and more socially balanced reforms that would take into consideration the specifics of Slovak economic reality.[9] The thing they have in common is their preoccupation with the lamentable state of Slovak society and economy – as they see it – in the transition process.

Slovakia has not typically been regarded as the cradle or home of liberal political and economic ideas.[10] Under such conditions, the concept of the liberal market economy could hardly be expected to flourish. Nevertheless, after the fall of socialism, a group of Slovak economists with an approximation of neo-liberal views emerged.[11] This group endorsed the shock therapy coming from Prague. It consists largely of economists who work for think tanks and analysts of financial corporations, as well as some academics. The most famous representatives are probably the leading Slovak economic policy-makers Ivan Mikloš, Jozef Kučerák, and a more centrist policy-maker, Brigita Schmögnerová. One should probably also include in this group younger economists like Anton Marčincin, Miroslav Beblavý, Ján Tóth, and Ján Oravec.

Principal academic journals

There are few economic journals in Slovakia. *Ekonomický Časopis* is published monthly by the Institute of Slovak and World Economics of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. The journal has an anonymous reviewing procedure. The University of Economics publishes an economic review, *Ekonomické Rozhľady*. In cooperation with partner organizations of other Central European countries, the Slovak Society for Operations Research edits a quarterly *Central European Journal for Operations Research*. The Slovak Central Bank publishes a review, *Biatec*.

Selection of publications in world languages

A natural way of comparing the publications of Slovak nationals with their international peers is to consider publications in Econlit. Slovak nationals who live and work abroad or who at least obtained their PhD abroad head the list. At the end of this text, we provide a (hopefully) complete list of these economists and the titles of their publications. Ján Fidrmuc from Trinity College Dublin, Jarko Fidrmuc from the Austrian Central Bank, Vienna, Július Horváth from Central European University Budapest, Martina Lubyová from the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Mikuláš Luptáčik from the University of Economics Vienna, and Luboš Pástor from the University of Chicago are Slovak nationals who published extensively in high-ranking internationally peer-reviewed journals. Of these authors, Luboš Pástor seems to be gaining the most international recognition.

The problem of the "brain-drain"

This is quite a serious problem, especially for the young generation of economists. The situation is similar among the promising young faculty, which aspires to an international career. A large number of Slovak undergraduate students of economics study at Charles University in Prague and also at some other Czech universities.[12] However, I do not have precise data on the extent of this exodus to Prague.

Conclusion

In this short essay, I describe the development of Slovak economic thought. This is an introductory work and requires further analysis. The main point of this short essay is to show the international community that there is a developing and rather interesting life in the economics community in Slovakia.

---

1 Jiřì Havel told the author of this essay that originally this issue was to be addressed in the appendix; but for technical reasons this idea never materialized.

2 For an empirical discussion of convergence between the Czech Lands and Slovakia, see Křovák and Zamrazilová (1992), Estrin and Urga (1997), and Fidrmuc, Horváth, Fidrmuc (1999).

3 These included the author of this essay and some other Slovak economists who did not continue an academic career in the 1990s. See for example Horváth (1985), Horváth and Ježek (1987).

4 Havel (1992) makes a similar note about the development of Czech economic theory.

5 Prucha (1995, 43-44) contains an interesting treatment of this issue.

6 In this section, I draw heavily on Fidrmuc (1998).

7 On November 4, 1940, the High Business School in Bratislava (Vysoká obchodná škola v Bratislave) was founded as a private institution. Among the founding fathers of the school were Jur Hronec, Július Pázmán, Jozef Fundárek, Imrich Karvaš, Rudolf Briška, Vladimír Králiček, and Ján Hromádka (see Ekonóm, The Information Bulletin of the University of Economics, January 2001: 27).

8 In this context, Cassel's 1941 dictum is still valid: "In my opinion, the important task was to train not many economists, but economists of high class who could advance the science of economics and improve its position in our country. Under these circumstances, it was no easy task for a professor to judge which students he should admit into the field. He has an enormous responsibility both towards society and towards the individual student" (Jonung, 1992: 37).

9 See Čapek (1993) for a critical point in this context.

10 "According to the liberal view, land can be sold freely in international trade. But that is true only if both parties to this trade are equal. If, however, one is weaker and the other is stronger, then this liberal rule would lead us directly into disaster. We in Hungary – namely our peasants – were exposed for almost half a century to economic competition in which the state worked against us with the landlords and with speculative traders. That is the reason why liberalism is not close to our hearts and hurts us especially in business matters." Milan Hodža in Slovenský Týždenník, September 12, 1903; quotation from Lisý et al. (1999: 315), translated by the author.

11 Mikloš (2001: 18-20) says in an interview: "The essence of Czechoslovakia's reform program was drawn up by a group of Czech economists. This was a terrific piece of luck for Slovakia, because at that time Slovakia had no economists who were up to the task. It's my belief that had Slovakia been left a decade ago to launch economic reforms with Slovak economists alone, it would have staggered, the same way Bulgaria or Romania did. We would have done nothing, or taken only insufficient measures." Also, when asked in the same interview how many top Slovak economists endorsed shock therapy, Mikloš answered the following: "… Most of the people who endorsed it were grouped around Jozef Kučerák, who was then Slovak Deputy Premier for Economics."

12 I thank Jarko Fidrmuc for raising this point.

References

Adam, Jan (1989): *Economic Reforms in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe since the 1960s*, MacMillan;

Adam, Jan (1993): *Planning and Market in Soviet and East European Thought, 1960s-1992*, St. Martin's Press;

Arestis, Philip and Sawyer, Malcolm (ed.) (1992): *A Biographical Dictionary of Dissenting Economists*, Edward Elgar;

Bálek, Alexej (1982): "Regionální aspekty vývoje efektivnosti čs. ekonomiky" (Regional Aspects of the Development of Efficiency in the Czechoslovak Economy), in: *Politická ekonomie*, 30, 811-826;

Blaug, Mark (1985): *Great Economists since Keynes*, Cambridge University Press;

Blaug, Mark (1986): *Great Economists before Keynes*, Wheatsheaf Books;

Briatka, Pavel (1969): "Slovensko a zahraničný obchod ČSSR" (Slovakia and the Foreign Trade of Czechoslovakia), in: *Zahraniční obchod*, 11, 41-50;

Cambel, Samuel (2000): "Podiel slovenskej národnej banky na hospodárskych prípravách SNP" (The Share of the Slovak Central Bank in Preparing the Slovak National Uprising), in: *Biatec Banking Journal*, No. 8;

Cambel, Samuel (2001): *Štátnik a národohospodár - Milan Hodža, 1878-1944* (Statesman and Economist - Milan Hodža, 1878-1944), Veda;

Čapek, Aleš (1992): "Tzv. specifika Slovenské ekonomiky" (So-Called Specifics of the Slovak Economy), in: *Politická ekonomie*, 2, 213-222;

Dančo, J. (1996): "Tretia, vlastná, alebo aká cesta transformácie hospodárstva Slovenska?" (Third Independent or Other Ways of Transformation of the Economy of Slovakia), in: *Zbornik 1995-1996 diskusneho klubu*, M.E.S.A., 10;

Dědek, Oldřich et al. (1996): *The Break-up of Czechoslovakia: An In-depth Economic Analysis*, Prague, Institute of Economics of the Czech National Bank, Aldershot, Avebury;

Džuban, Anton, Hvezdoň, Kočtúch and Pračko, Eduard (1966): "Národný dôchodok Slovenska" (National Income of Slovakia), in: *Ekonomický časopis*, 8, XIV, 719-740;

Eatwell, John, Milgate, Murray and Newman, Peter (1991): *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, 1987, reprinted with corrections;

Engwall, Lars (ed.) (1992): *Economics in Sweden. An Evaluation of Swedish Research in Economics*, Routledge;

Eichler, Gabriel (1993): "Ako by sa stredná Europa mohla stať tigrom?" (How Could Central Europe be a Tiger Economy?), in: *Trend*, 6 January;

Estrin, Saul and Urga, Giovanni (1997): "Convergence in Output in Transition Economies: Central and Eastern Europe, 1970-95", in: *Center for Economic and Policy Research*, Discussion Paper No. 1616;

Ferianc, Ján (1994): "Postavenie Slovenska v transformačnom procese" (The Place of Slovakia in the Transition Process), in: *Hospodárske Noviny*, 1 December;

Fidrmuc, Ján, Horváth, Július and Fidrmuc, Jarko (1999): "Stability of Monetary Unions: Lessons from the Break-up of Czechoslovakia", in: *Journal of Comparative Economics*, Vol. 27, No. 4, 53-81;

Fidrmuc, Jarko (1998): *Economic Education and Research Capacity Building in Slovakia*, mimeo, Vienna, Institute of Advanced Studies;

Fidrmuc, Jarko et al. (1994): *The Slovak Republic: After One Year of Independence*, Vienna, Bank Austria;

Filkus, Rudolf (1992): "Centrum nie je iba štát" (The Center is not only the State), in: *Hospodárske noviny*, No. 154, 10 August;

Gonda, Vladimír (1995): *Monetárna teória* (Monetary Theory), Bratislava;

Haluška, Ján and Olexa, Michal (1999): "Makroekonomicka analýza vývoja slovenskej ekonomiky v rokoch 1993-1998" (Macroeconomic Analysis of the Development of the Slovak Economy in the Period of 1993-1998), in: *Trend*, 20, 5;

Havel, Jiří, Klacek, Jan, Kosta, Jiří and Šulc, Zdislav (1998): "Economics and System Change in Czechoslovakia, 1945-92, in: *Economic Thought in Communist and Post-Communist Europe*, Wagener, Hans-Jürgen (ed.), 213-263;

Havel, Jiří (1992): "Discontinuity of Czech Economic Thought", in: *Prague Economic Papers*, 4;

Heretik, Štefan (1988): *Náčrt dejín politickej ekonómie (do sedemdesiatych rokov 19. storočia)* (The Outline of the History of Political Economy to the 1870s), Bratislava, Pravda;

Heretik, Štefan (1948): "Podiel Slovenska na národnom dôchodku ČSR" (Slovakia's Share in the National Income in Czechoslovakia), in: *Sociální revue*, No. 3, 95-97;

Hoffman, Pavel (1991): "Manévrovaci priestor reformy" (Room to Manouver in the Reform Process), in: *Hospodárske Noviny*, 16 April;

Hontyová, Kajetana, Sivák, Rudolf, Lisý, Ján and Gonda, Vladimír (1996): *Vývoj ekonomického myslenia na Slovensku* (The Development of Economic Thinking in Slovakia), Bratislava, Ekonomická univerzita;

Horváth, Július (1985): "Rozhodovanie o zahájeni investičnej vystavbŷ" (The Investment Decision Process), in: *ČSVTS-ŠBČS*, VI, 2;

Horváth, Július and Ježek, Tomáš (1987): "Parciálny človek a komplexný svet" (The Partial Human Being and the Complex World), in: *Prognostika, Studijni texty a aktualní informace pro potřeby odborné sekce prognostiky*, MV Komitetu pro vědecke řízení, Praha 1, ČSVTS;

Husár, Jaroslav (1998): "Päť rokov Slovenskej republiky" (Five Years of the Slovak Republic), in: *Nezávislé Združenie Ekonómov Slovenska*, Bratislava, Kartprint;

Húska, Augustin Marian (1991): "Integracia a národné ekonomiky" (Integration and National Economies), in: *Hospodárske Noviny*, 27 March;

Iša, Ján (1985): *Koniec "keynesovskej revolúcie"* (The End of the "Keynesian Revolution"), Bratislava, Pravda;

Iša, Ján (1996): "Dejiny ekonomického myslenia ako inšpiračný zdroj rozvoja ekonomickej teórie (The History of Economic Thinking as Inspirational Source of the Development of Economic Theory), in: *Vývoj ekonomického myslenia na Slovensku* (1996), Hontyová, Kajetana (ed.) et al., 191-200;

Jonung, Lars (1992), assisted by Gunnarsson, Elving: "Economics the Swedish Way, 1889-1989", in: *Economics in Sweden*, Engwall, Lars (ed.), 19-48;

Karasz, Pavol and Renčko, Juraj (1998): "Základné makroekonomické proporcie vývoja ekonomiky Slovenska v roku 1998 z pohľadu podnikov" (Basic Macroeconomic Proportions in the Development of the Economy of Slovakia from the Point of View of Companies in 1998), in: *Slovenská obchodná a priemyselná komora*, February;

Karasz, Pavol, Renčko, Juraj, Pauhofová, Iveta and Bauerová, Edita (1994): "Ekonomika Slovenska v roku 1994" (The Economy of Slovakia in the Year 1994), in: *Hospodárske Noviny*, 22, 2 February;

Karasz, Pavol and Renčko, Juraj (1999): "Základne makroekonomické proporcie vývoja ekonomiky Slovenska v roku 1999 z pohladu podnikov" (Basic Macroeconomic Proportions in the Development of the Economy of Slovakia from the Point of View of Companies in 1999), in: *Slovenská obchodná a priemyselná komora*, Bratislava;

Karvaš, Milan (2001): *Môj otec Imrich Karvaš. Život a dielo národohospodára, ktorý dosiahol na vrchol i celkom na dno* (My Father Imrich Karvaš. Life and Work of an Economist), Vydavateľstvo Rak;

Kočtúch, Hvezdoň (1964): "K otázkam ekonomického vyrovnávania Slovenska na úroveň českých krajín" (On the Question of Slovakia's Economic Convergence to the Level of the Czech Lands), in: *Plánované Hospodárství*, 8, 1-21;

Korček, Ľudovít (1992): *Vývin ekonomického myslenia. Stručný prehľad* (Development of Economic Thinking. A Concise Overview), Bratislava, Esprima;

Korček, Ľudovít (1996): "Ekonomické myslenie na Slovensku. Úvaha nad teoretickým odkazom Prof. Karvaša a Prof. Brišku" (Economic Thinking in Slovakia. On the Theoretic Message of Professors Karvaš and Briška), in: *Vývoj ekonomického myslenia na Slovensku*, Hontyová, Kajetana (ed.) et al., 41-66;

Kosta, Jiří (1991): "O pracích českých a slovenských ekonomu v exilu: 1948-1990" (Czech and Slovak Economists in Exile: 1948-1990), in: *Politická Ekonomie*, 9-10;

Košnár, Jozef (1994): "Stav slovenskej ekonomiky" (The Situation of the Slovak Economy), in: *Hospodárske Noviny*, 25 March;

Kozlík, Sergej (1992): "Naše hospodárstvo potrebuje nové implulzy" (Our Economy Needs New Impulses), in: *Trend*, 23, 3 June;

Křovák, Jiří and Zamrazilová, Eva (1990): "Analýza přesunu národního důchodu mezi republikami (Analysis of the National Income Transfers between Republics), in: *Politická ekonomie*, 963-970;

Kučerák, Jozef (1991), "Čo ohrozuje ekonomickú reformu?" (What is Endangering the Economic Reform?), in: *Hospodárske Noviny*, 46, 6 March;

Laščiak, Adam et al. (1985): *Dynamické Modely* (Dynamic Modeling), joint publication of Alfa Publishing House, Bratislava and SNTL, Prague;

Laščiak, Adam and Sojka, Jozef (1993): "Model transformacie ekonomiky Slovenska" (A Model of the Transformation of the Slovak Economy), in: *Hospodárske Noviny*, 135, 14 July;

Laščiak, Adam and Chajdiak, Jozef (1999): *Pohľady na ekonomiku Slovenska* (Views on the Slovak Economy), Bratislava, Statis;

Lipták, Július (1969): "Miesto Slovenska v zahranično-obchodných vzťahoch ČSSR" (Slovakia in the Foreign Trade Relations of Czechoslovakia), in: *Zahraniční obchod*, 8, 41-53;

Lisý, Ján (1996): "Ekonomické myslenie na Slovensku v poslednej tretine 19. storočia a začiatkom 20. storočia" (Economic Thinking in Slovakia in the Last Third of the Nineteenth Century and at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century), in: *Vývoj ekonomického myslenia na Slovensku* (1996), Hontyová, Kajetana (ed.) et al., 25-40;

Lisý, Ján et al. (1999): *Dejiny ekonomických teórií* (The History of Economic Theories), Elita;

Marčincin, Anton and Beblavý, Miroslav (ed). (2000): *Economic Policy in Slovakia 1990-1999*, Bratislava, Ineko;

Maťovčík, Augustín et al. (1999): *Reprezentačný biografický lexikón Slovenska* (Representative Biographical Lexicon of Slovakia), Matica Slovenská;

Mikelka, Eduard (2000): *Foreign Direct Investments in the CEEC Countries and their Influence on Industrial Restructuring, Especially in the Case of the Slovak Republic*, Bratislava, Institute of Slovak and World Economics, Slovak Academy of Sciences;

Mikloš, Ivan (1993): "Aký kapitalizmus na Slovensku" (What Type of Capitalism in Slovakia?), in: *Domino Efekt*, 20, 21 May;

Mikloš, Ivan (2001): *Rewriting the Rules. An Interview on Slovakia's Economic Reform*. Interview conducted by Hríb, Štefan and Žitňanský, Robert, Kalligram;

Musil, Jiří (ed.) (1995): *The End of Czechoslovakia*, Central European University Press;

"Náčrt ďalšieho postupu ekonomickej reformy" (Outline of the Further Development of Economic Reform) (1969), in: *Ekonomický Časopis*, 3;

Nemec, Jaroslav and Prachár, Ivan (2000): "Hlavné makroekonomické tendencie v Slovenskej republicke po roku 1989 a ich vplyv na očakávaný vývoj" (The Main Macroeeonomic Tendencies in the Slovak Republic after 1989 and Their Impact on Expected Development), in: *Ekonomický Časopis*, 48, 1, 20-45;

Nemec, Jaroslav (1995): "Vplyv privatizacie na ekonomiku Slovenskej republiky" (The Impact of Privatization on the Economy of the Slovak Republic), in: *Ekonomický Časopis*, 43, 2, 82-99;

Okáli, Ivan, Gabrielová, Herta, Hlavatý, Egon, Morvay, Karol and Outrata, Richard (2000): *Country Report – Development of Slovakia in 1999,* Bratislava, Institute of Slovak and World Economics, Slovak Academy of Sciences;

Olšovský, Rudolf (1958): "K 40. výročí rozpadu Rakouska-Uherska" (On the Occasion of the 40th Anniversary of the Breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire), in: *Politická ekonomie*, 789-796;

Oravec, Jan (1991): "Slovensko a jeho osamostatnenie" (Slovakia and Its Independence), in: *Ekonóm*, 50;

Pavlenda, Viktor (1965): "Meranie ekonomického vyrovnávania Slovenska" (Measurement of the Economic Convergence of Slovakia), in: *Ekonomický Časopis*, XIII, 3, 248-264;

Petričová, Jarmila (1996): "Počiatky ekonomického myslenia u nás v období rozpadu feudalizmu a nástupu kapitalizmu (1780-1866). Charakteristika hlavných predstaviteľov na Slovensku" (Economic Thinking in Our Country in the Period of the Breakup of the Feudal Regime and the Beginnings of Capitalism (1780-1866). Characteristics of Its Main Proponents) in: *Vývoj ekonomického myslenia na Slovensku* (1996), Hontyová, Kajetana (ed.) et al., 9-23;

Piovarčiová, Veronika (1996): *Teórie kapitálu, úroku a kapitálového trhu* (Theory of Capital, Interest Rate and the Capital Market), 1996;

Pračko, Eduard (1968): "Vývoj a problémy ekonomiky Slovenska" (Development and the Problems of the Economy of the Slovak Republic), in: *Plánované Hospodářství*, 8, 1-11;

Prucha, Václav (1995): "Economic Development and Relations, 1918-89" in: *The End of Czechoslovakia*, Musil, Jiří (ed.), 40-76;

Rychlík, Jan (1995): "National Consciousness and the Common State" in: *The End of Czechoslovakia*, Musil, Jiří (ed.), 97-105;

Rychlík, Jan (1998): Češi a Slováci ve 20. Století. Česko-slovenské vzťahy 1945-1992 (Czech and Slovak Relations 1945-1992), Academic Electronic Press Bratislava a ústav T.G. Masaryka Praha;

Schmögnerová, Brigita (1992): "Inštitucionálno-vlastnícke vzťahy podnikov v štátnom sektore a ich zmeny v Slovenskej republike" (Institutional and Ownership Relationship in the State Sector and its Changes in the Slovak Republic), in: *Ekonomický Časopis*, 40, 9, 627-640;

Schmögnerová, Brigita (1997): *Cúvanie Napred* (Moving Backwards Ahead), Bratislava, Nadácia Ladislava Novomeského;

Sedlák, Mikuláš (1993): "Problémy transformácie Slovenska" (Problems of the Transformation of Slovakia), in: *Hospodárske Noviny*, 142, 23 July;

Sedlák, Mikulaš (1994a): "Problémy transformácie hospodárstva a možnosti ich riešenia" (Problems of Transformation and the Possibilities of Solving Them), in: *Hospodárske Noviny*, 10 February, 28;

Sedlák, Mikuláš (1994b): "Ekonomické a socialne dôsledky transformácie hospodárstva Slovenska" (Economic and Social Consequences of the Transformation of the Slovak Economy), in: *Hospodárske Noviny*, 4, 7 January;

Sedlák, Mikuláš (1995): "Transformation of Economy in the Slovak Republic", in: *Ekonomické Rozhľady*, 1;

Sojka, Jozef (1970): *Ekonomická dynamika a rovnováha* (Economic Dynamics and Equilibrium), Epocha;

Sojka, Jozef and Šimkovic, Ján (1981): *Modelovanie národohospodárskych procesov* (Modeling Macroeconomic Processes), Bratislava, Alfa;

Stanek, Peter (1992): "Samostatné Slovensko bude na tom lepšie aj ekonomicky" (Independent Slovakia Will be Better off also in Economic Terms), in: *Trend* 1993, 3 June;

Strhan, Milan and Daniel, David P. (ed.) (1994): *Slovakia and the Slovaks. A Concise Encyclopedia*, Encyclopedical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava, Goldpress Publishers;

Szamuely, Lászlo and Csaba, Lászlo (1998): "Economic and Systemic Changes in Hungary, 1945-96," in: *Economic Thought in Communist and Post-Communist Europe*, Wagener, Hans-Jürgen (ed.), 158-212;

Šestáková, Monika (1996): "Ekonomická teória Imricha Karvaša a jej aktuálnosť pre súčasnosť" (The Economic Theory of Imrich Karvaš and Its Actuality for Contemporary World), in: *Vývoj ekonomického myslenia na Slovensku* (1996), Hontyová, Kajetana (ed.) et al., 88-95;

Šujan, Ivan (1993): "Účinnosť makroekonomickej politiky v rokoch 1991-1992" (Effectiveness of the Macroeconomic Policy in 1991-92), in: *Ekonóm*;

Tkáč, Marián (2000): "Tomáš Tvarožek, 1882-1945" in: *BIATEC*, 7;

Unčovský, Ladislav (1985): Operačná analýza v riadení podnikov, (Operations Research), Alfa;

Turčan, Pavol (1955): "Ekonomický význam spoločného úsilia Čechov a Slovákov pri hospodárskej výstavbe ČSR" (The Economic Importance of the Common Efforts of Czech and Slovaks in the Economic Development of the Czechoslovakia), in: *Politická Ekonomie*, 96-106;

Wagener, Hans-Jürgen (ed.) (1998): *Economic Thought in Communist and Post-Communist Europe*, Routledge Studies in the History of Economics.

Selected Bibliography

Bártová, Ľubica (1995): "Liberalization versus Protection: The Case of Slovak Agriculture", in: *Eastern European Economics*, July-August, Vol. 33, 4, 8-23;

Biskupič, Stanislav (1994): “Task Allocation Problem Solved by Augmented Simulated Annealing”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics,* 1994-95, Vol. 3, 1, 23-38;

Buček, Ján (2000): “New Approaches to Local Democracy: Direct Democracy, Participation and the ‘Third Sector’”, in: *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, February 2000, Vol. 18, 1, 3-16; “Sublocal Decentralisation – The Case of Slovak Big Cities”, in: *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy,* February 2000, Vol. 18, 1, 57-78;

Chobot, Michal (1998): “Comparison of Data Envelopment Analysis and Game Theory Approaches to Efficiency Evaluation”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1998, Vol. 6, 3-4, 275-78, with J. Institoris;

Fandel, Peter (1998): “Data Envelopment Analysis Application in Agricultural Production Efficiency Analysis”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics,* 1998, Vol. 6, 3-4, 159-66;

Fendek, Michal (1998): “Analysis of Substitution and Income Effects at Increasing the Efficiency of Tax System”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1998, Vol. 6, 3-4, 167-74; “Multiple Criteria Evaluation of Economic Potential of Selected Conversion Firms in Slovakia”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics,* 1996, Vol. 4, Iss. 4, 337-46, with E. Fendekova;

Fendeková, Eleónora (1993): “Multiple Criteria Evaluation of Economic Potential of Selected Conversion Firms in Slovakia”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1996, Vol. 4, 4, 337-46, with M. Fendek; “Choice of Firm’s Production Strategy in the Textile Industry”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1993, Vol. 2, 1, 85-91;

Fidrmuc, Jan: “Macroeconomic Development in the Czech Republic and Accession to the European Union”, in: *Prague Economic Papers*, December 2000, Vol. 9, Iss. 4, 309-24, with Jarko Fidrmuc; “Les adjustements aux chocs par les migrations inter-regionales: Le cas des Republiques tcheque et slovaque”, in: *Revue d’Etudes Comparatives Est-Ouest*, December 2000, Vol. 31, Iss. 4, 5-26; “Political Support for Reforms: Economics of Voting in Transition Countries”, in: *European Economic Review,* August 2000, Vol. 44, Iss. 8, 1491-1513; “The Stability of Monetary Unions: Lessons from the Breakup of Czechoslovakia”, in: *Journal of Comparative Economics*, December 1999, Vol. 27, Iss. 4, 753-81, with Július Horváth and Jarko Fidrmuc; “Unemployment and the Dynamics of Political Support for Economic Reforms”, in: *Journal of Policy Reform*, 1999, Vol. 3, Iss. 2, 139-56;

Fidrmuc, Jarko: “Restructuring European Union Trade, with Central and Eastern European Countries”, in: *Atlantic Economic Journal*, March 2000, Vol. 28, Iss. 1, 83-92; “Macroeconomic Development in the Czech Republic and Accession to the European Union”, in: *Prague Economic Papers*, December 2000, Vol. 9, Iss. 4, 309-24, with Jan Fidrmuc; “The Stability of Monetary Unions: Lessons from the Breakup of Czechoslovakia”, in: *Journal of Comparative Economics*, December 1999, Vol. 27, Iss. 4, 753-81, with Jan Fidrmuc and Július Horváth; “East-West Intra-industry Trade Dynamics”, in: *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv* 1999, Vol. 135, Iss. 2, 332-46, with D. Grozea-Helmenstein and A. Wörgötter;

Hatrák Michal: “Error Correction Models and Cointegration Analysis in Applied Econometrics”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics,* 1998, Vol. 6, 3-4, 183-91;

Hloušková, Jaroslava: “The Efficient Frontier for Bounded Assets”, in: *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, November 2000, Vol. 52, 2, 195-212, with M. J. Best; “Forecasting the Euro Exchange Rate Using Vector Error Correction Models”, in: *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 2000, Vol. 136, 2, 232-58, with B. van Aarle and M. Boss;

Horniaček, Milan: “The Approximation of a Strong Perfect Equilibrium in a Discounted Supergame”, in: *Journal of Mathematical Economics,* January 1996, Vol. 25, 1, 85-107;

Horváth, Július: “Stability of Monetary Unions: Lessons from the Break-up of Czechoslovakia”, in: *Journal of Comparative Economics*, Vol. 27, No. 4, December 1999, 753-81, with Jan and Jarko Fidrmuc; “Core and Periphery in the World Economy: An Empirical Assessment of the Impact of Integration Into the World Economy”, in: *International Economic Journal*, 1999, Vol. 13, 4, 35-51, with R. Grabowski; “Currency Crisis in the Czech Republic in May 1997”, in: *Post-Communist Economies*, 1999, Vol. 11, No. 3, 277-298; “Economic Integration in Central America and the Caribbean”, in: *Journal of Economic Development*, 1999, Vol. 24, No. 1, 121-132, with R. Grabowski; “On the European Monetary System: the Spillover Effects of German Shocks and Disinflation”, in: *Applied Economics*, 1998, 30, 1585-1593, with M. Kandill and S. Sharma; “Optimum Currency Areas and European Monetary Unification”, in: *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 1997, Vol. 15, No. 1, 37-49, with S. Dibooglu; “Investigations into the

Macroeconomic Interdependence of Western Europe: Is there Evidence for Two-Tier Europe?", in: *Journal of Quantitative Economics*, 1998, Vol. 14, No. 2, 41-65, with S. Sharma; "Prospects of African Integration in Light of the Theory of Optimum Currency Areas", in: *Journal of Economic Integration,* 1997, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1-25, with R. Grabowski; "Macroeconomic Interdependence and Integration in the Indian Sub-Continent", in: *Journal of Quantitative Economics*, 1997, Vol. 13, No. 1, 37-59, with S. Sharma;

Husár, Jaroslav: "Macroeconomic Model Based on Balance of Payments", in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics,* 1998, Vol. 6, 3-4, 193-201;

Instirotis, Juraj: "Comparison of Data Envelopment Analysis and Game Theory Approaches to Efficiency Evaluation", in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1998, Vol. 6, 3-4, 275-78, with M. Chobot;

Ivaničová, Zlatica: "Modern Access to the Analysis of Exchange Rates", in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1998, Vol. 6, 3-4, 203-13;

Jánošiková, Ludmila: "A Tabu Search Procedure for Allocation Problem", in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1996, Vol. 4, 4, 305-12;

Kvasnička, Vladimír: "Task Allocation Problem Solved by Augmented Simulated Annealing", in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics,* 1994-95, Vol. 3, 1, 23-38, with S. Biskupič; "Augmented Simulated Annealing Algorithm for the TSP", in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1993, Vol. 2, 4, 307-18;

Lubyová, Martina: "Effects of Active Labor Market Programs on the Transition Rate from Unemployment into Regular Jobs in the Slovak Republic", in: *Journal of Comparative Economics*, March 1999, Vol. 27, Iss. 1, 90-112, with J. van Ours; "Unemployment Durations of Job Losers in a Labour Market in Transition", in: *Economics of Transition*, 1999, Vol. 7, Iss. 3, 665-86, with J. van Ours; "Work Incentives and Other Effects of the Transition to Social Assistance: Evidence from the Slovak Republic", in: *Empirical Economics*, 1998, Vol. 23, Iss. 1-2, 121-53, with J. van Ours; "Unemployment Dynamics and the Restructuring of the Slovak Unemployment Benefit System", in: *European Economic Review*, April 1997, Vol. 41, Iss. 3-5, 925-34, with J. van Ours;

Luptáčik, Mikuláš: "A Consistent Formulation of the Leontief Pollution Model", in: *Economic Systems Research,* September 1999, Vol. 11, Iss. 3, 263-75; "The Accomplishment of the Maastricht Criteria with Respect to Initial Debt", in: *Zeitschrift für Nationalökonomie*, 1998, Vol. 68, Iss. 2, 93-110; "Reconsideration of Non-negative Solutions for the Augmented Leontief Model", in: *Economic Systems Research*, 1994, Vol. 6, Iss. 2, 167-70; "Optimal Dynamic Environmental Policies of a Profit Maximizing Firm", in: *Zeitschrift für Nationalökonomie*, 1991, Vol. 54, Iss. 3, 195-225; "Optimal Price and Advertising Policy under Atomistic Competition", in: *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 4, 57-71, 1982;

Marcinčin, Anton: "The Impact of Czech Privatization Methods on Enterprise Performance Incorporating Initial Selection-Bias Correction", in: *Economics of Transition*, November 1997, Vol. 5, Iss. 2, 289-304, with S. van Wijnbergen;

Menbere Workie Tiruneh: "Convergence Hypothesis in a Cross-Section of Economies", in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1998, Vol. 6, 3-4, 263-73;

Mizera Ivan: "Regression Depth: Comment", in: *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, June 1999, Vol. 94, 446, 417-19, with S. Portnoy,

Mlynarovič, Vladimír: "Compromise Programming and an Approximation of the Optimum Portfolio", in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1998, Vol. 6, 3-4, 225-36; "Application of Outranking Approach to Evaluation of the Voucher Privatization Process Outcomes in the Slovak Republic", in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1994-95, Vol. 3, 2, 171-82, with E. Sookiová;

Pacákova, Viera: "The Bayesian Inference in Actuarial Sciences", in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1997, Vol. 5, 3-4, 255-68;

Pálenik, Viliam: "Econometric Model Application for the Forecasting Macroeconomic Trend of the Slovak Republic", in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics,* 1998, Vol. 6, 3-4, 237-44;

Pástor, Luboš: "The Equity Premium and Structural Breaks", in: *Journal of Finance*, August 2001, Vol. 56, Iss. 4, 1207-39, with Robert F. Stambaugh; "Comparing Asset Pricing Models: An Investment Perspective", in: *Journal of Financial Economics*, June 2000, Vol. 56, Iss. 3, 335-81, with R. Stambaugh; "Portfolio Selection and Asset Pricing Models", in: *Journal of Finance,* February 2000, Vol.

55, Iss. 1, 179-223; “Asset Pricing Models: Implications for Expected Returns and Portfolio Selection”, in: *Review of Financial Studies*, Winter 2000, Vol. 13, Iss. 4, 883-916, with C. MacKinlay; “Costs of Equity Capital and Model Mispricing”, in: *Journal of Finance*, February 1999, Vol. 54, Iss. 1, 67-121, with R. Stambaugh;

Planovský, Ján: “Education and Wages in the Czech and Slovak Republics during Transition”, in: *Labor Economics,* November 1999, Vol. 6, 4, 581-93, with R. K. Filer and S. Jurajda;

Pospichal Jiří: “Task Allocation Problem Solved by Augmented Simulated Annealing”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics,* 1994-95, Vol. 3, 1, 23-38;

Sedlák, Mikuláš: “An Inevitable Part of Economic Reform: Demonopolization and the Development of Economic Competition”, in: *Soviet and Eastern European Foreign Trade*, Summer 1991, Vol. 27, 2, 47-62;

Sojka, Jozef: “Foreign Debt in the Slovak Economy”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics,* 1998, Vol. 6, 3-4, 303-08;

Sookiová, Eva: “Application of Outranking Approach to Evaluation of the Voucher Privatization Process Outcomes in the Slovak Republic”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics,* 1994-95, Vol. 3, 2, 171-82, with V. Mlynarovič;

Stern, Juraj: “State of the Art and Prospects of Logistics in Transforming Slovak Economy”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics*, 1994-95, Vol. 3-4, 349-56;

Šujan, Ivan: “Macroeconomic Evolution in the Czech Republic”, in: *Eastern European Economics*, March-April 1997, Vol. 35, Iss. 2, 7-20, with M. Šujanová; “The Role of Macroeconomic Policy in the Process of Economic Stabilisation in Central Europe”, in: *World Economy,* July 1994, Vol. 17, Iss. 4, 451-65; “Development Prospects of Slovak Economy in the Period 1993-1997”, in: *Prague Economic Papers*, 1993, 3, 245-258; “An Analysis of Factors Contributing to the Deceleration in the Growth Rate of the Czechoslovak Economy in the Period 1975-1980: A Simulation Analysis Using an Econometric Model”, in: *Soviet and Eastern European Foreign Trade*, Spring 1987, Vol. 23, Iss. 1, 31-53; “Simulations of Restoring the External Economic Equilibrium of Czechoslovakia”, in: *Comparative Economic Studies,* Winter 1986, Vol. 28, Iss. 4, 61-83; “The Econometric Forecasting Model of Czechoslovakia”, in: *Economics of Planning*, 1973, Vol. 13, Iss. 1-2, 15-31, with M. Tkáč;

Unčovský, Ladislav: “Concentration and Efficiency in Slovak Commercial Banking”, in: *Central European Journal for Operations Research and Economics,* 1998, Vol. 6, 3-4, 317-24;

Source: ECONLIT in August 2001. This list does not include working papers and chapters in books, nor non-English-language journals.

Table 1 Biographical data on selected Slovak economists before 1948

Briška, Rudolf (1908-1971) Between 1938-1950 Professor at the Faculty of Law of Comenius University.	*Problémy reagrarizácie* (Problems of Re-Agrarization), 1939; *Vojnové hospodárstvo* (War Economy), 1942; *Národohospodárska teória a prax* 1-2, (Economic Theory and Reality), 1943-48.
Hexner, Ervin (1898-1968) From 1931 General Secretary of the Central Association of the Slovak Industry in Slovakia. 1939-46 Professor at Chapel Hill, in 1944-1958 at the IMF, in 1958 Professor at Pennsylvania State University.	*Foundations of Cartel Law*, 1932; *The International Steel Cartel*, 1943.
Karvaš, Imrich, (1903-1981) Professor at the Faculty of Law at Comenius University from 1934, Minister in 1938, Governor of the Slovak National Bank (1939-1944).	*Hospodárska štatistika Slovenska*, (Economic Statistics of Slovakia), 1928; *Menový Problém,* (Monetary Problem) 1929; *Štátne príjmy a konjunktúra* (State Revenues and the Cycle), 1931; *Vplyv kartelov na konjunktúru* (The Impact of Cartels on the Cycle), 1932; *Problematika času v hospodárskej teorii* (Problems of Time in Economic Theory), 1937; *Základy hospodárskej vedy,* (Foundations of the Economic Theory), 1947.
Pázmán, Július (1907-1982) Worked in the central bank (1934-1939), head of the foreign currency department of the Slovak National Bank (1939-46), Professor (1946-1972) and Rector of the Economic University in Bratislava (1948-1949).	*Devizové hospodářství,* (Economics of Foreign Exchange), 1940, *O kontrole* (On Control), 1948,

Tvarožek, Tomáš (1892-1945) First Minister of Finance in the Slovak National Council.	
Stodola, Kornel (1866-1946) Co-owner of the tanning factory in Liptovsky Mikulaš, from 1920 Chairman of the Business and Industry Chamber in Bratislava, Senator between 1925-1939.	*Tarifná politika na Slovensku* (Tariff Policy in Slovakia), 1923; *Hospodárske záujmy Slovenska v sneme* (On Economic Interests of Slovakia in the Parliament), 1924; *V záujme Slovenska* (In the Interest of Slovakia), 1926.
Zaťko, Peter (1903-1978) Professor at the College of Commerce in Bratislava, 1940-49. High position in the Slovak state during and after the war until 1948.	*Industrializačná politika Maďarska a jej výsledky* (Industrialization Policy of Hungary and Its Consequences), 1930; *Domácka výroba na Slovensku a Podkarpatskej Rusi* (On Domestic Production in Slovakia and Sub-Carpathian Russia), 1931.

Table 2 Biographical data on selected Slovak economists active after 1948

Heretik, Štefan (1915-1983) Professor at the University of Economics in Bratislava.	*Teoretické základy súčasnej buržoáznej ekonómie* (Theoretical Foundations of Contemporary Capitalist Economics), 1973; *Náčrt dejín politickej ekonómie: do sedemdesiatych rokov 19. storočia* (The Outline of the History of Political Economy until the 1870s), 1988.
Hoffman, Pavel (born 1931) Researcher at the Institute of Economics of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Economic Minister in the 1990s.	*Zamestnanost a hospodársky rast*, (Employment and Economic Growth), 1971; *Priestorové vzťahy v národnom hospodárstve* (Spatial Economic Relation in the Economy), 1984.
Husár, Jaroslav (born 1936) Professor and Pro-Rector of the University of Economics in Bratislava.	*Aplikovaná ekonometria* (Applied Econometrics) 1998; *Rozumieme makroekonómii?* (Do We Understand Macroeconomics?) 1993; *Makroekonómia* (Macroeconomics) 1998.
Filkus, Rudolf (born 1927) Professor of the Economic University at Bratislava, and also researcher at Slovak Academy of Sciences. Minister in the 1990s.	*Civilizácia na rázcestí* (Civilization at the Crossroad), 1964; *Ekonomické aspekty technického pokroku* (Economic Aspects of Technical Progress), 1967; *Cena – nevyhnutná súcast hospodárskeho mechanizmu* (Price the Necessary Part of the Economic Mechanism), 1989.
Kočtúch, Hvezdoň Dušan, (1929-1994) Economic University in Bratislava, Professor at High School of Economics from 1968; from 1970 to 1974 worker, from 1979 to 1989 researcher at less influential sector-oriented institute in Bratislava. From 1990 again Professor at Economic University in Bratislava. Founder of the Independent Association of Slovak Economists (NEZES). One of the most influential non-liberal Slovak economists after the second world war.	*Ekonomická efektívnosť investícií: o optimálnom objeme investičnej výstavby* (Efficiency of Investment: on Optimal Size of Investment), 1959; *Meranie ekonomického vyrovnávania Slovenska* (Measuring the Convergence in Slovakia), with Viktor Pavlenda, 1964; *Za novú ekonomickú kvalitu česko-slovenskej federácie* (For New Economic Quality of the Czech and Slovak Federation), 1991.
Laščiak, Adam, (1929- 1998) Professor at Economic University in Bratislava.	*Dynamicke Modely* (Dynamic Modeling), 1985; *Optimalne Programovanie* (Optimal Programming), 1983; *Uvod do Ekonomiky SR* (Introduction to the Economics of the Slovak Republic), 1995.
Lazarčík, Gregor (born 1923) Professor Emeritus Brooklyn College, City University of New York.	
Löbl, Eugen (1907-1987) During 1945-1948 Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade in Prague; in 1952 sentenced to life imprisonment, in 1963-69 director of a bank in Slovakia; after 1969 in the U.S.A.	*The Responsible Society,* 1978; *Wirtschaft am Wendepunkt*, 1975.
Luptáčik, Mikuláš (born 1944) Graduate of the High School of Economics in Bratislava, 1966, Professor at the Economics University in Vienna, Austria.	*Geometrische Programmierung und Ökonomische Analyse*. Hain-Verlag, Meisenheim, 1977; *Nichtlineare Programmierung und Ökonomische Anwendungen. Athenäum*, 1981.
Markuš, Jozef, (born 1944) Graduated from the University of Economics in Bratislava, worked at Academy of Sciences, Minister in the 1990s and later the head of Matica Slovenska.	*Polnohospodársko-potravinárske prognózovanie* (Forecasting in Agriculture and Food Production), 1987; *Slovensko na prelome tretieho tisícrocia* (Slovakia at the Turn of the Third Millenium), 1991.
Mikloš, Ivan (born 1960), Minister and Deputy Prime Minister in the 1990s; influential liberal policy-maker.	*Rewriting the Rules, an Interview on Slovakia's Economic Reform*, 2001

Okáli, Ivan (born 1929) Researcher; 1983-1990 Director of the Institute of Economics of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava.	*Faktory a výsledky ekonomické rozvoja krajín RVHP* (Influences and Results in the Economic Development of COMECON Counties), 1980; *Stratégia oživenia alebo prežitia?* (Strategy of Boom or Survival?), 1993.
Pavlenda, Viktor (1928-1990)	*Meranie ekonomického vyrovnávania Slovenska* (Measuring the Convergence in Slovakia), with Hvezdoň Kočtúch, 1964.
Sedlák, Mikuláš (born 1928) Professor and Rector of the Economic University in Bratislava.	*Rozvoj organizačných štruktúr podnikov* (Development of the Organizational Structure of Enterprises), 1988; *Organizovanie a organizačná štruktúra* (Organization and the Organizational Structure), 1998.
Sojka, Jozef (born 1925) Professor and Pro-Rector of the Economic University in Bratislava.	*Ekonomická dynamika a rovnováha* (Economic Dynamics and Equilibrium), 1970; *Matematické modelovanie ekonomických procesov* (Mathematical Modeling of Economic Processes), with Jaromír Walter, 1986.
Schmögnerová, Brigita (born 1947) Centrist policy-maker, Minister of Finance.	*Cúvanie Napred* (Moving Backwards Ahead), 1997.
Šíbl, Drahoš, (born 1934) Professor at the Economic University in Bratislava.	*Ekonomická interdependencia vo svetovej ekonomike* (Interdependence in the World Economy), 1995; *Európska únia a Slovensko* (European Union and Slovakia), 1996.
Unčovský, Ladislav (born 1929) Professor at the Economic University in Bratislava.	*Operacná analýza v riadení podnikov* (Operational Research), 1985, *Modely sietovej analýzy* (Models of Network Analysis), 1991; *Stochastické procesy a modely* (Stochastic Processes and Models), with Katarína Čemická, 1992; *Teória a metódy logistiky* (Theory and Methods of Logistics), 1995.

Jože Mencinger

Economics – Slovenia

Discussant: Milan Vodopivec

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Slovenian economic thinking before 1989 was part of Yugoslav economics, both theoretically and methodologically. Thus, at least formally, it followed Marxism. Marx remained to be quoted until 1989, though in a rather superficial and ceremonial way, simply because it was considered proper to do so. In fact, actual systemic development in Yugoslavia had very little to do with Marxism and the same can be said for Yugoslav economics. In the theory of economic systems, the Yugoslav economy served as the only example of what was called the self-managed, the participatory, the labor-managed, or the socialist market economy. The model, however, was not particularly stable and the reality often differed considerably from its theoretical blueprints, which also often lagged behind actual changes of the system. In fact, systemic development was a process of constant reforms; all imaginable solutions were tried, often in a very uncoordinated manner; numerous and varied economic instruments were used; and each new economic instrument tended to change the structure and the system as such. In short, during the socialist era, Yugoslavia, and Slovenia as a part of Yugoslavia, changed their economic system more easily, profoundly, and frequently than any other socialist country.

Changes in economic writings simply followed politically motivated changes in the actual economic system, providing an ex-post theoretical rationale; it was enough to reread Marx and seek from the rich treasury of universally usable quotations the most suitable ones to serve, until the next change, as irrefutable proof of the correctness of the current interpretation. If and when changes in the economic system began to threaten the political dominance of the Party, a new solution was found by inventing a new version of a socialist economy.

The versions of socialist market economy were decisively shaped by three Slovenian politician-ideologues; Boris Kidrič in the 1950s, Boris Kraigher in the 1960s, and Edvard Kardelj in the 1970s; the latter dominated economic and political thinking in Yugoslavia for more than two decades. Yugoslav and Slovenian economists and other social scientists alike were quick to applaud their inventions, while doubts about their functioning and performances were rare and pushed aside.

The basic subject of research was the political economy of a self-managed economy. Benjamin Ward's "Illyrian firm", Evsey Domar's "producers' cooperative", Jaroslav Vaněk's "labor-managed market economy", and Branko Horvat's "realistic model" were all directly or indirectly inspired by the particularities of the Yugoslav institutional setting. Because domestic economists were unable to handle mathematical tools, such tools were with some exceptions more or less absent from pure theoretical discussions on the maximand of a self-managed firm in a socialist market economy. The vast majority of Slovenian economists, however, accepted the idea that income, rather than profit, was the proper maximand. This led to never-ending discussions of what "normal price" is in a socialist self-managed market economy. Again, most agreed that this was a specific production price. Based on that, a more practically oriented discussion developed on the required minimal accumulation rate, as a kind of a price for socially owned capital (Černe, 1970, Lavrač, 1968, Lipovec, 1968). The property issue became another important subject of research; Aleksander Bajt (Bajt, 1969) shaped the distinction between ownership in the legal and in the economic sense.

Economics was predominantly non-empirical and non-mathematical. Articles with an equation were rare, publishing abroad even rarer. Foreign trade and international economics were the first macroeconomic fields of empirical research (Pertot, 1962, 1969); monetary economics (Pokorn, 1967; Ribnikar, 1969) followed, but remained overlooked. In the 1960s, marginalism and microeconomics became standard subjects of the economics curriculum, particularly at the Law School (Pravna fakulteta), University of Ljubljana. Samuelson's textbook was translated and was used by the School of Economics (Ekonomska fakulteta). Aleksander Bajt, professor of economics with the Law School, also tried to combine the Marxist theory of distribution with methodological concepts of modern macroeconomics. In the 1970s and 1980s, Marxism or what was supposed to be Marxism was more and more augmented by a kind of synthesis between it and various economic theories; it was adapted to them or used to augment them, they were adapted to it, or it was simply left aside. The share of eclectic writings increased.

Empirical econometrics appeared rather early. Cobb-Douglas production functions on cross-section data were estimated in 1966. They were followed by estimates of aggregate consumption functions (Bajt 1970), the cobweb model in potato production (Mencinger, 1968), the quarterly model of inflation (Mencinger, 1971), and the aggregate econometric model (Mencinger, 1975; Bole, Mencinger, 1980). In the 1970s and 1980s, the Economic Institute of the Law School (Ekonomski institut pravne fakultete, EIPF) widely applied econometrics in analyzing various economic policy problems (unemployment, inflation, and exchange-rate determination).

In the 1980s, Yugoslavia's proverbial ability to adapt its economic system to daily political needs disappeared. Explanations for the inability to continue reforms might lie in the departure of politicians who always "knew" what to do next and who, for precisely that reason, were succeeded by mediocre slogan-mongers, or by the formation of Olson's distributional coalitions, each of which was strong enough to prevent changes but too weak to implement them. When the economic situation deteriorated into a profound economic, social, political, and moral crisis, the variety of ideas on the way out became particularly wide in the academic debates. A number of solutions were suggested and, in the process, most taboo topics were addressed (Jerovšek et al., 1985). These included recognition of labor and capital markets as indispensable segments of the market economy; calls for changes in the principles of self-management; the questioning of the concept of social property; and suggestions to replace it with collective property (Bajt, 1988).

In 1988, Yugoslavia reached the point at which any economic reform unaccompanied by political reform could only increase inconsistency between the economic and political system. The ability to reread and to reinterpret Marx, which had characterized the past so profoundly, did not suffice anymore. The rather peculiar economic system came to an end after continuous economic crisis, ideological disintegration, dysfunctional institutions, growing ethnic and social tensions, and political stalemate. While many economists speculated about other types of socialism, the federal government had to launch an economic reform. Contrary to expectations, the reform proposals of the so-called "Mikulic Committee" were radical, although theoretically confused and inconsistent. They devastated the basic premises of the existing economic system by arguing for the abandonment of what was called the non-property philosophy of social property and by demanding that the principle according to which management was responsible to labor only should be replaced by the principle according to which those who provide capital are entitled to management and profit-sharing. They also requested an integral market consisting of product, labor, and capital markets. These proposals directly questioned the premises of the Yugoslav economic system and reopened the old dilemma: socialism or efficiency. Two systemic laws, the Foreign Investment Law and the Enterprise Law, passed in December 1988, in fact reintroduced capitalism.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

The role of the old political elite in the transition process in Slovenia has been ambiguous. The "League of Communists" (Zveza komunistov) had already changed in the 1970s into a sort of conglomerate of the bureaucratic elite, and after 1990, it managed to remain a vast majority of the post-transitional political elite, as well. Indeed, these people never believed in socialism and could therefore easily adapt to any changes and to any system of values[1]. Also, the old economic elite – i.e., the former enterprise managers – have retained or even strengthened their positions in society. The "coalition" of these two elites has assured an exchange of economic and political support and enabled both to become winners in the transition process. While this may threaten the moral foundation of the society, an economist could argue that the swift adaptation of the old elite has been cheaper than the creation of a new one would have been.

This type of reasoning might be applied to economics and economists in Slovenia, as well. Thus, the theoretical premises of Slovenian economics changed in a predictable way without any formal redefinition of the discipline. Marx simply disappeared from citations, along with the old-fashioned political economy. Previous attempts to reconcile Marxism and neoclassical microeconomics or Marxism and Keynesianism disappeared as well. In short, "Marxists" swiftly and quietly turned into "monetarists"; those who applauded the ideas of "associated labor" have found the ideas of a "shareholder value" maximand equally attractive. There were no dismissals of professors from university positions and no rehabilitations, since there was no one to be rehabilitated[2]. The pillars of this softness and adaptability can be found in the process of pre-1989 democratization. The first steps toward transformation were actually initiated by the political non-conformism that emerged in the early 1980s and became stronger in Slovenia than in other parts of Yugoslavia. At the end of the 1980s, a basic consensus on democratization was achieved without any formal negotiations between new political actors and the existing political elite. This development partly explains why transition was so smooth and peaceful, why the members of the former elite became allies of the emerging civil society against Yugoslav authorities, why there was no revenge against them, and why they adapted so quickly and successfully to changes.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

The role of economics is to explain the behavior of economic subjects in given circumstances and to analyze systemic rules and economic policies. In Slovenia, this was rarely the case before 1990. Economics was, first, much too concerned with the commas in Marx's writings and, second, apologetic and normative. Unfortunately, the latter appears to characterize economics of transition countries once again, the only difference being the paradigm; the former Marxists' paradigm has been replaced by a neoclassical one. Slovenian economics has been no exception in applauding the triumph of the American "pure market" model over the European "social market economy" model, the "new economy", and the new "shareholder value" maximand. But while research before 1990 was preoccupied with a constantly changing economic system, after 1990, the new economic system was accepted as a given and indisputable fact. Research in this field therefore vanished, except for analysis of transition (Ovin, 1991; Mencinger, 1993b).

4. Thematic orientation and funding

A statistical overview of published articles since 1990 indicates a significant increase in the number of authors and fields of research. This has been partly due to the increase in the number of teachers in two schools of economics (the University of Ljubljana and the University of Maribor) and much stricter rules on their promotions. Independence, transition, and associate membership in the European Union created new fields for macro-economic research. It is thus not surprising that research on monetary economics has been the liveliest field of empirical research by far. Econometric studies of monetary and exchange rate policies (Bole, 1994, 1999; Mencinger, 1993a), of restructuring of the banking system (Borak, 1994; Ribnikar, 1991, 1996; Štiblar, 1996, 1998) and of fiscal policy (Bole, 1995; Stanovnik, 1997) abound. Independence increased interest in international economics – which was also dealt with in the framework of the general equilibrium model (Potočnik, 1992) – foreign debt (Mrak, 1996), and balance of payment problems; while increased unemployment created interest in labor economics (Kuzmin, 1996; Malačič, 1996; Mencinger, 1999; Vodopivec, 1992, 1994; Križanič, 1991). Interest in inflation reappeared after 1998 (Bole, 1999; Senjur, 1999).

Privatization has become another field of economic research. The dilemmas of how to privatize that preoccupied economists at the beginning of transition (Prašnikar et al., 1991; Mencinger, 1996) were followed by analyses of the effects of privatization patterns on governance and efficiency (Prašnikar, 1998, 2000).

Microeconomics evolved in the direction of applied microeconomics, particularly in two fields closely linked to it: industrial organization and general industrial policy (Petrin, Shepherd, Vahčič, 1996; Jaklič, 1993) and market structure (Petrin, 1993). Income inequality and income policy were another subject of empirical research (Borak and Pfajfar, 1995; Stanovnik, 1992, 1994). Labor market microeconomics (Vodopivec, 1992, 1994, 1995) and financial microeconomics (Ribnikar, 1996) were also new fields of research.

Econometric research has been impeded by lack of time, unstable institutions, and especially constant changes in data collection due to adjustments in accordance with Eurostat's statistical requests. In addition, despite – or because of – the availability of statistical packages, the gap between technical economics in Slovenia and international technical economics seems to be wider now than it was 30 years ago, when econometrics was bound to Fortran programming and punched cards. Many new empirical studies, namely, indicate that their authors often do not know what they are calculating and that empirical analysis is not linked to any explicit or implicit hypothesis, much less to common sense. Often, irrelevant statistical indicators are published because they form standard elements of a statistical package.

Despite many formal and institutional changes, there has been no real change in the funding of research. The users themselves have directly financed research by institutions that belong to the central bank's Research Department (Raziskovalni institut BS) or the government Office for Macroeconomic Analyses (Urad za makroekonomske raziskave). Research at the university and at some private research institutes founded by the government consists of "programs" funded by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Sport for a period of five years, while the same ministry funds "projects" (in which private institutes can compete to take part) for shorter periods, often in cooperation with another ministry responsible for a certain sector of the economy. Ministries or public entities can also use public money for research activities directly. Private sector financing of economic research has remained marginal.

5. Public space and academic debates

When discussing Slovenian economics since 1990, we should not neglect the impact of academic economists on the creation of a new country's economic system and on the Slovenian transition model. Academic economists not only exert indirect influence when participating in public and academic debates, but are also directly involved in the creation of a macroeconomic framework for a new country. Regardless of differences in their views on particular issues, it is certain that they contributed to the relative economic success of the new country, often by stubbornly rejecting foreign advice. The major reason for the majority of Slovenian economists' stubborn resistance to foreign advice can be partly explained by the fact that many of them studied abroad and acquired a knowledge of textbook economics. Furthermore, foreign advisers, who hardly distinguished among socialist countries, usually overlooked Slovenia's rather specific economic, social, and political position at the beginning of transition. Decades of never-ending reforms in Yugoslavia, namely, created many of what are considered essentials for successful transition: enterprises were autonomous, the government used standard economic policy tools, and basic market institutions existed. Slovenia shared these advantages with the rest of former Yugoslavia and possessed additional ones: a homogeneous, socially stable population; a diversified manufacturing sector;

predominantly private agriculture and partly private service sector; well established trade links with Western markets; and geographic position. Whether these specific features should be used in transition or not became the disputed issue among economists. While a majority of domestic economists considered social property and self-management exploitable advantages, foreign economists and a minority of domestic economists thought they would impede rather then assist transition.

Diverse positions were most clearly seen in the privatization disputes. Two major concepts of privatization competed. Most domestic economists proposed a gradual, decentralized, and commercial privatization, while foreign advisors and a minority of domestic economists insisted on a mass, centralized, and distributive privatization. Political rather than economic issues were at the center of the dispute; the gradualists believed that the legacy of self-management could be used in transition, while the shock therapists insisted that the socialist past should be forgotten immediately. The controversy resulted in a legal stalemate lasting a year and a half and ending in a compromise. The Law on Ownership Transformation passed in November 1992 combined the decentralization, gradualism, and diversity of privatization patterns from the first concept with the free distribution of vouchers from the second concept.

Macroeconomic stabilization[3] was another field of heated controversies. The “shock therapists” supported by foreign advisors suggested that an overwhelming package encompassing price stabilization, a fixed exchange rate, a balanced budget, the administrative restructuring of the manufacturing and of the banking system, and centralized privatization should be part of the package of measures for independence. Gradualists, on the other hand, suggested that macroeconomic independence issues based on pragmatic economic policy and a floating exchange rate system for the new currency be separated from transition. It was hoped that such a policy would result in a smaller loss in productivity and lower unemployment in exchange for some inflation. The gradualists prevailed. Pragmatism and gradualism proved successful in preparing institutional settings for a “new” country before the proclamation of independence[4]. The creation of the monetary system has so far been an unchallenged success of the academic economists who commanded the first Board of Governors of the Bank of Slovenia and who successfully rejected foreign advice and applied their own concepts. In addition, academic economists have been ministers, state secretaries, etc. Marko Kranjec, the first finance minister, for example, introduced a new income tax system, created the first budget of an independent country even before its independence, and had an indispensable role in the creation of the monetary system. As is well known, another academic economist, Velimir Bole, has been behind practically all decisions in monetary and fiscal policy for a decade.

6. Views on further development

What is the future of economics in Slovenia? It seems most likely that it will gradually become part of European economics and that it will attain a kind of equilibrium between theoretical economics, methodology, data, and common sense. Unfortunately, relatively few economists can master modern analytical tools and combine them with theory, economic reality, and common sense. Education in economics has remained weak; teachers are overburdened by lecturing to hundreds of MBA students and do not have enough time and will for research. Furthermore, the School of Economics, which is in fact a business school, feels constantly endangered by potential and future potential competition. Publishing abroad remains scarce. The consequence of all this is the absence of Slovenian economists in relevant foreign economic journals; economists who have more than 50 SSCI are rare, and 100 citation indices seems unreachable.

[1] The liberalism of the Slovenian League of Communists in the 1980s made it possible for Slovenia to become a forerunner of political changes in Yugoslavia; the Party's stand on the issues of Kosovo, its delegates' leaving the Yugoslav Party Congress in 1989, and their withdrawal from it in 1990 characterize its behavior.

[2] Ljubo Sirc could be an exception. After first being sentenced to death in a political process in the 1950s and then after spending seven years in jail, he fled the country when he was released. He studied and taught economics abroad.

[3] The assessment of initial conditions by Western advisers and financial institutions was false from the very beginning. While the so-called "monetary overhang" that existed in socialist countries disappeared practically overnight through hyperinflation, basic tools for macroeconomic stabilization policies nevertheless evolved from the assumption that aggregate demand exceeded aggregate supply. This implied that the gap should be reduced by increasing supply and decreasing demand through restrictive fiscal and monetary policies and rapidly liberalizing foreign trade and prices, while anchoring exchange rates, wages, and government spending. Such policies could only augment Kornai's "transformational depression" and push more domestically produced goods than needed to the bunch of Balcerowicz`s "pure socialist production goods", thus destroying domestic manufacturing and transforming many countries, notably Russia, to become providers of raw materials, and most other CIS countries without raw materials to become hopeless Third-World countries.

[4] The greater part of a systemic framework for an efficient market economy was created in 1990 and 1991, i.e., before political independence. The Income Tax Law and the Profit Tax Law introduced a simple, transparent, and non-discretionary system of direct taxes. The statutes regulating the monetary and financial system, like the Law on the Bank of Slovenia, the Law on Banks and Saving Institutions, the Law on Foreign Exchange Transactions, and the Law on the Rehabilitation of Banks and Savings Institutions, were passed together with the Declaration of Independence in June 1991. After independence, missing legal rules to guide economic behavior (company law) assure a predictable bargaining framework (codes regulating business transactions), enforce rules, and resolve disputes (bankruptcy, competition) were added. In short, the proper legal framework for an efficient market economy exists.

Selected Bibliography

Bajt, Aleksander (1968): "Društvena svojina-kolektivna i individualna" (Social Property – Collective and Individual), in: *Gledišta,* No. 9, 530-644;

Bajt, Aleksander (1970): *Potrošna funkcija: Testiranje tradicionalnih hipotez* (Consumption Function: Testing of Traditional Hypotheses), Ljubljana, EIPF;

Bajt, Aleksander (1988): *Samoupravna oblika družbene lastnine* (Self-managed Form of Social Property), Zagreb, Globus;

Bole, Velimir and Mencinger, Jože (1980): *Ekonometrični model jugoslovanskega gospodarstva* (Econometric Model of the Yugoslav Economy), Ljubljana, EIPF;

Bole, Velimir (1994): "Sterilization in a Small Open Economy: The Case of Slovenia", in: *Alternative Perspectives on Finance,* Borak, Neven and Mramor, Dušan (eds.), *Slovenska ekonomska revija*, Ljubljana, 23-36;

Bole, Velimir (1995): "Proizvodna nenevtralnost prometnega davka" (Production Non-neutrality of the Sales Tax), in: *Gospodarska gibanja*, 262, 23-36;

Bole, Velimir (1999): "Stabilization in Slovenia: From High Inflation to Excessive Inflow of Foreign Capital", in: *Financial Sector Transformation: Lessons from Economies of Transition,* Blejer, M. and Škreb, M. (eds.), Cambridge University Press, 309-333;

Borak, Neven (1994): "Sanacija bank" (Rehabilitation of Banks) in: *Naše gospodarstvo*, No. 1-2, 3-10;

Borak, Neven and Pfajfar, Lovrenc (1995): "Analiza neenakosti v delitvi dohodka v Sloveniji" (Analysis of Inequality in Income Distribution in Slovenia), in: *Slovenska ekonomska revija*, No. 1-2, 87-99;

Černe, France (1970): "Ekonomija blaginje in socialistična ekonomija" (Economy of Welfare and Socialist Economy), in: *Ekonomska revija*, No. 1-2, 55-78;

Jaklič Marko (1993): "Industrijska politika in ekonomska teorija" (Industrial Policy and Economic Theory), in: *Ekonomska revija*, No. 6, 424-433;

Jerovšek, Janez et al. (1985): *Kriza, blokade i perspective* (Crisis, Impasse, and Perspectives), Zagreb, Globus;

Križanič, France (1991): “Zaposlovanje in nezaposlenost v Sloveniji in Jugoslaviji” (Employment and Unemployment in Slovenia and in Yugoslavia), in: *Gospodarska gibanja*, 215, 25-44;
Kuzmin, Franc (1996): “Problematika nezaposlenosti v Sloveniji” (Unemployment Issues in Slovenia), in: *Naše gospodarstvo*, No. 1-2, 627-633;
Lavrač, Ivan (1968): “Cena uporabne vrednosti družbenega kapitala” (The Price of Value in Use of Social Capital), in: *Teorija in praksa*, No. 8-9, 25-47;
Lipovec, Filip (1968): “Dohodkovna cena kot stvarna mera uspešnosti v socialističnem gospodarstvu” (Income Price as Proper Measure of Success in a Socialist Economy), in: *Teorija in praksa* No. 8-9, 7-24;
Mencinger, Jože (1971): “Inflacija potražnje ili inflacija troškova?” (Demand Inflation or Cost Inflation?), in: *Ekonomska analiza*, No. 1-2, 1-16;
Mencinger, Jože (1968): “Teorem pajčevine in pridelovanje krompirja na Slovenskem v letih 1952-1966” (Cob-web Theorem and Potato Production in Slovenia, 1952-1966), in: *Ekonomska revija*, No. 3-4, 294-316;
Mencinger, Jože (1975): A Quarterly Macroeconometric Model of the Yugoslav Economy, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 1975, PhD dissertation, 26+201;
Mencinger, Jože (1993): “How to Create a Currency? - The Experience of Slovenia”, in: Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv, No. 2, 418-431;
Mencinger, Jože (1993): “Lessons from the Transition Process”, in: *Empirica*, No. 20, 189-204;
Mencinger, Jože (1996): “Privatization Experiences in Slovenia”, in: *Annales de l`Economie Publique Sociale et Cooperative*, 67/3, 415-428;
Mencinger, Jože (1999): “Generating Employment in Economies of Transition”, in: *Die Zerrissene Gesellschaft*, Heinrich Pfusterschmid-Hardtenstein (ed.), Vienna, Ibera Verlag, 209-225;
Merhar, Viljem (1998): “Kriza kapitalizma in redistribucija kapitala” (The Crisis of Capitalism and Redistribution of Capital), in: *Razgledi*, Ljubljana, No. 24, 3-4;
Mrak, Mojmir (1996): “Slovenia: External Debt Profile 1991-1995”, in: *Journal of International Relations*, No. 1-4, 6-13;
Ovin, Rasto (1991): “The Transition of the Ex-Communist States: How Useful is the Proven Record? The Case of Yugoslavia”, in: *Communist Economies*, No. 3, 337-353;
Pertot, Vladimir (1962): *Razvoj modernog svetskog tržišta* (Development of the Modern World Market), Ljubljana, Ekonomska fakulteta;
Pertot, Vladimir (1969): *Ekonomika mednarodne menjave v intervencionizmu* (Economics of International Trade under Interventionism), Ljubljana, Cankarjeva založba;
Petrin, Tea (1993): “Industrijska politika in podjetništvo” (Industrial Policy and Entrepreneurship), in: *Slovenska ekonomska revija*, No. 1-2, 140-148;
Petrin, Tea (1996): “Industrial Policy and Restructuring of Firms in Post-Socialist Slovenia”, in: *Review of Industrial Organisation*, No. 11, 325-337;
Pokorn, Jože (1967): *Denar in kredit v narodnem gospodarstvu* (Money and Credit in National Economy), Ljubljana, Cankarjeva založba;
Potočnik, Janez and Stanovnik, Peter (1996): *Analiza posledic vključevanja v EU z CGE modelom, temelječem na matriki družbenih raèunov za 1993 leto* (Analysis of the Effects of Joining EU with a CGE Model, Based on Social Accounts for 1993), Ljubljana, Institut za ekonomska raziskovanja;
Prašnikar Janez and Svejnar, Jan (1991): “Workers Participation in Management vs. Social Ownership and Government Policies: Yugoslav Lessons for Transforming Socialist Economies”, in: *Comparative Economic Studies*, No. 4, 27-45;
Prašnikar; Janez et al. (2000): “Enterprises in the Post-Privatization Period: Firm-Level Evidence from Slovenia”, in: *Eastern European Economics*, No. 5, 60-92;
Prašnikar, Janez (1998): “Behaviour of a Slovenian Firm in Transition”, in: *Ekonomska analiza*, No. 1, 57-73;
Ribnikar, Ivan (1969): *Osnovni pojmi o denarju* (Basics of Money), Ljubljana, Ekonomska fakulteta;
Ribnikar, Ivan (1991): “Finančni zlom plansko tržnega (ali tretjega) ekonomskega sistema” (Financial Collapse of the Planned-Market (or the Third) Economic System), in: *Teorija in praksa* No. 1-2, 23-31;
Ribnikar, Ivan (1996): “Money and Finance in the Eighth Year of Transition: The Case of Slovenia”, in: *Slovenska ekonomska revija*, No. 5-6, 371-388;
Rojec, Matija and Svetličič, Marjan (1993): “Foreign Investment in Slovenia: Experience, Prospects and Policy Options”, in: *Communist Economy*, No. 1, 103-111;

Stanovnik, Tine (1992): “Perception of Poverty and Income Satisfaction”, in: *Journal of Economic Psychology*, No. 13, 57-69;
Stanovnik, Tine (1994a): “Revščina in življenjski standard v Sloveniji” (Poverty and Standard of Living in Slovenia), in: *Razgledi,* No. 22, 20-21;
Stanovnik, Tine (1994b): “The Sale of the Social Housing Stock in Slovenia. What Happened and Why?”, in: *Urban Studies*, No. 9, 1559-1570;
Stanovnik, Tine (1997): “The Returns to Education in Slovenia”, in: *Economics of Education Review*, No. 4, 443-450;
Štiblar, Franjo (1996): “Banking as a Basis for Economic Cooperation in Less Developed Europe”, in: *Communist Economies*, No. 1, 79-91;
Štiblar, Franjo (1998): “Elements for Banking Sector Restructuring”, in: *Challenges and Opportunities for the Economic Transition in Yugoslavia*, EI Conference, Beograd, 281-296;
Tajnikar, Maks (1977): “The Coexistence of Market and Plan in the Development of Yugoslav Economic Thought”, in: *Eastern European Economics*, No. 1, 74-101;
Tajnikar, Maks (1997): “Prestrukturiranje realnega sektorja v slovenskem gospodarstvu v devetdesetih letih” (Restructuring of the Real Sector in the Slovenian Economy in the Nineties), in: *Slovenska ekonomska revija*, No. 3-4, 256-278;
Tajnikar, Maks (1998): *Upravljalska ekonomika* (Managerial Economics), EF Ljubljana;
Vodopivec, Milan (1992): *The Slovenian Labor Market in Transition, Issues and Lessons Learned*, WB Washington, 37;
Vodopivec, Milan (1995a): *Changes in the Distribution of Earnings during Transition: Evidence from Slovenia, ASSA Annual Meeting of the WB*;
Vodopivec, Milan (1995b): *Unemployment Insurance and Duration of Unemployment*, Policy Research Working Paper 1552, WB Washington, 33.

Hans-Jürgen Wagener

Demand and Supply of Economic Knowledge in Transition Countries

1. The market situation

The number of students who enrolled for studies in the field of economics (in the broad sense) has increased dramatically in the transition countries of Central and Eastern Europe since 1990. In Hungary and Poland, for instance, it has reportedly multiplied by a factor of 11. This reflects a fundamental shift in the relevance of economic knowledge in post-communist society in general, and in particular a rising demand for market-related know-how – a veritable demand shock. The wholesale rise in demand can be appropriately split between a demand for suitably educated people (managers, accountants, administrators, bankers, tax experts, marketing experts, economic policy advisers, etc.), a demand for economic analysis (market research, law and economics, macro-economic analysis, etc.), and a demand for teachers. The basic question now is how supply can meet this demand shock.

The normal reaction to a demand shock, after inventories have been depleted, is an increased effort on the supply side, in our case more courses in economics and business administration, perhaps new schools, and more capacity for research, perhaps new institutes. In teaching, this has happened all over the region, but in research it has not. Evidently, the supply reaction entails a time factor. The production of additional know-how takes time, at least the period required to obtain a degree. The production of additional research requires either idle capacities or structural shifts from less demanded sectors of knowledge, provided human capital is malleable in the given case, or it will have to await new output from the education sector. In the short run, we may conjecture an increase in capacity utilization, which, among other things, boils down to a higher student/teacher ratio, and an increase in the wages of those who have the required know-how and of those who are able to produce such know-how, trainers, teachers, scholars, etc., if labor markets are sufficiently flexible. The first aspect can be read from the statistics (in Poland, for instance, the student/teacher ratio in management and economics rose by a factor of 4). Whether the latter has happened, too, remains to be seen.

The particular historical situation, however, entails a major constraint for an adequate supply reaction: the transformation of the political and economic systems in Central and Eastern Europe has depreciated the stock of human capital and the available knowledge rather seriously. In other words, if Samuelson's dictum that "economics is what economists do" is correct, economics under the old regime was a completely different type of science than what is needed under the new regime of a capitalist market economy. There are two reasons for this. First, the different economic order: a centrally planned economy has different economic problems than a competitive market economy. Open economies have a different orientation than relatively closed ones. The primacy of politics over economics results in a degeneration of economic argument even if politics ought to be interested in an efficient use of its scarce resources. And second, the different economic ideology: according to Western economic philosophy, a different economic order may well constitute a different set of constraints for economic activity, but the fundamental "laws" of economic activity remain the same, i.e., they are of a universal character. Hence the basics of economics, i.e., micro-economics and its applications, such as labor economics, institutional economics, the economics of education and of health, etc., should be applicable everywhere and should be the basis of any academic teaching in economics.

This was not the view of Marxism-Leninism or the economic ideology of the communist regimes. They considered Western economics an apologetic bourgeois exercise of no interest whatsoever under a communist regime and based their academic teaching on what was called political economy, which had little resemblance to the classical subject of the same name and which lacked, above all, any micro foundation. The outcome of this state of affairs was that economists under the communist regime learned and practiced a knowledge that was of little avail under different conditions (and, by the way, also of little avail under the system for which it was designed). Such a general statement will have to be qualified later. But it all boils down to the fact that the positive demand shock in the market for economic knowledge was accompanied by a negative supply shock, both shocks being quite substantial. It is not difficult to conclude that there were serious disequilibria and problems.

Let us briefly apply to this situation the usual supply-and-demand analysis, the Marshallian cross. If the demand schedule shifts to the right and the supply schedule shifts to the left, we should get a new short-term equilibrium with a considerably higher price. Prices can be assumed to be sticky in one part of the market, especially the public market for economic knowledge (teaching, fundamental research), and flexible in another part of the market, especially the private market for economic knowledge (also teaching, applied research, the professions, management). In such a case, scarce resources will move from the public to the private market segment and we observe what I should like to call internal brain drain: able people stop teaching and doing research at the universities and the Academy institutes and become bank managers or business consultants. From the point of view of academia, this may be seen as a process of spontaneous adverse selection, as it was called in the Bulgarian comment. Its economic rationale, however, is hardly disputable. What the long-term equilibrium will be, will not be clear until after a longer period of time when long-term demand behavior has settled and the supply reaction has clarified.

2. Cognitive dissonance

The next question, therefore, addresses the state of economics at the time of the turnaround, above all, the state of knowledge of Western or market-related economics. A distinction must be made between what was taught as economics and what was thought to be economics. The differences in the region seem to be significant. We may distinguish open countries adhering to an enlightened Marxism or even notional Marxism from closed countries with a rather orthodox doctrine and, hence, little or no access to Western literature and no motivation to explore it. The first group certainly includes Hungary, Poland, and Slovenia, the second Romania, Bulgaria, the former Soviet republics, and, to a degree, also post-68 Czechoslovakia (and definitely, by the way, the GDR).

Even under the regime of enlightened Marxism, curricula were based on the paradigm of Marxist-Leninist political economy. The average student did not become acquainted with micro, macro, or monetary economics. And unorthodox texts like Lange's *Political Economy* or Kornai's *Economics of Shortage* were not admitted as textbooks for introductory economics. But scholars of economics were quite well informed about Western theoretical developments, although they could not really take part in them. With one remarkable exception: mathematical economics – optimal planning and control, operations research, input-output analysis, and some econometrics (good econometrics being hampered by bad statistics; we can already note here that the change in statistical data collecting after 1990 is somewhat underexposed in the reports). Throughout the region, mathematical economics was a niche of relatively unobstructed theorizing with a stress, however, on "mathematical" rather than on "economics". So the load of mainstream theory transported to the East by this route was quite limited.

The tolerance may nevertheless sound surprising, since mathematical economics is used in the West as an instrument to develop and support general equilibrium analysis and for such "apologetic" propositions as the two fundamental theorems of welfare economics. It is not so surprising, on the other hand, if we remember the equivalence proposition of Pareto that perfect competition and perfect planning, other things being equal, lead to the same optimum. In other words, apart from contributing to methodological advances, mathematical economics could flourish under the guise of the theory of planning – if the censor or party controllers would have made the effort to try to understand it.

In closed countries, the situation was definitely worse. Access to Western literature was very limited and, perhaps because of that, interest in it was lacking – though perhaps things were the other way around. Why should one take the trouble to study this rather hermetic scientific output that was neither compatible with "mainstream" Soviet doctrine nor seemed to be relevant to Soviet economic problems (which certainly was a fallacy, just take principal-agent theory), and that in addition did not particularly help to further one's academic or political career? The lack of interest was accompanied by a lack of understanding. First, the language: closed countries were characterized by poor knowledge of English. Second, terminology and method: marginalism, cost-benefit, utility, opportunity cost – all of that did not exist in Marxist political economy and was hard to understand for the average student of economics, with the exception of the small group of mathematical economists. It may be correct that the jargon of Marxist social theory was recognized as such and used as tribal language to veil interesting intellectual contributions, as the Slovak report remarks, or can be termed pragmatism in party language, as in the Hungarian report. However, this exacts a cost, that of being unable to communicate in another language in which some pertinent theories might be formulated. Such costs were revealed at the moment of system switch, when a new language had to be learned. In open countries, these costs were considerably lower or, as the Slovenian report holds: "In short, 'Marxists' swiftly and softly turned into 'monetarists'", pointing to a different problem, the problem that a change of creed does not preclude a continuity of dogmatism.

The situation at the time of the turnaround was in general the following. The number of graduates in economics (in the broad sense) was not particularly large. They were trained in practical capabilities and in more or less orthodox Marxist-Leninist theory. The normal practice of economic science had been to concentrate on the "what" and the "how" of very down-to-earth problems and to leave aside the "why". That is to say, there was a lack of analytical training, although technical standards could be high: the optimal transportation route for peat can be an intricate operations-research problem. What we hear about the post-reform situation permits the conclusion that not much has changed in this respect. In open countries, there were a number of knowledgeable economic scholars at universities and Academy of Science institutes who, in addition to Marxist-Leninist schooling, if they did not happen to be mathematical economists, were well versed in Western theory, which they had learned either from the available literature or from a stay abroad. In closed countries, such people were much rarer birds. This permits us to conjecture that the depreciation of economic knowledge after the system switch happened all over the region, but was less acute among academic scholars in open countries than in closed ones. It should follow that the supply of market-informed economists was relatively larger in the first group of countries than in the second. It would be rash to jump immediately into conclusions about potential transformation success. However, the hypothesis has been formulated "The earlier the knowledge, experience, and networks needed in the 1990s for a successful adjustment and adaptation to the market economy had been acquired, the more successful was the transformation process." (Meusburger, 2001: 5)

3. Continuity and change

The redefinition of the discipline of economics since 1990 raises the question of continuity and change. Where know-how could not be imported on a large scale, as it was in eastern Germany, continuity rested primarily in human capital. Know-how has been imported, there was remigration, and foreign scholars came for temporary stays, but all this remained on a marginal scale in most countries of the region. Estonia and the Czech Republic were mentioned as exceptions. And then there are those monsters of conditionality and external influence, the International Financial

Institutions (IFIs). The Bulgarian example is perhaps quite informative. For this country, it was stated that the IFIs have been central vehicles of transfer of economic knowledge: the conditionality of advice and financial support led to the adoption of a specific professional language and created data that were previously not used or not available in a predominantly etatist and corporatist environment. This happened in the 1920s as well as in the 1990s. The latter period, however, produced a much more outspoken doctrinal standardization. But let it be clear, it is language rather than content, even if the language transports some kind of "common sense fiscal and monetary policy rules", so the Bulgarian comment. The IFIs have, quite understandably, no genuine theoretical interest in the individual small countries except when they can be used as test cases. Bulgaria was a test case in the 1920s for the League of Nations' stabilization loans and, after 1997, for the introduction of a currency board. The repercussions of such experiments on local theorizing were not remarkable in the first case. In the second they remain to be seen.

In general, the redefinition of the discipline had to be accomplished by those who had been educated under the old system. All countries can be classified as open now, but their differences during the pre-reform period continue to have impact. A typical post-Soviet economist has no pre-reform knowledge of Western economic thought, he has no access to scientific journals prior to 1990, he probably even misses the broader Soviet scientific community, and he is confronted with a new *lingua franca* and a new terminology without sufficient financial means for extensive Western contacts and stays abroad. We find hints in the country reports, although this ought to be analyzed more thoroughly before making valid statements, that there is a continuity in dogmatic background or that the acquired history of economic thinking and of economic thought survives the apparent change in content. This could have been expected, since knowledge is to a great extent embodied in human capital

A typical Slovenian, Hungarian, or Polish economist is much more versatile; he or she possesses, so to speak, two stocks of knowledge from which he can draw information. It will be very hard to detect the actual interference between the two, but since the Marxist doctrine is keyed mainly to distribution, while the neo-classical doctrine is keyed exclusively to efficiency and the neo-Austrian doctrine is keyed to rivalry and anti-etatism, some interesting mixtures can be expected. Eclecticism can be expected to be the normal result and eclecticism is reported in several instances. At the same time, however, strong new orthodoxies are mentioned or even complained of. They may have already built up in the pre-reform period as dissenting fundamental opposition; this is more probable in the formerly open countries. But they can also be the result of the oversupply of new knowledge and of a bounded mental receptivity; this is more probable in the formerly closed countries. On the whole, we can conclude that there is a healthy diversity of views.

The reorientation of curricula and teaching contents can be briefly treated. Economics has become a universal science whose content is determined by Anglo-American standards. Where this has been questioned and a new and original theory for the case of transition has been sought, notably by scholars ignorant of standard theory, as seems to have been the case in Romania and Bulgaria, necessary changes have simply been delayed. It makes little difference whether standard theory is learned from Anglo-American textbooks or from indigenous textbooks. In Western Europe, we observe a slow crowding out of indigenous textbooks (in the national languages) by Anglo-American textbooks (either translated or, more frequently, in English). Small countries, like Scandinavia or the Netherlands, have progressed farther on this route than big countries, like Germany or France; but there the tendency is also visible. Why should it be different in Central and Eastern Europe? The same holds true of the steady crowding out of economics proper by business administration and finance, a phenomenon also reported for the transition countries. This can be ascribed to a greater influence of demand upon academic curricula.

In the context of continuity and change, what happened to the formerly well-developed departments of mathematical economics that were populated by exceptionally able people? At the outset of reform, one could have surmised that from now on, all economics would be "mathematical", i.e., on the highest level of the discipline and using the most advanced techniques. The Lithuanian report regrets: "Unfortunately, it never happened – due to the inability of many local teachers to do mathematics." This may be so, but there are other forces at work, too. One is internal brain drain – to which I will return in a moment – which is personified most conspicuously in Russia by Boris Beresovsky and Piotr Aven, two able mathematical economists who have found better occupation elsewhere. While formerly the niche of mathematical economics attracted bright minds who were interested in economics, but not in political economy, their scope of choice is now much broader inside and outside of academia. The other factor is demand: What is the use of a solid training in mathematical economics for a future manager or policy maker?

The predominance of the Anglo-American model of a free market system and the teaching of Anglo-American economics is repeatedly mentioned with certain reservations, while the continental social market economy and its doctrinal foundations, as in the German *Theorie der Sozialpolitik*, are missed. This is indeed surprising, since the outcome of transformation is much closer to the continental model than to the Anglo-American one (and this has been dubbed the Klaus paradox of rhetoric and policy). It is even more surprising, since pre-war traditions of economic policy and doctrine in most of the observed countries were continental, mainly German, which at that time meant anti-free-market and mercantilist, but also Bismarckian social policy. Of course, liberal Austrian economics originated in Austria; but it never gained policy relevance there. From reading the post-1990 literature, one would assume that the fields of labor economics and social policy were well developed in the region and could constitute a significant part of the curricula.

4. Change of elite

A new political and economic order presupposes a new elite. In our context this can mean two things. First, a new elite who do things: managers, bankers, and accountants who do business and politicians who shape economic policy. In a quite singular way, the system switch has changed the social importance of trained economists. Under the old regime and the primacy of politics, economists were secondary executives; now, the competitive market order and the task of transformation have made them truly chief executive authorities. Second, a new elite who teach things: the education of such new economic decision-makers calls for academic professors who are versed in the hitherto undervalued sciences. Since, as was remarked earlier, appropriate know-how could be imported only to a marginal extent, the build-up of human capital is a problem of investment requiring time and money. Neither seems to be at hand.

Transformation of the economic order to a competitive market system is one of the very few occasions in history when economists have assumed a leading role in politics. The list of names in the region is long and even the final conference of this project has suffered from this phenomenon, since two scheduled participants did not show up because they just had become cabinet members. One would conjecture that this is more probable in countries with shock or big bang transition than in countries where transition takes place gradually. For in the latter there is no period of exceptional politics requiring non-typical politicians. The distinction between typical politicians, as we know them from new political economy or public choice literature, and non-typical politicians is drawn by Leszek Balcerowicz, who holds: "During special times, such as a grave economic and/or political crisis or a democratic political breakthrough ..., there is far more room for non-typical politicians ..., economic technocrats in a position of political authority. These are professional outsiders who are called on to do a special job of bringing a country out of an economic crisis and/or transforming its economy." (Balcerowicz, 1996: 15) As soon as the period of extraordinary politics is over, the non-typical politician has to make way for or change into the typical one. The career of Ludwig Erhard in Western Germany between 1945 and 1966 is a good example of such a course of events. For the period of transition in Central and Eastern Europe, names like Balcerowicz, Kołodko, Klaus, Bokros, Dăianu, Mencinger, Gaidar, and others easily come to mind. Whether this state of affairs has improved the status of economic science remains to be seen.

Less spectacular, but none the less absolutely necessary, is a change in the managerial and bureaucratic elite. It may be questioned whether it suffices for the old elite never to have believed in Marxism and socialism and therefore to be able to "adapt to any changes and to any system of values", as the Slovenian report states. Nevertheless, it is a fact that the managerial and bureaucratic elite could not have been replaced in a wholesale manner and, hence, kept their positions. The same is true of academic personnel. This does not imply that there were no changes, indeed there were massive ones. The new system required more managers than the old. For the number of enterprises multiplied and the number of managerial jobs within each enterprise multiplied as well. And the new system required know-how in the business sector, which formerly did not exist: accountants, consultants, analysts in banks, tax specialists, and the like. Such people could come only from the academic sphere, and high salary differentials made it easy for them to switch over. This boils down to a massive internal brain drain from the academic to the business sphere. Quantitatively, the external brain drain is a minor phenomenon compared with the internal one. In qualitative terms, it may be serious, since foreign universities and international organizations, which are the most attractive, select only exceptionally bright people, and East-West income differentials are persuasive.

The normal development was that younger and more flexible scholars left the economic faculties and Academy institutes, while older people stayed on. At the same time, the change in stocks was accompanied by a change in flows, i.e., young graduates chose a career in the comparatively well-paying business sector and could only with great difficulty be lured into doctoral programs and a later academic career. The prospects of an academic career are reported to be rather gloomy because of sticky promotion chances, which is rather astonishing, given the demand for teaching capacity. But demand is not furnished with the necessary financial means, at least in the state sector. Today, those who stay in the academic sphere are still forced to take up multiple full-time jobs teaching in several of the newly established private business schools or working freelance for management consultants. It is not difficult to draw conclusions from this state of affairs about the professional quality of the average teacher, at a time when additional tuition-related research is required, and also about the volume and quality of autonomous scientific research.

5. Lack of fundamental research

Policy controversies – which move minds – are mentioned as missing. Established schools and learned disputes between them can hardly be expected in a region that just emerged from ideological monopoly and whose daily economic problems appear to be almost insoluble. Little wonder that no such fundamental controversies can be observed. As a matter of fact, there were few scholars in the region able to join mainstream debates, as the Hungarian report remarks, Hungary's János Kornai being one of the few exceptions. Indeed, there is enough controversy about actual policy issues. And since transformation studies have opened a new field for research and theorizing, putting economics into a wider context – of law and economics, historical path dependency, social embeddedness, and geographical and cultural influence, for instance – scholars of the region may be expected to join such new interdisciplinary approaches. It is too early to judge whether they have contributed significantly to a development whose sustainability is still open to debate.

Research being chiefly problem-oriented, it sounds reasonable that the first half of the 1990s was dominated by transformation issues, while questions of European integration came to the fore during the second half. Clearly, reform economics supplied the profession with ample opportunity for heated debate. Liberalization, stabilization, and privatization are all policy issues on which there may have been a Washington consensus – but the latter was not shared throughout the profession. The consensus about what had to be done was remarkably large among economic politicians in most of the countries under review. But the reports also testify to deviating opinions in the scientific community. Such deviating opinions are based, as a rule, either in Keynesian or in socialist doctrinal backgrounds. This is not the place to go into details. Suffice it to say that the substance and style of scientific discourse have converged to Western standards in the region.

Another point of concern in the reports is the lack of serious fundamental research. As a matter of fact, this is what should be expected. Fundamental research is a public good, which implies that in a competitive market of private suppliers and customers there is no demand willing to pay for it. No wonder the private education institutes do not engage in fundamental research. Funding such research is a typical state task or a task for public benefit foundations, which still have to emerge in the post-transformation landscape. In the state institutions, however, the enormous teaching obligations arising from the demand shock and the extreme shortage of funding leave little room for fundamental research, even if we take no account of possibly decreased intellectual capacities due to internal and external brain drain and, as mentioned in the Hungarian report, the lack of a class culture (*Bildungsbürgertum*) of orientation toward research and science. In addition, research is not properly valued, which may be ascribed to a high time-preference, research being a time-consuming investment with a long gestation period.

A high time-preference must be considered normal in a region that is under the impression of having lost 40 years or more under communist rule. The apparent time inconsistency is a general phenomenon in transformation, resulting eventually in short-term policy measures or a policy conundrum. To give just one example: Romania was one of the most closed countries of the communist world. In the 1970s and 1980s, Romanians were even forbidden to study in the Soviet Union. Knowledge of economics was, hence, extremely deficient. After the turnaround, the young generation left the country to be taught in the West. Those in charge of reform, naturally, stayed at home and had to get along with the knowledge they had. It is quite understandable that they tried to make a virtue of necessity and propagated an own Romanian way to the market.

If almost all reports regret that up to now debates on theoretical and methodological issues are missing and scholars are concentrating on policy issues, we may ask again: how could it have been otherwise? The economy of each of these countries is on the path of transition and European integration, and so is its discipline of economics. Policy issues are pressing, which is a second source of the time inconsistency of transformation. At least in the short run, the development of policy making and of management skills is not dependent upon the development of economic science, but much more upon the development of economic education. The development of new theories is *cura posterior*, what is needed are people with a sound background in established knowledge. The Polish report mentions "Nove's law" – the worse the state of economics, the better the performance of the economy and *vice versa* – which was formulated with respect to post-war differences between West Germany and Great Britain: German economics could not compare with British, but British welfare growth fell far behind German. It may be conjectured that a careful comparison of economic education of managers and policy makers can explain the paradox to a great extent (other reasons were, of course, also at work). This brings me to my final point.

6. Business as usual – which business?

It is obvious that all of the reporters and commentators are economists in the narrow sense of the word. Their disregard or even contempt for business economics and finance could not be more outspoken. What they are interested in, and what they consider important for the transition countries, is economics proper, as it has evolved from Adam Smith to Ken Arrow. The conspicuous lacunae of the surveys are business administration, marketing, accounting, taxes, capital markets and finance, i.e., the major part of what the exploding student population is fed upon and what, apparently, is in high demand.

This is a remarkable phenomenon and I wonder whether it is the result of a misunderstanding. It has to do with terminology and traditions prevailing in the region. In the US, you have faculties of economics and business schools, and these are clearly different institutions with different subjects. Competition, so to speak, is inter-industry, not intra-industry. In Germany we have, at least since the late 18th century, *Wirtschaftswissenschaft* (notably in the singular, not in the plural) consisting of *Betriebswirtschaftslehre* and *Volkswirtschaftslehre* (or *Nationalökonomie*), the latter consisting of *Wirtschaftstheorie*, *Wirtschaftspolitik*, and *Finanzwissenschaft.* Curricula are the same for a significant part of these programs. Competition is clearly intra-industry. In other words, if "economics" were translated as "*Wirtschaftswissenschaft*", it would comprise business administration with all its offspring. Today, *Volkswirtschaftslehre*, *économie*, or economics is a universal science determined, as mentioned, to a large degree by Anglo-American standards. All prestigious publication outlets are Anglo-American. For *Betriebswirtschaftslehre*, *gestion*, or business administration, this is much less the case. Here we may discern national schools that materialize in national curricula and national publication practices. The basic difference between Anglo-American business administration and German business economics is that the former is based less on a general scientific doctrine and hence is preferentially taught in the form of case studies, while the latter presents itself as a coherent body of knowledge that is taught, like economics proper, as a doctrinal whole (just see the seminal three volumes of Erich Gutenberg (1951-69)). It is typical that only two of the 133 references in the article *Betriebswirtschaftslehre* in the representative *Handwörterbuch der Wirtschaftswissenschaft* (1977) are English-language books. To the best of my knowledge, the impact of different management educations has not yet been evaluated, but it is perhaps here that the paradox of "Nove's law" can be solved: education in business matters.

We are just now observing a process of globalization of this part of the economic sciences under the leadership of international MBA programs. But it is not yet obvious that Anglo-American standards are superior in this field, as well. Which raises the questions: What are future managers taught? What is the doctrinal basis of the business programs? Is research being done in this field? Where does the knowledge come from? Under the old regime, economics proper was available at least under the guise of the critique of bourgeois ideology, but knowledge of marketing, accounting (which is definitely different from socialist bookkeeping), taxes, capital markets, and the like were simply nonexistent. And this is the instrumental knowledge used to run a firm in a market economy and the market economy itself.

The reports exhibit a kind of social science bias: whatever it may be, business administration is not regarded as a social science on equal footing with political science, sociology, and economics – contrary to German traditions. What shall we do with the orphan now? That depends on the purpose of the exercise. If we are interested purely in the history of science, nothing impedes us from delineating the disciplines under review according to preference. However, if we are interested in the role of economic knowledge in the process of transformation, the discipline has to be defined in a functional way: economics is what economists do, and the vast majority of economists function as managers, accountants, consultants, and the like and are in dire need of the appropriate know-how.

It seems too easy a conclusion to state that all the necessary know-how is available in the West and needs only to be transferred to the East. Of course, economics and business administration are well-developed and well-documented bodies of knowledge – public goods, as said, within the reach of everyone who wants to apply them. Without claiming that these bodies of knowledge represent the immutable Laws of the Market, they arguably lead to satisfactory results within the Western context. This does not necessarily imply that they produce similarly satisfactory results in a non-Western context. The crucial question, now, is whether the transformed Eastern Central European societies bring about Western or non-Western contexts. As long as economics, and even more so business administration, generalizes economic practices conducive to economic success (formulated in terms of socially specific values), their transfer and application should be preceded by an analysis of their contextuality. To the degree that the theories are logical inferences from axiomatic assumptions, their practical relevance has to be shown in a historical context. Both tasks call for an active indigenous science. The transformation of economics in Eastern Central Europe can be seen as the final phase in the internationalization of the discipline that was performed in Western Europe some 30-40 years earlier. However, it is precisely transformation that has underlined the importance of initial conditions, path dependencies, and cultural embeddedness for economic behavior and policy. So the dialectic of the universal and the specific makes knowledge transfer necessary; but without adaptation to the historical situation, the transplant remains a second best.

References:

Albers, Willi et al. (eds) (1977): *Handwörterbuch der Wirtschaftswissenschaft*, 10 Volumes, Stuttgart - Fischer, Tübingen - Mohr, Göttingen - Vandenhoek&Ruprecht;

Balcerowicz, Leszek (1996): “The Interplay between Economic and Political Transition”, in: *The Polish Quarterly of International Affairs*, 5, 9-28;

Gutenberg, Erich (1951-69): *Grundlagen der Betriebswirtschaftslehre*, 3 Volumes, Berlin, Springer;

Meusburger, Peter (2001): “The Role of Knowledge in the Socio-Economic Transformation of Hungary in the 1990s”, in: *Transformations in Hungary. Essays in Economy and Society*, Meusburger, Peter and Jönes, Heike (eds.), Heidelberg, Physica, 1-38.

Political Science

Hans-Dieter Klingemann

Political Science in Central and Eastern Europe: National Development and International Integration

Introduction

The emergence of political science in Central and Eastern Europe can be analyzed from two points of view. First, we can look at the development of political science from a historical perspective. To consider the past, to know where political science comes from in these various countries, helps us to understand how it is shaped today and where it might go in the future. Second, we can analyze the discipline's own discourse, its orientations, concepts, theories, and methods. This allows us to understand what political science considers important problems and how it processes these problems theoretically and empirically. We hypothesize that problem selection is affected by the problem agenda of the nation state. Theory development, however, transcends national boundaries and is subject to a global discourse. Both the historical and the analytical perspective have their own potential and contribute to a better understanding of "...the way in which decisions for a society are made and considered binding most of the time by most of the people" (Easton, 1953: 129-148).

In this short essay, we will address both the national development and the international integration of political science as a discipline. The section on national development touches upon the Communist past and the institutionalization of a modern political science in the decade of the 1990s. International integration will be discussed in terms of both the discipline's own discourse and the various organizational networks that link political scientists and their institutions across national borders. The analysis is based mainly on two surveys of the state of the discipline in Central and Eastern Europe. The first one covered the period of the 1990s up to the year 2000. The project was supported by the Thematic Network Political Science and included Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia (Klingemann, Kulesza, and Legutke, 2002). The second survey, which was initiated by Max Kaase and Vera Sparschuh, has produced country reports for the same set of countries, pushing the time frame a bit further.

1. National development

Our assessment of national development will not cover the time before the establishment of Communist regimes. However, we hasten to remind readers that Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and partly also Bulgaria and Lithuania have an intellectual heritage going back to the first half of the 20th century. In this discussion, we cover three topics. First, we describe the impact of the Communist era. Second, we look at the institutionalization of Political Science as an academic discipline after 1989, including the main areas of teaching and research as well as the main theoretical approaches. Third, we discuss the institutional conditions of a national discourse among political scientists, such as the emergence of political science journals and the establishment of national political science associations.

The Communist legacy

To understand the national development of Political Science, it is useful to remember the past. In the countries under study, the most recent historical impact came from the Communist past. Under Communism, "Political Science" was reduced to the study of Dialectical and Historical Marxism-Leninism. Courses were obligatory for all students and mainly covered Marxist philosophy and theory, political economy, and Scientific Communism. Chairs in these areas were established in all academic institutions. What was taught could hardly escape the Party's ideological control. However, politically relevant objects were also dealt with in History, Sociology, and Social Psychology – disciplines closer to empirical study and less subjected to ideological control. It is important to understand that the degree of Communist Party ideological control of academia was different in different periods and different countries. The grip of censorship was most severe under Stalinism and was rather liberal in the Gorbachev era. Bulgaria and Romania experienced national Communism. Slovenia, as part of the Yugoslav Federation, had the most advantageous conditions for the development of a modern Political Science. Departments of Political Science were established there early on. The Yugoslav Communist Party had few objections to participation in the "Western" discourse. A rough typology based on the rigidity of the Communist system as a condition for the development of modern Political Science distinguishes three groups of countries:

- Countries with a high degree of ideological control:
  Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania;
- Countries with a moderate degree of ideological control:
  Hungary and Poland;
- Countries with a low degree of ideological control:
  Slovenia.

Thus, we can attempt to distinguish between different sets of conditions for the development of Political Science as an academic discipline. In some countries, ideological control by the Communist Party was greater than in others. It is plausible to assume that these differences helped or hindered the development of Political Science after 1989.

Institutionalization of political science after 1989

There are no official statistics that are strictly comparable across the countries under study. However, relying on country reports describing the state of the discipline around the turn of the century, we count about 41 departments at state universities offering a bachelor's, master's, and/or doctorate in Political Science. The number of BA, MA and PhD students was approximately 16,000; they were taught by about 550 professors or full-time lecturers. This snapshot is incomplete, because it does not take into account private academic institutions offering Political Science. It is hard to generate systematic information about this part of the system of higher education, because many of these institutions have a rather short life span. On the other hand, we find some rather well-respected institutions among them, such as the Central European University in Budapest or the Collegium Civitas in Warsaw.

The overall figures cited above hide an unequal distribution across countries. The size of the university system, including Political Science, is obviously linked to the number of inhabitants and the wealth of a country. The numbers of inhabitants of the countries analyzed here range from 38.7 million in Poland to 1.5 million in Estonia, and per capita income in Poland, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia is more than double that of Bulgaria, Romania, and the three Baltic states. Thus, it is not surprising that small countries such as Latvia (1), Slovenia (1), and Estonia (2) support just one or two Political Science departments, whereas Poland (10), Slovakia (6), Hungary (5), the Czech Republic (5), and Romania (4) support four or more. Lithuania and Bulgaria are exceptions to the rule. Though rather small and not so well to do, Lithuania has established five universities, all offering Political Science. Bulgaria, on the other hand, supports Political Science at just two state universities. Quantity, however, must not be equated with quality. Slovenia is a case in point. Although there is just the University of Ljubljana, this university has invested heavily in its Social Sciences, including Political Science. Thus, by all standards, it can compare itself today with the best institutions in the field worldwide.

Klingemann, Kulesza, and Legutke (2002) present results of a survey of Political Science departments granting a BA, MA, or PhD, which offer insights into main areas of teaching. 37 of 41 departments completed the questionnaire. Comparative Politics (29), Theory and Methods (27), and Political Philosophy (27) were the subjects most frequently taught. Political Economy (14) marked the lower end, while National & Area Studies (25), International Relations (25), Political Sociology (24), and Public Policy (22) ranged in between. This picture is pretty much the same across countries. However, Lithuania, Romania, and Hungary tend to place more emphasis on Public Policy, while the Czech Republic, Poland, and Lithuania are more likely to stress international relations. Thus, with the exception of Political Economy, most students in Central and Eastern Europe are offered and taught all important sub-fields of modern Political Science. The neglect of Political Economy is surprising. It may, however, be a reflection of the high importance that was placed on a particular variant of Political Economy in the study of Dialectical and Historical Marxism-Leninism.

The research agenda of Political Science shows a clear link to the problem agenda of the country under consideration. Transition from autocratic to democratic rule including institutional reforms, the emergence of a competitive party system, elections, parliaments, political elites, and problems related to efforts to join the European Union and NATO are of concern to political scientists across these countries. There are, however, also problems that are nation-specific, such as Hungarians in the diaspora, Russian "minorities" in the Baltics, the fate of the Roma, or the disintegration of the Yugoslav Federation, to name just a few.

We have hypothesized that Political Science, like most other academic disciplines, should respond to problems of the society that supports it. By and large, this seems to be the case. Nevertheless, theories and methods used to understand and research these problems are much more linked to the international discourse. Results of the survey mentioned above show that the Historical Approach (32 times), Systems Theory (27) and Functionalism (19), and Neo-Institutionalism (18) have been mentioned as the most important theoretical approaches. Game Theory (5), Marxism (5), Existentialism (2), Phenomenology (2), and Cybernetics (1) were situated at the very end. Behavioralism (16), Organizational Theory (16), Rational Choice (14), and Hermeneutics (12) ranged in between. As far as the Historical Approach and Systems Theory and Functionalism are concerned, this result holds for all departments under investigation. Beyond that, we can observe more country-specific patterns. (West) German data from 1996 are available for comparison (Klingemann and Falter, 1998). As demonstrated in Table 1, the general pattern is quite similar.

Large differences in emphasis occur with Hermeneutics and Phenomenology. These two approaches seem to have lost explanatory power for problems facing Political Science today in general and for the explanation of problems of Central and Eastern European countries in particular. Theoretical approaches do not come from nowhere. Much of the discourse in this area has taken place in the many research projects initiated internationally and carried out in cooperation with scholars of the region. One example is a series of projects devoted to the analysis of competitive elections in Central and Eastern Europe (Klingemann and Taylor, series editors).

Establishing national discourse and interest representation

The creation of opportunity structures for communication is a precondition for building a national community of political scientists. Two elements are of key importance: the availability of political science journals and the establishment of a national political science association.

Ten years after transition, there is a rather well developed and differentiated field of professional political science journals. This is particularly true for Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Romania. In fact there is not a single country that fails to offer a journal to publish and discuss political science topics in its own language. At the same time, most of the journals – especially in the smaller countries – are confronted with severe financial problems.

In some instances, publication of a journal is linked to a national political science association. The establishment of such an organization is another step toward providing possibilities of professional communication and interest representation. National political science conventions are part of the routine of the discipline in most countries. At the time this essay was written, political scientists in all countries under study, with the exception of Estonia and Latvia, have created national political science associations. However, in these very small countries with just a few political scientists, meetings have been organized together with colleagues from other social sciences such as sociology, social psychology, or communication science.

2. International integration

The national development of Political Science is closely connected to international integration. A solid home base is of great help when entering the discourse abroad. We can observe efforts of cooperation between "the West" and Central and Eastern Europe involving individual political scientists and their academic institutions since 1989. Over time, the exchange of ideas and cooperation has grown in scope and intensity. This has been true both for American and Western European academic institutions and foundations. Technically, the availability of the Internet has greatly facilitated this process. In this short essay, we cannot do justice to the many forms this discourse has taken. What can be done is to cite a few examples that refer mostly to Western European projects.

Former immigrants like Iván Völgyes in Hungary and Rein Taagepera in Estonia were among the first to extend a helping hand to political scientists in the East. *Large-scale comparative research projects* like the European Values Study and the Work Values Survey, the Post-Communist Publics Survey, and the Comparative Party Manifesto Project, to name just a few, were very dependent on national talent and proved to be a good training ground for both sides. Examples of a more *institutionally-backed cooperation* could be observed in the Baltics and in Romania. The universities of Oslo, Aarhus, and Umea engaged the universities of Tartu, Riga, and Vilnius in a project titled "The Politics of Transition in the Baltic States". And organizations such as the Association des Universités Partiellement ou Entièrement de Langue Francaise/Université des Reseaux d'Expression Francaise quickly established ties with Romanian academic institutions. As the most prominent example of *foundations*, the Soros Foundation helped to support academic institutions such as the Central European University in Budapest and funded a multitude of research projects through its Open Society Fund. Last but not least, we should mention the *European Union* and its programs, such as the Tempus Program, which have helped to organize meetings, exchange students and faculty, and carry out research.

In 1993, nine Central and Eastern European countries formed the *Central European Political Science Association* (*CEPSA*). In September 2000, this association launched a new political science quarterly, the Central European Political Science Review, published in English. This development has greatly contributed to an exchange of ideas across national boundaries. In addition, one international and two European political science organizations have served as integrating institutions of the profession. The *European Consortium for Political Research* (*ECPR*) is most important for organizing comparative research. It is based on institutional membership and currently has more than 20 members in the countries under study. Founded as recently as 2001 by scholars from all parts of Europe, the *European Political Science Network* (*epsNet*) is concerned mostly with problems related to teaching Political Science. Individual and collective members come in almost equal numbers from Western and from Central and Eastern Europe. Finally, the *International Political Science Association* (*IPSA*) has made a conscious effort to integrate national political science associations and individual political scientists in the global discourse. All the countries that are dealt with here and have a national political science association also cooperate with IPSA. Needless to say, the *American Political Science Association* (*APSA*) has attracted a great number of Central and Eastern European scholars to become individual members, just as it has in most other parts of the world. The more than 16,000 American political scientists and their conventions form a center of gravity that cannot be ignored.

Conclusions

More than ten years after the great transition from autocratic rule to democracy, we can observe a lively political science community in Central and Eastern Europe. Institutionalization has progressed. Contours of a research agenda are visible that reflect the problems facing societies in various phases of a process of economic, social, and political change. There is participation in the discourse on theory development. In addition, students of Political Science have experienced a fair chance in the labor market. But this happy note is not meant to obscure that the material and financial conditions the discipline has to struggle with in most of these countries are inadequate, to say the least. In many instances, academia is unable to compete with private business for the best talent – with all the accompanying negative long-term effects for the development of the profession that entails.

References

Easton, David (1953): *The Political System. An Inquiry Into the State of Political Science*, New York, Knopf;

Klingemann, Hans-Dieter, Kulesza, Ewa and Legutke, Annette (eds.) (2002): *Political Science in Central and Eastern Europe: The State of the Discipline in the Enlargement Countries of the European Union Ten Years After the Revolution*, Berlin, edition sigma;

Klingemann, Hans-Dieter and Falter, Jürgen (1998): "Die deutsche Politikwissenschaft im Urteil der Fachvertreter. Erste Ergebnisse einer Umfrage von 1996/97", in: *Demokratie – eine Kultur des Westens?*, Greven, Michael (ed.), Opladen, Leske + Budrich, 305-341;

Karasimeonov, Georgi (ed.) (1997): "The 1990 Election to the Bulgarian Grand National Assembly and the 1991 Election to the Bulgarian National Assembly. Analyses, Documents and Data", in: *Founding Elections in Eastern Europe*, Klingemann, Hans-Dieter and Taylor, Charles L. (series eds.), Berlin, edition sigma;

Krupavičius, Algis (ed.) (2001): "Lithuania's Seimas Election 1996: The Third Turnover. Analyses, Documents and Data", in: *Founding Elections in Eastern Europe*, Klingemann, Hans-Dieter and Taylor, Charles L. (series eds.), Berlin, edition sigma;

Gabal, Ivan (ed.) (1996): "The 1990 Election to the Czechoslovakian Federal Assembly. Analyses, Documents and Data", in: *Founding Elections in Eastern Europe*, Klingemann, Hans-Dieter and Taylor, Charles L. (series eds.), Berlin, edition sigma;

Gel'man, Vladimir and Golosov, Grigorii V. (eds.) (1999): "Elections in Russia, 1993-1996. Analyses, Documents and Data", in: *Founding Elections in Eastern Europe*, Klingemann, Hans-Dieter and Taylor, Charles L. (series eds.), Berlin, edition sigma;

Goati, Vladimir (ed.) (1998): "Elections to the Federal and Republican Parliaments of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), 1990-1996. Analyses Documents and Data", in: *Founding Elections in Eastern Europe*, Klingemann, Hans-Dieter and Taylor, Charles L. (series eds.), Berlin, edition sigma;

Šiber, Ivan (ed.) (1997): "The 1990 and 1992/3 Sabor Elections in Croatia. Analyses, Documents and Data", in: *Founding Elections in Eastern Europe*, Klingemann, Hans-Dieter and Taylor, Charles L. (series eds.), Berlin, edition sigma;

Tóka, Gábor (ed.) (1995): "The 1990 Election to the Hungarian National Assembly. Analyses, Documents and Data", in: *Founding Elections in Eastern Europe*, Klingemann, Hans-Dieter and Taylor, Charles L. (series eds.), Berlin, edition sigma;

Tóka, Gábor and Enyedi, Zsolt (eds.) (1999): "Elections to the Hungarian National Assembly, 1994. Analyses, Documents and Data", in: *Founding Elections in Eastern Europe*, Klingemann, Hans-Dieter and Taylor, Charles L. (series eds.), Berlin, edition sigma;

Toš, Niko and Miheljak, Vlado (eds.) (2002): "Slovenia Between Continuity and Change, 1990-1997. Analyses, Documents and Data", in: *Founding Elections in Eastern Europe*, Klingemann, Hans-Dieter and Taylor, Charles L. (series eds.), Berlin, edition sigma.

Table 1: Theoretical Approaches*

	Central and EasternEurope 2000		West Germany 1996	
Historical Approach	1**	(32)***	2**	(52)****
System Theory	2	(27)	3	(38)
Functionalism	3	(19)	6	(18)
Neo-Institutionalism	4	(18)	1	(54)
Behavioralism	5/6	(16)	7	(16)
Rational Choice	7	(14)	5	(26)
Hermeneutics	8	(12)	4	(31)
Game Theory	9/10	(5)	9	(13)
Marxism	9/10	(5)	10	(12)
Existentialism	11/12	(2)	12	(4)
Phenomenology	11/12	(2)	8	(15)
Cybernetics	13	(1)	11	(10)
N	(37)			(316)

* The comparison omits Organizational Theory, a sub-field asked in the 2000 Central and Eastern European survey but not asked in the 1996 West German survey.

** Rank order;

*** Number of departments mentioning the respective theoretical approach;

**** Proportion of respondents mentioning the respective theoretical approach as important or very important for their own research work.

A MAP OF STATE UNIVERSITIES IN
CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE
TEACHING POLITICAL SCIENCE

◘ capital ○ university included ● university not included
The digit in front of the symbol indicates the number of the universities included

Georgi Karasimeonov

Political Science – Bulgaria

Discussant: Antony Todorov

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Under Communist Party leader Todor Zhivkov, who was in power from 1956 until the fall of the regime in 1989, Bulgaria combined formal allegiance to the Soviet Union with a specific nationally oriented policy in which the attempt to accommodate the intellectual elite played a significant part. It conducted a carrot-and-stick policy, allowing certain freedoms and deviations from the official communist ideology. This explains why some sciences initially labeled "bourgeois", such as sociology and political science, were able in the 1970s and 1980s to find their way in the scientific community and even to institutionalize themselves, especially in Bulgaria's major university, the University of Sofia (now the St. Kliment Ohridski University). Sociology was institutionalized in the early 1970s and very quickly became a popular scientific discipline and university course among students and teachers.

Political science had to follow a more difficult path than sociology because it dealt with notions directly associated with political power; these were seen as a threat to the political and ideological dominance of the Communist Party. The official line of the communist ideology was that political science was incorporated within "Scientific Communism", which was a universal "science" introduced as an obligatory course for all social and natural sciences at institutions of higher education. Nonetheless, in the early 1970s, a small community of scientists began to look for ways to circumvent the official ideological position. It was able to make some headway with the introduction of topics close to political science in the Western sense and in expanding its influence in various social science faculties.

The first breakthrough was the early 1970s inclusion in Scientific Communism of a specialized course on politics at the party's Academy for Social Management. Later, in the sociology department of Sofia University, political sociology was introduced. These developments had been foreshadowed somewhat earlier when two institutes – the Institute of Contemporary Social Theories and the Institute of International Relations – were set up at the Academy of Sciences; there, research was conducted in certain fields of political science. The Political Science Association was founded in 1974 and was able to bring together various scientists – mostly from law, sociology, and scientific communism – who showed an interest in political science.

The Bulgarian Political Science Association was under the control of the Communist Party's ideological institutions. Nonetheless, it was able to further the cause of the development of political science and bring together scholars interested in political studies. It was the only institution that maintained contact with its colleagues in the West, mostly by participating in the world meetings of the International Political Science Association (IPSA) and various workshops organized by the latter. In the beginning, teachers from the law faculty at Sofia University dominated the Political Science Association, but later teachers from the sociology department were able to gain growing influence in the association and to play a determining role in its development and activities in the 1980s. By then it had already established itself as a permanent institution.

The Political Science Association helped establish the Department of History and Theory of Politics at Sofia University. Members of the Political Science Association were able to give courses in the new discipline. This was a major breakthrough, three years before the fall of the regime. Political science was introduced in Sofia University as a separate five-year undergraduate course of study, and the first 20 students were enrolled in 1986.

Most of the association's members participated in conferences organized during this period and in the publication of various articles and books, which developed certain themes typical of political science. Examples were the appearance in the 1980s of Mincho Semov's *Politics in History and Theory*, Georgi Karasimeonov's book on social democratic parties, and various studies on the Western political system and international relations by authors such as Nora Ananieva, Nansen Behar, Penka Karaivanova, and others.

In other words, before the great changes in 1989, the Political Science Association and the new department had already become a center where a great number of scientists – arguably including some of the most forward-thinking in Bulgaria – were able to group and create the basis for the expansion of political science in the new conditions after 1989. A great number of these scientists came from the younger generation, who were able to specialize for a shorter or longer period in Western universities and were prepared to meet the challenges of political science under the new conditions.

Although the regime and its hard-line ideologists tried to stop this process, under the influence of perestroika in the Soviet Union and the growing crisis of the communist regime, this shift constituted a major achievement of Bulgarian scientists' long efforts. It can also be viewed as part of the process of the imminent demise of the regime, which was unable to stop the growing trends towards democratization and freedom, especially in the realm of social sciences. It is no coincidence that the first major dissident groups emerged in Sofia University; some of their members were excluded from the Communist Party and fired from the university in 1987. Most of them were from the philosophy faculty, where political science had first been introduced and where the new department had been established. In a way, the institutionalization of political science was a sign and a symbol of the end of the communist regime and of the birth of a new atmosphere in the social sciences, which brought with it the notion of liberal democracy and liberal democratic institutions.

Although, typically for the situation, the curriculum included so-called "ideological disciplines", by and large the program "copied" and was based on the American and West-European tradition in Political Science.

2. The development of political science since 1989

The development of political science was marked by two major tendencies in the scientific community and in society in general. One was a general distrust of political scientists and institutions that were engaged in political science. Anti-communists accused political scientists of being "false" scientists and of having served the old regime. This atmosphere of animosity created heavy moral and professional strains on those who had worked for the introduction of political science under the old regime. They had to face a certain ignorance and ideological animosity from those pretending to be the "true" bearers of democratic ideals. This had a detrimental effect on some institutions, especially in the realm of the Academy of Sciences. Two of the major institutions dealing with political science – the Institute of Contemporary Social Theories and the Institute of International Affairs – were disbanded, and most of their members were actually left without jobs and had to look for new professional careers. These institutes were victims of the first wave of anti-communist euphoria and of in many ways unfounded ideological attacks. Many of the people working in these institutes were competent scientists with a proficient knowledge of political science, and some of them, through their works, had played an important role in reforming the Communist Party and had helped to bring about the radical changes in 1989.

Also prey to the anti-communist wave were all university departments engaged in the ideological propaganda of the Communist Party, such as the departments of Scientific Communism and of History of the Communist Party and various Marxist-Leninist departments. In some ways this was a logical development, but many members of these departments were left without the possibility of continuing their work as scientists under the new conditions. At the same time, many Marxist-Leninists tried to disguise themselves as political scientists in an effort to survive under the new circumstances.

But aside from these consequences of the radical political changes, in time brand new possibilities for the institutional development of political science appeared. This was clearly revealed in Sofia University, where the Department of Political Theory (so renamed after the changes) was able to augment its staff and attract many new students. Each year after 1989, the enrollment of students and their interest in political science grew, reaching a peak of 120 new undergraduates in 1998. For the year 2001, the number was somewhat reduced to 60. At the same time, political science was introduced for the first time in some new universities, both state and private. The New Bulgarian University in Sofia, established in 1991, introduced political science as a full four-year course with a growing number of students. The same was true for several other universities, which introduced some form of political science in their curriculum.

The most recent development in political science can be characterized as normalization and consolidation. The first challenges have been overcome. Many independent institutes were created, mostly as NGOs, to cater to a range of different types of research. In addition, many public opinion institutions have been founded and have established themselves as influential mediators in political life. Political science and political scientists have a high degree of popularity and prestige. Some of them are regular commentators in the media.

As already mentioned, political science is taught as a separate social science discipline at the Faculty of Philosophy of Sofia University “St. Kliment Ochridski” and in various combinations with law, sociology, economics and history at other universities. At Sofia University, where the traditions are longest, the curriculum encompasses four years for a Bachelor of Arts degree and one additional year for a Master’s Degree, followed by a three-year doctorate. The undergraduate course includes the following courses in the major disciplines: theory of politics, political institutions, political parties, history of political ideas, political ideologies, international relations, political culture, empirical politology, history of political life, and a great numbers of elective courses. The MA includes three major groups of courses: international relations, comparative politics, and Bulgarian politics.

The New Bulgarian University also has an undergraduate and graduate course in political science. The curriculum in political science was influenced by the Institute of Political Studies in Paris.

The other universities mentioned combine political science with sociology or history and law. This is also true for the universities in Blagoevgrad, Plovdiv, and Varna. In 2001, the St. Cyril and Methodius University in Veliko Tirnovo also started an undergraduate course in political science.

There are “state requirements”, a list of subjects that are a compulsory part of a university discipline. For Political Science these are:

History of political ideas with a minimum of 240 hours; History of Bulgarian political life (90 hours); Theory of Politics (90); Methods of political analysis (90); Political organizations and institutions (90); Comparative political systems and regimes (90); Theory of international relations (90); Political culture (90); Local government (60); Social policy (60); and History of international relations (60).

Research in political science is being carried out at the universities and in non-state institutes, mostly NGOs. As mentioned, there is no longer an institute of political science at the Academy of Sciences, after the two earlier ones were disbanded. Among the best known of the new institutes of research – think tanks working on several projects with the aid of different foundations – are the Center for the Study of Democracy, the Center for Liberal Studies, the Center for Social Practices, the Institute for International and Regional Studies, and the Institute for Political and Legal Studies. Since they are still young institutions, research in all of them is still at the initial stage, but their first achievements are encouraging. Some of them have already published interesting books and conducted empirical studies, which have attracted considerable attention among political scientists and others. A rather specific institution is the Laboratory of the Study of Bulgarian Political Life at Sofia University, which is engaged mostly in empirical studies.

At the same time, in the absence of financial support from the state, all these NGOs depend on aid from private sources or from foreign foundations or projects. This places them under constant pressure and inhibits long-term planning and program development in the quiet, normal atmosphere typical of Western institutions. This is why their research activities are mostly marked by the necessity to adapt to the specific moment and the existing financial sources.

Through grant support, many universities and NGOs have been provided computers, and the Internet is increasingly becoming an invaluable source of information. A great number of political scientists have E-mail and Internet links, which allows them to feel part of the world community of political scientists.

Following 1989, the Political Science Association restructured itself and expanded its membership, reaching 60 in 2001. It is attempting to become one of the main centers of intellectual activity in the discipline – organizing conferences and encouraging the publication of books and the propagating of political science in various periodicals and newspapers. In 1991, it was able to start the publication of its journal, *Political Studies*, which, though facing great financial difficulties, was able to publish major articles from the classics in political science as well as from Bulgarian political scientists. After its initial four issues a year, it appeared irregularly until recently. It plays a very important role in the curriculum, where students and teachers use it as a valuable source on political theory and practice. Unfortunately, financial restraints have temporarily forced it to stop its publishing activity.

The Political Science Association supported the creation of the Students' Political Science Association, which has played a very important role in bringing together students for research activities. It organizes an annual national conference and other seminars where undergraduate and graduate students are brought together to discuss various important topics in the field of political science and contemporary Bulgarian politics.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

There was no pre-war tradition in political science in Bulgaria, but some major works, mostly by university teachers and researchers in law, treated topics that are today part of political science. The problems of the development of the state and democracy are discussed in works by Venelin Ganev, especially his study on "Democracy" (1946), and by Vladimir Vladikin, in his "Organization of the Democratic State" (1935). Vladikin wrote a remarkable essay on the essence of political science (1936).

Stefan Balamesov, one of the most famous writers in constitutional law, followed the French tradition later developed by Maurice Duverger and others, combining constitutional law with the study of political institutions.

In other words, there were scattered theoretical works leaning towards political science, mostly based on the institutional approach.

In the aftermath of the political change in 1989, which created brand new conditions for the development of political science, the main focus has been on current political developments. This is quite understandable – the post-communist change is so radical and unprecedented in history, and so many dynamic events took place in the span of a few years that Bulgarian political scientists were overwhelmed with various topics to be analyzed. They had to adapt to quite new circumstances and to a new environment, and their current involvement as citizens made it practically impossible to do fundamental research, at least in the early years of transition.

At the same time, the detrimental effects of the general distaste for the ideology and ideological themes connected in the public mind in part with the old dogmatic Marxism-Leninism made systematic research difficult. For this reason, most of the writings of political scientists reflected their participation in the development of the new party system and of the new political structures. Many of them were engaged as experts in political parties and in the media as political commentators (Minchev, Krastev, Karasimeonov, Dainov, Dimitrov, Mitev, and others).

All these factors, especially in the first few years after 1989, led political scientists' activities and theoretical thoughts to concentrate mainly on day-to-day politics rather than on more fundamental issues. Indeed, most of the attention of political scientists concentrated on the analysis of empirical data produced by the newly established institutes for public opinion, such as BBSS Gallup Bulgaria, Sova-Harris, MBMD, Alpha-Research, and others. Some successful attempts to apply content analysis to compare party platforms were made (Mitev).

Much attention was devoted to overcoming the deficit in the literature on political science by translating important classical works in political science (for example, Locke, 1996; Schumpeter, 1996; Parsons, 1995; Rawls, 1993; Przeworski, 1995; Michels, 1994; Nozik, 1996; Lipset and Rokkan, 1993; Habermas, 1994; Duverger, 1994; Bentham, 1994; Arendt, 1992; Almond and Verba, 1999) and by publishing anthologies (Karasimeonov, 1992).

The lack of a longer tradition in political science and the youth of the discipline are the major reasons for a certain chaos and eclecticism in theoretical and methodological approaches. Some teachers and researchers from the older generation are under the influence of the Marxist tradition and heritage. The majority of them have tried to adapt their courses and work to various dominant Western theories. The most popular such theories are the institutional, system, and structural-functionalist methods. A few have been attracted to behaviorism or to organizational and game theory (see table 1).

Although there is still a lack of systematic and well-structured research in Political Science, the main fields in the discipline are relatively well represented.

In the fields of History and Theory of Politics and Political Ideas, several textbooks were published. In the Theory of Politics, these are the works of Semov and of Fotev. More books appeared on the History of Political Ideas (Ivanov, Jankov, Todorov). A young and promising political scientist has written on the topic of conservatism, especially Edmund Burke (Malinov).

4. Thematic orientation and funding

The *transition* of the totalitarian regime to democracy was and is a major object of study for political scientists. Their works mainly follow the methodology developed by transitologists like O'Donnel, Shmitter, Gunther, Higley, Linz, Stepan, and others who analyzed transition to democracy in South America and Southern Europe. The collapse of communism in Eastern and Central Europe has given new impetus for testing the established theories of transition to democracy and the consolidation of new emergent democratic regimes. Several Bulgarian political scientists were included in international projects and publications dealing with various aspects of political transformation in Bulgaria and the establishment of new democratic institutions (Kanev, Karasimeonov, Kolarova, Dimitrov, Mitev, Todorov, Krastev).

The choice of themes is influenced by several factors. On the one hand, the political development sets the agenda for choosing the dominant topics (for example, institution building, the electoral process, party politics, etc.). On the other hand, the new university courses in political science determine the orientations of most teachers, who have to adapt to state requirements placed on the discipline.

At the same time, many themes are determined by the priorities set in international projects involving Bulgarian political scientists. Major themes determined by such projects in the years following 1989 include the emergence and consolidation of democracy, the establishment and functioning of new political institutions, local government, the emergence and role of civil society, the state of human and minority rights, and international and local conflict resolution.

The impact of thematic orientation is mostly felt at teaching institutions where the discipline is in a dynamic state. Many new and so-called "choice courses" are determined by the major thematic orientation, although there is a relatively open space for individual choices.

Much more restricted in their choices are think tanks and the so-called “third sector”, which are dependent on external funding, which in turn is tied to research in thematic fields set by the project.

Funding of teaching and research in political science is mostly based on public financing through the budget. In a period of economic depression and restructuring, this source is woefully insufficient to support the normal development of universities and faculties. This is not meant to downplay the major significance of state funding for the official recognition and establishment of political science as part of the social disciplines, including the establishment of new departments in that field. But today, public funding is quite insufficient to maintain the standards necessary for the development of the discipline by creating possibilities for teaching positions for a new generation of teachers. A great deficiency is the lack of or very limited funding for research, be it at the state universities or the Academy of Sciences. That is why research in political science is mostly dependent on the personal efforts of political scientists and on external funding and foreign sources.

Private funding by private business or donations is practically nonexistent, to a great extent a result of the lack of laws permitting tax exemptions for such funding in support of scientific research. The New Bulgarian University, which has the most developed political science department after the one at Sofia University, relies on private funding, mostly student fees.

5. Public space and academic debates

Most of the major monographs and studies analyze the Bulgarian political system and its new political institutions. This is quite understandable. The radical political transformation most definitely took place in the state and in other intermediary political institutions that emerged with the transition from the totalitarian to a democratic political system.

So the most frequent topics of research are the establishment and role of the new political institutions that substantiated the democratic legitimacy of the state embodied in the new constitution adopted by the Constituent Assembly in July 1991. The new constitution defined Bulgaria as a parliamentary republic. For the first time in the country’s contemporary history, new institutions were established – the Presidency and the Constitutional Court.

During the constitutional debates, political scientists also voiced their views on the scope of the role of the new institution and the scope of the presidential prerogatives. They joined their colleagues from Constitutional Law to express their arguments for a “weaker” or “stronger” presidency (Semov, Karasimeonov, Kanev, Kolarova, Minchev, etc.). That debate continues, based on the experience of the past years and the evolution of the separation of powers between the president and the executive. Political scientists continue to have divergent views. Some argue for a change to a stronger presidency, arguing that this would create greater stability, others support the status quo (Krastev, Pirgova, Blishnashki, Spassov).

The parliament and its role in the consolidation of democracy have also been a topic of research. Its role in government formation and its legislative activity have been researched in comparisons of the Grand National Assembly (1990 -1991) and its follow-ups – the 37th, 38th and 39th regular assemblies (Kanev). More detailed analysis of the activities of parliamentary parties and the functioning of parliamentary committees have been the topics of several studies (Kanev, Karasimeonov).

The role and decisions of the Constitutional Court have also drawn considerable attention. This brand new institution in Bulgarian politics has produced many controversial reactions among political circles and political scientists. Some of the political scientists see in it a de facto political institution that has played an overly political role and has not been able to keep a non-partisan position. Others say that although it has not been perfect in its activity, the constitutional court has been a very important barrier to the tyranny of the majority syndrome (Kolarova).

Some political scientists (Stefanova) have written on local government institutions in the process of democratization and on the means for developing local self-government.

Electoral Studies has evolved into a major field of research in Bulgarian political science. The founding and follow-up elections provided a major impetus for detailed analysis of electoral results. Political scientists discuss the effects of the electoral system as a factor of institutional stability or instability. Another topic is elections and election results in the process of establishing the new party system (Dimitrov, Kanev, Krastev, Todorov, etc.).

The emergence and establishment of political parties have been predominant issues in political research. Their major role in the process of transition and the consolidation of democracy, the dynamic changes in and restructuring of the party system, and the development and political profiles of the new post-communist parties have received the attention of a very large number of political scientists. A textbook on political parties (Karasimeonov) and many studies have been written in the past 12 years (Krastev, Kanev, Dainov, Malinov, Todorov, Minchev, Pirgova).

Major themes have been the role of parties in elite formation, their links to civil society, their role as a factor for stability or instability, their governing capacities, etc.

The definition of the party system as a bipolar confrontation reflected the initial harsh opposition between the ex-communist Socialist Party and the newly established Union of Democratic Forces. In their analysis of the party system, political scientists reach the conclusion that political parties, although very important in the process of transformation, have not been able to adequately fulfill their major functions and in many ways have failed in their aim to create conditions for citizens' active political participation. One of the reasons for this situation is the highly confrontational party model that has been established in Bulgaria; a second, the absence of sufficient links with civil society, which closed the party system to the demands of the people. From an organizational perspective, most parties display clientelistic tendencies and an absence of channels to facilitate regular changes in party leadership.

Bulgarian authors also discuss the appearance of new cleavages relevant to party formation. Some of them attempt to adapt Stein Roccan's typology to post-communist realities.

Residual (historical) cleavages are those inherited from pre-communist society and which, to varying degrees, manifest themselves in post-communist society. In some countries, they determine electoral and party preferences. They are more evident in the countries of Central Europe where the communist regimes were unable to completely eradicate old values and culture or where they accepted some elements of the market economy and tolerated forms of private property.

Transitional cleavages are those that determine political divisions and party formation at the initial stage of changes after the fall of the regime, but later disappear or are "swallowed" by new cleavages appearing as the post-communist societies are consolidated. They are the products of the initial pro- and anti-communism polarity that determined many of the party conflicts and divisions immediately after 1989.

Current cleavages are new cleavages marked by the specific contradictions and conflicts of post-communist societies; these result from the economic and political reforms. They are specific cleavages resulting from the changes in the social structure and property relations. To a great extent, they determine electoral behavior and party preferences when the major transitional cleft based on the communism/anti-communism polarity is partially or mostly resolved and society moves to resolve new conflicts and issues typical for the consolidation phase.

Potential cleavages are those major issues and conflicts in post-communist societies that might become current cleavages as a consequence of the evolution of the economic and political system. They are dependent on the nature of the transition and on the effect of the policies of the various political parties in power. All of these types of cleavages are present in post-communist societies, in various proportions and appearances. They have a distinct effect in each country, depending on its pre-communist, communist, and post-communist development, specifically the process of transition and consolidation (Karasimeonov, 1998).

One of the most extensively researched and debated issues is the evolution of the Communist Party, which was able to preserve a dominant role in the first phase of transition to democracy. The delayed differentiation and the postponement of the issue of its identity led to a crisis in its development and to an erosion in membership, but never to a real division between the social-democratic and the neo-communist wing. A very peculiar phenomenon is its development into a clan-type party in which major sectors of the leadership are connected to various groups of the former nomenclature. Because of its initial post-communist development as a conglomerate of various groups and interests whose values conflict, it is at the same time closely linked to the "new capitalists", as well as to groups suffering from the transition crisis. The postponed identity debate and growing internal controversies led at the end of 1996 and the beginning of 1997 to an internal crisis and to a loss of influence after the peak reached in the election of 1994, when it won the parliamentary elections. It lost the pre-term elections in April 1997 (Kanev, Todorov, Pirgova).

A new unexpected topic entered the public agenda and political theory as well – the emergence in 2001 of a new political movement led by exiled monarch Simeon II. Only two months after its appearance in public life, the National Movement Simeon II won the parliamentary elections by a landslide and formed the government. It was able to undermine the positions of the two major, right- and left-wing parties. How that was possible and the reasons for this phenomenon are a constant issue of debate among political scientists, who take divergent and even opposing views.

One of the dominant views is that the development in the post-communist countries has shown that the consolidation process does not exclude volatility of the party system. This is a result of the radical transformation of the economic and social structures that affect interests, values, and lifestyles of millions of people. It will take two or more generations to adapt to a new economic and social environment resulting from the establishment of the market economy and new principles of redistribution of social goods. Many social groups are unable to adapt to these new conditions and become marginalized. They are the losers of the transformation process. Politically, they feel they are disadvantaged outsiders of the system of representation; this is the social basis of new protest movements in the post-communist countries (Kanev, Malinov).

This is why democracies and the system of the representation have been periodically challenged by groups of outsiders who are inclined to support populist political parties and movements combining nostalgic and anti-system values. The main opponent of such movements is the particracy, which in post-communist countries is a new privileged class of politicians, party activists, state bureaucrats, and the new bourgeoisie, a product of political clientelism, corruption, and crime (Karasimeonov).

The emergence, rise, and success of such movements and parties in Hungary (Curka), Romania (Tudor), Slovakia (Meciar), and lately in Bulgaria (Simeon II) demonstrate the social malaise in relation to newly established parties and their capacity to respond to the losers and outsiders in societies.

Bulgaria is a special case. The political movement founded by ex-King Simeon II is not a retro-nostalgic, xenophobic, anti-European nationalistic movement, but a modern version of a populist alternative to the political and particularly the party model that was established in the country after 1989. It is the antipode of the confrontational bipolar party system dominated by the ex-communist BSP and the radical anti-communist UDF, which developed from the pro- and anti-communism cleft of the early 1990s that constantly divided the country (Karasimeonov).

On the other hand, the movement is a moral challenge to party clientelism and corrupt practices that marked Bulgarian politics in the last 12 years.

Political scientists note the multiple challenges to this fragile movement, which will either break it apart or transform it into a more stable, party-like formation in the coming years (Kanev, Krastev). Some of these challenges are linked to the new movement's ability to govern, its internal homogeneity, and its creation of organizational structures.

If the new movement stabilizes as a party, it will forge a new party configuration to replace the traditional 2+1 party configuration – a left and a right and a small ethnic party.

The role of civil society and the development of a new political culture reflecting political transformation have been an important topic of discussion and research. The process of the emergence of a post-communist civil society bears the imprint of a transition from passive attitudes of subjects to a new civic culture of active participation in the democratic process. Bulgarian political scientists are unanimous that this process will be prolonged, conflictual, and accompanied by generational transformations (Kanev, Tanev, Krasteva).

The nature of political transformation and transition has constantly stirred political scientists' interest in analyzing specific traits of the Bulgarian transition to democracy – the Round Table talks (Kolarova, Dimitrov) – to the various elements and stages of consolidation to democracy (Karasimeonov).

International relations have also been a hotly debated topic, since Bulgarian public opinion is divided on whether Bulgaria should join NATO or remain neutral. Most political scientists try to define the challenges and the brand new situation in which Bulgaria finds itself: without any clear alliances or "big brothers" for the first time in all its history. This makes it necessary to develop a real independent foreign policy based on a clear definition of Bulgaria's national, regional, and global relationships and priorities. With serious conflicts evolving in the Balkan region, the study of regional conflicts and their possible resolution is a constant topic of debates in the political science community (Minchev, Dronsina).

In general, the debates among political scientists in Bulgaria in recent years clearly show that they have to face many new, still undefined paradigms requiring further, very serious research. Many simplistic answers and conceptions simply do not hold, and a unique historical situation demands exceptional intellectual and theoretical knowledge and efforts. At the same time, political scientists – not only at home, but also at various international conferences – have been able to give their own assessment of the situation and to be critical of many Western and Eastern European assumptions about political and economic change in Eastern Europe.

6. Views on further development and major challenges

Political science went through its own transitional period, with its own phases. The first stage was the legitimization of political science and its institutionalization in the major academic institutions. The second stage was consolidation, characterized by the normal functioning of an established community of scholars and university staff with the necessary theoretical knowledge and resources to assure the discipline's development.

The major challenge political science faces today is the need to speedily overcome the lack of scholars who have sufficient knowledge of modern political science. Efforts to overcome this major deficiency are accompanied by serious efforts to fill the void in theoretical literature, by creating special libraries for political science, by translating major works, and by publishing specialized journals. Many political science students specialize abroad, working on their MA or PhD degrees. Some of these students hopefully will return to the country and join the political science community.

There is a great need for political scientists to conduct systematic research and to debate on major trends in political theory and new developments in political science. There are not enough political science community forums discussing the development of the discipline. The lack of a regular political science journal also hampers regular debates on major topics.

Another major deficiency among political science scholars is the dominance of descriptive approaches and "applied" political science – i.e., reaction to day-to-day political events. Well known scholars devote enormous amounts of time to political commentaries in the media and little to systematic research in political science. As a by-product of this tendency, some political scientists take ideological and partisan approaches. But a growing number try to analyze events and carry out research on a nonpartisan basis and to achieve results based on scientific knowledge, rather than on political bias.

The new generation of political scientists, in particular, faces a major challenge to establish a specific Bulgarian school in political science. The group of PhD students has grown significantly, but the lack of university positions for them leads to their dispersal and disqualification as researchers and teachers. A major cause of this is insufficient funding from the state budget or other sources. This can hamper the natural transition from the older to the younger generation.

The lack of professional opportunities for political scientists graduating from universities is cause for concern. Many of them look for other jobs, which disqualifies them in the long run. This leads to the brain drain of students and graduates who have joined the massive immigration of young people to the West – although the situation is even more acute with computer specialists.

Many Bulgarian political scientists have published in the well known international journals in the field like the *Journal of Communist Studies*, the *Journal for Political Research*, *East-European Politics*, *Party Politics*, *Süd-Osteuropa-Forschungen*, *Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie*, and others.

Enhancing international cooperation is essential for the development of political science. The growing participation of native political scientists in various forms of international cooperation enhances their knowledge in various fields of teaching and research. The Bulgarian Political Science Association is a member of IPSA, but has financial difficulties regularly paying its membership fee.

Only the department of political science at the University for National and World Economy is a member of European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), which is quite insufficient for regular contacts during ECPR sessions.

The establishment of the European Political Science Network and its institutionalization in June 2001 was a great step forward in enhancing international cooperation among political scientists from Western and Eastern Europe. For the first time since 1989, a political science association has been created on a partnership basis with scientists and teachers from all 27 EU and associated member countries. The association's flexible membership conditions and fees will make it the most representative institution in Europe up to now. A Bulgarian political scientist was chosen as a member of the first Interim Executive Committee of the newly established European Political Science Network.

The impact of the process of accession is being felt in a more positive way since Bulgaria was invited to join the EU in 2000. It was included in the Socrates program and other initiatives that benefit social scientists. Great expectations are tied to the 6th Framework program of the EU, which will expand funding in the social sciences.

Increasingly, political science, as a product of democracy, is becoming a major scientific resource for consolidating democracy.

Selected Bibliography

Alexandrov, Evgeni (1995): "Bulgarskata vunshna politika sled 1990 kato psihologicheski phenomen" (The Bulgarian Foreign Policy as a Psychological Phenomenon), in: *Mejdunarodni otnoshenija*, *15* (5-6), 44-48;

Bliznashki, Georgi (1995): *Parlamentarnoto upravlenie v Bulgaria* (Parliamentary Government in Bulgaria), Sofia, University Press;

Braikova, Tatjana (2000): *Teorija na sozialnata politika* (Theory of Social Politics), Sofia, University Press;

Dainov, Evgeni (1996): "Transition agenda: A Stop-go Modernization", in: *Three Viewpoints*, Sofia, Center for Social Practices, 30-48;

Dainov, Evgeni (2000): *Politicheskijat debat I prehodat v Balagarija* (The Political Debate and the Transition in Bulgaria), Sofia, Bulgarian Science and Culture Foundation;

Dimitrov, Dimitar (1993): "Bulgarskijat glasopodavatel" (The Bulgarian Electorate), in: *Politicheski Izsledvanja,* 1(1), 53-76;
Dimitrov, Philip (1995): "Nazionalnijat konsensus vuv vunshnata politika I osushtestvjavaneto mu ot instituziite" (The National Consensus in the Foreign Policy and its Realization in the Institutions), in: *Mejdunarodni otnoshenija*, 15(5-6), 31-35;
Dronsina, Tatjana (1999): *Rasreshavane na konfliktite* (Conflict Resolution), Sofia, University Press;
Fotev, Georgi (2001): *Granizi na politikata. Sociologocheski traktat* (Limits of Politics. A sociological treatise), Sofia, LIK;
Genov, Nikolai (1995): "Left, Right, Center: What does it mean in our country today?", in: *Politicheski Izsledvanja*, 3(1), 116-127;
Georgiev, Ivo (1996): "Indecisive Socialist Party Stumbles into Crisis", in: *Transition*, 2(3), 26-28;
Grigorova-Mincheva, Ljubov (1995): "Parliamentarism and Nation: Mutually exclusive or perfectly synchronizable Concepts. The case of Bulgaria", in: *Comparative Balkan Parliamentaris,* Grigorova-Mincheva, Ljubov, Sofia, International Center for Minority Studies and Intercultural Relations, 59-67;
Ivanov, Dimitar (1991): *Ot Platon do Bakunin* (From Plato to Bakunin), Sofia , University Press;
Ivanov, Dimitar (2000): *Poniatieto vlast v amerikanskata politicheska teorija* (The Notion of Power in American Political Theory), Sofia, University Press;
Jankov, Georgi (1998): *Politicheskata misal ot drevnostta do nashi dni* (The Political Thought from the Past to the Present), Sofia , Economics University Press;
Kanev, Dobrin (1994): "Sa budeshteto na bulgarskata demokrazija – s optimusm ili pesimisum" (On the Future of Bulgarian Democracy – between Optimism and Pesimism), in: *Politicheski Izsledvanja*, 2(1), Sofia, 19-22;
Kanev, Dobrin (1996): "Partiite v parlamenta" (Parties in Parliament), Parlamentarna Demokcratsija, 1(2), Sofia, 5-29;
Kanev, Dobrin (1997): "Political Culture and the Prospects of Democracy", in: *The 1990 Elections to the Bulgarian Grand National Assembly and the 1991 Elections to the Bulgarian national Assembly. Analyses, Documents and Data*, Karasimeonov, Georgi (ed.), Berlin, Sigma, 56-89;
Kanev, Dobrin (1997): "The Committee System of the Bulgarian Parliament: An Overview", in: *Working Papers on Comparative Legislative Studies II; The Changing Role of Parliamentary Committees*, L. Longley and A. Agh, Appleton, RCLS, 32-45;
Karasimeonov, Georgi (1993): "Sea Changes in the Bulgarian Party System", in: *The Journal of Communist Studies,* 9(3), London, 271 – 278;
Karasimeonov, Georgi (1993): *Politicheskite partii – obshta teorija* (Political Parties – General Theory), Sofia, University Press;
Karasimeonov, Georgi (1995): "Bulgaria's new Party System", in: *Stabilizing Fragile Democracies*, Pridham, Geoffrey and Lewis, Paul G. (eds.), London, Routledge, 254-265;
Karasimeonov, Georgi (1995): "Parliamentary Elections of 1994 and the Development of the Bulgarian Party System", in: *Party Politics*, 1(4), London, 579-587;
Karasimeonov, Georgi (1996): "The Legislature in Post-Communist Bulgaria", in: Olson, David and Norton, Philip (eds.), *The new Parliaments of Central and Eastern Europe*, London, Frank Cass, 29-59;
Karasimeonov, Georgi (1997): *Politika I politicheski instituzii* (Politics and Political Institutions), Sofia, University Press;
Karasimeonov, Georgi (1998): "Bulgaria", in: *The Handbook of Political Change in Eastern Europe*, Berglund, Sten et al. (eds.), Cheltenham, Elgar, 335-365;
Karasimeonov, Georgi (2001): *Challenges to Democracy, Eastern Europe Ten Years after the Collapse of Communism* (together with Berglund, Sten et al.), London, Elgar;
Kolarova, Rumjana (1996): "Bulgarskijat konstituzionen sud: Kljuchova politicheska institutzija v prozesa na demokratizatsija" (The Bulgarian Constitutional Court: Key political institution in the process of democratization), in: *Parlamentarna Demokcratsija*, 1(3), Sofia, 4-18;
Kolarova, Rumjana and Dimitrov, Dimitar (1995): "Roundtable Talks in Bulgaria", in: *The Roundtable Talks and the Breakdown of Communism*, Elster, John (ed.), Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 178-213;
Krastev, Ivan (1997): "Konstituzijata kato politicheska istorija" (The Constitution as Political History), in: *Parlamentarna Demokcratsija*, 2(5), Sofia, 25- 36;
Krasteva, Anna (1999): *Identichnosti, dialog, vlast* (Identities, Discourse, Power), Sofia, Petekston;

Malinov, Svetoslav (1997), “Ponjatieto grashdansko obstestvo I politicheskata teorija” (The Notion of Civil Society and Political Theory), in: *Citizens and Politics*, Karasimeonov, Georgi (ed.), Sofia, University Press, 17-37;

Malinov, Svetoslav (1999): “Kakvo e konservarisam?” (What is conservatism?), in: *Konservatizmat* (Conservatism), Sofia, Politeija, 2-22;

Minchev, Ognjan (1995): “Vunshnata politika na Bulgaria” (Bulgarian foreign policy), in: *Mejdunarodni otnoshenija* 15 (3), Sofia, 23-65;

Mitev, Petar-Emil (1994): “Posttotalitarnoto razvitie: Protodemokratsija ili protoavtoritarni regimi” (Post-totalitarian Development: Proto-democracy or Proto-authoritarianism. Alternatives for Bulgaria), in: *Politicheski Izsledvanja*, 2(1), Sofia, 22-26;

Parvanov, Anton (1995): “National question in Bulgarian foreign policy (1878-1989)’, Historical foundations and contemporary priorities”, in: C*omparative Balkan Parliamentarism,* Grigorova-Mincheva, Ljubov, Sofia, International Center for Minority Studies and Intercultural Relations, 33-51;

Pirgova, Marija (1998): *Parlamentarnata sistema v Balgaria* (The Parliamentary System in Bulgaria), Sofia, University Press;

Semov, Mincho (1993): *Politologija* (Political Science), Sofia, University Press;

Semov, Mincho (2000): *Teorija na politikata* (Theory of Politics), Sofia, University Press;

Spassov, Boris (1992): *Narodno Subranie* (The National Assembly), Burgas, University Press;

Spassov, Boris (1995): *Presidentut na Republikata* (The President of the Republic), Sofia, University Press;

Stalev, Jivko (1996): *Konstituzionnijat Sud* (The Constitutional Court), Sofia, University Press;

Stefanova, Milena (1999): *Mestnata vlast v Balagarija* (Local government in Bulgaria), Sofia, University Press;

Stoychev, Stefan (1992): *Izbiratelno zakonodatelstvo I izbori v perioda na prehoda kum demokratsija* (Electoral Legislature and Elections in the Period of Transition Towards Democracy), Sofia, University Press;

Tanchev, Evgeni (1997): *Presidentskata instituzija* (The Presidential Institution), in: *Parlamentarna Demokcratsija,* 2(5), Sofia, 3-25;

Tanev, Todor (2001): *Politicheskata kultura* (Political Culture), Sofia, University Press;

Todorov, Antony (2001): *Modernata politicheska misal* (Modern Political Thought), Sofia, NBU Press;

Todorov, Antony (1993): “Politicheskata kultura v moderna Bulgaria” (Political cultures in modern Bulgaria), *Politicheski Izsledvanja*, 1(3), Sofia, 20-32;

Todorov, Antony (1997): *Balgarskite isbori 1990-1996* (The Bulgarian Elections 1990-1996) with Krastev, Ivan et al., Sofia, University Press;

Todorov, Antony (2000): “Electoral Studies in Bulgaria”, in: *Elections in Central and Eastern Europe: The First Wave*, Klingemann; Hans-Dieter (ed.), Berlin, Sigma.

Table 1 Theoretical and methodological approaches

Institution	Behaviorism	Cybernetics	System Theory	Organizational Theory	Marxism	Game Theory	Neo-Institutionalism	Historical Approaches	Functionalism
Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridsky”	+		+	+			+	+	+
University for National and World Economy	+		+			+	+	+	+
New Bulgarian University			+			+	+	+	+
Plovdiv University “Paisii Hilendarsky”	+	+	+	+	+			+	+
Veliko Tarnovo University “St.Ciril and Metody”			+	+				+	+
South-west University “Neofit Rilsky”			+	+				+	
Varna Free University “Chernorizets Hrabar”	+		+	+		+	+	+	+

Table 2 Areas of teaching and research in Bulgarian political science institutions

Institution	Method and Theory	Politcal Philosophy	Com-parative Politics	Political Sociology	Political Economy	National/ Area Studies	Interna-tional Rela-tions	Public Policy
Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridsky”	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
University for National and World Economy		+	+	+	+			+
New Bulgarian University	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Plovdiv University “Paisii Hilendarsky”	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Veliko Tarnovo University “St.Ciril and Metody”		+	+	+	+			
South-west University “Neofit Rilsky”	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Varna Free University “Chernorizets Hrabar”	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Jan Holzer and Pavel Pšeja

Political Science – Czech Republic

Discussant: Zdeňka Mansfeldová

Introduction

It is not common to witness, let alone take part in, the birth or renewal of a social science discipline, especially a birth that is not natural, but a case of "artificial insemination", in this case the result of strong social demand. Of course, it is also not common – though not extremely rare either – for the natural development of science, here the social sciences, to be interrupted for more than five decades, disrupting personnel and institutional continuity in several academic fields for more than two generations and severing, if not completely obliterating, all existing ties and traditions. All this proceeded purposefully and by plan, motivated by an ideology that demanded the destruction of those fields liable to use their independent roots to produce arguments questioning the monolithic fortress of the Marxist-Leninist worldview.

The preceding paragraph describes the situation in Czechoslovakia, first during the Nazi occupation after 1939 and then, after a brief three-year intermezzo, for the next forty years following the "final" imposition of the totalitarian system of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (Komunistická strana Československa – KSČ). This situation was not ended until the events of 1989. The subsequent renewal of democratic principles had an impact on all aspects of society, including a wide range of academic institutions, universities, and research facilities. The process of acquiring a new self-identification and the discovery of the "normal" role of academic life in Czechoslovak (and then Czech) circumstances would in and of itself be worthy of thorough academic study. A specific, if not unique, genesis took place in the social sciences, especially in the field of political science. This field did not face the challenge of returning to its own pre-war traditions (as other social sciences did), for this was impossible. The developments preceding 1989 had liquidated all continuity, which meant that political science had to create the field anew. This text is (1) an attempt to describe the process of the birth of political science in the Czech lands following 1989 and (2) a description of the status and conditions that Czech political science has achieved at the beginning of the 21st century. This report intends to describe and, given the limited scope of the text, partially analyze the current state of Czech political science as it is, without any ambition (inappropriate in this context, anyway) to compare this condition with possible or ideal variants of understanding political science.

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Any attempt to identify a tradition of Czech political science appears somewhat problematic, due to the specific nature of the genesis of the social sciences in the Czech and Czechoslovakian settings.

In the Czech lands, study of the broad, classical core of political science began at the end of the 19th century, i.e., in the period when Czech academia was being established. But political science was not established as an independent field of research; politics as an original social phenomenon, political parties, and questions of democracy were studied within the framework of sociology, economics, governmental studies, and law.

During the inter-war period (1918-1938) the process of creating social sciences acquired a paradoxical context. In the enthusiasm accompanying the foundation of an independent Czechoslovak state and the complete break with the Habsburg era, the social sciences were assigned specific "nation-building" tasks. The thematic interests, methodology, and evaluation of the environment in which these fields developed were created almost exclusively by the leading figures of Czech public life of the late 19th and early 20th centuries – first and foremost, Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, a professor of philosophy (see Opat, 1990). Among the factors that created this special atmosphere in the Czechoslovak political scene were Masaryk's key role in the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian empire and his cooperation in exile with Edvard Beneš (also a sociologist) during World War I. Even more important was the privileged position that both of them enjoyed after 1918. This atmosphere was mediated by certain circles in society, including the print media and academia.

Given these circumstances, it is essential to look also for the characteristic features that gradually shaped the newly emerging field of Czech political science: an emphasis on moral elements in politics, the demand for harmony between politics and ethics, contempt for the phenomenon of political power and for political authorities, skepticism toward the phenomenon of political parties[1], an emphasis on national (ethnic) features, a more or less uncritical approach to the phenomenon of democracy, and, last but not least, a specifically Czech ideologizing of the concept of politics as a reflection of the debate on the "Czech Question". This debate, seen as a controversy over the meaning of Czech history, expressed a collection of philosophical, historical, sociological, and theological questions associated with the modern existence of the Czech nation and its independence (see Havelka, 1995). During the 1930s, a new theme emerged in social science disciplines: the role and status of Czechoslovakia in Central Europe and the possibility and probability of the Czechoslovak Republic surviving as an island of democracy in a sea of multiplying authoritarian and pre-totalitarian regimes.

These features are reflected in the publishing activities of individual authors who dealt with Czech politics between the wars. In addition to Masaryk (*Demokracie a politika* – Democracy and Politics, 1912, *Rusko a Evropa* – Russia and Europe, 1921, *Světová revoluce* – World Revolution, 1925, and *Cesta demokracie* – The Path of Democracy, 1933) and Beneš (*Politické stranictví* – Political Partisanship, 1912, *Povaha politického stranictví* – The Nature of Political Partisanship, 1920, and *Nesnáze demokracie* – The Predicament of Democracy, 1924)[2], those worthy of mention include Jan Mertl (*Politické strany. Jejich základy a typy v dnešním světě* – Political Parties: Their Foundations and Varieties in the Modern World, 1931 and *Co s politickými stranami* – What is to be Done with Political Parties, 1938), Josef Ludvík Fischer (*Soustava skladebné filosofie* – The System of Structural Philosophy, 1931, *Třetí říše* – The Third Reich, 1932, and *Krise demokracie* – The Crisis of Democracy, 1933), Kamil Krofta (*Stará a nová střední Evropa* – The Old and New Central Europe, 1929), and other authors writing on the boundary of political science and sociology (Inocenc Arnošt Bláha, Emanuel Chalupný, etc.).

The actual standing of political science in this period is evidenced by the fact that it was not possible to study political science as a separate university subject in the Czechoslovak Republic. The Independent School of Political and Social Sciences (Svobodná škola politických a sociálních nauk) established in 1929 failed to receive accreditation as a university. Political topics were studied in other academic fields. This means that the institutional process of fission in the fields of law and economics, in which two very distinct methodological schools were formed during the inter-war period and each associated with one of the two leading Czech universities (the Prague normative school at Charles University and the Brno positivistic school at Masaryk University), did not take place in the field of political science. During this period, there was no journal exclusively focused on politics; politics was discussed in sociological journals. *Sociální revue* (Social Review), *Časopis Svobodné školy politických a sociálních nauk v Praze* (Journal of the Independent School of Political and Social Science in Prague) and *Parlament* (Parliament) were published in Prague, while *Sociologická revue* (Sociological Review) and *Index* (Index) were published in Brno. After a mere twenty years of autonomous development, World War II brought Czechoslovak academic studies to a halt. This meant that the social sciences completed only the initial phases of development and that no definite and lasting foundations for political science in the Czech lands had been laid.

Even in the period following World War II, when political science experienced an unprecedented level of expansion, the situation in Czechoslovakia did not return to normal. However, the interim period from 1945 to 1948 did witness the emergence of several institutional initiatives (for example the establishment of the School of Political and Social Sciences in Prague – Škola politických a sociálních věd; the first student graduated from the School in 1949, and the School was closed in 1952) and remarkable texts (Neubauer, 1947). Soon afterward, however, the possibility of free and independent research in the social sciences was definitively ended with the assumption of power by a totalitarian communist regime that relied on Marxist-Leninist philosophy as its explanatory worldview. The term "political science" was blacklisted, its place taken by "scientific communism" as the sole tool and methodology for explaining social processes. All existing academic institutions were, of course, robbed of all channels of information, and contacts with the West were broken. The perceived ideal was to be Soviet science, including its confused entry into the social sciences. The majority of experts either found themselves in exile or in communist prisons and work camps; at best, they were only forbidden to publish and/or lecture.

The all too brief intermezzo in the second half of the 1960s brought a certain change in association with the careful political liberalization that culminated in the Prague Spring. This included a loosening of publishing activities (e.g. Tlustý and Klofáč, 1968, texts by Lubomír Brokl, Miroslav Jodl, Pavel Machonin, Zdeněk Mlynář, and Jan Škaloud, as well as the translation of several key works of political science into Czech) and institutional initiatives. A key move in this area was the foundation of the Czechoslovak Association of Political Science (Československá asociace politické vědy, 1964), a step brought about by the participation of several Czech and Slovak academics at the IPSA world congresses in 1961 and 1964 and by the need for academic representation abroad. Additional institutional activities included the renewal of political science as a field of study at Charles University in Prague and at Comenius University in Bratislava (both in 1967) and projects initiated by the Institute of the State and Law of the Czechoslovak Academy of Science (Ústav státu a práva Československé akademie věd). All of this, together with the opportunities for contact with developments abroad, had a major impact on creating an open atmosphere in social science circles, reflected in a return to a number of themes taboo up to that time. The early, violent end of this era meant a new revision, and soon afterward Czech academics moved into the reality of "normalization" in the 1970s, whose first phase was accompanied by the repression of the individuals who had participated in the reform movements and which later moved to replace political science with "scientific communism". The partial relaxation of state control in the late 1960s cannot be seen as constituting any sort of continuity; while the developments of the era were clearly an attempt to renew the possibility of studying politics, there was no relationship to the situation before 1948 in either the scientific or the personal sense.

The final two decades of development of communism in Czechoslovakia prior to 1989 did not lead the authorities to relax ideologically and reorient toward guaranteeing a stable everyday status quo, as took place in Poland and Hungary (in the spirit of the definition of a "post-totalitarian" region by Linz and Stepan, 1996: 42-51). In the social sciences this meant a total isolation from the developments in Western social sciences and no changes in social science paradigms. Basically, "official" research produced nothing, and only individuals (Petr Pithart, Václav Benda, Rudolf Kučera, and Milan Šimečka in Slovakia, etc.)[3] maintained sporadic contacts with the dynamically developing world of social sciences. Separate "islands" of intellectual freedom formed around these individuals and operated either within or on the margins of political dissent structures (e.g. apartment seminars in Prague, the "Underground University" in Brno, some Christian associations, etc.).

In spite of this, during the 1980s the place to look for the future members of the political science community was universities and other academic institutions, primarily departments of history, law, sociology, and area studies (e.g. the Oriental Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Science – Orientální ústav Československé akademie věd), where even at this time descriptive-analytical or statistical-analytical research was being carried out, i.e., methodological options that were as non-normative as possible. This does not apply, however, to departments of philosophy, which functioned *en bloc* as departments of Marxism-Leninism. In any event, a compulsory part of all university studies (not just in social sciences) was to pass courses in the history of the international workers' movement, the history of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Marxist-Leninist philosophy, political economy, and scientific communism and atheism. The study of philosophy was in effect limited to the history of ideas.

A second group of potential members of a renewed or reestablished field of political science were those in exile, of course divided into two generations. The first, older generation included individuals who left Czechoslovakia after 1948, including Ivan Gaďourek (University of Groningen), Jiří Nehněvajsa (Pittsburgh University), and Mojmír Povolný (Lawrence University). The second generation of exiles was recruited from those who often occupied important positions in Czechoslovak academia in the 1950s and 1960s and who espoused Marxism-Leninism. Paradoxically, only their active participation in the 1960s reform movement drove them from their homeland. Within this group, there is a clear difference in standing between the first wave, especially Zdeněk Mlynář (Innsbruck)[4], and the second, which dates to the 1970s, when a number of individuals from the fields of political philosophy and theory found themselves outside the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (e.g. Václav Bělohradský in Trieste, Miroslav Novák in Geneva). The degree of these individuals' influence on Czech political science after 1989, however, varied greatly (see below).

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

As already stated, in the Czech setting, the development of social science has been discontinuous, lacking the possibility to follow earlier, primarily inter-war traditions. In this sense, the concept of "paradigm shift" is not an apt description of the process at the end of the 1980s and in the early 1990s. Marxism-Leninism had not achieved its 40-year exclusive position in Czech academia as the result of free and open discussion – although leftist-oriented academic circles in the inter-war period and after 1945 should not be ignored – but by the repression of all other ideas and by total control over the formulation and testing of theses dealing with social processes. In this sense, to speak of Marxism-Leninism as a scientific paradigm would mean accepting the forms of communist science. On the other hand, it remains true that the build-up of political science after 1989 was accompanied by an atmosphere disparaging of Marxism, and in this sense the association of a "paradigm shift" is not entirely mistaken.

The situation of a "changing elite" appears to be much simpler. As already stated, given the official nonexistence of political science in communist Czechoslovakia, it is not possible to speak of any sort of continuity. Even on a practical level, departments and institutes of Marxism-Leninism were (fortunately) not a source for the new political science community. The realities of a state under communist rule necessarily meant that any officially accepted attempt to foster political science had to strictly follow the lines laid down by the leading communist party and its ideology, which entailed severe distortions. In other words, anything proposed as political science before 1989 (naturally with the notable exception of dissenters) had to collaborate with the communist regime, thus further cementing complete discontinuity. Modern historians, specialists in constitutional law, political sociologists, and experts in various regional studies founded various departments of political science. Only on this individual level can some elements of continuity be seen – and here, too, only with the era prior to 1989 and with the 1968 generation. The disruption from developments before 1948 is almost complete.

It can therefore be said that, given the model of its founding and establishment, Czech political science after 1989 has managed to reach a status precisely and exclusively under the precondition that it would not be connected with institutions and individuals associated with the era prior to 1989, especially with the omnipresent and omnipotent institutes of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, political economy, and scientific communism and atheism dating from this period. This automatically disqualified a great number of departments, primarily though not exclusively at technical universities, where the trend toward a turnover in personnel can barely be perceived. This is why departments of social sciences at some universities are not included in the overview of the development of Czech political science departments, even though some of their members have tried to gain officially recognition as political scientists.

Searching for the roots of political science at the departments of constitutional law (at the Faculty of Law, Masaryk University in Brno – Právnická fakulta Masarykovy univerzity v Brně) or at the departments of legal theory (at the Faculty of Law, Charles University in Prague – Právnická fakulta Karlovy univerzity v Praze) is a methodological error based on both a mistaken perception of the methodological-theoretical foundations of legal studies, and, on a practical level, on the varied development of Czech legal studies in the inter-war period and before 1989. For this reason, the authors of this article have the clear (normatively neutral) opinion that there is no reason to include constitutional law in a survey of Czech political science.

As the previous lines make clear, if Czech political science was to prove its ability to establish itself as a modern and independent field of study, it also had to develop new institutional structures. Basically, in the first half of the 1990s, three different lines of institutional development were observable: (1) new departments of political science were established at universities, (2) specialized research institutions were developed, and (3) some departments of constitutional law, Marxism-Leninism, etc. strove to establish themselves as regular political science institutions. The latter attempt soon proved generally unacceptable, and mainstream Czech political science rejected incorporating its proponents and representatives, though certain exceptional individuals formerly belonging to this developmental line did succeed in gaining recognition for their ability to work professionally under new circumstances.

Departments of political science emerged almost immediately after the fall of the communist regime in November 1989; nevertheless, this took place only in the most important centers – at Charles University in Prague and the Masaryk University in Brno (both in 1990). In the course of time, these departments at the Faculties of Arts and of Social Sciences (Prague – Filozofická fakulta a Fakulta sociálních věd) and the School of Social Studies (Brno – Fakulta sociálních studií) acquired the status of being the most advanced political science institutions in the country. In the same year as these departments, the Department of Political Science and European Studies at the University of Palacky in Olomouc (Katedra politologie a evropských studií Palackého univerzity v Olomouci) was founded and in several years became another – in fact the last new – important center of Czech political science. Recently, in close connection with the foundation of new, regional universities, other political science departments have appeared, but they have not operated long enough to permit us to assess their contribution to Czech political science. Moreover, the most prominent scholars in the field tend to work in Prague or in Brno.

The Faculty of International Relations at the University of Economics in Prague (Fakulta mezinárodních vztahů Vysoké školy ekonomické) has a peculiar position in the current structure of political science university departments in the Czech Republic. While this institution deals with international aspects of trade and economics, two of its parts – the Department of Political Science (Katedra politologie) and the Jan Masaryk Centre of International Studies (Středisko mezinárodních studií Jana Masaryka)[5] – play an important role in Czech political science. Extensive publishing activities, the presence of some first-rate political scientists, and also notable international activities and memberships enable us to view these institutions as among the main elements of political science in the Czech Republic.

Specialized research institutions were given a special position within the framework of Czech political science from the very beginning. In fact, only two institutions of this kind proved to be functional and durable enough to survive; nonetheless, both of them exert great influence on developments in the political science community. Today, the *International Institute for Political Science* (IIPS – Mezinárodní politologický ústav) in Brno and the *Institute of International Relations* (IIR – Ústav mezinárodních vztahů) in Prague serve as leading scientific organizations focused primarily on research, publication programs in the field, and conferences. Each institute publishes a specialized journal (see below).

The IIPS was founded in 1990 by a small group of Czech social scientists who had been forced to go into exile under the communist regime (Mojmír Povolný, Lawrence University in Appleton and Ivan Gaďourek, University of Groningen, should be mentioned here again). After a period of several years during which the Institute focused primarily on the study of general developments in the Czech and Slovak societies and on sources and possibilities of Czechs and Slovaks cohabiting in a single state, from about 1995 on, the IIPS began to stress the necessity of conducting a broader range of activities. This trend resulted in the introduction of several comparative research programs analyzing, among other problems, politics in Central and Eastern Europe (including the Baltic area), European integration, the foreign policies of selected countries, etc.

The IIR was founded as an institution specialized in international politics and in many respects was and still is an organization spectacularly different from the IIPS. The IIPS is affiliated with Masaryk University, but its staff consists of no more than three full-time researchers, and research work is usually done by groups of part-time researchers selected for a particular task; the IIR is affiliated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (which, naturally, in some cases channels the Institute's research aims and priorities), its staff has about twenty members, and its range of particular programs is also conspicuously broader. The IIR focuses on security analysis, European integration, developments in the Balkans, Czech-Slovak relations, Czech-German relations, and a series of other *ad hoc* projects.

Dramatic changes in the institutional structures, connected with building up personnel almost completely from scratch, were followed by a re-emergence of scholars persecuted by the communists and/or living in exile. Vladimír Čermák, the author of a brilliant five-volume monograph *Otázka demokracie* (The Question of Democracy), an excellent political philosopher, and now a Justice of the Constitutional Court, is probably the most important representative of the former category; the latter, more numerous, is represented e.g. by Václav Bělohradský, Rudolf Kučera, and Miroslav Novák (see above), and the founders of the IIPS in Brno. Although no one can doubt that these scholars contributed immensely to the development of Czech political science, their influence peaked in the early 1990s. In the course of the last decade, they were gradually replaced by a younger generation (Vladimíra Dvořáková, Petr Fiala, Michal Klíma, Jiří Kunc, Blanka Říchová, Maxmilián Strmiska, etc.); only Miroslav Novák still plays a very important role in the discipline; his works are among its best products.

While there is a limited but important influx of formerly persecuted scholars, there are no departures of Czech political scientist at present. Even though increasing numbers of students spend part of their study years at a foreign university, we do not know of a single case of a political scientist of any importance leaving the Czech Republic to work abroad. Naturally, to consider this proof of the self-sufficiency of Czech political science, on the one hand, or of generally high public esteem of its representatives, on the other, would be a dangerous self-delusion. No research has been done on this matter, but we may conclude that the basic reasons are that (1) research frequently focuses on the problems and needs of the Czech Republic, thus addressing a very limited audience, and (2) though it includes some top-level scholars, the political science community in the Czech Republic is too small and, compared with its Western counterparts, underdeveloped in the scope of its topical orientation. This in no way lowers the high value and prospects of research done in the fields of political parties, policy analysis, comparative political science, etc.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

As repeated throughout this text, there is a remarkable discontinuity in the tradition of Czech political science. But the history of the inter-war development of Czech political science, even in the broader context of the genesis of Czech (Czechoslovak) democracy, was widely discussed throughout the 1990s, and an attempt was made at its revitalization. In fact, the devotion of a (generational) segment of the social science community to the atmosphere of Masaryk's Czechoslovakia not only represents part of the "folklore" of Czech politics, but, in its own way, also a very important characteristic exerting influence on the Czech academic community, including political science.

Efforts in this direction were especially marked in the first half of the 1990s, and in this sense, the initial phase of the formation of political science in Czech academia may be called the stage of searching for one's identity. This process was affected by the existence of markedly varied ideas about the fundamental tasks of the social sciences and especially of political science, given its relationship to First Republic "morals", and thus created a strong divisional criterion in its own way.

On the one hand, this created the possibility of once again forming the emerging field of Czech political science into a specific social phenomenon primarily focused on the obligations to cultivate this young democratic, and therefore very imperfect, political sphere. This meant the renewal of the "constructive" view of political science as basically a theoretical handbook of democracy, serving to raise and educate a newly democratic society. This range of tasks would in turn be reflected in the political science community's tools and means. The followers of this orientation, being open to interdisciplinary approaches, focused (1) methodologically on a normatively ontological historicizing (and even narrative) approach, (2) stylistically on adopting a journalistic style, (3) thematically on the historical development of the Czech political system and on themes underlying this system (democratic theory, politics and ethics, political ideology, etc.), and (4) on presentation in the media.

In contrast, the other variant concept of political science saw it as an independent, theoretical, and abstract social science, emphasizing empirical-analytical and descriptive approaches and carefully avoiding normative judgements. This was also reflected in the focus on professional texts and themes like political parties and interest groups, political and party systems, theories of transition and consolidation, political extremism and radicalism, etc.

An interpretation of the clash this hints at is not simple and there has certainly been no definite outcome. On the other hand, what appeared to clash here were two different generations (those with backgrounds in the 1960s and those educated in the 1980s) and two divergent methodological approaches (a normative ontological approach versus an empirical-analytical approach). This division also has a regional and institutional aspect. The first group (with a degree of simplification) can be identified as "Prague" and the second works at the Department of Political Science of the School of Social Studies at Masaryk University in Brno (Katedra politologie Fakulty sociálních studií Masarykovy univerzity v Brně). A number of exceptions defy this classification, but this division is a fair representation of reality. A search for a similar division in inter-war legal studies (see above) has thus far appeared to be too ambitious a task.

The process described indicates the up-and-coming generation of political scientists' consciousness of the importance of methodological preferences. The current dominance of empirical-analytical approaches is also evidence of relatively rapid adaptation to contemporary issues in Western academia, especially by the younger generation of Czech political scientists. In this sense, the thematic priorities of political science in the West and in the Czech lands are basically in accord, in part thanks to ever-increasing contacts among both researchers and students. In parallel, Czech political science has shown a certain degree of immunity to some opportunistic and/or "politically correct" underlying themes in the social sciences (e.g. research on affirmative motivation, etc.). The authors have been led to this position by bad experience with efforts to renew the "social" roles of political science and their obligations from the point of view of self-identification as a social entity (nation, citizenship, etc.). In this sense, the social sciences in post-communist countries could provide Western academia with valuable "methodological" information.

Remarkably, this general accord in theoretical and methodological approaches is not reflected by any relative importance of quantitative and qualitative research in Czech political science. While the research tools used in Czech political science are generally the same as in the rest of the world, quantitative analysis is seldom practiced. Put simply, collection, selection, elaboration, and evaluation of huge quantities of different data is frequently viewed as a costly and time-consuming method demanding immense amounts of time from scholars and their assistants; and in the final analysis, this exceeds the possibilities of individual departments and research institutions. On the other hand, this does not mean it is impossible to trace some influence of the quantitative approach in Czech political science. But this falls within the field of sociology. If we take into account that some researchers (primarily sociologists) tend to prefer this area and try to use the data as background for further analyses focused on political values and behavior, then this method does appear in Czech political science. Here we also must accept that sociology provides the key initiative in this form of analysis. In this sense, there is significant overlap between political science and sociology, epitomized in the special field of political sociology. Lubomír Brokl, Zdeňka Mansfeldová, and Klára Vlachová-Plecitá are some of the most striking representatives working in this way.

Some other disciplines at the intersection of various fields can be mentioned: political sociology seems to be most innovative and active in bringing new ideas into political science, and political philosophy and political economy play a role as well. While the latter represents a detached area whose representatives do not tend to browse in political science proper, the former offers some remarkable personalities, for example the aforementioned Vladimír Čermák and Václav Bělohradský (who also works in political sociology). Other areas significant in the Czech Republic and connected with political science are theory of law and research on problems of nationalism (primarily Miroslav Hroch). Pavel Barša, from 1999-2002 a fellow of the Central European University in Budapest and a specialist in problems at the intersection of political ideas, political theory, and nationalism, must also be mentioned.[6]

Taken altogether, theoretical and methodological orientation and approaches in Czech political science reflect the standard modes of operation, the most relevant exception being the quantitative approach; but there are some minor features specific to the Czech Republic. First, since political science in the Czech Republic is quite a new discipline, it follows that its approaches are new as well; consequently, the political science community still needs to learn how to refine its tools and make use of its possibilities. Second, as indicated earlier, it is precisely the discipline's prevailing aim of a more or less value-free position and its increasing inclination to a non-normative focus, an attitude held primarily against any manifestations of social engineering, that paradoxically includes certain normative aspects. While these features are clearly products of the Czech Republic's historical development, it is hard to predict how long their influence will persist.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Czech political scientists have not ignored questions of the transition of political systems, which has been a standard theme for political science since the 1960s. On the other hand, given the gaps in publishing, especially of books, in political science as a whole (i.e., including classical themes such as political philosophy, political ideology, political systems, etc.), the question for the Czech political science community has been and remains: what is to be done first? In a thorough attempt to find a suitable answer, we searched through university curricula and the topical foci of major works of political science in the Czech Republic, thus identifying the following areas of main interest.

The background of some political scientists (Vladimíra Dvořáková, Jiří Kunc, and representatives of Ibero-American studies) resulted in an early orientation toward questions of the transition of political systems from undemocratic to democratic models. In the second half of the 1990s and at the beginning of the 21st century, many of the works published in the Czech Republic have focused primarily on studies of transition, especially questions of the post-communist countries, models of democracy ideal for countries in transition (Westminster versus consociational democracy), models of mediation of interests (pluralism versus corporativism), the center-regions relationship in the post-communist areas and its manifestations in party systems in Central and East Europe, and other aspects of processes of transition (Ladislav Cabada, Břetislav Dančák, Jan Holzer, Michal Kubát, Maxmilián Strmiska, and others).

Consequently, even if *transitology* and *consolidology* have not assumed an exclusive position in the structure of political science research in the Czech Republic, they are undoubtedly major topics. Paradoxically enough, although in the first years of the 1990s problems of transitology as such went virtually unreflected, the more time passes after the events of 1989, the more attention is paid to them. In recent years, transitology is emerging as a truly separate and dynamic subfield with a prospect of further growth.

While transition as a general phenomenon is currently a hotly discussed topic in Czech political science, several other specific and general fields are considered relevant problems in the discipline. What these fields have in common is their relevance to political and social processes that have occurred in the Czech Republic in the last ten years:

The political system of the Czech Republic is obviously a "must" topic in national research; naturally, this is due not only to the obvious fact that political science cannot do without probing into the political mechanisms of the state, but also to the interconnectedness of the system and deep social and political transformation. Similarly, research on the *party system of the Czech Republic* seeks the causes determining the nature of the system, the character of its components, their relationships, and their probable future direction. The general development of the system on the theoretical and practical levels is also of great importance.

While *European integration* was regarded as one of the key areas in political science research from the beginning of the 1990s, the problems discussed in this framework have undergone an impressive transformation. At first, the lead was taken by various analyses of the notion of European integration; these were predominantly practiced in the spirit of political philosophy. Consequently, the question of the relationship between the Czech Republic and the EU occupied the stage; at present, although Czech-European relations still remain an obvious point of interest, the main current of research in the area is increasingly focused on the processes within the European Union and (but not exclusively or even primarily) on their impact on enlargement strategies.

Security studies, another important research area in Czech political science, are based on assumptions analogous to those accepted in the case of European integration, i.e., the conviction that the national interests of the Czech Republic are to be reached by including the Czech Republic in Western European structures. Here, the main task traditionally was to describe and analyze possible sources of security dangers and to design appropriate developmental strategies. At present, the role of the Czech Republic as a member of NATO is often taken as a background for attempts to redefine security needs and tasks.

Curiously enough, *modern Czech and European history* is also a frequently researched topic (Prague, Olomouc), even though – if we take a truly strict view – it is not part of the discipline at all. On the other hand, some scholars in the field see it as a source of information that was grossly distorted before 1989 and should now be researched anew and examined from the perspective of political science.

The comparison of political and party systems presents difficult, but challenging questions, thus increasingly acquiring a status as the most progressive field of study (together with issues of European integration). Classical works by Giovanni Sartori, Klaus von Beyme, and their younger followers are being thoroughly and deeply discussed, thus serving as a starting point for proper research in the area. Miroslav Novák (Prague) and Maxmilián Strmiska (Brno) can be justly ranked among the top specialists in this field of research. Finally, *political extremism and radicalism* is a very important and innovative field of study in Czech political science. The connection between this research and the practical issues of preventing extremist and radical groups from carrying out activities that disturb the social peace plays a key role in the position of this research area. Miroslav Mareš in Brno and Zdeněk Zbořil in Prague are the top university specialists with this research agenda.

Among other areas with some potential to grow and to assume a more relevant position are *political theory* (Brno, Prague), *policy analysis* (Brno), and *election studies* (Prague). All these subfields are in the process of establishing themselves as not only independent, but also rapidly flourishing research areas, possibly ousting modern history as one of the leading topics and thus impelling Czech political science further on its way to standard character.

While the diversity of topics and views still does not correspond to the range customary in other (traditional) national political science communities, if we consider the "underpopulation" of the discipline's landscape in the Czech Republic, we can recognize that Czech political science can meet strict criteria in proportional comparison. From this point of view, it might come as a surprise that the wide range of views has not resulted in a more variable institutional structure. In the final analysis, however, particular institutions usually tend to share one common interest, the education of students, and their research activities are more influenced by the personal preferences of their staff. In other words, the basic direction is the same, but different paths are taken.

Organizational and institutional changes have proved to be essential for the theoretical, methodological, and thematic changes described above. The theoretical aim was the state's withdrawal as the sole donor to (and guarantor of) academic institutions and an increase in the role of private sponsors. But here this principle proved to be in error or at least premature.

It is possible (necessary) to interpret this statement within the framework of the position of Czech universities, whose most significant source of finances (through the 2001/2002 academic year) has been subsidies from the national budget. Logically, these are limited by the capacity of the Czech Republic's post-communist economy and by the academic community's limited ability to "blackmail" the government into providing increased funds in comparison with other aggressive pressure groups. This fact is not affected even by the students' significant, constant, and growing interest in studying social sciences: for example, at Charles University and Masaryk University, ten times as many apply to study in the relevant departments as the latter can currently absorb. The question of tuition as a partial solution to the difficult situation in the Czech Republic has become highly politicized and faces an uncertain and unpredictable future. Nevertheless, beginning with the academic year 2001/2002, universities are permitted to admit a limited number of paying students. But even these students, if they show they are able to handle university studies by acquiring 60% of the ECTS credits needed to complete baccalaureate studies, are to be allowed to finish their studies for free.

A second significant source of finances for universities is grants, which are of course designed exclusively for research (and not educational) activities and projects. But the state and the government budget dominate this area as the most significant donor to (and by extension, controller of) individual grant projects, thus influencing themes, methodology, results, outputs, etc. What is more, the state controls the widely criticized system of distributing these funds. While the role of private institutions, foundations, associations, and centers is not insignificant, it remains a secondary source.

Nevertheless, the role of private institutions is slowly growing – at a slightly accelerating rate. After a new law was enacted permitting the creation of private universities, some institutions of this kind have been or are being established, in spite of huge financial, operational, and formal problems; therefore, if their internal capacities and external limits allow them to keep up in the long run and strengthen their competitiveness, they may become another "pillar" of political science research. Two examples are New York University Prague, founded in 1999 as a local branch of New York University, and the College of Public Administration and International Relations in Prague (Vysoká škola veřejné správy a mezinárodních vztahů), which completed its accreditation process in Autumn 2001. However, some features of this kind of institution make it impossible to regard them as fully comparable to public universities. The most important of these features is the legal limits on the functions private universities and colleges may perform: the law defines private educational institutions at the university level as organizations whose task consists in filling gaps in the supply offered by state universities. In other words, the relationship between public and private universities is stipulated as complementarity, rather than competitiveness.

Research supported by political entities, e.g. political parties, plays a special role. Given the Czech public's generally critical view of questions relating to the financing of political parties, this does not play a significant role in terms of the needs of the academic community. From this perspective, the Czech media can be seen as playing a more active role, allowing their customers to "survive" with the relative poor and sequestered Czech market in public opinion research. Given these facts, it appears that the most promising solution for a large number of Czech researchers and institutions is to focus on projects using the more liberal parameters of support offered abroad in various fields of social science.

5. Public space and academic debates

The first thing to be stressed here is that Czech public discussion suffers from the existence of two divergent ideas of what political science, its tasks, and its objectives are. This point is addressed in more detail in Chapter 6, so here we merely highlight a certain gap between the topics discussed in the country's newspapers and leading magazines and those emphasized in the discipline itself. In some cases, the same topic may be discussed, but handled differently. As mentioned before, political science focuses predominantly on an empirical notion of the world and society, while the media and public devote much more attention to normative aspects, often taking them as criteria that should decide on the nature of the discussion. The questions of Czech political parties, the electoral system, and the position of the president are among the themes most debated in the public space, while such international topics as European integration and security problems are usually left to circles of the Czech intelligentsia and have not met with much public attention. On the other hand, political science in the Czech Republic sees the foci of its own interest in precisely these international themes, thus standing on the same ground as the intelligentsia, but maintaining reserve in the clash between the empirical and the normative approach; among the other issues, it elaborates especially the problems connected with the Czech party system, but on a purely professional basis. The other two themes are examined as well, but more as a consequence of public demand than because of their status as important problems.

These trends can also be seen in the contents of Czech professional journals. The Czech political science community is not too numerous: just over 2,000 people, including students (see Tables 1 and 2), and even this number was reached only in recent years. It follows that, reflecting developments within the discipline's expanding community, purely political science journals appeared only several years after 1989; in the earlier years, other journals, like *Sociological Review* (Sociologický časopis), offered space for political science texts. Now, six specialized political science journals unambiguously take the lead, serving the community well.

The most important and most successful is the quarterly *Politologický časopis* (Journal of Political Science), published since 1994 by the International Institute for Political Studies in Brno (Mezinárodní politologický ústav). This was the first scientifically reviewed political science journal in the Czech Republic. It offers studies, shorter articles, and reviews and also publishes materials from conferences and discussions on various topics. Foreign authors as well as Czech scholars contribute to the journal.

Politologická revue (Review of Political Science) is generally seen as the JPS' biggest competitor and its Prague-based counterpart. This journal emerged in 1994 and is published by the Czech Political Science Association (CPSA) (Česká společnost pro politické vědy; see below). It is published twice a year and offers articles, studies, and reviews, but also interviews and reports of important events in the Czech Republic and abroad. As an official journal of the CPSA, it also provides information about changes in the political science community in the Czech Republic.

Mezinárodní vztahy (International Relations), published by the Institute of International Relations (Ústav mezinárodních vztahů) in Prague four times a year, is another leading theoretical journal. As its title suggests, the journal focuses on the discipline of international relations and its subfields. It prints articles on theoretical and practical aspects of international relations, security issues, and global problems; moreover, it offers reviews of major works in the fields. It is the only Czech journal offering in-depth studies of current problems in international relations.

Far fewer theoretical articles and studies on international themes are offered by the monthly *Mezinárodní politika* (International Politics), which is also published by the Institute of International Relations (Ústav mezinárodních vztahů). This periodical focuses on global politics and economics; on a regular basis it also offers appendices of European Union documents. It deals primarily with “hot” questions of current international activities, pays a lot of attention to area studies, and follows fresh developments in various parts of the world. It is the only journal that targets readers outside academic circles, thus presenting itself as a link between part of the nonprofessional public and academics.

Politika v České republice (Politics in the Czech Republic), published every two months, monitors political activities in the Czech Republic. This journal assumes a unique position within the range of the discipline’s journals, serving as a sole sources of detailed information about events and processes in Czech political life. It describes developments in the parliamentary system (with sections titled Government, President, Parliament, and Constitutional Court), in party politics (giving detailed overviews of all the major parties’ activities), and in economic and foreign policy; it also reproduces important documents. Founded in 1997, it directly continues the tradition of the journal *Building of a State* (Budování státu), which was first published in 1990.

Finally, the quarterly *Středoevropské politické studie* (Central European Political Studies) was founded in 1999 as an on-line magazine. It is a unique undertaking in the Czech political science community, not only because of its electronic form, but also because it is multilingual. Contributions to the journal are published in their original languages – Czech, English, or German. There is also a printed version, published annually, which offers a selection of the most interesting texts of a volume. This journal, as well as the one described in the previous paragraph, is published by the International Institute for Political Studies (Mezinárodní politologický ústav).

This lively journal publication activity is accompanied by steady growth in the publishing of original works by Czech political scientists; these books usually have a high-quality professional background and need not fear critical comparison with foreign works of the same kind. On the other hand, these books are seldom published in languages other than Czech. Exceptions include Miroslav Novák’s *Une Transition Démocratique Exemplaire?* (published by CEFRES in Prague) and Jiří Večerník and Petr Matějů, *Ten Years of Rebuilding Capitalism* (published by Academia in Prague). The latter, however, is an interdisciplinary symposium (the editors are sociologists) including, among other texts, a contribution on the development of the Czech party system (authors Petr Fiala, Miroslav Mareš, and Pavel Pšeja). On the other hand, foreign-language texts published in journals or symposia both in the Czech Republic and abroad seem to be growing more numerous (for details, see Table 3).

Troublesome is that virtually no databases have been built up. Until now, no need has been felt to create a resource of this kind, since the low number of members of the Czech political science community means that a general survey can be maintained without such a tool. Nevertheless, the time is probably coming when some databases will have to be created – for example, when collecting data for Table 6, the authors of this text were hindered by the lack of a database of articles in Czech political science journals. Manuals are subject to the same lack of interest; textbooks, on the other hand, are increasingly becoming a common part of the Czech literature in the field. From the very brief *Pozvání do politologie* (Invitation to Political Science – Vladimír Čermák, Dalibor Houbal, Petr Fiala) to the much more thorough, but a little too specific

Základy politologie (Basics of Political Science – Karolína Adamová, Ladislav Křížkovský), the basic textbooks have long been established in the field. In recent years, some authors have made ambitious attempts to write textbooks in specialized fields within the discipline. Of these, *Přehled moderních politologických teorií* (The Overview of Modern Theories in Political Science) by Blanka Říchová and *Moderní analýza politiky* (Modern Policy Analysis) by Petr Fiala and Klaus Schubert are top-quality works whose scientific value indicates that Czech political science is well advanced and able to act as fully matured discipline. The latter work is also the most successful example of cross-border cooperation.

6. Views on further development

Twelve years after it was founded as a separate field of study, Czech political science finds itself in a dichotomous state. On the one hand, in areas where it is most advanced, we can justly speak of the high level of its knowledge and scientific performance, both underlined by rich publication and teaching activities; on the other hand, where research is limited or has not been initiated at all, the field is still in its infancy. Though it is extremely difficult to predict the future of the discipline, political science in the Czech Republic can progress not only through internal advancement, but also through international cooperation.

This kind of cooperation can build on several different lines of international contact that have already been established in recent years. These contacts can be pursued on three levels – individual, institutional, and organizational. While the two former are easy to understand and are limited only by the particular capabilities of the acting individuals and institutions, the third level consists in cooperation practiced through professional associations. On the individual level, lots of personal contacts have been established in the course of the last decade, thus connecting Czech political science with all the relevant countries of the world – from Russia through Western Europe to the United States. On the level of institutions, almost all departments and research institutions have already made agreements with partners abroad; naturally, these agreements influence the development of the respective institutions, but they don't have the capacity to modify the character of the discipline as such. Seen from this point of view, with some exceptions to be addressed later, the only relevant level is that of the associations.

In fact, two key organizations of this kind operate in the Czech Republic – the Czech Political Science Association (CPSA), an umbrella organization for all working in the field, and the Association for the Study of International Relations (ASIR – Asociace pro studium mezinárodních vztahů), an independent association of scholars specialized in international relations. Compared to the overall situation of the discipline in the Czech Republic, the first of these organizations, the Czech Political Science Association, has an unbelievably long tradition: it was established as early as 1964. In the period of 1964-1969, the Association undertook a lot of activities, including participation in IPSA congresses and workshops; as the repression following the suppression of the "Prague Spring" increased, the Association's operations were brought to a virtual halt. After 1989, it was renewed and became the only organization covering the whole political science community. At first, it focused on arranging lectures and seminars, later also beginning to organize workshops of Czech political scientists and to arrange conferences on various topics, e.g. transition to democracy, problems of globalization, etc. The Association has more than 200 members (including the students' section) and several working groups. Finally, it is a member of IPSA, and Jan Škaloud, the head of the Association, served two terms as a member of the IPSA's executive committee until the IPSA Congress in 2000. At this congress, Vladimíra Dvořáková was elected a member of this committee in Jan Škaloud's place.

As a younger counterpart to the CPSA, the Association for the Study of International Relations was formed in 1998 to support the study of international relations and to promote the advancement of Czech foreign policy in the process of European integration. Its primary focus is on scientific research, education, publishing, and other informational activities and initiatives related to the Czech Republic's accession to the European Union, so its activities can be seen as one of the first indicators of EU accession's impact on political science in the Czech Republic. The Association for the Study of International Relations also takes an active part in preparing and organizing contacts and events dealing with international scientific cooperation and in disseminating information about Czech foreign policy. It also organizes round tables where current problems of international politics are discussed, e.g. the situation in the Balkans and the Stability Pact in Southeastern Europe or new political concepts in Western Europe (the Third Way). Finally, this organization aims to contribute to the development of international relations as a science.

Significant international cooperation on the universal level can be seen in the participation of Czech bodies in European structures. In recent years, some Czech institutions have taken part in the activities of transnational bodies like the European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR). The Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences and the Centre for Economic Research & Graduate Education (CERGE) at Charles University are full members. The European Political Science Net (EPSNet) was constituted several months ago, and several Czech institutions have joined (departments of political science at Brno Masaryk University, Olomouc Palacký University, Prague Charles University, Faculty of Arts, and also the Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences are either collective or individual members). Similarly, some scholars specialized in international relations have become members of the Central and East European International Studies Association (CEEISA). Surprisingly enough, CEEISA has a very sizable group of members from the Czech Republic, with Zuzana Lehmannová (Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics in Prague – Fakulta mezinárodních vztahů Vysoké školy ekonomické) even being President of the CEEISA Directorate. However, only a minority of these Czech members can be ranked as specialists in the fields of political science and international relations, the rest working in other disciplines. Efforts are being made to establish a relationship with ISA.[7] Finally, the Central European Political Science Association (CEPSA) appears to be a possible tool for more deeply incorporating Czech political science in the broader European context (Vladimíra Dvořáková/University of Economics and Blanka Říchová/Charles University are members of the CEPSA executive committee). Generally, international contacts are regarded as a necessary tool to further the development of Czech political science; in this respect, the prospects of future accession to the European Union play an important role. Nevertheless and quite surprisingly, the possible impact of Czech membership in the EU is not presently treated as a momentous problem; on the other hand, there are some efforts to make use of possibilities offered by the Fifth (and soon the Sixth) Framework Programme. If these efforts bear any fruit, the chances for a truly "European" character of Czech political science may grow.

The final point to be addressed is the relationship between political science research and public activities. As indicated earlier, the public idea of what political science is differs greatly from its real nature. In other words, this discipline has two contradictory faces. One, the original and true to its character, shows it as a field of empirical research, populated by scholars engaged in a standard, primarily descriptive and analytical research program. The other, generally promoted by the media, paints a picture of a field actively intervening in day-to-day political processes and commenting on all events, even ephemeral ones. This second face results from two factors: media efforts to make things very simple and the emergence of certain persons whose scholarly activity is virtually nonexistent but whose real preoccupation is self-presentation in the media. The resulting image not only affects public perception of political science as a field of study, but also leads to some biased expectations. For example, the public often supposes that the task of a political scientist consists in explaining or evaluating the truthfulness the statements of politicians and in predicting what will happen. In this sense, the interactions between the public and the political science community are often one-sided. While political science research rarely makes any impact on public policy, the public mood determines the interests of a small part of the political science community. Nevertheless, the majority of political scientists focus on teaching activities and are not interested in public involvement.

In this context, the polls can be seen as a special example of how distorted the public perception of some problems is. While political science regards the polls and their results as an auxiliary tool of limited relevance, the public and the media have grown accustomed to making far-reaching conclusions that dramatically exceed the real value of the polls. The editorials of the country's leading newspaper are often engaged in the thorough analysis of any of a great number of polls.

Nevertheless, to briefly characterize the state of the art in Czech political science twelve years after its founding: in many respects it is a full-blown science with advanced staff and burgeoning literature. On the other hand, there are sectors of the field that are obviously under-researched. Also, the public image of the discipline has little to do with its real condition. So political science in the Czech Republic can be considered a successful field, but one exhibiting faults and inadequacies.

There are a number of marked asymmetries between Western and Czech realities in the field of political science. These include the amount of time spent on individual research projects, the institutional, personnel, and even thematic and methodological continuity of the field, and, naturally, also the financial resources available in academic circles, which determine the mobility of teachers, researchers, and students, as well as the generosity of political parties in supporting individual research projects. On the other hand, probably nothing remains but to take the optimistic view that Czech society will be able to define the development of science and research as one of its priorities and, consequently, create conditions that will begin to approach Western standards.

---

1 During the First Republic, this led to the use of terms such as "partokracie" (partocracy) in the analysis of political and party systems.

2 Beneš, of course, only published his key theoretical text *Demokracie dnes a zítra* (Democracy Today and Tomorrow) in exile in 1941.

3 Western political science circles (with the notable exceptions of Roger Scruton, Jacques Rupnik, and the geopolitical theorists) were, in fact, only minimally interested in the internal development of the Soviet bloc.

4 Zdeněk Mlynář is an interesting example of the private odyssey that a number of Czech (Central European) intellectuals went through after World War II. Originally an enthusiastic communist and an active participant in the process of forming the communist regime in Czechoslovakia, in the 1960s he was one of the key members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and in 1968 the head of a research team (called "Mlynář's Team") examining reform of the political system at the Institute for the State and Law of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. Subsequently, he was an important figure in anti-normalization circles and later, in exile, a professor of political science in Innsbruck, Austria.

5 For the sake of simplicity and because of the substantial personal and scientific overlapping of these institutions, we cover them later in the text and its appendices under the general heading of the Faculty of International Relations. Nevertheless, both authors wish to emphasize that these institutions occupy important positions in Czech political science.

6 Selected texts falling within some of the fields described in this paragraph were added to the list of major works in Czech political science. See Appendices.

7 There is also a certain relationship with the Political Science Association (PSA): Michal Klíma (Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics in Prague – Fakulta mezinárodních vztahů Vysoké školy ekonomické), one of the best scholars in the field, is a member of this organization.

References

Havelka, Miloš (ed.) (1995): *Spor o smysl českých dějin 1895 – 1938* (Controversy over the Meaning of Czech History), Prague, Torst;
Linz, Juan Jose and Stepan, Alfred (1996): *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation. Southern Europe, South America and Post Communist Europe*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press;
Neubauer, Zdeněk (1947): *Státověda a teorie politiky* (Governmental Studies and Political Theory), Prague, Jan Laichter;
Opat, Jaroslav (1990): *Filozof a politik T. G. Masaryk 1882-1893* (The Philosopher and Politician T. G. Masaryk 1882-1893), Prague, Melantrich;
Tlustý, Vojtěch and Klofáč, Jaroslav (1968): *Politická věde a sociologie politiky* (Political Science and Sociology of Politics), Prague, SPN.

Selected Bibliography (1991-2001)

This list of works was compiled on the basis of the following criteria (their order does not imply any degree of relevance):
1) importance of the work for the development of Czech political science
2) innovative character of a scientific approach and/or methodological focus of the work
3) degree of citation response
4) opening of new topics in Czech political science
The authors of this report asked about 15 of the most relevant political scientists in the Czech Republic to offer those of their own texts that they personally consider most important. Our list could thus be checked and in some cases also amended and/or supplemented.

Adamová, Karolína, Křižikovský, Ladislav, Šouša, Jiří and Šoušová, Jitka (2001): *Politologický slovník* (Dictionary of Political Science), Praha, C.H. Beck;
Aktuální problémy demokratizace postkomunistických států střední Evropy (Current Problems of Democratic Post-communistic States of Central Europe) (1995), Praha, Česká společnost pro politické vědy při Akademii věd České republiky;
Barša, Pavel (1996): "Conflit ethnique et choix rationnel. Quelques éléments d´analyse", in: *Revue M*, Aoutseptem, Paris, 28-36;
Barša, Pavel (1999): *Politická teorie multikulturalismu* (Political Theory of Multiculturalism), Brno, Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury;
Barša, Pavel (2001): *Západ a islamismus. Střet civilizací nebo dialog kultur?* (West and Islamism. Clash of Civilisations or Dialogue of Cultures?), Brno, Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury;
Barša, Pavel and Strmiska, Maxmilián (1999): *Národní stát a etnický konflikt* (National State and Ethnic Conflicts), Brno, Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury;
Cabada, Ladislav (2001): "Konsolidacija demokracije v postjugoslovanskem prostoru v primerjavi s postsovjetsko Evropo", in: *Demokratični prehodi II*, Fink-Hafner, D. and Haček, M. (eds.), Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede, 95-110;
Čermák, Vladimír (1992-1999): *Otázka demokracie* (Question of Democracy), *1-5*, Praha, Academia+Olomouc, Nakladatelství Olomouc;
Dančák, Břetislav (ed.) (1999): *Pobaltí v transformaci. Politický vývoj Estonska, Litvy a Lotyšska* (Baltic States in Transition. Political Development of Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia), Brno, Masarykova univerzita;
Dančák, Břetislav and Fiala, Petr (eds.) (1999): *Nacionalistické politické strany v Evropě* (Nationalistic Political Parties in Europe), Brno, Masarykova univerzita;
Dančák, Břetislav and Mareš, Miroslav (eds.) (2000): *Zahraniční politika politických stran v České republice, Maďarsku, Polsku a na Slovensku* (Foreign Policies of Political Parties in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia), Brno, Masarykova univerzita;
Dvořáková, Vladimíra and Kunc, Jiří (1994): *O přechodech k demokracii* (On Transitions to Democracy), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Dvořáková, Vladimíra and Kunc, Jiří (1997): "Los Desafios de la transicion Checoslovaca", in: *Revista de Estudios Politicos*, No. 95, 271-293;

Dvořáková, Vladimíra and Kunc, Jiří (2000): "Transformation policier en république tchèque: Une réforme ambivalente?", in: *Les cahiers de la sécurité intérieure, Revue de sciences sociales*, No. 41, Troisième trimestre, Paris, IHESI, 83-102;

Dvořáková, Vladimíra and Voráček, Emil (eds.) (1993): *The legacy of the past as a factor of the transformation process in post-communist countries of central Europe: The territory of Poland, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Hungary, former GDR*, Praha, Vysoká škola ekonomická;

Fiala, Petr (1995): *Katolicismus a politika* (Catholicism and Politics), Brno, Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury;

Fiala, Petr (1995): *Německá politologie* (German Political Science), Brno, Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury;

Fiala, Petr (ed.) (1998): *Politický extremismus a radikalismus v České republice* (Political Extremism and Radicalism in the Czech Republic), Brno, Masarykova univerzita;

Fiala, Petr (1999): "Die katholische Kirche im postkommunistischen Transformationsprozess der Tschechischen Republik", in: *Ost-Dokumentation. Bildungs-, Wissenschafts- und Kulturpolitik in Mittel- und Osteuropa,* 13, No. 4, 9-20;

Fiala, Petr (ed.) (2000): "Policy of Adaptation. Efforts of East European Countries to Meet European Integration Standards", in: *German Policy Studies/Politikfeldanalyse*. Symposium Issue, 1, No. 4. Harrisburg (USA), Southern Public Administration Education Foundation;

Fiala, Petr and Hanuš, Jiří (1999): "The Czech Catholic Church in a democratic society (1989–1999)", in: *The Month: A Review of Christian Thought and World Affairs*, 32, No. 9, 10 July, 366-372;

Fiala, Petr, Holzer, Jan, Mareš, Miroslav and Pšeja, Pavel (1999): *Komunismus v České republice. Vývojové, systémové a ideové aspekty působení KSČM a dalších komunistických organizací v české politice* (Communism in the Czech Republic. Developmental, Systemic and Ideological Aspects of the CPBM and Other Communistic Organisations in the Czech Politics), Brno, Masarykova univerzita;

Fiala, Petr, Mareš, Miroslav and Pšeja, Pavel (2000): "Development of Political Parties and the Party Systém", in: *Ten Years of Rebuilding Capitalism: Czech Society after 1989*, Večerník, Jiří and Matějů, Petr (eds.), Praha, Academia, 273-294;

Fiala, Petr, Mareš, Miroslav and Pšeja, Pavel (2001): "Formation of the System of Political Parties in the Czech Republic, 1989-1992", in: *Studia Polityczne*, No. 12, Warszawa, Instytut Studiów Politycznych Polskiej Akademii Nauk;

Fiala, Petr and Pitrová, Markéta (2001): *Evropská unie. Historie, instituce, politika* (European Union. History, Institutions, Policies), Brno, Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury;

Fiala, Petr and Schubert, Klaus (2000): *Moderní analýza politiky* (Modern Policy Analysis), Brno, Barrister&Principal;

Fiala, Petr and Strmiska, Maxmilián (1998): *Teorie politických stran* (Theory of Political Parties), Brno, Barrister&Principal;

Handl, Vladimír, Pick, Oto and Hon, Jan (1998): *Vztahy Spolkové republiky Německo ke státům střední Evropy od roku 1990* (Relations of the Federal Republic of Germany towards Central European States since 1990), Praha, Ústav mezinárodních vztahů;

Hnízdo, Bořivoj (1995): *Mezinárodní perspektivy politických regionů* (International Perspectives of Political Regions), Praha, ISE;

Holzer, Jan (2000): "Tajemnica czeskiego wyborcy a Czechosłowacka Partia Ludowa", in: *Pokolenia i portrety. Wzór osobowy ludowca w XX wieku*, Paruch, W. and Wojcik, A. (eds.), Lublin, Wydawnictwo UMCS, 385-397;

Holzer, Jan (2001): *Politický systém Ruska. Hledání státu* (Political System of Russia. Searching for a State), Brno, Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury;

Khol, Radek (2000): *Old Strategic Thinking in the New Strategic Environment: Problems of Adapting the Security Policy of the Czech Republic*, Roma, NATO Defense College Monographs Series;

Kitschelt, Herbert, Mansfeldová, Zdeňka, Markowski, Radosław and Toka, Gábor (1999): *Post-Communist Party Systems. Competition, Representation and Inter party Cooperation*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP;

Klíma, Michal (1995): "Perestroika and Soviet Foreign Policy", in: *Soviet Perestroika, 1985-1993*, Bradley, John (ed.), New York, Columbia University Press, 169-181;

Klíma, Michal (1998): *Volby a politické strany v moderních demokraciích* (Elections and Political Parties in Modern Democracies), Praha, Radix;

Klíma, Michal (2000): "Incomplete Democracy in the Czech Republic or Three Anomalies", in: *Central European Political Science Review*, 1, No 2, December, 223-233;

Klíma, Michal (2001): *Kvalita demokracie v České republice a volební inženýrství* (Value of Democracy in the Czech Republic and Election Engineering), Praha, Radix&Marshall;
Klokočka, Vladimír (1991): *Politická reprezentace a volby v demokratických systémech* (Political Representation and Elections in Democratic Systems), Praha, ALEKO;
Kotyk, Václav (1998): *Vztahy centra a regionů Ruské federace* (Relationship of the Centre and Regions in the Russian Federation), Praha, Ústav mezinárodních vztahů;
Krejčí, Oskar (1994): *Kniha o volbách* (A Book on Elections), Praha, Victoria Publishing;
Kubát, Michal (2000): *Politika v Polsku po roce 1989. Volby, volební systémy a jejich politické konsekvence* (Politics in Poland after 1989. Elections, Electoral Systems and their Political Consequences), Praha, Karolinum;
Kunc, Jiří (ed.) (1999): *Demokracie a ústavnost* (Democracy and Constitutionalism), Praha, Karolinum;
Kunc, Jiří (2000): *Stranické systémy v re-konstrukci: Belgie, Itálie, Španělsko, Československo, Česká republika* (Party Systems in Re/construction: Belgium, Italy, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Czech Republic), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Leška, Vladimír et al. (1998): *Rusko, Polsko, střední Evropa: Dědictví minulosti a současnost* (Russia, Poland, Central Europe: Heritage of the Past and Contemporary Situation), Praha, Ústav mezinárodních vztahů;
Litera, Bohuslav, Švec, Libor, Wanner, Jan and Zilynskyj, Bohdan (1998): *Vzájemné vztahy postsovětských republik* (Interrelationships of the Post-Soviet Republics), Praha, Ústav mezinárodních vztahů;
Mansfeldová, Zdeňka (1997): "Social Partnership in the Czech Republic", in: *Interest Representation in the Political System of the Czech Republic,* Brokl, Lubomír (ed.), Praha, SLON, 99-150;
Mansfeldová, Zdeňka (1998): "The Czech and Slovak Republics", in: *The Handbook of Political Change in Eastern Europe*, Berglund, S., Hellén, T. and Aarebrot, F. H. (eds.), Edward Elgar, 191-230;
Marek, Pavel et al. (2000): *Přehled politického stranictví na území českých zemí a Československa v letech 1861-1998* (Survey of Political Partisanship in the Czech Lands and Czechoslovakia in 1861-1998), Olomouc, Univerzita Palackého;
Novák, Miroslav (1996): "Démocratie(s) et efficience(s). Y a-t-il un choix constitutionnel supérieur à tous les autres?", in: *Revue internationale de politique comparée*, No. 3, Décembre, 689-712;
Novák, Miroslav (1997): *Une transition démocratique exemplaire? L'emergence d'un systeme de partis dans les pays Tcheques*, Praha, CeFReS;
Novák, Miroslav (1999): *Systémy politických stran. Úvod do jejich srovnávacího* studia (Systems of Political Parties. Introduction into Comparative study), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Novák, Miroslav (2000): "Is there an optimal model for democracy?", in: *The Challenges on theories of democracy*, Larsen, S. U. (ed.), Boulder, Social Sciences Monographs and New York, Columbia University Press, 370-394;
Pitrová, Markéta (1999): *Institucionální struktura Evropské unie* (Institutional Structure of the European Union), Brno, Masarykova univerzita;
Říchová, Blanka, Cabada, Ladislav and Dvořáková, Vladimíra (1999, 2000): *Komparace politických systémů* (Comparison of Political Systems), Vol. I-III, Praha, Vysoká škola ekonomická;
Říchová, Blanka (2000): *Přehled moderních politologických teorií* (Survey of Modern Theories in Political Science), Praha, Portál;
Strmiska, Maxmilián (1998): *Regionální strany a stranické systémy. Španělsko, Itálie, Velká Británie a Severní Irsko* (Regional Parties and Party Systems in Spain, Italy, Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Brno, Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury;
Strmiska, Maxmilián (1998): "Appunti sull´interpretazione del Sessantotto e sulla genesi della Nuova Sinistra italiana", in: *Per il Sessantotto. Studi e ricerche*, Giachetti, D. (ed.), Pistoia, Massari Editore, Centro di Documentazione, 55-59;
Strmiska, Maxmilián (2000a): *"Ozbrojená opozice". Studie k subverzívnímu terorismu* ("Armed Opposition". A Study on Subversive Terrorism), Brno, Masarykova univerzita;
Strmiska, Maxmilián (2000b): "Dez anos depois: Consolidando os sistemas partidários na Europa Centro-Oriental pós comunista", in: *Teoria e Sociedade*, IV, No. 6, 178-211;
Strmiska, Maxmilián (2001): *Challenges of consolidation and the post-communist party systems: Collection of essays*, Brno, Masarykova univerzita.

Table 1 Number of graduate researchers in the political science institutions in the Czech Republic

Institution	Professors	Assistant Professors	Lecturers	Researchers	Summary
ÚPOL FF UK	0	3	4	1	8
KP FSS MU	0	3	6	0	9
ÚFSV	0	3	10	0	13
IMS FSV UK	3 (min 50%)	4 (min 50%)	16 (min 50%)	0	23 (min 50%)
IPS FSV UK	0	5	10	0	15
MPÚ MU	0	1	1	1	3
KAS ZČU	0	2	5	0	7
SÚ AV ČR	0	1	0	5	6
ÚMV	0	0	0	18	18
KPES FF UP	0	2	7	0	9
USS MU	0	0	0	2	2
ÚSS VA	1	0	1	1	3
VA – Dept. of social sciences	0	0	3	0	3
VŠE	1	4	4	0	9

Table 2 Number of students at Czech universities who study political science as one of their majors

Institution	Bachelor's program – internal	Bachelor's program – external	Master's program – internal	Master's program – external	Doctor's program – internal	Doctor's program – external
ÚPOL FFUK	0	0	237	0	8	9
KP FSS MU	app. 300	app. 260	39	0	21	11
ÚFSV	90	0	0	0	0	0
IMS FSV UK	app. 300	0	app. 200	0	12	?
IPS FSV UK	180	0	130	0	18	30
KPES FF UP	72	0	48	0	5	12
VŠE	0	0	30	0	6	12

Note: Institutions entered in the list (see the end of the table section) but missing in the table are research organizations without teaching activities.

Table 3 Number of published articles, essays, and other professional texts in the most important Czech political science journals (*Journal of Political Science*, *Review of Political Science*, *International Relations*), 1996-2000

Institutions	JPS	RPS	IR	Summary
ÚPOL FF UK	1	3	2	6
KP FSS MU	28	3	2	33
ÚFSV	0	0	2	2
IMS FSV UK	1,5	0	5	6,5
IPS FSV UK	2,5	5	1,5	9
MPÚ MU	3	0	0	3
KAS ZČU	0	2	0	2
SÚ AV ČR	1	1	2	4
ÚMV	1	0	24	25
KPES FF UP	0	0	0	0
USS MU	0	0	0	0
ÚSS VA	0	0	0	0
VA - Dept. of social sciences	2	0	0	2
VŠE	7	4	1	12

Other institutions	JPS	RPS	IR	Summary
Dept. of International Law - PrF UK	0	0	7	7
Dept. of Constitutional Law and Political Science - PrF MU	4,5	0	0	4,5
Institute of Studies in Sociology - FSV UK	0	2	0	2
Dept. of International Commerce - FMV VŠE	0	0	2	2
Dept. of Theory of Law - PrF MU	1	0	0	1
Dept. of Sociology - FSS MU	1	0	0	1
Dept. of Theory of Law and Legal Doctrines - PrF UK	1	0	0	1
Institute of National Economics - AV ČR	0	0	1	1
Institute of State and Law - AV ČR	0	0	1	1
Dept. of Theory of Law, Constitutional and International Law - Police Academy of the Czech Republic	0	0	1	1
Jan Masaryk Centre of International Studies - VŠE	0	0	1	1
Dept. of International and European Law - FMV VŠE	0	0	1	1

List of institutions and appropriate abbreviations:

ÚPOL FF UK - Institute of Political Science, Faculty of Arts, Charles University
KP FSS MU - Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University
ÚFSV- Institute of Philosophy and Social Sciences, University of Hradec Králové
IMS FSV UK - Institute of International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University
IPS FSV UK - Institute of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University
MPÚ MU - International Institute for Political Science, Masaryk University
KAS ZČU - Department of Sociology and Political Science, West Bohemian University
SÚ AV ČR - Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences
ÚMV - Institute of International Relations, Prague
KPES FF UP - Department of Political Science and European Studies, Faculty of Arts, Palacký University
USS MU - Institute of Strategic Studies, Masaryk University
ÚSS VA - Institute of Strategic Studies, Military Academy, Brno
VŠE - University of Economics, Prague
PrF UK - Faculty of Law, Charles University
PrF MU - Faculty of Law, Masaryk University
FMV VŠE - Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics

Raivo Vetik

Political Science – Estonia

Discussant: Vello Pettai

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Political Science is one of the youngest social science disciplines in Estonia, since there were no institutions or research in this field up to the mid-1980s. In Soviet times, ideological control of political ideas and studies related to political issues was strong, access to Western scholarship was restricted, and contacts with foreign political scientists were prohibited. Even compared with sociological research, which goes back to the 1960s, political science is a completely new phenomenon in Estonia. The discipline is taking its very first steps to define its research objects, methodological approaches, and role in public debate.

However, political and philosophical reasoning on nationalism, Estonia's place in the international system, and the modernization of Estonian society date back to the second half of the 19th century, when Estonia started its nation building project. Two key figures at the beginning of Estonian political thought were Carl Robert Jakobson and Jakob Hurt. The latter formulated an idea that has become a cornerstone of Estonian national ideology – "As a small nation, we can not become a big power, but we can become great in our culture." (Hurt, 1989) Another key focus of Estonian national ideology has been the country's relationship to its big neighbors and conquerors – Russia and Germany. Oskar Loorits maintains that Estonia's only viable geopolitical strategy is to maintain both openness and restrictions in its relationship to these two countries (Loorits, 1937).

Beginning in 1995, a books series "History of Estonian Thought" started to publish key texts of this period of Estonian political thinking: Juhan Luiga (1996): *Mäss ja meelehaigus* (Rebellion and the Dollar); Ilmar Tõnisson (1999): *Emajõe ääres* (By Emajõgi); Jüri Vilms (1999): *Kahe ilma vahel* (Between the Two Worlds); Konstantin Päts (2000): *Eesti riik* (The Estonian State); Oskar Loorits (2001): *Meie, eestlased* (We, Estonians), etc.

The Estonian state's small size, geopolitical position, and history have made nation building one of the main themes of Estonian political thought. In the European cultural space, there have been two different patterns of thinking on nation building – political-territorial and ethnic-cultural. In the West, nations emerged as a rule within already existing states. Underlying their identity were political principles evolved in the modern era, whereby the democratization of the social order was effected and the king's subjects became sovereign citizens. The state was conceived as an aggregate of citizens endowed with equal rights and residing in the given territory.

In Central and Eastern Europe, nations came into being under the conditions of foreign empires. That is why the carriers of nationalism were mainly language, culture, and traditions. These became tools to shape the new identity and to help people stand up against the foreign power. The right to national self-determination was construed as the right of nations, defined in ethnic-cultural terms, to have their own states.

Estonians have embraced the concept of a state proceeding from their cultural heritage and language. When the nation emerged in the 19th century, it was not political ideas but cultural resistance that shaped the understanding of nationhood. The promotion of Estonia's own language, its stock of cultural heritage, and the creation of new national traditions were highlighted against the pressure from the Russian Empire and the cultural dominance of the Baltic Germans. Later, in the Soviet period, too, cultural resistance was a natural strategy for Estonians to withstand the deleterious communist ideology. As a result, this tradition still affects many Estonians' thinking, even though the need for further modernization of the society and the external European environment make it imperative to reconsider the role of ethnicity in the national ideology and to move toward politically understood nation-statehood.

In Soviet times, there were two different kinds of reflection on politics in Estonia. One direction was based on Estonia's occupation by the Soviet Union. The existing political regime was perceived as alien, threatening, and repressive. The phenomena of double consciousness, typical for many Central and East European countries (Hankiss, 1990), also developed among Estonians; this meant that loyalty to the communist regime was expected at work and in formal interactions, but dissatisfaction with and protest against the system were the dominant dispositions in informal circles of friends and family.

Second, Marxism-Leninism was an obligatory subject at all Estonian universities during the Soviet period. All graduates had to take courses and pass exams in this subject. Marxism-Leninism was divided into four sub-areas: philosophy (Dialectical and Historical Materialism), political economy (capitalist and socialist), the history of the communist party of the Soviet Union, and scientific communism. Each of the sub-areas was supposed to cover one or another aspect of the functioning of society and politics. In particular, scientific communism included a number of issues like the nationality question, the relationship between communist and capitalist world systems etc., that Marxist-Leninist ideology considered politically relevant topics even in the socialist period of the development of humankind.

About 150–200 people taught at the Marxism-Leninism departments of Estonian universities in the 1980s. Some of these people conducted research on political theory[1]. Some wrote interesting pieces about contemporary political issues in Estonia and the Soviet Union[2]. However, all of this remained on a very abstract level and was implemented in "hidden" language. Empirical studies and the political science approach per *se* were out of the question in those days.

Of the four sub-areas of Marxism-Leninism and their respective departments at the universities, the general public and students regarded only two as real "red subjects". These were the history of the communist party of the Soviet Union and scientific communism. Taking these subjects was a kind of ritual obligation for students, and often even the lecturers themselves did not regard them seriously. On the other hand, the situation was quite different in the departments of philosophy and political economy. Much depended on a particular lecturer, his qualification, and his research interests. Some lecturers were highly esteemed by students, and their courses were among the most popular.

A characteristic feature at these departments was that lecturers' courses and research focused on problems as far removed as possible from Marxist issues, obviating the need to touch upon ideological controversies. However, one of the channels to get information about new theories and approaches to politics in the West was through Marxist sources criticizing Western thought. Lecturers and students used to read these texts with a "double eye", trying to differentiate authentic information from the commentators' obligatory ideological surface.

The Department of Philosophy at Tartu University is a good example. Not only has the department survived and developed successfully in the 1990s, its leading figures (Eero Loone, Ülo Matjus, Rein Vihalemm) also finally managed to get their professorships after Estonia regained independence at the beginning of the 1990s. These scholars have been prominent figures in Estonian academia since then and are trying to relate the Estonian life-world to Western philosophy. On the other hand, unlike at the departments of philosophy at Estonian universities, there are virtually no survivors from the former departments of history of the communist party of the Soviet Union or from departments of scientific communism.

It is difficult to evaluate the impact of Western theories on people interested in political issues in these times. There were pre-war translations of a number of classical political texts, but their circulation was tightly restricted under the totalitarian regime. The same was true of new literature. At the end of the Second World War, the majority of Estonia's intellectual elite left for the West. In the next decades, they were quite active in their new home countries, keeping the ideas of Estonian statehood and independence alive. A number of Estonian-born social scientists were internationally known: Ilmar Tammelo, Rein Taagepera, Aleksander Loit, etc. These people discussed and published on political ideas and issues, though most of their texts remained unavailable in Estonia. *Vaba Eesti tähistel* (At the Milestones of Free Estonia), published by the Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus in Tallinn in 2000, provides a good overview of some key Soviet-period texts by Estonian expatriates.

In this context, a specific characteristic of the Estonian dissident movement can be explained. Oppositional activities during the Soviet era had less to do with social scientists and social science concepts like democracy or liberalism than with cultural-ethnographic concepts and ideas. Particularly the idea of civil society and the problems related to civil initiative were interpreted much more vaguely in Estonia than in many other Central and Eastern European countries. One reason for this was that the latter countries maintained their national societies and some traditions of private property even during the socialist period, while in Estonia they were totally eliminated. The opposition movement in Central and Eastern Europe was largely based on the ideology of civil society, but in Estonia it was based mainly on the ideology of the ethnically understood nation-state. Thus, historical experience and cultural concepts contributed more than Western ideas did to the ideological climate of the opposition movement in Estonia during the Soviet era.

Social scientists' engagement in the movement oppositional to the communist regime in Estonia began in the course of Perestroika in the mid-1980s. In 1987, four prominent social scientists – Edgar Savisaar, Siim Kallas, Tiit Made, and Mikk Titma – published an open letter titled "IME" (Isemajandav Eesti, *Self-Governing Estonia*), which argued to establish a system of self-government in Estonia (Edasi, September 26, 1987). Later, a number of social scientists developed political ideas and a new political system in the country. For example, three scholars from the Institute of International and Social Studies in Tallinn were elected representatives to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in 1989, where they played a role in initiating the democratic processes that were to bring about the dissolution of the Soviet Union. A number of social scientists became members of the Estonian Parliament in later years.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

The first opportunities for political science research *per se* in Estonia emerged after 1985. In Gorbatchov's era of openness and liberalization, it proved possible to reflect on ongoing political events, to get access to Western literature, and even to write PhD dissertations on democratic political processes.[3]

Estonian scholars began visiting Western universities and political science research centers at the end of the 1980s. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of external influence on the development of the political science discipline in Estonia in the following years. Scandinavian universities, particularly the departments of political science at the University of Oslo and the University of Aarhus, were the most important cooperation partners in the initial stage of the development of political science research and institutions in Estonia.

Many political science concepts, theories, approaches, and institutional patterns were directly copied from the experiences of these universities. Yet the term for the political science discipline itself was not coined in Scandinavia, but in Germany. As in some other post-communist countries, the term "political science" tended to be avoided because of its perceived closeness to the term "scientific communism". The new term "politology" was chosen to signal to the broader public and to scholars themselves a new beginning in Estonian political reflection and analyses.

But obviously it was not possible to have well-structured and developed political science research and institutions immediately in the first years of politology's existence in Estonia. Building up a new discipline has been time-consuming and sometimes even painful. The biggest problem has been lack of people interested in the subject. Historical and conceptual approaches, borrowed from the previous social science tradition, remained the most prominent paradigm in Estonian political science for quite a few years. To some extent, this remains true even now.

As a result of the first visits and conferences at the end of the 1980s, several joint research and exchange programs with Scandinavian universities were launched. For example, the Nordic-Baltic research project “The Politics of Transition in the Baltic States” started in 1990. It was financed by a grant from the Nordic Council of Ministers and involved about 40 scholars from the universities of Aarhus, Oslo, Umea, Tartu, Riga, and Vilnius. In 1992, an exchange program titled “Project Balticum” was launched at the Department of Political Science of the University of Oslo. This program became the most important development site for a number of Estonian political science people and institutions throughout the 1990s. Professor Arne Stokke was the key person behind the project. The political science communities in all three Baltic states have greatly appreciated his enthusiasm and commitment. A number of Baltic scholars commonly called the Oslo University “my second home” in the first half of the 1990s.

Numerous visits, staff and student exchanges, research, and other forms of cooperation were instrumental in gaining new professional skills, teaching materials, literature, and experience needed for the emerging political science discipline in Estonian universities and research institutes. Besides the major programs named above, quite a few other projects can be identified: the European Union TEMPUS project “Political Science in the Baltic States” (1992-1995), the European Union Euro-Faculty project (beginning in 1992 and still continuing), a grant from the Soros Foundation to develop Political Science and Public Administration teaching (1994-1995), a joint project with the University of Connecticut for the exchange of social scientists (1994-1997), etc. All these projects involved the Department of Political Science of Tartu University (Tartu Ülikool) as the main Estonian partner. Besides Tartu University, political science also started at the Tallinn Pedagogical University (Tallinna Pedagoogikaülikool, TPU) as a major and at Tallinn Technical University (Tallinna Tehnikaülikool) as a minor specialization at the beginning of the 1990s.

A structural feature greatly influencing the launching and further development of the discipline is the smallness of the political science community in Estonia. Currently only about 40–50 persons are involved in political science teaching or research, and there were even fewer 5–6 years ago. The two main institutions in the field have been the Department of Political Science at Tartu University and the Institute of International and Social Studies of the Academy of Sciences[4]. These institutions represent well the most important achievements and problems in the development of political science in Estonia in the 1990s, so the next section first provides a detailed description of these institutions. Several new institutions were established in the mid-1990s, but these are still only beginning to define their place and role in Estonian political science.

The Department of Political Science at Tartu University

The Department of Philosophy and Political Science at Tartu University was established in Fall 1989. It was the result of the reorganization of the former Department of Philosophy, which was divided into two units, one of them focusing on political science. The staff of the department came mainly from the fields of philosophy, history, and law in other departments of Tartu University. In the first years, the department did not have its own students, but taught introductory courses in political science at the Faculties of Philosophy, Law, and Economics. However, the department’s lecturers focused on different areas of political science research and, step by step, thematic specialization evolved in the department.

The process of specialization was chaotic as everyone chose his own research subject. Some fields of research and teaching – for example, problems related to ethnic conflict, nationalism, and nation building – proved more popular than others. This is because the ethnic issue has been a burning problem in Estonia since the end of the 1980s. The influence of Rein Taagepera and the Estonian translation of his “Seats and Votes” have made electoral systems a popular subject at the universities.

Since 1992, Professor Rein Taagepera[5], an internationally known political scientist, has been one of the key figures in the development of political science in Estonia. He established a new Faculty of Social Sciences at Tartu University, including subunits of political science, sociology, and economics. As a result, the political science subunit from the Department of Philosophy and

Political Science moved from the Faculty of Philosophy to the new Faculty of Social Science and became an independent unit with students of its own.

The following numbers illustrate the institutional growth of the Department of Political Science at Tartu University in the period 1989-2000. In 1989, there were 4 staff members in the political science unit at the Department of Philosophy and Political Science, but there were no students majoring in political science. In 1993, the respective numbers were 5 and 50; in 1996, 6 and 85; and in 2000, 10 and 117. The department has developed a broad international cooperation network and regularly receives visiting professors from the West, via Fulbright or other exchange schemes.

An important structural development took place in 1995, when the department was divided into two units and the subunit of public administration established a separate institution, the Department of Public Administration and Social Policy. However, in Fall 2001, the university council decided that these two departments should have a joint BA program beginning in 2002. Considering the limited human and financial resources of a country like Estonia, such a pattern seems to best meet the aims of developing political science as a discipline and society's needs for political science graduates.

Estonian expatriates contributed to the development of the Department of Political Science at Tartu University. Rein Taagepera was the founder of the new Faculty of Social Sciences, as already mentioned. Two other active members of the department – Vello Pettai (a graduate of Columbia University) and Andres Kasekamp (a graduate of the University of Toronto) – have contributed Western educational background and research experience. Besides lecturing at Tartu University, Andres Kasekamp is also the coordinator of the Institute of Foreign Affairs, a newly established non-governmental institution in Tallinn.

The number of graduates in political science is still comparatively low in Estonia, and it is difficult to make generalizations about their prospects in the labor market. However, since Estonian public service has developed very fast since independence was regained, some graduates have been able to find good positions and launch remarkable careers. Political science graduates can also be found in Estonia's politics, media, and private sector. A new development is that MA degrees are becoming popular among Estonian public servants, creating a growing market for the departments of political science and public administration at both Tartu and Tallinn. Also, Estonia's accession to the EU is creating new needs for these majors. As a result, new challenges and opportunities for growth are emerging for these departments.

The Institute of International and Social Studies at Tallinn Pedagogical University

The Institute of International and Social Studies (IISS), founded in 1988 under the name of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law, was a key political science research institution in Estonia in the 1990s. It was established as a specialized research institute for a country going through the processes of democratization and marketization. It was a time when political and economic reforms had begun in the Soviet Union and the independence movement was gathering momentum in Estonia. This situation made it possible to address issues and theories that had been forbidden for decades. For instance, the institute published documents concerning events related to the Soviet occupation of the Baltic states in 1939–1940.

Prior to the establishment of the IISS, the majority of its researchers had worked at the Institute of History (sociologists and philosophers) or at the Institute of Economics (jurists and political scientists) of the Academy of Sciences. In 1989, the Institute's first year of operation, it employed 85 people, including 39 scholars. About ten of them were directly engaged in political science and international relations research. During the 1990s, the IISS developed as an academic research and development institution in the fields of sociology, political science, and international relations; philosophers and lawyers left the institute. In 1998, in the framework of science reform in Estonia, the IISS joined Tallinn Pedagogical University.

IISS research work focuses on:

- Social Stratification and Mobility in a Changing Society: Generational Paths in Contemporary Estonia,

- Changing Values and Lifestyles in Estonia: Economic and Social Resources of Families,
- The Social Dimension of Euro-Integration and Perspectives of the Estonian Nation-State,
- Cultural Dialogue in Estonia: Ethnic, Regional, and Global Factors,
- Democratic Governance in Estonia: Problems and Solutions,
- International and Security Studies,
- Crime and Crime Prevention in Estonia.

In addition to research work, IISS scholars lecture at a number of universities in Estonia and abroad, perform consultancy work, and have helped prepare several Estonian state programs (for example "Integration of Estonian Society 2000-2007"). The institute has well-established research cooperation with Western institutions (Tampere University, Helsinki University, Jyväskyla University, Uppsala University, Oslo University, Michigan University, etc.). The institute cooperates with a number of governmental and non-governmental bodies and foundations in Estonia as well as with international organizations like the United Nations Development Agency, the United Nations Union, UNESCO, the Representative of the European Commission in Estonia, the OSCE representative in Estonia, etc.

Department of Public Administration, University of Tartu

The Department of Public Administration and Social Policy at Tartu University was founded in 1995. The department has since created Bachelor's, Master's, and PhD curricula. Currently there are 161 undergraduate students, 19 Master's students, and 15 PhD students in Public Administration. About 3/4 of more than 150 alumni work in public service; some of them have already reached the ranks of the senior civil service. A third of the alumni have continued their studies in Master's and PhD programs abroad.

The department's personnel consists of eight full faculty members; several foreign professors and senior civil servants have also offered individual courses since 1995. The Department has signed bilateral agreements for the exchange of undergraduate students with the University of Helsinki, the University of Maastricht, the University of Constance, the University of Jena, and the Institute of Administration in Braganca, Portugal.

The Department of Public Administration's research projects include the following topics: Public Administration as *Staatswissenschaft,* Polis Theory, the Continental European Tradition of Public Administration and Its Application Today, Hermeneutic Theory of Bureaucracy, Comparative Civil Service Reforms, the Administration of Small States, Innovation, ICT and Industrial Policy, Fiscal Decentralization in Estonia and Europe, Non-Governmental Organizations, Critique of the New Public Management, the Separation of Powers, the Anthropology of Political and Administrative Systems, and Civil Service Career Patterns.

At the beginning of 2002, the Department of Public Administration and Social Policy faced a structural reform in which the Chair of Social Policy was moved to the Department of Sociology. The Department of Public Administration was enlarged by the creation of a Chair of Public Management. In the future, the Department of Public Administration will concentrate on the development of graduate programs, which means gradually shifting its focus from the undergraduate program to the MA and PhD programs.

The Department of Government at Tallinn Pedagogical University

The Department of Government at Tallinn Pedagogical University offers BA and MA curricula in political science and public administration. The predecessor of the Department of Government was the Department of Social Theory, which offered introductory courses in social sciences (sociology, political science, economics, etc.) at TPU. In 1994, a BA curriculum in public administration was established with the assistance of a TEMPUS program (1992–1995) carried out in cooperation with Manchester Metropolitan University (UK), University College Galway (IRL), and Tallinn Technical University.

In 1998, the Department of Social Sciences was renamed the Department of Government, while the chairs of sociology and population studies separated from the department and formed a new Department of Sociology. The department's staff consists of 11 full members, including two professors. The department's Chairs of Comparative Politics and Public Policy were established in Spring 2001. According to the department's developmental plan, the Chair of Human Development and Public Management will be established in the coming years.

There are three research groups at the Department of Government. The research group on institutional policy includes seven persons (including MA students) and focuses on two research directions: the study of decision-making in government and the study of administrative policy in Estonia in the 1990s. The second research group consists of five researchers and research assistants and focuses on the politics of multiculturalism. The third research group on civic culture and civic education includes five researchers and research assistants and participates in various programs at the International Association for Evaluation of Educational Achievements.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

The research work of Estonian political scientists in the early years of independence concentrated on the problems of post-communist states and societies in transition. Scholars carried out research on issues like nation building and ethnic politics, the reconstruction of civil society, post-communist cultural, social, and political transformations, international relations, etc.

The Marxist doctrine and approaches, which dominated theoretical and methodological orientations in Estonian political science for decades, had been totally abandoned by the beginning of the 1990s. There are practically no people from old Marxist-Leninist university departments left in Estonian academia. There has even been overreaction to past experiences. The majority of Estonian political scientists have regarded everything even remotely recalling left-wing ideology with suspicion. Such a state of affairs has had a detrimental impact on the balance and quality of public debate on societal and political issues, which has been one-sidedly liberal over the first ten years of building independence and a market economy in Estonia.

Table 1 shows that the continuing dominance of qualitative approaches still signals Estonian political science research's methodological underdevelopment. Not enough people in the political science community have been systematically taught research methods and educated in political science according to Western standards. Much is still on the amateur level. However, prospects of improvement are not bad, since two PhD Schools in Social Sciences (Tartu University and Tallinn Pedagogical University) have been established; they also offer joint courses.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

We have already mentioned cooperation with Scandinavian universities. The impact of the Scandinavian political science tradition can also be seen in the development of thematic orientations of political science in Estonia. A number of research projects were carried out in the 1990s under the direct leadership of the scholars like Anton Steen and Arne Stokke of the University of Oslo and Jan Ake Dellenbrant of the University of Umea. These projects focused on subjects like parliamentary government, inter-ethnic relations and nationalism, elite transformation, party formation and electoral behavior, etc. Such cooperation helped to shape the understanding of political science research and its methods, sources, and style.

Currently, Estonian comparative political scientists conduct studies on parties and party systems. Tiina Randviir and Rein Toomla (Raitviir, 1996; Toomla, 2000) have carried out the first studies of Estonian parties and elections. In the same field, Vello Pettai (Pettai and Kreuzer, 1999) has carried out a comparative analysis of election laws and a study of the various levels of institutionalization of parties in the three Baltic States. In the same field of research Rein Taagepera and Evald Mikkel (Taagepera, 1997, Taagepera, 1998, Taagepera; Grofman and Mikkel, 2000) have also investigated the effective number of parties, the election threshold in electing national representation bodies, and the development and genealogy of Estonian political parties. Andres Kasekamp (2000) carried out a study of right-wing movements in the inter-war period in the Estonian political context.

The democratization of transitional societies in general and the examination of emerging civil society have received considerable attention. The most important of Andrus Park's works are collected in his memorial proceedings (Park, 1995). Jüri Ruus (Ruus, 1999) has analyzed the Estonian political elite and its attitude toward democracy in the transitional period. Rein Ruutsoo and Siisianen (1996) studied NGO-participation, citizen initiative, social capital, and growth difficulties in Estonia and other Baltic transitional societies. Rein Taagepera (Taagepera, 1998) also wrote a book on the political development of eastern Finno-Ugric peoples in the Russian Federation.

Estonian political scientists including Hallik (1996), Ruutsoo (1999), Vetik (1999), and Berg (2001) have written on inter-ethnic relations and ethnic policy. Raising the question of the type of democracy that fits re-independent Estonia most, Vello Pettai (1998) has examined the ethnic democracy model and its features. On the other hand, Raivo Vetik (2001) has focused on the model of multicultural democracy.

The changed international situation, traditional challenges, and new foreign policy orientations have given international relations and geopolitics a respectable place in the development of political science as a scientific discipline in Estonia. One central research topic has been security policy and particularly regional security in the Baltic Sea region (Vares and Haab, 1994; Jaanson, 1995; Berg and Oras, 2000).

Estonian political scientists have also been developing research in the field of public administration. At Tartu University, attention focuses on the theory and history of public administration, state service, organizational theory, the non-profit sector, and the administrative organs of small countries (Drechsler, 1999, Randma, 2001). At Tallinn Pedagogical University, research focuses on comparative studies of reforms of governing institutions and structures (Sootla, 1996).

A trend in Estonian political science has been to carry out applied research commissioned by the ministries and other government institutions as well as to take part in the preparation of state policy programs. One example of this is a research project carried out by Institute of International and Social Studies on national integration and multiculturalism: *Democratic Multiculturalism: a New Model of National Integration* (Vetik, 2001). This project became a conceptual base for the "Integration Program of Estonian Society 2000-2007" adopted by the Estonian government in March 2000.

There are two main sources of funding for political science research projects in Estonia. These are grants from the Ministry of Education (for 1–5 years) and the Estonian Science Foundation (for 1–3 years). These grants are meant to fund "fundamental research". The subjects of directly state-funded projects include: *Democratic Governance in Estonia: Problems and Solutions*, (Raivo Vetik), *Social Dimensions of European Integration and Perspectives of the Estonian Nation-State* (Aksel Kirch), and *Estonia in the System of International Relations* (Peeter Vares). The projects funded by the Estonian Science Foundation include: *Policy Networks and Elite Participation in Legislation. The Case of Estonia* (Jüri Ruus), *Geopolitical Reasoning and Discourse in Post-Soviet Estonia: Identity, Boundary-Producing Practices and Context* (Eiki Berg), *Political Institutions and Party Cohesion in the Baltic States* (Vello Pettai), and *1999 Estonian Riigikogu Elections* (Rein Toomla).

Along with the above two main internal sources, the Estonian government, the State Chancellery, the Chancellery of the Estonian Parliament, the Office of European Integration, and a number of other state institutions have been internal donors to political science research during the 1990s. These bodies have funded research related to the needs of everyday policy-making in Estonia, like the structure and functioning of central and local administration, Estonia's EU accession, political trust in state institutions, etc. Examples of cooperation between social scientists and public servants include the preparation of the yearly Estonian Human Development Reports (since 1995), the Estonian Sustainable Development Report (in 2001), a future scenario "Estonia 2010", etc.

A large share of funding of Estonian political science comes from cooperative projects with Western research institutions. There are projects funded by the EU 5th Framework Programme – for example the IISS is engaged in a major comparative project "Value Systems and Socio-Economic Conditions", which includes 13 European countries. The Open Estonia Foundation, established by George Soros more than ten years ago, has also been a very important source of financing for smaller projects and research visits.

However, since the number of people engaged in political science is still very small in Estonia, many research areas are still uncovered. The Estonian state's policy on financing science and development is a factor in this. For example, EU countries allocate an average 1.8% of GDP to R&D, but Estonia allocates only 0.6%, one of the lowest rates even among accession countries.

5. Public space and academic debates

The role of political scientists in public debate on social and political issues in Estonia grew remarkably during the 1990s. Some scholars have become opinion leaders whose comments and analyses are regularly sought by major newspapers and other media. They have contributed articles on burning issues of social stratification and poverty, trust in state institutions, nation building strategies, inter-ethnic issues, etc. The best example of the possibility to have an impact on the public agenda was an open letter from 26 Estonian social scientists in Spring 2001, published by all major media channels in Estonia (*Postimees*, April 23, 2001). The letter sought to draw attention to major problems in Estonian politics and society. The title of the open letter – *Two Estonias* – has become a keyword everyone in Estonia is aware of, since the media now use this metaphor daily in discussing various social and political problems.

There are no professional political science journals *per se* in Estonia. *A Monthly Survey of Baltic and Post-Soviet Politics* was published in the first half of the 1990s and had subscribers in many countries all over the world. It published the chronology of the most important political events, important political documents, and analysis of the political situation in the three Baltic States and in other parts of the former Soviet Union. However, the journal was shut down for financial reasons a few years ago. Another journal, *Trames – Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences* (formerly published as *Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis* (Dorpatensis) B, established in 1893, and the proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, *Humanities and Social Sciences*, established in 1952) is an official publication of the Estonian Academy of Sciences and the Tartu University, founded in 1997. *Trames* publishes original scholarly and research papers from all fields of the humanities and social sciences. It is attempting to become the connecting footpath allowing free movement of thought between East and West (which tend to look at things differently). It is also a footpath toward a more open and free society as well as a mirror reflecting the social processes leading to such a society. *Trames* is peer-reviewed and is published quarterly in English, each issue comprising about 100 pages. The journal is sent to more than 200 libraries in the world.

In 1996, the Estonian Social Science Data Archives (ESSDA) were established at Tartu University. The actual work of this institution began even earlier. In 1993, a group of sociologists, psychologists, political scientists, and human geographers at Tartu University formed an initiative group to create a databank on social sciences and began to work out a corresponding development project. Relying upon the financial support of Tartu University, the group began transferring materials deposited in the Computing Center of Radio Estonia to magnetic disks. In Summer 1994, a project to create a databank was presented to the Open Estonia Foundation, or more specifically to the Higher Education Support Project. The application for support received a positive response, and a grant was awarded for the years 1994–1996. Currently, 214 data files from the years 1975–1994 have been transferred to the databank and 127 data files have been transferred to SPSS format. Regular cooperation with foreign social science data archives has also started. The first and so far only issue of the journal *Estonian Social Science Online* (ESSO) was published on October 19, 1999. The journal was launched with the help of a grant received from the Open Estonia Foundation and is a part of the electronic resources of the ESSDA.

6. Views on further development

The main feature of the further development of political science discipline in Estonia is the consolidation of sustainable undergraduate and graduate programs at the universities and the improvement of the quality of research. The weakest element in current teaching is that instruction often remains only theoretical and abstract. It is mostly based on experiences and literature from Western countries, because there is little literature on local political issues. The latter can be brought into being only through research on local political issues and publication of the results, particularly in the framework of research-based MA and PhD programs, which have been established in recent years both in Tallinn and Tartu.

Another positive prospect is that a number of young Estonians are in the process of defending their PhDs at Western institutions (Heigo Kadakmaa at Uppsala University, Kristi Raik at Turku University, Piret Ehinat at the University of Arizona). It is to be hoped that they will return to Estonian universities and research institutes in the near future and will strengthen the prospects of the development of the political science discipline.

The role of external factors in developing Estonian political science has changed considerably in recent years. If ten years ago the main purpose of the foreign contacts was to get new ideas for research, teaching, and institution building, now the relationship is becoming more mutual. One of the new forms of cooperation is networking. For example, the “NordBalt” project includes about 30 people from the universities of Uppsala, Tallinn, Tartu, and Riga and aims to promote cooperation and contacts between MA and PhD students at these institutions.

Another new feature in Estonian political science is the use of public opinion surveys carried out by market research companies. It has become a usual pattern for political scientists to prepare the research instrument and, after conducting fieldwork, to carry out analyses of the data. This kind of cooperation has been financed by state institutions like the Chancellery of the Parliament, the EU Information Agency, etc.

Several large political science conferences organized in recent years have been a positive sign of the development of political science in Estonia. In 1998, the IISS in Tallinn organized an International Political Science Association regional conference “Perspectives of Democratic Consolidation in Central and Eastern Europe” with participants from 14 countries from all over the world. Columbia University Press published a volume based on the conference papers (Berg-Schlosser and Vetik, 2001). In 2000, the IISS launched the Estonian Social Science Annual Conference series, with two conferences so far and two volumes published based on abstracts of the papers (Vetik, 2000; Berg, 2001). This forum has the potential to become the most important annual social science event in Estonia.

Last but not least, new non-governmental institutions engaged in policy analyses have emerged in Estonia. First, in 2000 the non-governmental think tank “Praxis” was established. This institution focuses on public policy issues like the evaluation of the effectiveness of the labor market, local government investment funds, etc. The aforementioned Institute of Foreign Affairs in Tallinn, which is still in an embryonic stage of development, also represents non-governmental organizations.

---

1 For example, Rem Blum at Tartu University developed a theory of revolution and the concept of alienation.

2 For example, Gustav Naan, 1969.

3 For example, the author of this report defended his PhD thesis on John Rawls’ theory of justice in 1989.

4 Since 1998 affiliated to the Tallinn Pedagogical University.
5 He was also professor of political science at the University of California at Irvine.

References

Berg, Eiki (ed.) (2001): *Proceedings of II Annual Conference of Estonian Social Sciences*, Tartu;

Berg, Eiki (2001), "Ethnic Mobilization in Flux. Re-visiting Peripherality and Minority Discontent in Estonia", in: *Space Polity*, 5, No. 1;

Berg, Eiki (2001): "De-constructing Border Practices in the Estonian-Russian Borderland", in: *Geopolitics*, 5, No. 3;

Berg, Eiki and Oras, Saima (2000): "Writing Post-Soviet Estonia on to the World Map", in: *Political Geography*, 19, No. 5;

Berg-Schlosser and Vetik, Raivo (2001): *Perspectives on Democratic Consolidation in Central and Eastern Europe*, Columbia University Press;

Drechsler, Wolfgang (1999): *Die selbstverwaltete Gemeinde: Beiträge zu ihrer Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft in Estland, Deutschland und Europa*, Berlin, Duncker&Humblot;

Hallik, Klara (1996): "Ethno-political Conflict in Estonia", in: *Ethnic Conflict in the Post-Soviet World*, Kelleher, K. and Walker, L. (eds.), Sharpe;

Hankiss, Elemér (1990): *East European Alternatives*, Oxford University Press;

Hurt, Jakob (1989): *Kõned ja kirjad* (Speeches and letters), Tallinn, Perioodika;

Jaanson, Kaido (1995): "Estonia and Baltic Sea Cooperation: From Idea to Reality", in: *Nationalities Papers,* 23, No. 1;

Kallas, Siim, Made, Tiit, Savisaare, Edgar and Titma, Mikk (1987): "Ettepanek: Kogu Eesti täielikule isemajandamisele" (Proposal: Estonia to become totally self-governing), in: *Edasi*, September 26;

Kasekamp, Andres (2000): The Radical Right in Interwar Estonia, London, Macmillan & New York, St. Martin's Press;

Loorits, Oskar (1937): *Oma rada* (One's own path), Tallinn;

Loorits, Oskar (2001): *Meie, eestlased* (We, Estonians), Tartu, Ilmamaa;

Luiga, Juhan (1996): *Mäss ja meelehaigus* (Rebellion and the dolour), Tartu, Ilmamaa;

"Open letter of 26 social scientists: To Estonia" (2001), in: *Postimees*, April 23,

Naan, Gustav (1969): *Võim ja vaim* (Power and the mind), in: *Looming*, *12*, Tallinn, 1856-1878;

Park, Andrus (1995): *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Sciences. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 44, No. 3;

Päts, Konstantin (2000): *Eesti riik* (The Estonian State), Tartu, Ilmamaa;

Pettai, Vello (1998): "Emerging Ethnic Democracy in Estonia and Latvia", in: *Managing Diversity in Plural Societies Minorities, Migration and Nation-Building in Post-Communist Europe*, Opalski, M. (ed.), Ottawa, Forum Eastern Europe;

Pettai, Vello and Kreuzer, Marcus (1999): "Party Politics in the Baltic States: Social Bases and Institutional Context", in: *East European Politics and Societies*, 13, No.1;

Ruutsoo, Rein and Siisianen, M. (1996): "Restoring Civil Society in the Baltic States 1988-1994", in: *European Studies*, 2;

Ruus, Jüri and Steen, A. (1999): *Change of Regime, Continuity of Elites? The Case of Estonia,* Akademika, University of Oslo;

Raitviir, Tiina (1996): *Comparative study of Estonian elections in transitional period (1989–1993)*, Tallinn, Teaduste Akadeemia Kirjastus;

Randma, Tiina (2001): *Civil service careers in small and large states: The cases of Estonia and the United Kingdom*, Baden-Baden, Nomos;

Sootla, Georg et al. (1996): "The Role of Local Autonomy in Democratic and Democratizing Societies. New Local Government Acts in the Czech Republic, Estonian and Norway", in: *Nation. Power. Society*, Warszawa;

Taagepera, Rein (1997): "Effective Number of Parties for Incomplete Data", in: *Electoral Studies,* 16, No. 2;
Taagepera, Rein (1998): "Nationwide Inclusion and Exclusion Thresholds of Representation", in: *Electoral Studies,* 17, No. 4;
Taagepera, Rein (1998): *The Finno-Ugric Republics and the Russian State*, London, Hurst & Co Publishers;
Taagepera, Rein, Grofman, Bernard and Mikkel, Evald (2000): "Fission and Fusion of Parties in Estonia, 1987-1999", in: *Journal of Baltic Studies,* 31, No. 4;
Toomla, Rein (1999): *Estonian Parties,* Tallinn, Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus;
Tõnisson, Ilmar (1999): *Emajõe ääres* (By Emajõgi), Tartu, Ilmamaa;
Vaba Eesti tähistel (At the milestones of free Estonia), Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus, 2000;
Vares, Peeter and Haab, Mare (1994): "The Baltic States: Quo vadis?", in: *Central and Eastern Europe. The Challenge of Transition*, Karp, Regina (ed.), Oxford University Press;
Vetik, Raivo (1999): *Inter-ethnic Relations in Estonia 1988-1998*, Tampere University Press;
Vetik, Raivo (ed.) (2000): *Proceedings of I Annual Conference of Estonian Social Sciences*, Tallinn, TPÜ Kirjastus;
Vetik, Raivo (2001): *Democratic Multiculturalism: A New Model of National Integration*, Aland Island Peace Institute;
Vilms, Jüri (1999): *Kahe ilma vahel* (Between the two worlds), Tartu, Ilmamaa.

Table 1 Methodological orientations

	Behaviorism	Comparitive approach	Cybernetics	Existentialism	Hermeneutics	Marxism	Rational choice theory	Game theory	Functionalism	Historical approaches	Phenomenology	System theory	Organizational theory	Neo-Institionalism	Others: Constructivism
TUES, Institute of International and Social Studies		X							X	X		X	X	X	
University of Tartu, Department of Political Science		X					X			X		X		X	X
University of Tartu, Department of Public Administration	X	X			X					X			X		
TUES, Department of Government		X							X	X		X	X	X	

Máté Szabó

Political Science – Hungary

Discussant: András Lánczi

The development of political science in Hungary has to be interpreted against the background of a totalitarian and post-totalitarian tradition and the democratic transformation of 1989. The totalitarian system annihilated all autonomous social sciences, including Hungarian political science from the pre-communist period. In the 1970s, some social scientists began to conduct political analyses and empirical surveys related to attitudes, legitimacy, and public opinion. The first scholars oriented toward a Western type of political science came from other disciplines, such as philosophy (Csaba Gombár), sociology (Kálmán Kulcsár), law (Péter Schmidt), and public administration (József Halász). Hungarians started to participate in IPSA meetings, and thereafter the idea of Hungary having its own political science discipline was on the agenda. The 1979 Moscow IPSA World Congress was the breakthrough, not only for the Hungarians participating, but also for the legitimacy of political science. From the Moscow conference on, one could hardly deny the legitimacy of political science in Hungary (Szoboszlai, 1982; Farkas-Halay, 1984). So-called "legitimizing" debates at the end of the 1970s, especially after the 1979 World Congress of the International Political Science Association in Moscow, set the stage for the institutionalization of political science in Hungary. Is political science possible and useful, for what, and do we need it? What are its relations to history, law, and political theory? All these questions needed to be discussed within the new frame of political and spiritual opportunities after 1989.

Parallel to the process of liberalization starting in the 1980s and concluding with the democratization of 1989, political science gained more and more access to scientific resources and to public life. Some political scientists, such as Attila Ágh, László Lengyel, László Kéri, Mihály Bihari, Kálmán Kulcsár and Béla Pokol, played an important role in the process of democratization, using their expertise to help new political organizations, advising them or the new government and parties. The mass media often asked political scientists to interpret the new institutional setting for the public. The possibility of publishing on subjects taboo in communist times opened up space to publish archive material, to interpret it, and to discuss problems of the new political system. Most of these discussions were tied to current problems of Hungarian democratization, the new institutions, and their balances and imbalances.

After 1989, international political analysis deliberately separated its development from that of political science, meaning that its practitioners left the Hungarian Political Science Association (HPSA) and established their own organization, and the study of international relations went its own way in teaching and in the later development of publication. However, in the mid-1990s, the challenges of EU accession for research and teaching have shown that this separation can no longer be maintained. The Europeanization process, the analysis of globalization and its effects, and studies of global and international governance are newly integrating the community of the policy-related social sciences.

The main research interests today are party systems, elections, public opinion, voting behavior, institutional change, and civil society, especially NGOs. The specific way the regime changed in Hungary – an institutionalized replacement of the old political elite with a new one – took place without major mass mobilizations; and rapid development toward a Western-type party system and with few triumphs for trade unions directed the focus of political science to constitutionalism, elections, elites, and political parties. There are very few projects oriented toward political protest, strikes, trade unions, and corporatism. The most important foreign policy issues are European integration and NATO partnership, of course. The Teleki and Illyés

Foundations provide separate research funds for research on Hungarian minorities in other countries. Thus, ethnic minorities, self-government, and autonomy are also important areas of research. Basic research on political theory and history is located mainly at the universities. The Institute of Political History, the Institute of the 1956 Revolution, and the 20th and 21st Century Foundations are centers of contemporary history and political science research, and they have publication series based on their research materials.

The Hungarian higher education system has recently accepted political science as a major of its own. No more than 500 diplomas have been issued. This means that political science – like economics and sociology – is still not glutting the Hungarian labor market. Until recently, students with a double major such as law/political science or economics/political science could find jobs quite easily in various areas of higher education, civil service, or politics.

Political science at the beginning of the 21st century in Hungary is on the verge of becoming one of the mass curricula channels of social sciences in higher education, but it has been established in the research and scientific qualification system for a longer time.

Hungarian political science, like the social sciences in general, enjoys much more freedom and autonomy than during the communist period; but it is faced with political and social problems and challenges generated by the transformation. The discipline was born in and through the transformation and, like economics and sociology, does not have any institutionalized past in the Communist system.

In Hungary, the destruction of former structures and experiences of social sciences has been limited; the academy of sciences has maintained its position as a kind of "ministry of science", and government-based higher education still has an almost exclusive monopoly, the only exceptions being the reinstitution of church-based higher education and the establishment of some international or foreign (Western) university programs. How is social science restructured under conditions of free access to international market and of academic freedom? Private or association-based social sciences have their own budget for research and teaching; its privileges of access to internal or international communication and resources are equal to those of government-based institutions. Hungary preserves a continental-European style of the domination of government support and control over research and teaching, but since 1989, NGOs have been developing as a form for education and research. Main private institutions, like the Central European University, are foreign; Péter Pázmány and Károli Gáspár Universities are church-based.

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

After the defeat of the 1956 revolution and especially after the experiments with economic reforms in 1968, the development of Hungary's social sciences was ambivalent. Hungary's communist leadership included "softliner" and "hardliner" groups after 1956; their ideas about science policy were different, too. The "softliners" in particular viewed the social sciences as "tools for social engineering", a type of "social technology", and they tried to establish "pseudo-free zones" where research and teaching without the limitations of the ruling ideology and elite could support party-led modernization. This sector enjoyed government/party resources and political support for applied research for the political elite, but its results did not become part of general scientific communication. The majority of the publications and teaching and research units had no free communication with Western or other free social science communities and produced solely for the "official" market. Another segment was the independent sector: dissidents and critical intellectuals who obtained their education and some training at official universities and then gave up or were forced to give up their official carrier, thus breaking with the limitations of the official social science and political discourse (Csizmadia, 1995).

Two institutes of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party, the Institute for Party History and the Institute for Social Sciences, were important for the development of political science in Hungary and gained recognition after they were transformed and put under public control after 1989. Archive material of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and of other leftist parties, interviews, and other documentation allowed for the development of a research institution, the Institute of Political History (Politikatörténeti Intézet). It was loosely tied to the newly established Hungarian Socialist Party, which governed the country from 1994-1998. Well-known political scientists like Mihály Bihari, Csaba Gombár, Péter Schmidt, László Lengyel, Béla Pokol, László Bruszt, János Simon, István Hülvely, Zsolt Papp, István Balogh, and József Bayer carried out research related to political science at the Institute of Social Science in the 1970s. This group was also connected to universities and other institutes and formed the core group of the Hungarian Political Science Association before 1989. After 1989, the reorganized institute was established as the Institute of Political Science of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Magyar Tudomanyos Akademia/MTA – Politikatudományi Intézete).

There was also a "dissident social science discourse" with elements of political analysis, political theory, and philosophical debates. Some intellectuals had professional social science education, defined research interests, and the desire to disseminate their research results in a kind of "alternative education" (Szilágyi, 1999). Though their numbers were limited, they had considerable impact on Hungary's pseudo-free official social science community as well as on Western social sciences. Before and after 1956, there was a Hungarian "exile social science community" in Western political and other social sciences – for example, Iván Szelényi, Ágnes Heller, Mihály Vajda, Péter Kende, Charles Gáti, Iván Völgyes, Rudolf Tőkés, etc. These people had connections to the dissidents and also an impact on official social and political analysis (Faragó, 1986). Some Hungarian dissidents were relevant for the development of political science, like Miklós Haraszti, Miklós Tamás Gáspár, György Bence, György Konrád, Miklós Szabó, Ágnes Heller, and Ferenc Fehér, among others.

Among the various Western foundations supporting social science development, the joint George Soros/Hungarian Academy of Sciences network (Quigley, 1997; Nóvé, 1999) was especially beneficial; since the mid-1980s, it has provided official and unofficial Hungarian social scientists interested in political research with broader opportunities to participate in Western education and research. The Soros network, today fully developed regionally and globally, began its Eastern European activities in Hungary. It certainly had a great impact on the opening up of the old system and on the early renewal of the social sciences, including of political science. The Soros-HAS programs included fellowships, conference grants, equipment, research costs, and books for the groups of the unofficial and of the official but non-dogmatic scientists and intellectuals. The appearance of the Soros Foundation, combined with the Academy of Sciences, was a clear sign of regime change in the 1980s. Its activities in political science have included:

- the establishment of a network of official and of unofficial interested persons,
- a network of Hungarian, Western and Eastern scholars,
- the establishment of a semi-independent evaluation system, separated from the communist hegemony, and
- helping new institutes and young scholars to win scholarships, books, equipment, or gain access to research facilities.

This had a great impact on the political and intellectual transformation in Hungary and the whole region.

A wide range of pre-communist traditions was rediscovered and popularized by the founders of political science in Hungary. There is a debate whether these traditions have anything to say for re-emerging political science of the new millennium in Hungary (Balogh-Bayer, 1999 versus Lánczi, 2001/a).

My own interpretation of the relevance of pre-communist political science and theory, especially of theory in the democracy tradition, is as follows. Hungarian culture and education developed after the Habsburg Empire finished the "reconquista" of state territory from the Ottoman Empire at the end of the 17th century. The Habsburgs consolidated their power against the rebellious Protestant Hungarian elites in the 18th century. During the 19th century, in the process of establishing the national and liberal values of a civil society against Habsburg rule, a current of critical political thought with contributions toward a scholarly political analysis developed. On the other hand, the official state science, "Staatswissenschaft", and cameral science, "Kameralistik", were part of the university curricula for lawyers and administrators, too (Arczt, 1987).

Hungarian contributions to the theory of democracy and civil society came from unofficial, critical political thinkers, forced into inner or outer emigration (Nagy, 1994; Schlett, 1996, 1999) during their lifetimes. Some of them held official teaching positions in Hungary, but they were not part of the official Staatswissenschaft. József Eötvös (1813-1871), an activist of the 1848-49 national and democratic revolution and an émigré in Germany, wrote and published in German against the Habsburgs, and later returned to Hungary (Schlett, 1987; Eötvös, 1981). Oszkár Jászi (1875-1957), an activist in the 1918 republican revolution and later an émigré in the USA until his death, publishing there in English (Jászi, 1989), worked against both the Habsburgs and the nationalism of Hungarian elites and for a civil society. An opponent of Fascism and later of Communism was István Bibó (1911-1979), an activist both in the 1945 national and democratic renewal and in the 1956 revolt against Stalinism, published in English in the 1960s (with the help of the UK political scientists, Bernard Crick and Bibó, 1986) after long prison years in "inner emigration".

There are many parallels in the life stories of these three thinkers, whom I regard as the mainstream tradition of the theory of democracy and civil society in Hungary: All of them were long excluded from the official Hungarian discourses, they played an active role in the higher ranks of politics for awhile, and they had to come to theoretical terms with their defeat in emigration, and this had some fruitful impact on their political theory.

So, we find a Staatswissenschaft tradition irrelevant to the modern social sciences and the theory of democracy; a "nominal" political science; and a "critical" unofficial tradition of critical and innovative political theory, relevant to the theory of democracy and civil society in Hungary. Established and boring political science versus an unofficial, interesting, and critical "dissent" that developed parallel to the former in a rather non-communicative way between 1848 and 1989. The communist period continued these patterns of development that had been established in the previous systems, so the schism between official and unofficial continued, and the new dissenting political science looked back upon the old one. The pre-communist traditions had a symbolic alternative character for generations of dissent and opposition in Hungary that criticized and rejected official Marxism-Leninism. Needless to say, current socio-political orientations determined which earlier Hungarian political thinkers they considered interesting; nationalists, liberals, and socialists had and have their preferences within the range of pre-communist political analysis in Hungary.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

One author suggests that the political science that grew from Western Marxism and oppositional discourses has led to a "society versus the state" paradigm, with a latent or manifest plea for the idea of the self-government of civil society (Körösényi, 1996, 1999/a). In his view, this trend is overwhelming in the Hungarian and generally in post-communist political science communities. To counterbalance this "hidden continuation of Marxism" and leftism, he says the new political science must be rooted in the government-oriented study of politics, in analytical policy and the tradition of studying governance. This approach maintains that Marxism and leftism survived the fall of Communism and that the nominal decline in references to the Marxist tradition does not mean a new beginning. It is true that, after 1989, some subjects of the oppositional discourses, like Central Europe, human rights, and civil society, became major foci and topoi of political science discourse and entailed a continuation of the international opposition discourses in a new institutionalized setting. Theories of democracy and civil society, mainly liberal and neo-liberal ones, emerged from these circles of scholars (Kis, 1987; 1997; 2000; Halmai, 1990; 1994), disseminated by the international and especially regional networks of the Soros Foundations and Open Society Institutes. But the same institutions also support sober public policy analyses and government studies (Körösényi, 1999; Stark and Bruszt, 1998; Tóka, 1995; 1999). One may have doubts whether Marxism survived in the political sciences and in the other social sciences after its death in the post-communist region, as hypostased. "Transitology" also focuses on democratization, so it has also been a trend supportive of the dominant civil society paradigm (Bozóki; Körösényi and Schöpflin, 1992; Miszlivetz, 1999; Szoboszlai, 1991, 1992). But a closer look at the transition literature shows that, especially in the beginning, it was highly oriented toward institutions and elites and only later included approaches stressing the role of political culture and civil society.

Among Hungarian émigré political scientists, György Schöpflin (London School of Economics), Iván Völgyes (University of Nebraska, died in an airplane crash in Hungary in 2001, commemorated in Politikatudományi Szemle, Vol. 10, No. 1-2, 5-7), Rudolf Tőkés (University of Connecticut), Andrew Arató (New York City, New School of Social Research), and Andrew C. János (University of California at Berkley) played especially important roles in organizing research teams and projects on Hungarian transition in a comparative perspective and in helping young scholars to gain fellowships and publication possibilities.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

Let's have an overview of the subjects of these discussions, based on the ten volumes of the academic journal of political science, *Politikatudományi Szemle* (Political Science Review).

Presidentialism vs. parliamentarism in the new democracies

The Hungarian system is a parliamentary one, but in the early 1990s there were tensions between the first president's drives and the constitutional rules, which were interpreted by the Constitutional Court. The debate brought up interesting comparative materials on the separation of powers and regime types.

Civil society in Eastern Europe

The suppressed, "catacomb"-type civil societies of the region were liberated during the transition, but new institutions and rules have developed that exert influence and constraints on them. Dissenters' civil society utopias are confronted with the post-communist reality of political apathy and alienation in Hungary and elsewhere.

Left and right in the new politics

Non-Communist political directions were banned to a common garbage can in the Communist system, but after 1989, a new differentiation, cleavage system, and party system developed and organized in various patterns and profiles; classical Lipset-Rokkan cleavage theory is applied to interpret this new system.

State neutrality vs. state interventionism

The "Party-State" was almighty and powerful in the communist era; after 1989, the two domains separated, and the power of the state was pressed to reduce, but at the same time the transformation itself, its regulation, and its institutionalization in the economy and in civil society assigned new and great tasks to the state. The preservation of state neutrality makes divergent challenges to the post-communist political realm.

Politics of the 21st century

What is the future of politics? Is there any politics in a globalized new world where nation-states diminish and supranational coordination mechanisms emerge?

Democracy in Hungary

What are the requirements for pluralist democracy and stability in a new political system where legacies of the past and challenges of the international environment, of economic transformation, and of social tensions test the performance of democratic institutions? Do liberalism and democracy have their own Hungarian roots, or do they share in the international crisis of liberalism?

Parties, electoral behavior, the electoral system, and the party system of Hungary

The general elections repeatedly exhibit the interplay of these factors of political behavior, institutions, and their country-specific features. Political apathy, a process of concentration in the parties, dominant majority elements, and the disproportionality of the electoral system produce the ambivalent consequences of stable governments and party concentration.

Constitution-making in Hungary

The constitution-making debate is unreal in the sense that we do not have a systematic, new post-communist constitution in Hungary, but a complex of piecemeal modifications by Parliament and the Constitutional Court of the old, communist constitution. How should we develop a new one: through expertise, referendum, compromise?

Ethnicity and politics, diverging political community concepts

Hungary and the millions of Magyars abroad have a public sensitive to these questions in times when the role of the nation-state is diminishing due to globalization, Europeanization, and regional autonomy. Minority rights protection is still a matter of politics with and against the state.

The Europeanization process and its challenges to policy-making in Hungary

EU enlargement has implications for the institutions and policy processes of the new Hungarian democracy. What are the requirements? Are there EU patterns in the different areas of politics, polity, and policy? What can we expect accession to result in? Will Hungarian democracy have a second transition after ten years of democratization? And if so, how?

Debate after 1989 focused sharply on pre-communist traditions in Hungary, raising questions like: Do we have any? Are they helpful in establishing or re-establishing a new political science? The main focus of the debate was on the relevance, existence, or rejection of former Hungarian traditions (Balogh-Bayer, 1999; Lánczi, 2001/a). In the mid-1990s, András Körösényi articulated the problem of the re-emergence of a still dominant Marxist-Leftist paradigm (1996; 1999/a). A generally debated thesis was that Western patterns and research were colonializing the social sciences in the post-communist countries (György Csepeli; Antal Örkény and Kim Schepple, 1997). The most recent identity discourse in the Political Science Review 1999-2000 is about political science's boundaries with journalism, political essays, and analysis writing for the public, which try to define the limits of academic analysis, policy-making, and public debates in a pluralistic political system. The role of the think tanks and of political science in policy making was earlier articulated in the 1998-1999 debate in the *Political Science Review*; again, the question was the practical efficacy of the science and the limits of its scientific mission. Erzsébet Szalai (2000), the winner of the 2000 Bibó Prize, initiated at the weekly *Élet és Irodalom* (Life and Literature) another discourse on the lack of critical social science in post-1989 Hungary.

Surveying the wide range of topics of debates, we may state that the basics of the new politics were at the forefront of the debate, which translations of texts by major Western political scientists connected to international and European debates and which reflected Hungarian political and public issues, too.

Political science in Hungary has made few methodological innovations and has little methodological consciousness. Political scientists apply mainly traditional legal, historical methods in case studies, policy and institutional analysis, or philosophical and historical analysis and focus on the field of history of ideas and political philosophy. The more empirically oriented research is done by sociologists and social psychologists applying the methodologies standard in the analysis of political phenomena in the US.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Transition became a major – almost the exclusive – object of study after 1989. Earlier, a very few scholars performed avant-garde work on alternatives of social and political change in Hungary and

Eastern Europe, working with foreign, mainly American institutions and scholars. We may mention Elemér Hankiss (1990) and László Bruszt (with Stark, 1998), who later become part of the international transitology discourses. Other young Hungarian scholars – Ákos Róna-Tas, József Böröcz, and Árpád Szakolczai – spent longer periods abroad in graduate or postgraduate studies in the US and could join the transitology discourse at an early stage, mainly as employees of American or other Western universities. The abovementioned scholars, who gained prestige in international networks, introduced some younger scholars to the subject during their research work in Hungary, and other Hungarians cooperated with foreign institutions and scholars, so a second generation of transitologists, including András Bozóki, Zsolt Enyedi, Miklós Sükösd, Béla Greskovits, arose, later to crystallize mainly around the Central European University Political Science department. For the broader group of Hungarian political scientists, it was very important that the American Political Science Association launched some bilateral meetings of scholars in the US and in Hungary (the joint volumes of the conferences, Szoboszlai, 1991, 1992) and that the Fulbright Foundation and other US-based foundations supported the development of Hungarian political science in many ways. Important in the Hungarian transitology discourse is the outstanding scholar, Attila Ágh (1998), who maintained US connections after the bilateral association meetings. He developed the Department of Political Science of the Budapest School of Economics into a kind of Hungarian Center of Democracy Studies with the support of the Fulbright Foundation and of other international foundations, which launched a series of conferences after 1989 on the issues of transitions, inviting the international transitology community and issuing a series of papers in a number of series of books in English and Hungarian. Some thematic orientations with methodological implications are mentioned below.

Political theory, political ideas

Here the research focus is on works in the specific Hungarian liberal, nationalist, and conservative political intellectual traditions, which were suppressed by the communist system. After the communist regime, leftist and especially Marxist traditions are not very popular. Anarchism, feminism, and new social movement theories have some impact, but on the whole the "left" is left out of the "mainstream" of non-Marxist, non-leftist ideologies as subjects of research in Hungary (Lánczi, 2001/a). Mainstream activity in political theory is the translation, interpretation, and "reacquisition" of Western political philosophy after four decades of isolation.

A theoretically important problem that has long challenged Hungarian thinkers is the composition of the political community, because the Hungarian ethnic community includes millions of Hungarians in Western emigration and in neighboring countries like Romania, Slovakia, Croatia, Serbia, Ukraine, Slovenia, and even Austria. This implies a strong affinity to the theoretical problem of the "nation"; the establishment, analysis, composition, and legitimacy of "political community"; and issues of "minority vs. majority", regionalism, autonomy, ethnic minorities, and multi-culturalism.

The Hungarian political system

Research highlights vary in this field according to the main problems of Hungarian democracy after 1989, which challenged political science in a fruitful manner. Major topics were:

- parlamentarianism vs. presidentialism;
- representative vs. direct democracy;
- majority or proportional electoral system;
- "partocracy" vs. civil society;
- European integration vs. sovereignty, and
- the nation-state vs. minority issues.

Theoretical approaches are rather eclectic. There is a mainstream, old-type constitutional institutionalism connected to the framework of human rights. Behaviorist approaches dominate electoral, public opinion, mass media, and party system research. There is a connection between old and new types of historical and contemporary approaches to institutionalism. New institutionalism is linked to rational choice theory in policy research, especially in the field of European integration. The practical reason for the pursuit of research on minority problems is mentioned above.

The main orientation of Hungarian political science was institutionalist and theoretical, but, since 1989, there have been attempts to introduce more pragmatic, policy-oriented methodology and orientation. Among younger scholars, there is a shift from the earlier "German-style", legal-philosophical approach toward a more "American-style", economically oriented social science.

International and comparative politics

Hungary is a small East-Central European (ECE) country that never had many direct overseas socio-cultural ties. Area studies are not really developed here. The main focus, of course, is on the welfare democracies, especially in Western Europe, and on EU accession. Thus, the Pacific, Asia, Africa, and Australia are not really integrated in political science research. The main focus is on the ECE area itself and on Europe as a "moving target" of EU accession. This limited focus characterizes both international and comparative approaches. Of course, there is teaching on international organizations in the form of international law and international relations studies. Special attention is paid to the issues of regionalism, minorities, and autonomy. Globalization studies are an upcoming, but rather weakly developed field in Hungarian political science. One of the reasons for its weakness is the dominance of "transitology interest", which overstresses self-reflectiveness in the post-communist countries. Inner-area comparison is also a rare product. Impending EU accession has increased interest in other ECE countries. But interest in neighboring countries with larger Hungarian minorities is stable. Issues of minority rights, territorial and personal autonomy, regional cooperation, and Europeanization as a process integrating semi-sovereign nation-states in a new political community are very popular subjects in Hungarian political science.

Political science institutions

State universities

A major in political science was first established at Miskolc University in the Faculty of Letters/Philology in 1993. The curriculum was established by Béla Pokol (successors: István Balogh, Sándor Kovács, and at present László Kürti), who, at that time, was dean of the institute, but later left the faculty. The first diplomas were awarded in 1998. The second major was established in 1997 at the Budapest Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of State and Law, headed by Mihály Bihari (1985-1999) and continued by Máté Szabó. Its first main diploma output was in 2002. In 2001, the first university-based Political Science Institute was established here; it offers MA and PhD courses and has the right to award the "habilitation". At the same university, ELTE in 1995, József Bayer established an MA program at the Faculty of Letters/Philology as well; his successor István Vida established another in 2001 at the new Faculty of Social Sciences. István Hülvely began a major program at the Faculty of Letters/Philology in Debrecen in 1997. In Pécs, a major program was opened in 1999 at the Faculty of Letters/Philology, headed by Márta Kunszt. At the Budapest School of Economics, the department led by Attila Ágh (1989-) organized a political science minor curriculum for students with another major in economics, international relations, or sociology. This type of secondary diploma teaching started early in 1986 at the ELTE Faculty of State and Law, headed by Mihály Bihari. There is a bigger department at the University of Szeged, headed by Péter Paczolay, and there are two departments at the University of Pécs (György Andrási, Faculty of Law; Márta Kunszt, Faculty of Letters). International relations are taught at the Budapest School of Economics in an institute separate from political science and headed by Zsolt Rostoványi. The first main diploma course in international relations started in 2000, before a combination of economics and international relations was instituted there.

In 1991, István Stumpf established and has since headed the Századvég-Budapest School of Politics , a private school training politicians and oriented toward improving practical skills; later it combined forces with the Budapest School of Economics Political Science Department.

PhD courses in political science are taught at the ELTE Faculty of State and Law, the Budapest School of Economics, and the Miskolc University. There are 15-20 PhD students per semester in international relations and in political science. A growing number of young Hungarian social scientists are completing their PhDs abroad, especially in the U.S. or in Western Europe.

Habilitation in political science is currently only possible at the Eötvös Loránd University's Faculty of State and Law and at the Budapest School of Economics. About ten habilitations in political science were completed by January 1, 2001. Only the Academy of Sciences is also entitled to grant a "Dr. sc." qualification, which allows doctors to apply for a professorship at a university. At the moment, there are about 10-12 professors of political science in Hungary. Some of them got their qualification in other disciplines (law, philosophy, history), some of them qualify as a Dr. sc. from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and some of them qualified by ELTE's Faculty of Law "habilitation".

Colleges

In Hungary, there are plenty of colleges (főiskola); their differences from the universities are great. There are no proper political science departments at the colleges. Rather, there are integrated departments for social science; these teach sociology, psychology, history, economics, and international relations to students who do not have any qualifications in these fields yet, and there are too many students of low or doubtful quality. Thus, after 1989, accreditation regulations were developed to qualify for "university" and "college" status. Attempts were and are made to integrate some of the colleges in local or regional universities. This process is far from finished.

In localities like Pécs, Szeged, Debrecen, Győr, and Miskolc, where universities do exist, local and regional colleges are conceived as parts of a "local higher education network". This does not exclude the parallel existence of university and college political science departments. Budapest has a special status. There has never been an integrated University of Budapest. Thus, it is almost impossible to establish one, although management and finances almost require it. There have been many attempts to organize it, but all failed. So, the Ministry of Education accepted some of Budapest's local higher education networks or alliances in 1999, but no overall integration has been achieved. Cooperation in higher education in Budapest does not include the CEU, which is an international institution acting in Hungary according to its own rules, finances, and policy. This means that there are parallel departments of political science in Budapest (CEU, ELTE, BSE, private universities).

Research: the domination of the Academy of Sciences

In Hungary, research is still a domain of independent research institutes, while universities are mainly for teaching. There have been attempts to reintegrate research and teaching in post-communism, but without real success. The Hungarian Academy of Sciences supervises and finances the Institute of Political Science. The Institute has prestige among the research institutes of the HAS; evaluations rank it quite highly. The Institute of Foreign Affairs (Magyar Külügyi Intézet) and Institute of Regional Studies were organized in 1992, independently from the Academy, in the László Teleki Foundation. They have some functions in advising the government in foreign policy affairs. There is a private institute for "Research on the 1956 Revolution"; it functions partly as an institute for contemporary history, publishing a vast amount of archive materials on and analyses of the revolution and its consequences. The 20th and 21st Century Institutes, supported by the Viktor Orbán government (1998-2002), also focus on contemporary history, political science, and policy analysis, and they support various political science projects as well as conferences.

Political science research is financed mainly by the government and the Academy. Some political parties have their own small research groups or units. Most research funding is distributed competitively. There are some research funds available for Hungarian political scientists from the Soros Open Society Foundation. Western governments, the European Union (EU), the U.S. and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) launched various research support programs for democratization research, providing political scientists with financial support. "Korridor", a private research institute established by Csaba Gombár and László Lengyel, conducts political analysis and consultation for and on government and policy processes. The Századvég-Budapest School of Politics is connected to the political education center of the same name, and there are some public opinion research centers as nongovernmental institutions (TÁRKI, Szonda-Ipsos, Medián).

Private universities

The sole foreign private university that has some importance in the area of political science is the Central European University established by George Soros. János Kis, a leading figure of the liberally minded dissent in Hungary in the Kádár era, established its political science department in Budapest in 1992. Later, Departments for International Relations and for European Studies were established. The CEU is registered in the U.S. and recruits professors from the U.S., Western Europe, and even Eastern European countries. The staff of the Political Science Department also includes some Hungarian citizens. Students come from all over the world, and the courses are in English. The guiding idea of the CEU was to educate or re-educate a new elite in post-communist countries, based on the idea of an open society, spreading liberal values, and using the methodology of the U.S.-dominated, Western social sciences. In 2001, when the institute had its 10th anniversary, new goals and organizational forms for the further development were declared. Originally, CEU activities were oriented toward awarding a second diploma to people who already earned a university or college degree in their respective countries. There are more and more PhD programs in both political science and in international relations/European studies.

In 2001-2002, three new private educational institutions were opened: the King Sigmundus University, the College of Communication, and the Gyula Andrássy German-language university. They are located in Budapest, do some work political science, and are oriented toward journalism, international relations, and European studies.

5. Public space and academic debates

Before 1989, political science existed solely in oral debates, mainly in the Hungarian Political Association and its sections, without any written publication or documentation. Later, the Association produced its yearbooks, which documented these debates. The *Yearbook of the Hungarian Political Science Association* series of the HPSA was the sole national periodical (Magyar Politikatudományi Társaság Évkönyve 1983-1992, 11 volumes). The yearbooks were thematically oriented, but basically all subjects discussed in the HPSA were welcome. There was documentation of the most interesting discussions, but studies were also published without oral discussion. It had a wide circulation, and most of the bigger libraries bought it. Members of the HPSA, at that time between 400-500, received a copy; and it was sold in social science bookshops. Its editor was the general secretary of HPSA, György Szoboszlai.

After 1989, with the publication of the two English volumes of the Association's Yearbook, the series finished with its 11 volumes (1984-1991), and from 1992 to the present, the Institute of the Political Science of the Academy of Sciences and the Association jointly published the Hungarian-language *Political Science Review* (Politikatudományi Szemle), which is not the only, but the main organ of political science debate.

These institutional dynamics – first the Association as a vital and central point of discussion, then its transformation and the pioneering role of the Review – can be viewed in historical perspective. The Hungarian Political Science Association (HPSA) was established in 1982 as a forum for softliner communists, for social scientists interested in politics, and for some of the unofficial thinkers. Before 1989, the Hungarian Political Science Association was the only focus for national and of international cooperation among political science-oriented social scientists. Luckily, after 1989, it lost its former monopoly as a wide range of recently established institutions of research and teaching thrived and pursued cooperation policies within and outside Hungary. The role and function of the HPSA changed under the new conditions after 1989. Local and institutional positions of political science became stronger, and the association is no longer the only place to meet and publish.

International relations studies established their own association in 1992, The Association for Foreign Affairs of Hungary (Magyar Külügyi Társaság). After 1989, the HPSA's policy has been to stress the professional character of the discipline. In 1992, the HPSA and the Institute of Political Science of the Academy of Sciences jointly launched the *Political Science Review*, a quarterly with peer review. This is the first and only professional political science journal in the Hungarian language. Every year since it was established, the HPSA has organized an annual meeting in Budapest on a special topic. Every year since 1995, there has been one meeting with a local group outside Budapest in one of the bigger towns.

Since the 1994 meeting in Austria, every year there has been a Central European meeting, too, a regional cooperation meeting of Central European Political Science Associations. The second meeting, in 1995, was organized in Budapest, Hungary; a Hungarian group has participated in every meeting since (1996 Slovenia, 1998 Croatia, 1999 Slovakia, 2000 Poland, 2001 Vienna). In 2000, the associations of the cooperating countries established the *Central European Political Science Association* as a regional unit within the IPSA. Jerzy Wiatr from Poland was elected the first president and József Bayer of Hungary a vice–president. The association publishes a journal in English (2000-) called *Central European Political Science Review*. Its editorial office is in Budapest, and János Simon is the editor.

In 1993, in cooperation with the István Bibó Foundation, the HPSA established a prize for the most outstanding political scientist of the year, the *István Bibó Prize*. István Bibó played an important role in the 1956 revolution, was sentenced to prison, and was never allowed to re-enter scientific and public life. So far, the prize has been awarded to the following scholars: Csaba Gombár, Péter Schmidt, Mihály Bihari, István Schlett, Attila Ágh, József Bayer, András Körösényi, Erzsébet Szalai, and Kálmán Kulcsár. Since 1998, József Bayer, Director of the Institute of Political Science of HAS, has been President of the HPSA. From 1998-2000, the General Secretary was Tibor Navracsis, ELTE University, Faculty of State and Law; since 2001, it has been Gábor Török, Department of Political Science of Budapest School of Economics.

The Review is not the only publication in political science in Hungary. We have a differentiated group of periodicals and series of books on political science and materials related to policy analysis.

National journals and periodicals

In 1988, the Budapest School of Economics Department of Political Science began publishing *The Yearbooks of Hungarian Politics*, which are edited by a board consisting of Sándor Kurtán, Péter Sándor, and László Vass. The *Yearbook of Hungarian Politics* tries to focus on the events in the respective year. Their documentation, analysis, surveys, texts, and facts, plus scholarly essays, studies, and politicians' writings, provide an impressive "testament" of a year of Hungarian politics. The large volumes are now published with the support of universities, the state, political and other foundations, and business. They are available by subscription and can be purchased in bookshops (Magyarország Politikai Évkönyve, volumes every year from 1988 on; a special issue on the first ten years was published in 1998).

Supported by the Institute of Political Science of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the HPSA, an editorial board with changing composition issued the *Political Science Review* as the first (and still only) political science journal in Hungary (Politikatudományi Szemle, two issues in 1992; four issues each in the 1993-1999 volumes; two issues in the 2000 volume; four each year from 2001 on). The founding editors were András Bozóki (ELTE/CEU), Márton Szabó (Institute of Political Science), and Máté Szabó (ELTE University, Faculty of Law, Department of Political Science). Chief of the board was Csaba Gombár, succeeded by Péter (Pierre) Kende, a repatriated former émigré. The current editorial board consists of Tamás Fricz (IPS), Ervin Csizmadia (IPS), Sándor Kurtán (BSE), and András Lánczi (BSE). The journal publishes studies, information, debates, book reviews, and translations.

Foreign Affairs (Külpolitika), covering international politics, has been published by the Institute of Foreign Affairs for a long time. It began a new series in 2000. There are many other journals publishing social science articles, including political science and related fields, e.g. *Századvég* (End of Century), *Múltunk* (Our Past), *Valóság* (Reality), *Kritika* (Critique), and *Mozgó Világ* (World in Motion). The proceedings of the annual meetings of the HPSA since 1995 have been published by the organizing faculties (Szeged, Pécs, Miskolc, Székesfehérvár and Nyíregyháza). Needless to say, all larger departments try to have their own book series, such as the Budapest School of Economics, the ELTE Faculty of Law, and Századvég-Budapest School of Politics , which also launched a social science journal *Századvég: új folyam* in 1996. The historically oriented research institutes have plenty of archive and interpretive publications, such as *Múltunk*, the journal of the Institute for Political History. There are many publications, yearbooks, and various series of the Institute of History of the 1956 Revolution.

The substantial issues of the debates in Hungarian political science are not particularly methodological. On the other hand, Hungarian political science is quite self-reflective, being keen to establish the discipline's contours and borders against related disciplines and to delineate what political science is about. The character and the institutional boundaries of the respective programs determine what related disciplines are involved in teaching and research. Generally, political science is seldom combined with sociology, for reasons based in the differing development of the two disciplines in Hungary. Sociology was established under communism in Hungary and wanted to avoid the "dangers" of studying politics under authoritarian rule. Political science was fully established after 1989 in the middle of the democratic transition, when sociology was already a "closed", institutionally matured, and established discipline. As a rule, sociologists have a good methodological background. Political science, in contrast, has less empirical sophistication, tends to verbosity, and combines dreams and reality under the eyes of the already "complacent" sociologists.

Political science in Hungary was institutionalized as a new discipline at the time of regime change, when Western aid and support was rather open to the demands of a new discipline in a new democracy. This means that various Western governments and Western-based programs provided helped to build up the new discipline, including financing new computer systems, developing data bases, teaching computer skills, and networking. The CEU publishes the most in English, followed by the Budapest School of Economics Political Science Department and then the Institute of Political Science of the HAS and the "Savaria University Press" of Szombathely. Important were the English-language volumes of the aforementioned Hungarian Center for Democracy Studies of the BSE on the first parliaments, as were those of the Institute of Political Science of HAS on organized interests and those of the "Korridor" Institute on the first Hungarian government.

In some courses before 1989, a kind of "socialist" political science or political sociology was taught based on the Hungarian translation of a political sociology manual written by a Polish sociologist and political scientist, Jerzy Wiatr (1980), which tried to implement Western categories in Marxist-Leninist terms, i.e., using some Marxist phraseology, but basically importing the concepts of Western social sciences, or on the political sociology manual of Hungarian law, political science, and sociology by Kálmán Kulcsár (1987).

The manuals, comprehensive introductory volumes on political science in the Hungarian language, were as follows. The only manual of political science in the Hungarian language was long the joint effort of Mihály Bihari and Béla Pokol, of the Department of ELTE Faculty of State and Law. It was first issued in 1992, is now in its 9th edition with more than 8,000 copies sold, and is still one of the most widely used manual (Bihari-Pokol, 1992-2000). It has a heavy German-oriented theoretical, institutional approach and almost no empirical orientation. It is written for students with some legal background and includes no problems of international politics at all. To provide a basic political education, a collection of essays "What is politics?" was published in 1994, supported by the centrist liberal-conservative party FIDESZ (Gyurgyák, 1994). With similar goals, a collective reference work, "Good Citizen", was published in Debrecen in 1996 (Civitas, 1996). A collection of texts of contemporary political philosophy and political science has been used at the Szeged University and elsewhere since 1995 (Kovács, 1995). The Bihari-Pokol volume's long-lasting monopoly was broken in 1996 by another duo of authors, Katalin Haskó and István Hülvely, who designed their much shorter manual with a background in history and philosophy for the new political science program in Debrecen and faculties other than law (Haskó-Hülvely, 1996; 2000). A second revised edition was released in 2000, and about 3,000 copies have been sold. This manual is also a type of reference work, systematically using short definitions. It is an introduction to theories and institutional patterns of modern democracy and does not include empirically oriented methodology instruction. Of its nine chapters, only one shorter chapter focuses on international politics. Important Western reference works were translated into Hungarian, for example the Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Thought. Gergely András, József Bayer, and Kálmán Kulcsár (1999) have edited a collective Hungarian-language reference collection of studies of the most relevant research fields in political science.

The third widely used manual, by József Bayer and published in 1999, treats issues and problems of both political science and international politics. It is based on a systematic analytical differentiation between politics, policy, and polity, following U.S. models. Bayer also published an introduction to the history of political theory (Bayer, 1998). Already in 1996, Péter Paczolay and Máté Szabó attempted to deal with the history of ideas and political theories, with an emphasis on the emergence of the American science of politics. There are publications by András Lánczi (2000, 2001) and Ferenc Huoranszki (1999) available in Hungarian on the past and present of political philosophy. István Schlett (1996, 1999) treats Hungarian political thinking in a still-continuing series of volumes written in the vein of a German-oriented history of ideas. There are various series of area- or issue-specific manuals, like the one from Osiris publishing house, translating standards by Lipset, Almond-Verba, Dahl, etc. and publishing some Hungarians authors, too.

The biggest faculty in Hungary, the Department of Political Science of the ELTE Faculty of State and Law, issued its own manuals with Osiris and Korona publishers, but since 1999, mainly the faculty's own publisher Rejtjel has issued its textbooks and manuals (about 16 volumes so far). The most fruitful series of political science books, partly manuals and textbooks, is the political science series published by the foundation Villányi úti konferenciaközpont alapítvány and edited by János Simon, a researcher of the HAS Institute of Political Science since 1996. This series has 2 volumes, including the Haskó-Hülvely manual.

A variety of databases are available. Research related to political science is done in public opinion poll institutes. The abovementioned *Yearbook of Hungarian Politics* publishes some of the most relevant material for political scientists, among them Media, Szonda-Ipsos, Gallup, TÁRKI , Marketing, and Modus. More historically oriented databases, including on historical electoral results, party statutes, and oral history materials, are found at the Institute of Political History, the 1956 Institute, and the Open Society Archives of the CEU. Various institutions produce historical and contemporary databases on the work of the Hungarian Parliament, like the Jelenkutató Alapítvány or the Parlamenti Iroda. The party-based foundations finance the publication of the Yearbook of Hungarian Politics, which tries to be open toward all political directions and to involve experts who are able to collect reliable data on Hungarian politics. The goal of the yearbook is to refer to all relevant databases and to deliver current political analyses.

6. Views on further development

America is a high-ranking target in international exchange and communication for young Hungarian and East Central European scholars. PhD programs in the USA and other university programs and centers of civic or other types of adult education, such as the UK-based Open University, are present in Hungary. The European Community-centered political and cultural orientation of young Hungarians is again supportive of English-speaking scholars.

Among Western European organizations, the ECPR has four Hungarian member organizations at present: the TÁRKI, a social science research institute; the CEU Department of Political Science; the Department of Political Science of the Budapest School of Economics; and the ELTE Faculty of State and Law Department of Political Science. The recently emerging Thematic Network, a European political Science Network organized in France in 2001, has a growing number of cooperation partners and dues-paying members in Hungary. The HPSA is an IPSA member organization and participates in the European and Central European regional and sub-regional networks of national political science associations.

Another US-centered pillar of assistance in reconstructing Hungary's social sciences is private and corporate donors who work through and with NGOs to establish institutions alternative to the government-based official education and research in the post-communist, East-Central European countries. One of the most famous of these institutions is the network and system of the Soros Foundation, the network of research support in the Open Society Institute and the Central European University. The first ten years after 1989 in Hungary and the region saw a boom of especially US-based aid and restructuring programs for social sciences, especially for political science. There is also a network and subsidy system based on EU funds, governments, academies, foundations, and private donors. The same pattern is to be observed in the case of the Collegium Budapest, a center for advanced study located in Budapest, which also focuses also on social sciences and political science research cooperation (Heinrich, 1999), and at a similar institution, the Vienna-based Institute for Human Sciences, which focuses on the post-communist region and has vibrant contacts with social scientists, including political scientists, in Hungary.

Selected Bibliography

"A magyar politikatudomány kialakulása és oktatásának kezdetei" (The beginnings of the Hungarian political science education: A report) (1997), in: *Politikatudományi Szemle,* Vol. 6, No. 3, 159-169;

A politikai filozófiák enciklopédiája (Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Thougth), Budapest, Kossuth, 1995;

Ágh, Attila (ed.) (1994a): *The First Steps*, Budapest, Hungarian Center of Democratic Studies;

Ágh, Attila (1994b): "Country Report on Political Research in Hungary", in: *Political Research in Eastern Europe*, Klingemann, Hans-Dieter, Mochmann, Ekkehard and Newton, Kenneth (eds.), Bonn-Berlin, Informationszentrum Sozialwissenschaften, 77-105;

Ágh, Attila and Kurtán, Sándor (eds.) (1995): *The First Parliament*, Budapest, Hungarian Center of Democratic Studies;

Ágh, Attila and Ilonszki, Gabriella (eds.) (1996a): *The Second Steps*, Budapest Hungarian Center of Democratic Studies;

Ágh, Attila (1996b): A magyar politikatudomány helyzete (Current situation of Hungarian political science), in: *Politikatudományi Szemle*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 144-149;

Ágh, Attila (1998a): *Emerging Democracies in East Central Europe and the Balkans*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar;

Ágh, Attila (1998b): *The Politics of Central Europe: Systemic Change in East Central Europe and the Balkans*, London Sage;

Angelusz, Róbert and Tardos, Róbert (1998): "Létviszonyok és utánpótlás a tudományos szférában" (Life conditions and recrutation of contemporary Hungarian science), in: *Századvég*, Vol. 3, No. 11, 63-79;

Anveiler, Judit et.al. (1993): "Tudóselvándorlás" (Brain-drain), in: *Magyar Tudomány*,Vol. 38, No.5, 568-572;

Arató, Andrew (1999): *Civil társadalom, foradalom és alkotmány* (Civil society, revolution and constitution), Budapest, Új Mandátum;

Arczt, Ilona (1987): *A "politikai tudományok" oktatása a budapesti egyetem jogi karán 1770-1948* (Teaching of the policy sciences at the university Budapest Faculty of Law), Budapest, Diss. Elte Ájk Politológia Tanszék;

Balogh, István (1999): A politikatudomány Magyarországon (Political science in Hungary), in: *Politikatudományi Szemle*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 131-143;

Balogh, István and Bayer, József (1999): „A politikatudomány elméleti alapjai" (Theoretical foundations of political science), in: *A politikatudomány arcai*, Gergely, András, Bayer, József and Kulcsár, Kálmán (eds.), Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 53-91;

Balogh, István (2000): *Határharcok. A politika és a tudományos értelmiség kapcsolatai* (Political and scientific elites in Hungary before 1989), Budapest, MTA Politikatudományi Intézete;

Barnes, Samual and H.-Simon, János (eds.) (1998): *The Postcommunist Citizen*, Budapest, Erasmus Foundation, IPS-HAS;

Bayer, József (1998): *A politikai gondolkodás története* (History of political thougth), Budapest, Osiris;

Bayer, József (1999): *A politikatudomány alapjai* (Introduction to political science), Budapest, Napvilág;

Berács, József (2001): "Rendszerváltás előtt a magyar felsőoktatás" (Hungarian higher education before the transitions), in: *Vezetéstudomány*,Vol. 22, No. 3, 41-53;

Best, Heinrich and Becker, Ulrike (eds.): *Sozialwissenschaften im neuen Osteuropa*, Vol. 1-3, 1994, 1995, 1997, Bonn-Berlin, Informationszentrum für Sozialwissenschaften;

Bibó, István (1986): *Válogatott tanulmányok I-IV* (Selected writings), Budapest, Magvető;

Bihari, Mihály (ed.) (1982): *Politika és poltikatudomány* (Politics and political science), Budapest, Gondolat;

Bihari, Mihály (1987): "A politikatudomány helyzete" (The current situation of political science), in:: *Válság és reform. A Magyar Politikatudományi Társaság Évkönyve*, Szoboszlai, György (ed.), Budapest.MPT 212-237;

Bihari, Mihály and Pokol, Béla (1992-2000): *Politológia* (Political science), Budapest, Universitas;

Bogdanor, Vernon (ed.) (2001): *Politikatudományi enciklopédia* (The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Science), Budapest, Osiris;

Bozóki, András, Körösényi András and Schöpflin, George (1992): *Post-Communist Transition. Emerging Pluralism in Hungary*, London, St. Martins Press;

Civitas (1996): *A jó polgár* (The good citizen) Társadalomismereti forráskönyv, Debrecen, Csokonai Kiadó;

Csepeli, György, Örkény, Antal, Schepple, Kim et al. (1997): "Colonialisation or Partnership? Eastern Europe and Western Social Sciences", A Discourse in: *Sozialwissenschaften im neuen Osteuropa* Best, Heinrich and Becker, Ulrike (eds.), Vol. 3, Bonn-Berlin, GESIS, 21-59;

Csizmadia, Ervin (1995): *A magyar ellenzék. I-III* (The opposition in Hungary), Budapest, T-Twins;

Eötvös, József (1981): *Művei I-II* (Works), Budapest, Magyar Helikon;

Faragó, Béla (1986): *Nyugati liberális szemmel* (Under Western eyes), Párizs, Magyar Füzetek;

Farkas, Dezső, Halay, Tibor (eds.) (1984): *Politikatudomány és társadalomtudományok* (The political science and the social sciences), Debrecen, TIT;

Gergely, András and Bayer, József-Kulcsár Kálmán (eds.) (1999): *A politikatudomány arcai* (Profiles of Hungarian political science), Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó;

Gombár, Csaba, Hankiss, Elemér, Lengyel, László and Várnai, Györgyi (eds.) (1995): *Question Marks: The Hungarian Government 1994-95*, Budapest, Center for Political Research;

Gombár, Csaba, Hankiss, Elemér, Lengyel, László and Várnai, Györgyi (eds.) (1994): *Balance. The Hungarian Government 1990-1994*, Budapest, Center for Political Research;

Gyurgyák, János (eds.)(1994): *Mi a politika?* (What is politics?), Budapest, Századvég;

Halmai, Gábor (1990): *Az egyesülés szabadsága* (The freedom of association), Budapest, Atlantisz;

Halmai, Gábor (1994): *A véleményszabadság határai* (Limits of the freedom of opinion), Budapest, Atlantisz;

Hankiss, Elemér (1990): *East European Alternatives*, Oxford, Clarendon Press;

Klingemann, Hans-Dieter et al. (eds.) (1994): *Political Research in Eastern Europe*, Bonn-Berlin, Informationszentrum Sozialwissenschaften;

Haraszti, Miklós et.al. (1992): *Beszélő összkiadás* I-III, Budapest, AB Beszélő;

Haskó, Katalin and Hülvely, István (1996, 2000): *Bevezetés a politikatudományba* (Introduction to political science), Budapest, Villányi úti könyvek;

Heinrich, Hans-Georg (ed.) (1999): *Institution Building in the New Democracies*, Budapest, Collegium Budapest;

Huoranszki, Ferenc (1999): *Filozófia és utopia,* Budapest, Osiris;
Jászi, Oszkár (1989a): *A kommunizmus kilátástalansága és a szocializmus reformja* (Communism and socialism), Budapest, Századvég;
Jászi, Oszkár (1989b): *Magyar kálvária-magyar feltámadás* (Hungarian retreat and resurrection), Budapest, Magyar Hírlap;
Kis, János (1987): *Vannak-e emberi jogaink*? (Do we have human rights?), Párizs, Magyar Füzetek;
Kis, János (1997): *Az állam semlegessége* (Neutralism and governance), Budapest, Atlantisz;
Kis, János (2000): *Alkotmányos demokrácia* (Constitutional democracy), Budapest, INDOK;
Körösényi, András (1996): "A magyar politikai gondolkodás főárama (1989-1995)" (The main current of Hungarian political thougth), in: *Századvég*, No. 3, 80-108;
Körösényi, András (1999a): *The Hungarian Political Sytem*, Budapest, CEU Press;
Körösényi, András (1999b): "The Mainstream of Hungarian Political Thinking (1989-1995)", in: *Hungary in Flux*, Spéder, Zsolt (ed.), Hamburg, Kramer Verlag;
Kovács, László Imre (ed.) (1995): *Politológiai szöveggyűjtemény* (Texts of political science), Szeged, JATE;
Kulcsár, Kálmán (1987): *Politikai és jogszociológia* (Sociology of law and politics), Budapest, Kossuth;
Kurtán, Sándor, Sándor, Péter and Vass, László (eds.): *Magyarország Politikai Évkönyve* (The Yearbook of Hungarian Politics), Budapest, Demokrácia Kutatások Magyarországi Központja, 1989-2001;
Lánczi, András (2000): "A magyar politikai filozófia születése" (The birth of political philosophy), in: *A XX. Század politikai filozófiája*, Lánczi, András (ed.), Budapest, Pallas-Attraktor, 199-219;
Lánczi, Andás (2001a): "A politikatudomány helyzetéről és állapotáról" (The state of political science), in: *A politika reneszánsza*, Lánczi, András (ed.), Budapest, Pallas-Attraktor, 146-167;
Lánzi, András (2001b): "A politika, mint tradíció" (Politics as tradition), in: *A politika reneszánsza*, Lánczi András (ed.), Budapest, Pallas-Attraktor, 130-146;
Magyar Politikatudományi Társaság Évkönyve (The Yearbook of the Hungarian Political Science Association), Budapest, 1982-1992;
Miszlivetz, Ferenc (1999*)*: *Illusions and Realities*, Szombathely, Savaria University Press;
Nagy, J. Endre (1993): *Eszme és valóság* (Ideals and realities), Budapest-Szombathely, Pesti Szalon;
Nóvé, Béla (1999): *Tény-Soros*, Budapest, Balassi;
Ormos, Mária (1992): "A reformtörekvésektől az autonómia felszámolásáig" (Science under communism), in: *Magyar Tudomány*, Vol. 37, No. 9, 1051-1060;
Paczolay, Péter and Szabó, Máté (1996): *A politikatudomány kialakulása* (The development of political science), Budapest, Korona;
Quigley, Kevin F. (1997): "George Soros: The Leader of the Band", in:. *For Democracy's Sake. Foundations and Democracy Assistance in Central Europe*, Quigley, Kevin F. (ed.), Washington-Baltimore, Woodrow Wilson Center Press and The Johns Hopkins Press, 87-103;
Réz, Pál et.al. (1991): *Bibó emlékkönyv I-II* (Homage á Bibó), Budapest-Bern, Századvég-EMPSZ;
Schlett, István (1987): *Eötvös József*, Budapest, Gondolat;
Schlett, István (1996, 1999): *A magyar politikai gondolkodás története I-II* (The history of Hungarian political thougt), Budapest, Korona;
Stark, David and Bruszt, László (1998): *Postsocialist Pathways*, Cambridge (Mass.), Cambridge University Press;
Szabó, Máté (1992): *A politikatudomány helyzete* (The state of political science), in: *Magyarország politikai évkönyve*, Kurtán, Sándor, Sándor, Péter and Vass, László (eds.), Budapest, Demokrácia Kutatások magyar Központja.-Economix, 232-242;
Szabó, Máté (1996a): "Politikwissenschaft in Ungarn", in: *Politikwissenschaft. Geschichte und Entwicklung in Deutschland und Europa*, Lietzmann, Hans J. and Bleek, Wilhelm (eds.), München-Wien, Oldenbourg Verlag, 314-385;
Szabó, Máté (ed.) (1996b): *The Challenge of Europeanization in the Region*, Budapest, HPS IPS HAS;
Szalai, Erzsébet (2000): "Vita a tudás és az értelmiség társadalmi szerepéről (Élet és Irodalom)" (Discussion on knowledge and itellectuals), in: *Ezredváltó dilemmák Magyarországon*, Szalai, Erzsébet (ed.), Budapest, Új Mandátum, 98-238;
Szilágyi, Sándor (1999): *A Hétfői Szabadegyetem* (The Free University) Budapest, Új Mandátum;
Szoboszlai, György (ed.) (1991): *Democracy and Political Transformation*, Budapest, Hungarian Political Science Association;
Szoboszlai, György (ed.) (1982): *Studies in the field of political science in Hungary*, Budapest, Hungarian Political Science Association;

Szoboszlai, György (ed.) (1992): *Flying Blind. Emerging Democracies in East-central Europe,* Budapest, Hungarian Political Science Association;
Tóka, Gábor (ed.) (1995): *The 1990 Election to the Hungarian National Assembly*, Berlin, Edition Sigma;
Tóka, Gábor and Enyedi, Zsolt (eds.) (1999): *Elections to the Hungarian National Assembly 1994*, Berlin, Edition Sigma;
Tóka, Gábor, Kitschelt, Herbert, Mansfeldova, Zdenka and Markowski, Radek (1999): *Post-Communist Party Systems*, Cambridge (Mass.), Cambridge University Press;
Tőkés, Rudolf (1988): Politikatudomány Magyarországon az 1980-as években (Political science in Hungary in the eighties), in: *Századvég*,No. 6-7, 16-37;
Tőkés, Rudolf (1996): *Hungary's Negotiated Revolution. Economic Reform, Social Change and Political Succession 1957-1990*, Cambridge (Mass.), Cambridge University Press;
Wiatr, Jerzy J. (1980): *A politikai viszonyok szociológiája* (Sociology of politics), Budapest, Kossuth.

Andris Runcis

Political Science – Latvia

Discussant: Deniss Hanovs

Introduction

The appearance of the academic field of political science in Latvia in the late 1980s was not the result of an exclusively autonomous scientific development. Rather, it was primarily due to major political changes in Latvian society that significantly influenced changes in education and research activities in the social sciences.

In analyzing the development of political science, first of all we must take into account the development of social thought in Latvia. The social views of the Latvian intelligentsia have generally been based on the intellectual foundations of Europe, especially 18th- and 19th-century Germany.

Inter-war period[1]

The social sciences in the 1920s and 1930s in Latvia were characterized by many new accents and the names of many new thinkers, but this period can be set apart from the previous one only to a certain extent. Innovations in this era include discussions between the defenders of democracy and those who supported the ideas of authoritarianism.

The development of social ideas was helped enormously by the establishment of the University of Latvia and by the subsequent publication of its journal, *Latvijas Universtitātes raksti* (Acta Universitatis Latviensis). Now the faculty of the university gradually took the lead in developing and popularizing the social sciences.

Looking at the most prominent social thinkers of this era, we must first mention those who began their activities before the proclamation of Latvia's independence: Pēteris Zālīte (1864-1939), Pauls Dāle (1889-1968), Pauls Jurevičs, Teodors Celms (1893-1989), and Robert Vipper (1859-1954). An important work by Celms was the collection of writings *Patiesība un šķitums* (The true and the seeming, 1939), which examines the structure, goals, and norms of society, as well as issues concerning the community-based lives of people. Celms believed that population growth and the increasing availability of information and the increasing speed of traffic would probably lead to an increasing role for mass movements, increasing the likelihood of social chaos. That, in turn, might facilitate increases in state power, propaganda, nationalism, and authoritarian leadership, leading to military tensions and increased international conflicts. Vipper also played an important role in the development of social thought in that era. He devoted much attention to socio-philosophical issues. In his article *Morāliskās katastrofas un morāliskās slimības Eiropas sabiedriskajā dzīvē* (Moral catastrophes and moral illnesses in European society), he wrote about scientists' responsibility in society.

Latvian thinkers in this era also devoted a great deal of attention to national issues. Artūrs Kroders analyzed the history of the Latvian intelligentsia and nationalism in his *Domas par latvju kultūru* (Thoughts on Latvian culture, Riga 1921). The ideas of nationalism were also developed in Ernests Brastiņš' *Latviskās Latvijas labad. Mājieni un aicinājumi. 1925-1935 gadam* (For a Latvian Latvia: Hints and Recommendations for 1924-1935), in which he analyzed issues of national consciousness, nationalism, and Marxism. High scientific culture was evident in Kārlis Dišlers' article on the self-determination of nations (1932).

Most nationalist publications were written in the second half of the 1930s. During this time, a collection of writings edited by Jãnis Lapiņš was published under the title *Jaunais nacionālisms* (The new nationalism, Rīga, 1937), as was a book by Kroders, *Pa Jaunās ideoloģijas ceļiem* (Along the paths of the new ideology, Rīga, 1937) that analyzed nationalism, leadership, solidarity, and the ideas of national unity. The ideologues of Latvian nationalism opposed political liberalism and parliamentarianism, and they held collective rights to be higher than individual rights. The ideology of Latvian nationalists was not, however, typified by intolerance toward representatives of other nationalities. Rather, Latvian nationalism was characterized by a dislike of Marxism, whose propaganda championed other ideas of solidarity. Like other nationalists, the ideologues of Latvian nationalism worshiped at the altar of rural patriarchies and rural lifestyles, criticizing everything that had to do with industry.

Of separate interest are discussions about the defenders of democracy and authoritarianism. In 1927, a collection of articles was published under the title *Demokrātijas krīze* (The crisis of democracy). The publisher was the academic section of the political party, the Latvian Farmer's Union. As the title of the book suggests, the authors all believed that there was a crisis brewing in the Latvian democratic system, but they were all critical of dictatorship and Bolshevism. The crisis in democracy was primarily associated with the existence of numerous, small democratic parties in Latvia and the destructive activities of their leaders. A way out of the crisis, the authors felt, would be found in amending the country's elections law to reduce the influence of these small parties. The authors did not question democratic values, writing in one instance that the democratic crisis had to do with "the incomplete nature of its forms of implementation and the political unpreparedness of the people". Alfrēds Bērziņš analyzed Latvia's election law and Skujenieks' idea of applying a percentage barrier to parliamentary elections, which was first implemented in Latvia 60 years. A noteworthy analytical article is Kārlis Dišlers' article *Vai parlamentārisma vai demokrātijas krīze?* (A crisis of parliamentarianism or democracy), written in 1927. There were many more writings, however, in which authors praised Ulmanis' leadership cult and denigrated parliamentarianism. The position of these people is best characterized by the formula they propagated: One nation, one leader.

Also active around this time were social democrats and persons near to them. On the 50th anniversary of the death of Karl Marx, a collection of articles called "*Markss un marksisms*" (Marx and Marxism) was published by the Marxist Club of Rīga. The collection offered an analysis of Marx's views on virtually all important aspects of public life.

Specific attention should be devoted to the activities of the Academic Social Sciences Association of the University of Latvia (also known as Acquitas), which was supposed to help develop the sciences of economics, sociology, and law.

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

The political and legal legacy of central one-party dominance was very influential, especially in higher education. The University of Latvia was established in 1919 only as a classical university. After "the restoration of Soviet power in Latvia", a strong centralized system was introduced to university education. In the 1950s, the University of Latvia was divided into several institutions – engineering, medicine, and agriculture.

In the Soviet Union from Brest to Sakhalin Island, subjects (political economy, the history of the CPSU, scientific communism), lectures, and seminars were taught according to the same centralized scheme and from the same textbooks. Usually all textbooks were prepared in Moscow and officially accepted by the Ministry of Education of USSR; no deviations from the official path were accepted. In the social sciences, there were no textbooks written by other authors, for example, from Latvia. The approved "textbooks" were translated into the various languages of the Soviet union, including Latvian.

Ideological disciplines were compulsory in all faculties and study programs. It was impossible to complete university studies without a final state exam in these disciplines. At the end of the 1980s, this provoked strong reactions among students, who started to refuse to take courses in these disciplines or to attend several teachers' ultra-orthodox lectures.

Latvia did not have political science at all even in before World War II. The field of political science didn't face the challenge of returning to pre-war tradition, as was the case in philosophy and sociology. Philosophy and sociology were taught in the Soviet period, and there were small scientific communities in the country. But this is does not mean that political subjects were not investigated at all. They were continuously covered by representatives of other disciplines, such as law, history, sociology, economics, demography, statistics, and philosophy, but from these disciplines' viewpoints. During the period of the Soviet occupation, the social sciences were covered by all the various branches of Marxism-Leninism, which was the only authorized approach in education and research. There were no specialized departments, academic programs, periodicals, professional associations, or conferences in the field of political science in the academic history of Latvia; access to and contacts with Western researchers, books, and journals were restricted. The appearance of academic political science in Latvia in the late 1980s was not the result of an exclusively autonomous scientific development leading to a new discipline.[2] Liberalization of the Soviet regime in the 1980s and democratic changes brought the necessity to establish a non-ideologized academic and research discipline – political science – instead of the former ideological disciplines: the history of the CPSU, historical materialism, the political economy of Marxism-Leninism, and scientific communism.

The content of "scientific communism", as the official political science discipline, was changed significantly at the end of the 1980s. Officially the name "scientific communism" was retained, but in reality it became less and less ideological. The study program took on new themes: social and political movements, political parties, bureaucracy, social stratification, and modern global problems. In the 1970s and 1980s, a lot of attention was paid to the issue of *Weltanschauung*. The state supported several theoretical research projects (as the "department's research topic"). Several conferences were staged and their conference proceedings published. Mikelis Asmanis at that time defended a second doctoral thesis (Dr. hab.) about Weltanschauung and later published a book *Formirovanije nauchnogo mirovozrenija* (The Formation of the Scientific World View, Riga, 1984). The author focused on the development of *Weltanschauung*, specific features of individual and group (or class) worldviews, and various factors that influence the development of a scientific worldview. The problem of the formation of "worldviews" was one of the basic subjects for researchers and lecturers.

One sociologist, Eduards Oziganovs, was interested in Max Weber's political theory. In the Bachelor's program, he taught a course on Western sociological theories, but research interest focused mainly on political science and sociology. He defended a PhD thesis on Max Weber and later published it as a book, *Politicheskaja teorija M. Vebera* (Political Theory of Max Weber, Rīga, 1986). This was the first theoretical book about Max Weber's political theory published in Latvia, but in Russian.

Officially, the name of the discipline "scientific communism" was retained to keep diploma records unified. So students organized a large demonstration called "the funeral of scientific communism". The demonstration was organized as an enormous funeral service for orthodox Marxism-Leninism, accompanied by ironic slogans like "the Party, the army and the Soviet nation are forever united", "Lenin alive forever", "the victory of communism is inevitable", and so on. There was a coffin full of orthodox Marxist-Leninist literature, and the students displayed pictures of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Brezhnev, Gorbachev, and other Soviet leaders.

From the end of 1988 on, social science lecturers were quite free to choose the topics for lectures and to prepare new courses. The sudden lifting of political control encouraged lecturers to prepare new courses that did not fit the official communist platform.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

At the beginning of the 1990s, a new approach was introduced for former researchers and instructors in all, and not only social sciences. All Soviet-era researchers and instructors who had defended a doctoral or second doctoral thesis (doctor habilitus) were required to undergo a procedure of nostrification (in Latvian – *nostrifikacija*) confirming that their theses were more than a compilation of quotations from Marxist-Leninist works. In the social sciences, several doctoral thesis were not confirmed. These ideological hard-liners were expelled from universities and research institutes and had no more influence on the decision-making and research process at all. Instead, new candidates moved in. Political science had never been a research field before, so all researchers who chose political science started to do research in a completely new area. Some young researchers who finished their PhD thesis abroad chose topics about nationalism or about the influence of the political parties and political elite on democratic consolidation.

The institutionalization of political science

As the result of reform in social science in 1989, the University of Latvia established a political science department (in Latvian – *politologijas katedra*) for the first time. There were lengthy discussions and a number of proposals for a name under which to market the new discipline. The original name introduced was *politology*. There were no scientists with academic degrees in political science in Latvia at the time. In the beginning, the staff of the new department was put together from young, highly motivated teachers from the departments of scientific communism, history, law, and sociology.

The earlier extremely centralized teaching system was broken and teachers were quite free to offer courses and to choose the content of those courses. In fact, every teacher prepared his own specialized academic course, and students were free to choose because the courses were all elective. At that time, a very limited amount of Western political science books were available. But despite these difficulties, new courses were developed very fast because young teachers had the appropriate professional and analytical skills and were very open to new ideas and approaches. The first systematic course in political science for department teachers was introduced by the Latvian political scientist Rita P. Peters from the University of Massachusetts (USA).

Between 1990 and 1992, a variety of teaching materials about different political science themes were prepared and published in Latvian and Russian: political parties, social stratification, social democracy, political regimes, the history of political ideas in Latvia, and modern global problems.

The most important institutions included the Department of Political Science, University of Latvia; the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the University of Latvia; the Latvian Institute of International Affairs; Vidzeme University College; the Baltic Strategic Center; and the Center for Human Rights and Ethnic Studies. Here are the profiles of two of these institutes:

The University of Latvia, Social Science Faculty, Department of Political Science.

The Department of Political Science was established in Autumn 1989 to give the course "Introduction to Political Science" to the students of the University of Latvia. Since 1991, the Department has started work to establish a Bachelor's study program in political science. Earlier, Latvia did not have any scientists with a university academic degree in political science at all.

A full course of major academic studies in political science was first established at the University of Latvia in 1992. The curriculum was planned by the staff of the Department of Political Science and Einars Semanis, who was at that time the head of the department of political science at the University of Latvia.

The University of Latvia is the only institution of higher education in Latvia that offers Master's studies in political science. The academic study program leading to a Master's degree in political science is a continuation of the Bachelor's program, supplemented with deepened theoretical studies in the same and related sciences. The goal of studies is to provide possibilities for Master's candidates to follow the latest achievements of political science and to teach skills of theoretical analysis and research work, as well as to impart the necessary knowledge for the objective analysis of current political events on the basis of thorough theoretical knowledge.

From the very beginning, the Department of Political Science has moved toward gaining international experience and introducing that experience into the Department's activity. There was little experience with political science in Latvian society at the beginning of the 1990s. So links on the international level were established, and long-term partners were found to help develop political science in Latvia and to ensure that the quality of academic and research work met the requirements of contemporary science.

A major step toward quality was taken in 1992 when the Department of Political Science started to participate in the TEMPUS project "Political Science in the Baltic States" (partner universities: University of Aarhus, Denmark; Swansea University College, United Kingdom; Umea University, Sweden). The direct aim of this project was to prepare Bachelor's study programs that would meet international standards. All lecturers of the Department took part in training and re-qualification programs, including at least two semesters as students in Western universities. In 1995, the Department of Political Science received a proposal from Brussels Free University (Andre Miror) to join an already existing TEMPUS project aimed at strengthening the program "international politics".

Vidzeme University College, Department of Political Science

Vidzeme University College was founded in 1997 to maintain a higher educational program in political science, economics, tourism, and communication. The study program comprises the four most significant political science subdivisions: political theory, comparative politics, international relations, and public administration. Because of the practical focus of the political science program, special attention is paid to public administration studies. In addition, students are offered optional courses (about 11% of the total amount) that focus on various specific issues. 46 students were enrolled in the political science program in 1999. Bilateral relations: Vidzeme University College's main cooperation partner has been Lillehammer University College (Norway). Its faculty actively participated in developing Vidzeme University College's study programs. The exchange of teachers is an important element for ensuring study quality.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

More than 50 years of Soviet occupation and Marxist-Leninist ideological dominance changed intellectual discussion. At the end of the 1990s, some pre-war ideas were used when the independence issue was discussed. Pre-war tradition was used mainly in the context of discussions about the Constitution (Satversme) and electoral law. Some ideas about the national issue were discussed, but the international and geopolitical situation differed from that of the inter-war period, so new Western ideas about multicultural society were put on the agenda.

From the beginning to the middle of the 1990s, the quantitative approach dominated in political science, especially in research on political elites, political parties, and electoral behavior. From the middle of the 1990s on, more attention was paid to the qualitative approach, because more and more sociologists used this method and political scientists used the data to explain various political phenomena, for example citizen attitudes toward electoral system change and toward having the state president elected by all the people.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

First contacts with Western researchers were made in 1989 and 1990 when the first Latvian political scientists from the USA came to the University of Latvia and introduced some basic approaches and theories. That was the first impact. The second came when the first researchers and instructors from the University of Latvia went to the University of Oslo (Norway) and Aarhus University (Denmark) as students or guest researchers. The first joint research projects with researchers from the Department of Political Science at the University of Oslo started.

The main research projects in the beginning of the 1990s were “The Baltic States on the Road to Democracy”, conducted in cooperation with the Baltic and Nordic governments; “The Latvian Elite in the transitional period”, a joint University of Latvia and University of Oslo project; “Parliamentary Government in Latvia”, a joint University of Latvia and University of Oslo (Project Balticum) project; “Electoral Behavior in Latvia”; “Democratization in Latvia”; “Public Support for Education”; and “The Political Process in Latvia since the Restoration of Independence”.

First themes were proposed by Western researchers. From the middle of the 1990s on, researchers and instructors chose themes in their own way and the main topics were the political elite, political parties, electoral behavior, and local government reform. The ethnic composition of Latvian society, the geopolitical situation, and internal and external security issues were the key points. A lot of research was done on multicultural society, civil society, and the integration of society. Research in the field of international relations was mostly devoted to the regional security issue. Especially active in this field was the Latvian Institute of International Affairs (Latvijas Arpolitikas institutes).

One project, *Ethnicity and Politics in Baltic States*, was carried out in Oslo with support from the University of Oslo (Steen, 1997). The research reports were put together in an anthology. The purpose of the anthology was to analyze how ethnic structure in the three Baltic states has resulted in rather different social and political responses. Several topics were covered: elites and democratic development, inter-ethnic communication, political participation, institutional constraints in the implementation of citizenship rights in Latvia, common national identity among Latvians and Russians, and integrative politics.

Private vs. public funding

After the collapse of the Soviet union during the transition period, all research institutes and universities faced severe financial problems. But from the beginning of the 1990s on, the Latvian Academy of Sciences and the government introduced a completely new funding system, the grant system. All the sciences received a certain amount of money – some more, some less. The new procedure introduced project competition; for example, political science was in a group together with sociology and psychology. Neutral experts evaluated every project. The Science Council made the final decision. Another source of funding was carrying out joint projects with Western universities or research centers.

The Soros Fund Latvia supported various projects, exerting extremely strong influence in the field of private funding. In the beginning, the Soros Fund Latvia supported the translation of classical books in political science into Latvian, but it later started to support research projects. The latest Soros Fund Latvia initiative is the establishment of a new Internet portal – politica (politika). Recent research topics have been about latent political propaganda in the mass media before elections and about responsible politics – the reform of the electoral system and the procedure of electing the State President.

The Latvian Institute of International Affairs functions only on the basis of funding from Western countries – Sweden, the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, etc. The profile of this institute:

The Latvian Institute of International Affairs

The Latvian Institute of International Affairs (LIIA) carries out research in the field of regional security in the Baltic Sea region. Many projects have been done in cooperation with Swedish social scientists (Arteus, Gunnar and Atis, Lejiņš, 1997). Cooperation between the Latvijas Ārpolitikas institūts and the Forsvarshogskolans strategiska institution (FHS/SI, the Department of Strategic Studies at the National Defense College of Sweden) has taken various forms, including an international conference in Jurmala from June 14-16, 1997.

The changes since 1989 in the strategic map of the Baltic Sea region have been revolutionary. The Baltic Sea region emerged as a new component in the building of a new European security order. The Baltic Sea region today is a meeting place for many different organizational and national interests: NATO, the European Union, the WEU, and Nordic, Baltic, Russian and Polish national interests. The purpose of this analysis is to highlight the main security concerns of Latvia six years after independence was restored in 1991. The main question that we attempt to answer is: To what degree has the Latvian state succeeded in fulfilling its goal of securing the "irreversibility of restored independence" as defined in Latvia's foreign policy concept?

Local grants, international projects and contract work, and various highly rated international scholarships appeared: the British Council stipends, NATO Individual or Institutional Grants, the Research Council of Norway Scholarships, Volkswagen Foundation stipends, and Fulbright Fellowships.

5. Public space and academic debates

The political science community is rather small in Latvia, with only few a dozen political scientists doing research and teaching. The main debated themes are ethnic and citizenship issues and security issues. The principal academic journals include Humanities and Social Sciences Latvia, the Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences, and Latvian History.

The German-Latvian Social Science Center (Deutsch-Lettisches Sozialwissenschaftliches Zentrum in Riga – DeLaSSC; the leader of the project is Professor Manfred Kerner from the Free University Berlin) was established in 1997 with financial support from the Volkswagen Fund.

Since 2001, Eurofaculty has offered a small grant for research in public administration. The purpose of this grant is to involve graduate students in carrying out various projects together with senior researchers.

Research contacts have been established largely on the basis of participation at international conferences and seminars or of joint projects started from in teaching context and later continued in research. Several teachers have lectured at foreign universities.

6. Views on further development

Political science is one of the most popular specialties in Latvia and the number of persons who wish to pursue this field of study is constantly increasing. Since Latvia is becoming more and more involved in international processes, especially in the context of the EU and of the related expansion of political operations within the country, there will be an increasing demand for thoroughly trained professionals with specialized knowledge.

European affairs is an important field, given Latvia's rapid movement toward the EU – a process that dictates the need for a greater range of specialists who are involved in these matters. The role of this specialization will increase all the more once Latvia becomes a member of the EU, when Latvian citizens will have to become involved in resolving EU-related issues at the national, regional, and all-Union level.

The Social Science Database (Socialo zinatnu datu baze), at the Academy of Sciences, was established in 1996 by Aivars Tabuns with financial support from the Latvian Science Council. Political science studies are very popular in Latvia. Since 1992, this study program has been among the programs that have received the most applications for studies. Political scientists and even political science students are involved in political activities.

The career opportunities for graduates in political science are good, because society lacks this kind of specialists. They work in governmental institutions, private organizations, or NGOs.

---

[1] Tabuns, Aivars. Sociology in Latvia: yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Humanities and Social Sciences Latvia*. 4(13)/96; 1(14)/97, 7.-64.

2 Semanis, E. Academic Political Science in Latvia: The First Steps, *Scandinavian Political Studies*, Vol.17, No.2, 181-192.

Selected Bibliography

Apsalons, Edmunds (1996): "Baltic Cooperation and Integration: The Baltic Community", in: *The Baltic States: Search for Security*, Lejiņš, A. and Bleiere, D. (eds.), Riga, LIIA, 202-220;

Aschmanis, Mikelis (1994): "Eine enge oder lose Integration Europas?", in: *Föderalismus und die Architektur der europäischen Integration*, München, Südeuropa Gesellschaft;

Aschmanis, Mikelis (2000): "Die Europaintegration aus Sicht der baltischen Staaten – politische und wirtschftliche Interessen", in: *Entwicklungsstrategien in Nordeuropa – Baltikum and Finnland*, Neuss, Beate, Juraczek, P. und Hilz, W. (eds.), Tübingen-Stuttgart, Europäisches Zentrum für Föderalismus-Forschung;

Arteus, Gunnar and Atis, Lejiņš (eds.) (1997): *Baltic Security: Looking Towards the 21st Century*, Riga, LIIA;

Bleiere, Daina (1995): "Ukraine's Integration with Central and Eastern Europe: The Potential for Regional Cooperation", in: *Ukraine and Integration in the East. Economic, Military and Military-Industrial Relations*, Jonson, L. (ed.) Stockholm, Swedish Institute of International Affairs, 81-89;

Bleiere, Daina (1996): "Multilateral and Bilateral Relations with Poland, Ukraine and Belarus", in: *The Baltic States: Search for Security* (Baltic Security Studies, IV), Lejiņš, Atis and Bleiere, Daina (eds.), Riga, LIIA, 114-141;

Bleiere, Daina (1997): "Integration of the Baltic States in the European Union: The Latvian Perspective", in: *Small States in a Turbulent Environment: The Baltic Perspective*, Lejiņš, Atis and Ozolina, Zaneta (eds.), Riga, LIIA, 60-112;

Bleiere, Daina (1997): "Baltic Security in the Central European Context", in: *Baltic Security: Looking Towards the 21st Century*, Arteus, G. And Lejiņš, A. (eds.), Riga, 186-202;

Bleiere, Daina (1998): "Lettonie", in: *Les Caisses depargne en Europe*, Vol. 2, Paris, 167-182;

Bleiere, Daina (1998): "Cooperation of the Baltic States with Central Europe: Problems and Perspectives", in: *Baltic States at Crossroads*, Jundzis, T. (ed), Riga;

Bleiere, Daina (1998): "The New Role of Central Europe in Baltic State Policies", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, No. 2(19), 2(20), 102-138;

Bleiere, Daina (1998): "Latvia and the Future of European Security", in: *European Security and NATO Enlargement: A View from Central Europe*, Blank, Stephen et al. (ed.), Carlisle, US Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, 119-146;

Bleiere, Daina (1999): "The Implementation of Copenhagen Political Criteria for EU Membership by Latvia", in: *The Baltic States in a Enlarging European Union: Towards a Partnership between Small States?*, Malfliet, K. and Keygnaert, W. (eds.), Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 49-64;

Bleiere, Daina and Stranga, Aivars (2000): "The Latvian Russian Crisis of 1998", in: *Crisis Management in a Transitional Society: The Latvian Experience*, Stern, Eric K. and Hansen, Dan (eds.), Stockholm, 216-260;

Broks, J., Ozoliņš, U., Ozolzīle, G., Tabuns, A. and Tisenkopfs, T. (1996, 1997): "The Stability of Democracy in Latvia: Pre-requisites and Prospects", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, No. 4(13)/96, No. 1(14)97, 103-135;

Cielava, Valdis and Meļķīsis, Edgars (1994): "The 1922 Constitution: Cornerstone of Latvia's renewed democracy and constitutionality", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences Latvia*, No 1(2), 18-29;

Dišlers, Kārlis (1927):"Vai parlamentārisma vai demokrātijas krīze?" (Is a crisis of parliamentarism or democracy?), in: *Tautas Tiesības*, No. 2 and 3;

Dišlers, Kārlis (1932): 'The Principle of Self-Determination of Nations and its Juridical Essence', in: *Acta Universitatis Latviensis*, Vol. 2, No. 1, Riga;

Feldmanis, Inesis and Stranga, Aivars (1994): *The Destiny of the Baltic Entente. 1934-1940*, Riga, LIIA;

Jonson, L. (ed.) (1995): *Ukraine and Integration in the East. Economic, Military and Military-Industrial Relations*, Stockholm, Swedish Institute of International Affairs;

Kalniņš, Valts (1995): "Latvian Political Parties and 'Western Standards'", in: *New Democracies in Europe: Translating West*, Selected Conference Papers, Vienna;

Kalniņš, Valts (1997): "The Citizenship Issue in the Baltic Countries: A Comparative Analysis – with Emphasis on Latvia", in: *Ethnicity and Politics in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania*, Steen, A. (ed.), Oslo, University of Oslo, Research Reports, No. 2, 59-89;

Kapustans, Janis (1995): "Inter-Baltic Cooperation an Common Institutions: The Latvian Perspective", in: *The Baltic States: Cooperation and looking for the new Approaches*, Vilnius;

Laķis, Peteris (1997): "Mechanisms for Establishment of a Political Elite in Post-Communist Societies", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, No. 4 (13) 96, No. 1 (14) 97, 148-167;

Lejiņš, Atis (1997): "The Quest for Baltic Unity: Chimers or Reality?", in: *Small States in a Turbulent Environment: The Baltic* Perspective, Lejiņš, Atis and Ozoliņa, Žaneta (eds.), Riga, LIIA, 147-183;

Muiznieks, Nils (1993): "Latvia: Origins, evolution and triumph", in: *Nations and Politics in the Soviet Successor States,* Bremner, Ian and Taras, Ray (eds.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press;

Ostrovska, Ilze (1996): "State and Civil Society: Priorities during the Transition", in: *The Aftermath of "Real Existing Socialism" in Eastern Europe*, Hersh, J. and Schmidt, J. (eds.), Vol.1, London, McMillan, 122-135;

Ostrovska, Ilze (1997): "The State and Its Civil Society: Priorities in a Period of Transition", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, No. 4 (13) 96, No. 1 (14) 97, 64-81;

Ostrovska, Ilze (1998a): "Institutionalization of Democratization: a Concealed Interest Group", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Riga, 26-33;

Ostrovska, Ilze (1998b): "The Developing Civil Society: Peculiarities in Latvia", in: *Democracy, Economy and Civil Society - The Cases of Russia and the Baltic States,* Hjerrpe, Reino et al. (eds.), Helsinki, UPI and Stakes, 71-88;

Ostrovska, Ilze (2000): ""Nationalism and Democracy: Choice Without Choice", in: *Integration and Ethnopolitics,* Riga, 154-164;

Ozoliņa, Žaneta (1996a): "Latvian Security Policy", in: *The Baltic States: Search for Security*, Lejiņš, Atis and Bleiere, Daina (eds.), Riga, LIIA, 29-58;

Ozoliņa, Žaneta (1996b): "The Nordic and the Baltic Countries: A Sub-Region in the Making?", in: *The Baltic States: Search for Security*, Lejiņš, Atis and Bleiere, Daina (eds.), Riga, LIIA, 93-113;

Ozolina, Žaneta (1997): "Baltic-Nordic Integration, Cooperation and Integration", in: *Small States in a Turbulent Environment: The Baltic Perspective,* Lejiņš, Atis and Ozolina, Žaneta (eds.), Riga, LIIA, 244;

Ozolina, Žaneta (2000): "Crisis Prevention or Intervention: Latvia's Response to the Proposed Russian Security Guarantees", in: *Crisis Management in a Transitional Society: The Latvian Experience*, Stern, Eric K. and Hansen, Dan (eds.), Vol. 12, Stockholm, 188-216;

Ozoliņš, Andris (1996): Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in the European Security Architecture: Limits and Opportunities", in: *The Baltic States: Search for Security*, Lejiņš, Atis, and Bleiere, Daina (eds.), Riga, Latvian Institute of International Affairs, 76-93;

Pabriks, Artis (1994): "Citizenship and Rights of Minorities in Latvia", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences,* Latvia, No. 1(2), 60-68;

Pabriks, Artis and Purs, Aldis (2000): *Latvia: The Challenge of Change*, London & New York, Routledge;

Rodins, Mihails (1997): "National Identity and the Democratic Integration of Latvian Society", in: *Ethnicity and Politics in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania*, Steen, A. (ed.), Oslo, University of Oslo, Research Report 02/97, 89-116;

Rodins, Mihails (1999): *The Attitudes of Political Elites of Russian Federation towards Corruption*, Berlin, Biab-Bericht;

Rozenvalds, Juris (2000): "The Political Responsibility of Intellectuals in a Transitional Society", in: *New Ethics - New Society: Or the Dawn of Justice (Acta Philosphica Fennica 65),* Airaksinen, Timo and Loukola, Olli (eds.), 221-231;

Runcis, Andris (1999): "Democratization in Latvia", in: *Democratization in Central and Eastern Europe*, Kaldor, Mary and Vejvoda, Ivan (eds.), London, Pinter, 38-51;

Runcis, Andris (2000): "The Citizenship Issue as a Creeping Crisis", in: *Crisis Management in a Transitional Society: The Latvian Experience*, Stern, Eric K. and Hansen, Dan (eds.), Vol. 12, Stockholm, 61-98;

Semanis, Einars (1994): "Academic Political Science in Latvia: The First Steps", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, No. 1(2), 4-18;

Spolītis, Veiko (2001): "Latvia's Armed Forces in 2000, Possibilities and Challenges", in: *Brassey's Central and Southeast European Security Yearbook*;

Steen, Anton (ed.) (1997): *Ethnicity and Politics in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania*, University of Oslo, Department of Political Science, Research Report 02/97;

Stranga, Aivars (1996): “Russia and the Security of the Baltic States: 1991-1996”, in: *The Baltic States: Search for* Security, Lejiņš, Atis and Bleiere, Daina (eds.), Riga, LIIA, 141-186;
Stranga, Aivars (1997a): “The Baltic States in the European Security Architecture”, in: *Small States in a Turbulent Environment: The Baltic Perspective*, Lejiņš, Atis and Ozolina, Zaneta, Riga, 11-60;
Stranga, Aivars (1997b): "Baltic-Russian Relations: From 1995 to the beginning of 1997", in: *Small States in a Turbulent Environment: The Baltic Perspective*, Lejiņš, Atis and Ozolina, Zaneta (eds.), Riga, LIIA, 1884-237;
Štamers, Guntis (1996): “The Ethnic Issue in Baltic-Russian Relations”, in: *The Baltic States: Search for Security*, Lejiņš, Atis and Bleiere, Daina (eds.), Riga, LIIA, 186-201;
Tabuns, Aivars and Tabuna, Ausma (2001): “Regime Identity”, in: *National, State and Regime Identity in Latvia*, Tabuns, Aivars (ed.), Riga, Baltic Study Centre, 145-173;
Vanags, Edvins (1994): “Development of Local-Self Government in Latvia”, in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, No. 1(2), 38-50;
Vipper, Robert: “Morāliskās katastrofas un morāliskās slimības Eiropas sabiedriskajā dzīvē” (Moral catastrophes and moral illnesses in European society), in: *Latvijas Universitātes raksti*, Philology and Philosophy series II, No. 3, 1931-1933.

Table 1 Department of Political Science, Social Science Faculty; University of Latvia

Year of foundation	1989
Professional staff	5 professors 2 associate professors 4 lecturers 3 assistants 8 part-time lecturers
Academic degrees awards by Department	BA & MA & PhD in Political Science

Table 2 Department of Political Science, Vidzemes University College

Year of foundation	1996
Professional staff	3 associate professors 4 assistants
Academic degrees awarded by College	BA in Political Science

Table 3 European Integration Institute, Department of Political Science, Medical Academy of Latvia/Riga Stradins University

Year of foundation	1998
Professional staff	2 associate professors 15 docents
Academic degrees awarded by Institute	BA in Political Science

Table 4 Major Theoretical Approaches in Political Science

	DPS, University of Latvia	DPS, Vidzemes University College	EII, DPS, ACU/RSU
Methodology of Political science	X	X	X
Political theory	X	X	X
Political philosophy	X		
Political economy	X		
Comparative politics	X	X	X
International politics	X	X	X
International organizations	X		X
Transitology	X		X
Political parties, interest groups	X		
Elections, electoral systems	X		X
Political sociology	X		
Public policy and public administration	X	X	
Organizational theory	X	X	X
Marxism			
Game theory	X		
Functionalism	X		X
Behaviorism	X		X
Rational choice	X		X
System theory			
Existentialism			
Phenomenology			
Hermeneutics			

Algis Krupavičius

Political Science – Lithuania

Discussant: Algimantas Jankauskas

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation and of the years of transformation, 1989-1991

The rebirth and development of political science in contemporary Lithuania is a fascinating story, because of its close connection to the democratic changes and the restoration of the Lithuanian state at the end of the 1980s. The roots of contemporary Lithuanian political science are found in 1988 – a turbulent and decisive year in modern Lithuania's history.

However, a broader historical perspective is very important in understanding the development of even young academic disciplines, like political science in Lithuania. History here is significant in at least two ways: it is relevant to recognize even discontinuous roots in order to establish contemporary identities of the discipline, and "internalized history" helps to construct the contemporary discourse of the academic discipline.

The University of Vilnius, founded in 1579, is the oldest university in the Baltic region and was based on deep international academic traditions. The historical origins of studies in governance and politics here are an excellent example. First attempts to teach ideas of the state and governance were concentrated at the Faculty of Philosophy as early as the late 1670s, when the Department of Ethics was established here. Among the most prominent professors at that time were Modzelewski Zacharij, Pucilowski Kristup, and Boreysza Andrius. Theoretically, studies of politics were strongly oriented toward the works of Aristotle, Cicero, St. Thomas Aquinas, Bodin, and Lips. On the other hand, Machiavelli was among the most severely criticized authors, because to a large extent he denied traditional Roman Catholic values in politics. Moreover, Machiavelli greatly favored the republic over the monarchy, and the latter was the political reality of the united Polish-Lithuanian state (for more, see Plečkaitis, 2000: 25-46). From a methodological point of view, political philosophy and political history were two main approaches to deal with political phenomena.

Before World War II, there were two centers of political research and studies in Lithuania: Vilnius and Kaunas. During the 1920-39 Polish occupation of the Vilnius region, the Institute of Eastern European Research (IEER) was established in 1930 at the University of Vilnius. This institute, initially headed by Jan Rozwadowski, provided the academic basis for in-depth political research and studies in Vilnius during the 1930s. The library of the IEER comprised about 20,000 volumes at the end the decade. The institute also developed a few periodical publications of its own, including *Balticoslavica* and *Annals of the Institute of Eastern European Research* (Pšibilskis, 1995: 168-169). After the Soviet occupation in 1940, the institute was dissolved and its traditions were lost to the academic context of Lithuania.

It was in this context that political science was formally launched in Lithuania. Alongside the IEER, a School of Political Science was founded at Vilnius University in the inter-war period. If the goal of the IEER was primarily the organization of research on countries "between the Baltic and the Black Sea", the School of Political Science was responsible for studies in political science. In 1939, there were seven native Lithuanians among the students in politics (Pšibilskis, 1995: 172).

Efforts to establish a School of Political Science in Kaunas after the Poles occupied Vilnius are credited to Römeris Mykolas, Rector of Vytautas Magnus University (VMU). The VMU was founded in 1920 as the School of Higher Studies and was renamed the University of Lithuania in 1922. Later it became the principal center of academic investigations and studies in inter-war

Lithuania. In 1933, Römeris proposed the foundation of a School of Political Science. Later, a proposal was drawn up to establish a Higher School of Political Science, but unfortunately, this project was never implemented.

However, it would be an exaggeration to suggest that political studies and research did not exist at all in inter-war Lithuania. According to a bibliography of Lithuanian political thought prepared by Budzinauskas in 1993, more than 100 publications in the period 1920-40 can be considered writings in the field of political theory (Budzinauskas, 1993: 123-127). Among the most important contributors to political studies were professors of the VMU, such as Kazys Pakštas[1] and Stasys Šalkauskis in the study of geopolitics, Antanas Maceina and Vosylius Sezemanas in the field of theories of nationalism, and Mykolas Römeris[2] in theories of the state, constitutionalism, and representation. At the same time, moreover, various authors published a substantial number of academic works on political ideologies, political institutions and parties, and in the area of foreign policy.

After the Soviet Union's return to Lithuania in 1944, a centralized system of social and political sciences was introduced in the country. The Moscow authorities put political studies under exceptionally strict control, because this field was considered a major instrument of ideological indoctrination. All academic programs were strictly censored and centralized. The VMU was divided into several institutions of higher education in 1951, with the aim of destroying the pre-war historical heritage of academic life in independent Lithuania. The academic community suffered enormous losses due to Soviet repression and the emigration of Lithuanian professors to the West from 1944 on.

The only university able to survive during the Soviet occupation was the University of Vilnius[3]. It was no accident, therefore, that the academic community at the University of Vilnius in 1988 initiated the discussion about de-ideologizing social science studies. The first stimulus for the awakening of the academic community in Lithuania came through the *perestroika* policy initiated by Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985. During the first phase of the liberalization of the communist system, because of their social status and deeper knowledge of ongoing processes, members of the academic community in particular were permitted to express formerly prohibited ideas and to criticize "failures of the Soviet lifestyle". However, the major immediate impulse for discussion on the future of the social sciences was the changing socio-political situation within Lithuania after the establishment of the Sąjūdis movement in June 1988, when Lithuania, along with Estonia and Latvia, became the frontrunners of reform in the former Soviet Union.

In the autumn of 1988, an open discussion of the status and teaching of ideological academic subjects – *History of the CPSU* and *Scientific Communism* – began in Vilnius. Nevertheless, there were certain structural preconditions within the University of Vilnius. Along with the highly ideological departments on the History of the CPSU and Scientific Communism, the University had a few other departments in social sciences, such as the Department of Philosophy, the Department of History of Philosophy, and the Laboratory of Sociological Research, as well as the Faculties of History and Law. University of Vilnius had the advantage of having developed quite strong internal networks in the social sciences and humanities during the 1970s and 1980s.

Of course, some of most interesting questions, especially in retrospect, hinge on the evolution of Lithuanian political science – how it began and who was involved.

The leader and moderator of this discussion was Rolandas Pavilionis, Head of the Department of History of Philosophy at the time. Initially, the discussion developed in the departments of the university and among students who refused to attend the lectures of the most orthodox professors. But in only a few months, it spread like wildfire through all the institutions of higher education in the country. The discussion did not acquire real social and academic resonance until a pro-reform daily, *Komjaunimo tiesa* (Komsomol's Truth), published an article by Pavilionis titled "Social sciences and philosophy: how can we wake up from lethargy?" on October 14, 1988. Pavilionis argued that the two ideological disciplines – *History of the CPSU* and *Scientific Communism* – must be replaced by political science. In his words, the new curriculum could consist of a mixture of law, civic education, and the political history of Lithuania, as well as the history of political ideas. He said that the reform of social sciences must be started immediately. The new socio-political situation and the legalization of the Sąjūdis movement were extremely favorable factors for speedy reform in the social sciences. The slogan "democracy now" in the environment of Lithuanian higher education meant, above all, change in the system of social sciences at the university.

Who comprised the camp of reformers? Among the leading figures were middle-aged professors of philosophy such as Pavilionis and Nekrašas from the University of Vilnius, as well as a group of young researchers and postgraduate students: Bielinis, Vitkus, Krupavičius, and some others who had finished their studies at various academic institutions in Moscow during the initial period of *perestroika*. It is interesting that this group was never formalized, nor did it have a clearly defined membership. All who were interested in reforming the social sciences were entitled to join the discussion at their own convenience. A free spirit of discussion dominated all the meetings, where formal academic titles were ignored. It was a radically new phenomenon compared with the earlier, highly centralized academic climate.

Another major group interested in the introduction of political science consisted of lecturers in the Faculty of Law at the University of Vilnius. This group sought to introduce political studies for students of law, a goal that was achieved in 1989. Very soon, all institutions of higher education were involved, and this produced a network of discussions on the status of the social sciences, but primarily on the prospects for political science throughout Lithuania.

Initially, the group or rather groups of reformers had very different views about the content of political science. This was based on their very different academic backgrounds, ranging from history, philosophy, and sociology to law and scientific communism; it also reflected a certain generation gap. The youngest but very active group of would-be political researchers was only 25-30 years old. Another important aspect was that the process of introducing political studies involved lecturers from the two ideological departments, History of the CPSU and Scientific Communism. At least some of them expected to survive in their academic positions during the reform, which they conceived as being moderate in scope; the idea of an official period of transition to the new configuration and curriculum of the social sciences was also suggested. But as it turned out, another approach was taken to the situation.

During the first phase of reform, in Autumn 1988 and early 1989, few practical results were achieved. First of all, Pavilionis coined the term "politology" (*politologija)*, compounded from two Greek words, "politike" and "logos", to refer to political science in Lithuania. The reasons why this term was chosen rather than "political science" (*politikos mokslas*) were never explained, though the younger generation of would-be researchers in politics argued for the latter. There is only one logical argument to explain the birth of "politology" instead of "political science". The term "political science" sounded too much like the term "scientific communism", which had been taught at Lithuanian universities before the reform. The term "politology" was new and stressed a rhetorical distance to scientific communism better than the term "political science" did. On the other hand, the term "politology" for political science already existed in some European languages, for example as "politicologie" in Flemish or "politologie" in Czech. Since the Lithuanian academic community was the *first* to start the reform of the social sciences in the former Soviet Union, the term "politology" traveled very quickly to the Russian language and to other languages of the former USSR.

From 1989 to 1991, major activities concentrated on the elaboration of curricula in political science. In addition to this main trend, serious organizational changes were implemented.

First, existing departments of history of the CPSU and scientific communism were merged and renamed departments of social sciences in 1989. The only exception was the University of Vilnius. Two new departments of political science and political history were established to replace the old ones. Not until mid-1991 did these departments merge into a single entity. Furthermore, old-guard professors were forced to leave the universities. In Autumn 1989, the number of lecturers in these new departments decreased to less than half the level of the pre-reform period. The formal requirement to pass an exam on the history of the CPSU and scientific communism in order to graduate from the university was abolished.

Second, the previous highly centralized system of education in ideological subjects became extremely decentralized, so that every lecturer was absolutely free to choose the content of his or her courses. Since the new lecturers in politics had very different backgrounds and a majority had poor knowledge of Western political science traditions, this change has had a twofold effect on the quality of studies. On the one hand, it was a clear sign of the democratization of the academic environment, but, on the other hand, the content of would-be political science included concepts ranging from the post-Marxist "civil society" to international relations and "nuclear deterrence". In brief, new political scientists had a desire to present to their students an enormous mixture of various socio-political ideas that were scarcely related to each other or to the broader experience of political science. During the years of political science's early childhood, such a mixture was understood and interpreted as an indication of the lecturers' professional maturity and broad knowledge of socio-political phenomenon.

The content of political science courses matured surprisingly quickly. By 1991, a certain stability in the political science curriculum had evolved. Introductory political science courses were based on Western standards of political science. At that time, the most popular university textbook was *"Power and Choice. An Introduction to Political Science"*, by Philip W. Shively. Elective courses were also introduced, including international relations, Lithuanian government and politics, and theories of democracy.

Lithuanian political science matured rapidly for several reasons. The first major input came from and through the exchange of ideas at Western colleagues' seminars and visiting lectures at Lithuanian universities; especially active were professors of politics from the United States, such as Julius Šmulkštys, Aleksandras Štromas, Tomas Remeikis, Richard Mills, and Stasys Vanagūnas and from Germany, Egbert Jahn. In 1991, Lithuanian-American professors established the Lithuanian Political Science Network in the US with the aim of helping Lithuania's universities with textbooks and advice on organizing political studies in the most efficient way. Another source of innovation and support for the development of political science came from international grant organizations and programs such as the Civic Education Project; the Soros, the Fulbright, and other foundations; and individual Western European universities, especially in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Nevertheless, by 1991, the first phase of the institutionalization of political science was over and the academic community of Lithuania had accepted the new subject. The first professional publication of political scientists – *Politika* (Politics) – was launched at the initiative of Bielinis (University of Vilnius) in 1989. In 1991, it was renamed *Politologija* (Political Science).

1991 was not only the year when the restored Lithuanian state was internationally recognized, it was also a symbolic watershed in the institutional development of political science. In 1991, the period of initial formation of departments of political science was over, but no single entirely new institution had been created in the field.

2. Development of the discipline since 1992

Institutional development

1992 was uniquely important for the institutional development of political science in that the first really new institution, the Institute of International Relations and Political Science (Tarptautinių santykių ir politikos mokslų institutas), was established at the University of Vilnius. The Institute was founded on February 7, 1992 as the Institute of International Relations and was relatively unaffected by remnants of the past. On November 26, 1992, the Institute was renamed the IIRPS

(TSPMI). From 1992 on, the general development of political science was closely tied to the activities of the IIRPS.

Structurally, the IIRPS was based on an entirely new framework. Instead of a traditional departmental structure, the institute introduced an Academic Commission to coordinate studies and to draw up bachelor and master's studies programs, as well as a Research Commission to link research groups' activities at the IIRPS. At the beginning of 2000, there were functioning research groups on Political Ideas, Political Sociology, Public Administration, International Relations, Central and Eastern Europe, and European Integration. From 1992 to 1998, Kūris headed the IIRPS. In 1998, after Kūris was appointed a lawyer at the Lithuanian Constitutional Court, Lopata assumed leadership of the IIRPS.

The Institute's strategy in forming its own faculty was to recruit graduates oriented toward an academic career in the field of international relations and political science. Developing international cooperation enabled many of the young researchers in the IIRPS to get some training at Western universities. The initial faculty of IIRPS was recruited mostly from other departments of the University of Vilnius, such as the departments of political science, philosophy, law, economics, history, and geography; it included visiting professors from various Western universities. Not only because of its location in the capital city, the IIRPS was able to get greater support for the modernization of its programs of studies from national and international sources, especially through the assistance programs of the European Union[4]. However, without flexible management and internal dynamics, all these funds would simply have been wasted.

In 1994, the IIRPS started to support the publication of *Politologija,* and its faculty became major contributors to the journal. The research activities of the IIRPS include international relations, political parties and state institutions, and related fields. But the primary emphasis is on the post-communist states, transition to the rule of law, the role of nationalism, regional security, and foreign policy. The Institute has well-developed connections with leading public opinion research agencies, including the Baltic Surveys, the Social Information Center, and Vilmorus.

Since 1996, the IIRPS has significantly expanded its teaching areas by introducing MA programs in International Relations and Diplomacy, European Studies, Comparative Politics, Public Administration, and International Communication. To improve research and studies, infrastructure was established: its European Documentation Center and its American and Asian Studies centers.

The wave of institutionalization and specialization of political science in Lithuania since 1992 not only entailed the development of new institutions, but also the increasing stability and sustainability of structures, institutions, and human resources. Notwithstanding the leading role of IIRPS, there were at least a few other centers in political science in Lithuania. One was the Department of Political Science (Politologijos katedra) at the University of Klaipėda, founded in 1992 as the Department of Sociology and Political Science. In 1995, it was reorganized as two separate departments: sociology and political science. Nevertheless, the history of political studies in Klaipėda started in 1992, when a full four-year bachelor's program in politics was introduced. Since 1996, the department has MA degree studies with specializations in political theory and public administration. The faculty here was small (only six scholars in 2000), but, as at the IIRPS, very dynamic. Professors like Leonidas Donskis, Vaidutis Laurėnas, and Vytautas Valevičius played the role of *spiritus movens* here.

The next center of political studies and research in Lithuania is, of course, the Institute of Political Science and Diplomacy (Politikos mokslų ir diplomatijos institutas), including the Department of Political Science at the Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas. Political studies had a rather novel start in 1990-1992 in Kaunas, because the subject was based exclusively on visiting scholars from the West. The Department of Sociology and Political Science developed good connections with the University of Linköping (Sweden), and many lecturers in politics came through the Civic Education Project (CEP), along with visiting Lithuanian-American professors of politics. But in the following years, political science at the Vytautas Magnus University ran into serious problems. These were related primarily to the absence of institutional arrangements and to the university administration's strategy of retain all former Marxism-Leninism lecturers who had converted to political science after 1989 (see more Vareikis, 2000: 114). Political science was placed under the umbrella of a joint department of sociology and political science, in which political studies were considered the little brother of sociology. A new and native faculty in political science was recruited very slowly, and visiting scholars were not integrated in the department's research activities. The situation improved in 1995, when the department introduced a master's program in collaboration with the University of Bergen (Norway). But problems of defining a research strategy for the institution remained, because the department employed the majority of its native scholars on a part-time basis.

The institutional framework of political science at the VMU changed significantly starting in 1997. The Department of Political Science was founded at the VMU in January 1997. In 1998, the Institute of Political Science and International Law was established here, and in 1999 it was renamed the Institute of Political Science and Diplomacy. However, a great opportunity for a breakthrough in political science at the VMU had already been missed. At the beginning of 2000, the Department of Political Science faced the same tasks as 3-4 years earlier: to develop a core of permanent staff, implement modern teaching technologies, and strengthen academic exchange with foreign universities.

Moreover, the Institute of Political Science and Diplomacy faces a strong competitor in the Policy and Public Administration Institute (Politikos ir viešojo administravimo institutas), Kaunas University of Technology (KTU). Despite the 1995 reorganization of the Department of Political Science as the Department of Public Administration, political science remained in a relatively strong position here. Political scientists at the KTU were able to publish nine major books between 1990 and 2000, including a textbook "The Contemporary State", edited by Matakas in 1999, which became in one of most popular publications among university students in the country.

In 1995, a shift to public administration at the KTU was initiated by Jasaitis,[5] a graduate of West Point Military Academy (USA) with an MA in political science from the University of Kansas and a PhD in public administration from the University of Florida, who returned to Lithuania in 1992 as a visiting professor at Vytautas Magnus and Technology Universities in Kaunas. In the following years, he strongly advocated introducing public administration studies at the university level in Lithuania.

Finally, the Public Administration Department (Viešojo administravimo katedra) at the Kaunas University of Technology was established in 1995, becoming the first academic unit in the field in Lithuania. On the basis of the PA Department at the KTU, the Policy and Public Administration Institute (PPAI) was founded in 1999.

The institutional development of political science at KTU might be described as constant adaptation to a changing environment and a broad effort to develop research and training in the social sciences. An interdisciplinary approach and cooperation among various social science disciplines is a *modus vivendi* here.

The Department of Political Science and Sociology at the Vilnius Pedagogical University traces its roots from the year 1989. The Law University did not establish an independent Department of Political Science until September 1999, replacing the former Department of Philosophy and Political Science. Since 2000, political studies at the Lithuanian Military Academy seem to be expanding very rapidly after the establishment of a separate Department of Political Science. However, all these departments have a common feature: they are small.

Along with these centers of political science, there are departments of social science in all the larger institutions of higher education in Lithuania that teach political science courses and carry out some research, for example Vilnius Technical and Lithuanian Agricultural Universities. In addition, a few independent research institutions were founded in Lithuania since 1992. Among them are the Center of Strategic Studies, the Institute of Democratic Politics, the Center of

Political Information and Analysis, and the Center for Nonviolent Action. But due to lack of resources and lacking any connection to universities, most of them did not survive.

The maturation of the political science community

In 1988 and even in 1990, many "newborn" political scientists thought what they needed most of all was academic freedom. In 1991, these feelings changed substantially. It became clear that researchers in politics were losing contact with each other and were cut off within their small departments. In early 1991, at the initiative of political scientists from the universities of Vilnius and Kaunas, a group was formed to discuss the existing state of political science and to find ways to combat the tendency to isolationism at university departments. The outcome of these discussions was the founding of the Lithuanian Political Science Association (LPSA) in June 1991. Krupavičius (Kaunas University of Technology) was elected President of the LPSA. The regulations of the association set out two major goals: to reinforce the development of political research in Lithuania and to foster dialogue among researchers in Lithuania and with international organizations. The LPSA became the first independent professional organization of researchers in politics in the former USSR and in the Baltic States. In 1994, the LPSA joined the International Political Science Association and established working relations with a majority of Central European associations. Since 2000, the LPSA has been a member of the Central European Political Science Association.

In 1994, it became evident that the institutional basis of political science was sufficiently developed and that further evolution of the LPSA must be closely connected to existing institutions. In January 1995, the LPSA conference decided to transfer the staff of the organization to the Institute of International Relations and Political Science, University of Vilnius. Kūris was elected President of the LPSA.

The new institutional basis of the LPSA changed its internal situation considerably. First, it provided technical opportunities to communicate with political scientists in the country on a day-to-day basis. The LPSA continued to publish an information bulletin on a regular basis. Second, much more attention was paid to conferences as the most efficient instrument of communication among researchers in Lithuania. Third, to some degree it increased the informal staff of the LPSA.

Jankauskas (University of Vilnius) is current President of the LPSA, which has more than 80 members, including the absolute majority of political researchers based at Lithuanian universities, some political analysts from the mass media, and even a few politicians from mainstream political parties.

Communication is clearly the LPSA's top priority. This function is implemented in a number of ways: by organizing the dissemination of information about international events and grants, the annual LPSA conference and seminars, and round tables; by publishing the journal *Politologija* in cooperation with the IIRPS; and by staging the annual competition for the best publication in political science. At the beginning of 2000, the LPSA created a webpage, http://www.lpasoc.lt, and changed the regulations of its best publication competition, introducing two annual awards, one in research and one in teaching. Among the winners for the best political science publication are Lopata, Žalys (1994-1995), Žėruolis (1996), Vilpišauskas (1997), Kūris (1998), Jokubaitis (1999), Vitkus and Novagrockienė (2000), and Matonytė and Laurėnas (in 2001). The best publications cover a broad range of topics including party politics, issues of political theory, and foreign policy problems.

However, the major annual event is the LPSA conference, an opportunity for the majority of political scientists in the country to meet each other and have face-to-face discussions. The LPSA is a non-profit organization; the most frequent sponsors of LPSA conferences have been the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, the Algirdas Brazauskas Foundation, and the Institute of International Relations and Political Science (as a co-organizer of conferences since 1994). The subjects of the LPSA conferences vary from year to year, but the general trend has been that approximately 3/4 of the conference topics are domestic political issues (like *Democracy in Lithuania: Elite and Masses* (1995), *Interest Groups, Power and Politics* (1997), *Public Administration in Lithuania* (1998), *Political Science in Lithuania: Retrospective and Perspective* (1999), *Lithuania after the 2000 Seimas Elections*, (2000), *Political Culture in Lithuania: Stereotypes and Trends of Development*, (2001)), and 1/4 are foreign policy and international issues (*Lithuanian National Interests and Political System* (1994), *Lithuania and its Neighbours* (1996)). These new developments in the LPSA became possible only because Lithuanian political science improved both in quality and on the institutional level.

3. Core research areas, theoretical and methodological approaches

Some years ago, Almond noted that political science literature from "the ancients until the present day, demonstrates a unity of substance and method, cumulative in the sense of an increasing knowledge base and improving in inferential rigor. There is a pluralism in method and approach, but it is eclectic and synergetic, rather than isolating... This pluralism is not 'isolating', it is eclectic and interactive, governed ultimately by its uncompromising commitment to rules of evidence and inference." (1996: 89) Priorities, differentiation, and theoretical and methodological advancement in various research areas comprehensively indicate a real level of development in the academic discipline.

From a theoretical and methodological point of view, the development of Lithuanian political research exhibits several phases:

- a period of getting familiar with basic theoretical and methodological approaches used by the Western community of political scientists and acquiring research identities,
- a period of exclusively normative, descriptive (qualitative), and case-based research,
- a shift from descriptive (qualitative), normative, and case-based research to empirical, quantitative, and comparative studies of political life. Certainly, these periods tend to overlap and the boundaries between them are not and never will be very clear. The first and the 1989 generation of Lithuanian political researchers were mostly autodidacts, i.e., without BA or MA degrees from political science departments at universities, so the formation of research identities took time.

The years 1990-1995 were a period of research identity formation in Lithuanian political science. Some of the main research interests during this period were:

- political science as a discipline,
- the political history of the Lithuanian state and its institutions,
- democracy and democratization as a case study of Lithuania and in a comparative perspective,
- the development of democratic political culture and political parties,
- electoral processes in Lithuania,
- Lithuanian and Baltic security and foreign policy.

This list reflects the research agenda of the Institute of International Relations and Political Science from 1993 to 1995. Major research projects there included studies on *Governmental Changes and Prospects for Democracy in Lithuania* (NATO Democratic Institutions Fellowship, 1993-1994), *Lithuanian Political Culture* (Friedrich Naumann Foundation, 1994-1995), *the Lithuanian Party System* (1994-1997), and *Lithuanian Security and Foreign Policy* (1995-1999).

Since 1996, IIRPS priorities have expanded into at least two relatively new areas – public administration and studies of Lithuania's integration in the EU[6]. At the end of the 1990s, the IIRPS was a leader in research on international relations and EU integration.

In 1993, the IIRPS established a Scientific Council in political science, becoming the only institution in Lithuania that can grant a doctoral degree in politics. Vitkus presented the first PhD thesis to the Council on the issues of European integration in November 1993. From 1993 to 1999, seven doctoral theses in political science were defended at the Institute of International Relations and Political Science[7]. At the beginning of 2000, eleven students were studying in the IIRPS PhD program. 72 percent of the PhD theses already defended focused on domestic political issues or on democracy and democratization, only 28 percent on international or European politics. However, current trends of PhD topics bring more variety: 10 percent concentrated on public administration and 32 percent on international relations, while European integration and the Lithuanian political system have had equal shares of 29 percent each (Lopata, 1999: 91).

Because of its history, the faculty of the Policy and Public Administration Institute (KTU) was predominantly oriented toward public policy research. However, this institution had three major research priorities: public administration, political science, and sociology. Research on political science here took a comparative approach and included the following topics: governmental institutions and history of the Lithuanian state, elections and electoral systems, parties and party systems, the political elite and political transformations, and political socialization.

Some topics of investigation that formally belong to the areas of public administration and sociology are closely connected to political science, like citizen participation in governance, the sociology of community development, and public participation.

Since 1996, in both Kaunas-based institutions – Vytautas Magnus University and KTU – only two PhD theses were defended, both in the field of political sociology[8]. In Spring 2000, as many as nine PhD students out of 26 enrolled in Public Administration and Sociology programs at the KTU decided to focus their dissertations on topics directly connected to political science[9].

The major research priorities in Klaipėda were the following topics: the development of modern political resources in Lithuania with special attention to regional and local politics, political thought and political philosophy, and public administration (Laurėnas, 2000: 104- 105).

Methodological sophistication and the variety of theoretical approaches are a reflection of the infancy or maturity of a discipline. A survey of the most popular theoretical approaches at the country's eight institutions of political science showed that the historical (traditional descriptive) approach was still the most popular. Behaviorism, functionalism, and systems theory were second, third, and fourth. Neo-institutionalism was a close fifth. Less popular were organizational and rational choice theories, hermeneutics, and phenomenology. Marxism was clearly rejected, but the Lithuanian political science community has so far also rejected two others – game theory and existentialism. Unfortunately, there is no data on the use of quantitative and econometric methods in political studies. Nevertheless, simple observations of current trends suggest that, in the late 1990s, quantitative political research was expanding faster then ever before, and although it was not a prevalent way to deal with political phenomena and political data, it played a significantly increasing role.

Lithuanian political science emerged when the rational choice revolution was over and Western political science communities were entering the period of rapprochement based on neo-institutionalism. Despite strong Western influence on the formation of political science, this was one reason why methodological debates in Lithuanian political science have a compromise-oriented spirit. On the other hand, methodological debates are still low-intensity and low-profile, and perhaps some major methodological and theoretical disagreements have not yet manifested themselves. Another reason contributing to the lack of methodological debates is the relatively small size of the community. Post-modern political science is specialized, fragmented, and hybridized in every subfield. Lithuania's few experts are much more exposed to ongoing debates in various international research groups and networks than in the Lithuanian political science community.

Finally, we may turn to the most overt evidence of the vigor of Lithuanian political science, its published output and bibliographic analysis. The first significant book in political science was published in 1990: a collection of texts in political science titled *Studying political science*, edited by Vitkus. It is still the reference source for teachers in political science at Lithuanian high schools. Subsequent publications in political science can be divided into three groups:

- textbooks and other teaching material,
- publications arising from conferences and workshops, including the journal *Politologija*, and

- research publications.

Of course, since Lithuanian political science is still young, in recent years attention and efforts have concentrated on preparing teaching materials for university students. A textbook that has had a major influence on teaching political science is *Politologijos įvadas* (An Introduction to Political Science), written by Vitkus and published in 1992, although it was originally a textbook for students in the upper grades of Lithuanian secondary school. On the other hand, individual universities have published a number of textbooks of varying quality in the field since 1991. Among the best-known textbooks are *Šiuolaikinė valstybė* (The Contemporary State) (Matakas, 1999) published by Kaunas University of Technology, *Tarptautinių santykių istorija* (The History of International Relations) (Lopata, 1997), and *Politikos mokslo pagrindai* (The Basics of Political Science) (Novagrockienė, 2001).

Periodical publications and conference materials reflect the research interests of political scientists more adequately than textbooks. In this field, the leading institution is again the Institute of International Relations and Political Science. The most important source reflecting developments in Lithuanian political science is *Politologija*, the only research journal in the field in the Baltic states. From 1998 on, the IIRPS and the Political Research Center under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have also published a specialized journal on foreign policy and international relations, Lithuanian *Foreign Policy Review*.

Almost 70 percent of Lithuanian political science publications have been released since 1995, or during the last five to six years. During these years, political research has become more specialized, and there are clear signs that more extensive studies on various aspects of political reality will be presented in the future.

There is no perfect classification, and it is especially hard to classify a study and research area that is clearly moving toward multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches. In political science, plurality and diversity of approaches is a current reality; Klingemann and Goodin quite recently noted that there are several sciences of politics because “the truths of political science, systematic though they may be, are and seem inevitably destined to remain essentially probabilistic in form.” (1996: 9) A single volume in political science can combine many different approaches, since the content and understanding of politics are changing significantly. For example, the boundaries between domestic and international politics are blurring, and a volume on European integration published, say, in Germany might be classified as a publication on national/ area studies or, no less likely, as a study of international relations.

Despite these difficulties of classification, during a decade of political science development in Lithuania, publication has been concentrated as follows: political philosophy – 25.1 percent (The leading institution here is the IIRPS, University of Vilnius. This area dominates in translated books); political science: methods and theory (including general textbooks) – 22.3 percent; and international relations – 19.8 percent (see Table 1). Trends in publication during last the 3 or 4 years show some new priorities: since 1997, most books on international relations have been related to European Union studies; national and area studies are very dynamic fields of interest among Lithuanian scholars; and last but not least, attention to public policy and public administration is increasing. But political economy and comparative politics remain underdeveloped research areas.

Certainly, books in political science mirror the developing specialization in the field. Since 1996, with minor exceptions, books have been published in eight major political science fields every year: Method and Theory, Political Philosophy and Comparative Politics, Political Sociology, Political Economy, National/Area Studies, International Relations, Public Policy, and Public Administration.

4. Public space and academic debates

Political scientists in Lithuania entered public debates very early. In 1992, the LPSA brought together 12 experts on political parties for a period of almost two months to study in detail the campaign and results of the 1992 Seimas elections. The tradition of evaluating the electoral campaigns and presenting forecasts has been continued during all parliamentary and local elections since 1992.

Until 1994, the IIRPS had a relatively low public profile. The first major public event organized by the IIRPS was the conference on "Lithuania's national interests and its political system", held December 16-17, 1994. The aim of the conference was simple and ambitious: to invite political scientists and Lithuanian politicians to discuss the country's political problems together. The academic community, the decision-making institutions of Lithuania, and the national media warmly welcomed this event. Subsequently, the joint Lithuanian Political Science Association and IIRPS conferences became unique meeting places, permanent and established channels of communication between the political elite and political researchers. Now it is no surprise to see the top officials of the country, including the president and prime minister, at these events.

Discussions on elections, Lithuania's integration in the EU and NATO, reforms in the public sector, and other highly sensitive public issues are hardly imaginable in the mass media without extensive comments by political scientists. In the last few years, the IIRPS has had a special weekly column on foreign and security matters in the largest Lithuanian daily, "Lietuvos Rytas".

Since 1998, the IIRPS has become more involved in think tank activities, organizing the round table discussions of foreign and local experts, producing special reports on issues pertaining to Kaliningrad (Russia) and Belarus. In recent years, researchers from the Policy and Public Administration Institute (KTU) are constantly asked to give expertises to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Seimas' committees on public policy and the public administration.

There are many signs that political science enjoys a high public profile in general. But the best evidence is that many official guests to Lithuania visit political science institutions. The IIRPS leads again here. Among its most prominent guests in the last few years were Romano Prodi (President of the EU Commission), Yevgenij Primakov (Prime Minister of the Russian Federation), Vaira Vyke-Freiberga (President of Latvia), and Prince Charles of England.

5. International cooperation and funding situation

The speedy development of political science in Lithuania would be impossible without strong international – Western – assistance and influence. From the very beginning, access to Western scholarships, grants, libraries, experience, and help with human and material resources was an extremely important element in building and shaping political science as a discipline in Lithuania.

There was no single pattern and/or experience in the development of international contacts. Along with various institutions' conscious strategies, various "contingencies" like time, location, and personalities played significant roles here. The content of international cooperation has changed significantly during the decade since 1990.

During the years of the institutionalization of political science, the most important sources included the Nordic impact, Lithuanian-American professors of political science coming back or at least temporarily teaching at Lithuanian universities, and the EU TEMPUS project on "Political science in the Baltic states", which was launched in 1992. In 1990, with financial support from the Nordic Council of Ministers, the universities of Aarhus, Oslo, and Umea started a project on "The politics of transition in the Baltic states" as the first international project involving not only researchers from Nordic universities, but also from Vilnius, Tartu, and Riga. The EU TEMPUS project and a substantial financial donation ($100,000) from the Lithuanian-American Supreme

Committee of Lithuania's Liberation were two major factors for a fresh start of the Institute of International Relations and Political Science, University of Vilnius.

From 1996 to 1999, the IIRPS coordinated a TEMPUS/PHARE project on the Establishment of an MA European Studies Program with Thames Valley University (UK), Groningen (NL), Saarbrücken (Germany), and Nice (France). The IIRPS participated in research programs with institutions in Denmark, Estonia, Great Britain, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Sweden, and the USA.

Political science at the Vytautas Magnus University benefited from slightly different sources of international cooperation, i.e., primarily from the Civic Education Project, Fulbright scholars, and a bilateral agreement with the University of Bergen.

Initially, the Department of Public Administration at the KTU was supported by the US-Baltic Foundation. PhD program in public administration was designed and implemented in cooperation with Hamline University (USA). The majority of first-year doctoral students were able to spend a semester at Hamline University to observe public administration in an advanced democratic country and to take advantage of a Western university library and facilities, as well as to share the experience and expertise accumulated by the faculty. Many researchers of the Policy and Public Administration Institute have had the opportunity to study and to conduct research in the UK, Germany, Sweden, Finland, and the USA.

Institutions that helped in one or another way to develop political research and studies in Lithuania include the USAID, the US–Baltic Foundation, the National Democratic Institute, the United Nations Development Program, the EU TEMPUS program, and various international and national research funding organizations like the IREX, the DAAD, the Open Society Fund, the Swedish Institute, the ACLS, the SSRC, etc.

Since 1996, the IIRPS and LPSA have held a major international conference every two years. In 1996, it was the second symposium of the International Political Science Association on "The challenge of regime transformation: new politics in Central and Eastern Europe" on December 10-15. In 1998, the LPSA, Uppsala University, and the Institute of International Relations and Political Science organized the 2nd Baltic-Nordic Conference on Regionalism and Conflict Resolution. In June and July 2000, the IIRPS hosted an international summer school on the Consolidation of Party Systems in Central-East Europe, sponsored by the Higher Education Support Scheme and the Open Society Fund.

The increasing number of publications in English by Lithuanian scholars is also a significant factor in the internationalization of the field. The IIRPS and the LPSA carried out a major effort here by launching the Lithuanian Political Science Yearbook in 2000. *Lithuanian Political Science Yearbook, 1999* was distributed to the libraries of 50 major European and American universities.

To briefly summarize the changing agenda of international cooperation, during the first five-year period, or until about 1995, material aid (in shaping basic curricula, obtaining books and collecting libraries, installing computers and software, training in research methods, i.e., in developing basic study and research facilities and skills) and a donor-recipient relationship dominated international collaboration. Since the mid-1990s, Lithuanian political scientists and their institutions and organizations have joined such main international bodies of the profession as the IPSA and the ECPR and have became more involved in various research networks. During this phase of development of international cooperation, emphasis was placed on joint and collaborative research. As a result, the partnership between Lithuanian and Western counterparts became much more equal and mostly research-oriented.

Since 1998, new directions have emerged in international cooperation, including attempts to provide assistance to institutions of higher education and to building a democratic society in Belarus and the Kaliningrad region (Russia). Applied and research projects carried out by the IIRPS, Municipal Training Center (KTU) in these countries signal that Lithuanian political science is becoming a donor of knowledge and expertise to the less developed post-Soviet countries. The story of the early 1990s tends to repeat itself, but Lithuanian political science plays a very different and new role here.

To the degree that the major priorities of university-based political science are teaching and the organization of studies, but not research, the main funding source is the state budget. State subsidies come to various departments and institutes strictly in accordance with the number of students enrolled in their programs.

However, the ratio between state subsidies and external funding varied widely among institutions. For example, the Institute of International Relations and Political Science drew 62 percent of its budget from state subsidies, but as much as 38 percent from international and private sources (Lopata, 1999: 88). Most other institutions were much more dependent on state funding. In 2001, about 85 percent of the total income of the Policy and Public Administration Institute, Kaunas University of Technology, was based on state subsidies.

The ratio between state funding, on the one hand, and private, foreign, and international donations, on the other, was very different in the area of research. Till the mid-1990s, Western national and international institutions had the exclusive role of granting money for research projects. Since the mid-1990s, some modest research grants have been available through the Lithuanian State Science and Studies Foundation.

However, most research money (no less than 50 percent) came through various international cooperative projects. At the end of the 1990s, an increasing amount of funds started to come from various EU-related institutions, along with funding available from Scandinavian countries and US foundations.

6. Views on further development

Without a doubt, political science is one of most dynamic academic subjects in Lithuania. From the perspective of political science, the last decade of the 20th century was a breakthrough. The prestige of political studies is clearly increasing, because entrance into undergraduate and postgraduate studies in politics is highly competitive.

The number of students in political science is still significantly increasing. In a period of just one year from 1997 till 1998, the number of first-year students increased from 60 to 120 at the Institute of International Relations and Political Science, University of Vilnius. The total number of undergraduates in the only three institutions (IIRPS, Vytautas Magnus and Klaipėda universities) that offer a BA degree in political science exceeded 570 students at the beginning of 2000. Despite highly competitive entrance standards – in 1998, 15.48 applications were received for every student place at the IIRPS (Lopata, 1999: 89) – political science had prestige because of good job perspectives.

Certainly, jobs in the central and local civil service absorbed the majority of graduates in political science and public administration from 1995-2000. The process of state building, which included reforms of central and local government after 1990, broadly opened this part of the job market for young university graduates.

Data on IIRPS alumna (112 persons) between 1997 and 1999 shows that 15 percent of BA graduates were employed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 13 percent by the Seimas, 7 percent by the Ministry of Defense, 3 percent by the President's office, and 14 percent by other governmental institutions, while 8 percent found jobs in the mass media and the private sector and 34 percent in other businesses and non-profit organizations (Lopata, 1999: 90).

The same success story is true for MA graduates in public administration at the KTU. Of the 94 graduates from this program in 1996-1999, as many as 9 percent were employed by the central government, 12 percent by municipalities, 18 percent by science and education institutions, 31 percent by business firms, 24 percent by health care institutions, and 6 percent in the banking sector (Staponienė, 1999).

Graduates in politics from Lithuanian universities are successfully competing for international grants and fellowships. Especially during the last three or four years, research in politics has started to draw more national and international funds (unfortunately, there are no exact statistics), and at the same time the new Lithuanian political elite is recognizing the need for political expertise.

But perhaps the most important development has been within political science itself. Western methods and models of conducting research were adopted in a very short period of time. The identity of political science in Lithuania was greatly developed through the intense internationalization of the discipline. Together, these factors strengthened the position of political studies and research in the Lithuanian academic community and among its counterparts in Central and Eastern Europe.

---

1 Kazys Pakštas graduated from Fordham University (USA) in 1918. From 1925 to 1939, he taught at Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas. In 1939, he moved back to the United States and taught at the University of California at Los Angeles, as well as at the Universities of Duquesne, Maryland, and Steubeville's College.

2 Mykolas Römeris studied at Ecole libre des sciences politique in Paris in 1903-1905; he was appointed Rector of Vytautas Magnus University (Kaunas) in 1927-1928 and in 1933-1939.

3 All the other universities in Lithuania were reorganized from various institutions of higher education that existed in the Soviet years after 1989. For example, Vytautas Magnus University was re-established in 1990, the University of Klaipeda was founded in 1992, and the University of Technology (Kaunas) was reorganized from the Polytechnic Institute of Kaunas in 1990.

4 The IIRPS took part in three TEMPUS projects in 1992-1999: JEP-4923-92 Political science in the Baltic States (1992-1993), JEP-06106-93 Development of International Law/International Relations and Diplomacy Studies in Lithuania (1993-1994), and JEP-11289-96 European Studies MA program at the IIRPS (1996-1999).

5 Ed Jasaitis died in April 2000 in the USA.

6 The IIRPS has conducted the following major research projects since 1996: *Lithuanian Political Elite Research* (1996-1997); *Lithuanian Integration in the EU (1997-2000); Lithuanian Political Culture (1999-2000).*

7 Vitkus, Gediminas (1993); Guogis, Arvydas (1994); Jankauskas, Algimantas (1995); Novagrockienė, Jūratė (1996); Žilinskas, Gintaras (1998); Bielinis, Lauras (1996); Šiliauskas, Saulius (1999). Three more people – Statkus, Slavėnas, and Degutis – received PhDs in political science from the University of Vilnius in 2000-2002.

8 Palidauskaitė, Jolanta (1996); Matonytė, Irmina (1999).

9 Two of them studied political parties, four chose interest groups and citizen participation, and three others investigated inter-institutional relations and social policy issues.

References

Almond, Gabriel A. (1996): "Political Science: The History of the Discipline", in: *A New Handbook of Political Science*, Goodin, Robert E., Klingemann, Hans-Dieter (eds.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 50- 96;

Budzinauskas, Vladas (1993): "Politinės minties Lietuvoje bibliografija" (Bibliography of political thought in Lithuania), in: *Politologija*, Vol. 3-4, No. 4, 110-175;

Goodin, Robert E., Klingemann, Hans–Dieter (1996): "Political Science: The Discipline", in: *A New Handbook of Political Science*, Goodin, Robert, E. and Klingemann, Hans-Dieter (eds.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 3- 49;

Laurėnas, Vaidutis (2000): "Politikos mokslas ir studijos Klaipėdos universitete: Lietuvos kontekstas" (Political science and studies at University of Klaipėda), in: *Politologija*, Vol.17, No.1, 97- 110;

Lopata, Raimundas (1999): "Politikos mokslai Lietuvoje: Naujos akademinės disciplinos ir mokslinių tyrimų formavimasis ir raida" (Political science in Lithuania: Formation and development of new academic discipline and research), in: *Politologija*, Vol.16, No. 4, 83-92;

Plečkaitis, Romanas (2000): "Politikos mokslas senajame Vilniaus universitete" (Political science in the old Vilnius university), in: *Politologija*, Vol. 19, No.3, 25-49;

Pšibilskis, Vygintas (1995): "Politikos mokslai ir studijos tarpukario Vilniuje" (Political science and studies in inter-war Vilnius), in: *Politologija,* Vol. 6, No. 1, 164-174;

Shively, Philip W. (1987): *Power and Choice. An Introduction to Political Science*, New York, Random House;

Staponienė, Vida (1999): *Viešojo administravimo magistrantūros studijų programos raida Kauno technologijos universitete* (Development of public administration studies at the Kaunas University of Technology), Kaunas, Kauno technologijos universitetas;

Vareikis, Egidijus (2000): "Politikos mokslai Kauno Vytauto Didžiojo universitete- paieškų ir sprendimų dešimtmetis" (Political science at the Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas: A decade in a search of identity), in: *Politologija*, Vol.17, No.1, 111- 121.

Selected Bibliography

Bielinis, Lauras (1996): *Kalbėjimo strategijų analizė politiniame tekste (Lietuvos Respublikos Prezidento A.Brazausko kalbų pavyzdžiu)* (Strategies of speech in a political text (based on the examples of the speeches of the Lithuanian President A. Brazauskas)), Vilnius, Vilniaus universitetas;

Degutis, Mindaugas (1999): *Socialinių tyrimų metodologija* (Methodology of Social Research), Kaunas, Naujasis lankas;

Gricius, Algirdas (1999): "Lithuania and its Belarussian policy", in: *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, No. 3, 31-50;

Guogis, Arvydas (1994): *Švedijos socialdemokratijos ideologija* (Ideology of Swedish Social Democracy), Vilnius, Vilniaus universitetas;

Jankauskas, Algimantas, Kūris, Egidijus and Novagrockienė, Jūratė (eds.) (1997): *Lietuvos politinės partijos ir partinė sistema* (Lithuanian Political Parties and Party System), Kaunas, Naujasis lankas;

Jankauskas, Algimantas (1995): *Organiškos valstybės koncepcija Lietuvoje (Tarpukario ir išeivijos laikotarpis)* (Concept of organic state in Lithuania (Inter-war period and emigration)), Vilnius, Vilniaus universitetas;

Jankauskas, Algimantas (ed.) (2000): *Lithuanian Political Science Yearbook, 1999*, Vilnius, Institute of International Relations and Political Science;

Jankauskas, Algimantas (ed.) (2001): *Lithuanian Political Science Yearbook, 2000*, Vilnius, Institute of International Relations and Political Science;

Jarašiūnas, Egidijus (1999): "Konstitucinė justicija ir politinis procesas: Sąveikos tendencijos ir doktrinos paieškos" (Constitutional justitia and political process: Trends of interaction and a search of doctrine), in: *Politologija*, No. 3, 18-49;

Jokubaitis, Alvydas (1997): *Postmodernimas ir konservatizmas* (Postmodernity and Conservatism), Kaunas, Naujasis lankas;

Jokubaitis, Alvydas (1999): "Liberalizmo tapatumo problema" (Problems of Liberalism identity), in: *Politologija*, No. 1, 3-25;

Junevičius, Algis (1999): *Europos sąjunga* (European Union), Kaunas, Technologija;

Krupavičius, Algis (1996): *Politinės partijos Lietuvoje: Atgimimas ir veikla* (Political Parties in Lithuania: Rebirth and Activities), Kaunas, Literae Universitatis;

Krupavičius, Algis (1998): "The Post-communist transition and institutionalization of Lithuania's parties", in: *Political Studies,* Vol. 46, No.3, 465-491;

Krupavičius, Algis (ed.) (2001): *Lithuania's Seimas election 1996: The third turnover. Analyses, Documents and Data*, Berlin, Ed. Sigma;

Kūris, Egidijus (1998): "Politinių klausimų jurisprudencija ir konstitucinio teismo obiter dicta: Lietuvos Respublikos Prezidento institucija pagal Konstitucinio Teismo 1998 m. sausio 10 d. nutarimą" (Jurisprudence of political issues and obiter dicta of Constitutional Court), in: *Politologija*, No. 1, 3-94;

Laurinavičius, Česlovas (1997): *Politika ir diplomatija* (Politics and diplomacy), Kaunas, Naujasis lankas;

Laurinavičius, Česlovas (1998): "The Baltic states between East and West: 1918-1940", in: *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, No. 1, 87-96;

Petrauskas, Zenonas, Steponavičius, Gintaras (1998): *Lietuva ir tarptautinės organizacijos* (Lithuania and international organizations), Kaunas, Naujasis lankas;

Lopata, Raimundas (1997): *Tarptautinių santykių istorija* (History of International Relations), Vilnius, Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla;

Lopata, Raimundas, Žalys, Vytautas (1995): "Lietuvos geopolitinis kodas" (Geopolitical code of Lithuania), in: *Politologija*, No. 1, 13-21;

Lopata, Raimundas (1999): "Lithuania and the Kaliningrad oblast: A clearer frame for cooperation", in: *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, No. 3, 51-66;

Masiulis, Kęstutis (1996): "Mokslas totalitarinėje visuomenėje" (Science in the totalitarian society), in: *Politologija* , Vol. 7, No. 1, 134-142;
Masiulis, Kęstutis (1997): *Lietuvos elitas: Ekonominės vertybės, politinės orientacijos, prognozė* (Lithuanian Elite: Economic values, political orientations, prognosis), Vilnius, Pradai;
Matakas Juozas (ed.) (1999): *Šiuolaikinė valstybė* (Contemporary state), Kaunas, Technologija;
Matonytė, Irmina (1999): *Sociologinės elito interpretacijos ir jų taikymas posovietinėje erdvėje* (Sociological interpretations of elite and their use in the post- soviet space), Kaunas, Vytauto Didžiojo Universitetas;
Matonytė, Irmina (2001): *Posovietinio elito labirintai* (Labyrinths of the post-soviet elite), Vilnius, Knygiai;
Nekrašas, Evaldas (1998): "Is Lithuania a Northern or Central European country?", in: *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, No. 1, 19-45;
Norkus, Zenonas (1996): "Balsavimo paradoksai" (Paradoxes of voting), in: *Politologija* , Vol. 7, No. 1, 50-67;
Norkus, Renatas (1999): "The U.S. role in Lithuania's foreign and security policy", in: *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, No. 3, 13-29;
Novagrockienė, Jūratė (1996): *Daugiapartinės sistemos formavimasis ir raida Lietuvoje* (Formation and development of multi-party system in Lithuania), Vilnius, Vilniaus universitetas;
Novagrockienė, Jūratė (2001): *Politikos mokslo pagrindai* (Basics of political science), Vilnius, Vilniaus universiteto leidykla;
Palidauskaitė, Jolanta (1996): *Lietuvos politinės kultūros raida valstybingumo atkūrimo ir įtvirtinimo laikotarpiu* (The development of Lithuanian political culture during the reestablishment and strengthening of independence), Kaunas, Technologija;
Petrauskas, Zenonas (1996): "Europos politikos paraštėje" (On the outskirts of European politics), in: *Politologija*, Vol.7, No. 1, 143-150;
Šerpetis, Kęstutis (ed.) (1992): *Politinis procesas* (Political process), Šiauliai, Pedagoginis Institutas;
Šerpetis, Kęstutis (ed.) (1993): *Politikos būtis ir politinė sąmonė* (Political being and political consciousness), Šiauliai, Pedagoginis Institutas;
Sirutavičius, Vladas (1996): "Lietuvos visuomenės demokratizacija ir dvi lietuvių 'tautinio atgimimo' tendencijos" (Democratization of Lithuanian society and two tendencies of 'national revival'), in: *Politologija*, vol 7, No.1, 118-133;
Statkus, Nortautas (1998): "Ar galima etniškumo ir nacionalizmo teorijų sintezė" (Is the synthesis of ethnicity and nationalist theories possible), in: *Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmas*, No. 2, 178-194;
Šaulauskas, Marius Povilas (1998): "Postkomunistinės revoliucijos želmenys: į postmodernią Lietuvą?" (Outcomes of the post-communist revolution: To post-modern Lithuania?), in: *Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmas*, No. 2, 77-94;
Šiliauskas, Saulius (1999): *Demokratijos samprata Lietuvos Respublikoje (1918-1940)* (Meanings of democracy in Lithuanian Republic (1918-1940)), Vilnius, Vilniaus universitetas;
Talat-Kelpša, Laimonas (1998): "Prezidentas ir įstatymų leidyba: Veto teisės naudojimas Lietuvoje" (President and legislature: The use of veto right in Lithuania), in: *Politologija*, No. 2, 57-69;
Vareikis, Egidijus (1998): "The Eastern Baltic subregion: Conflict and cooperation", in: *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, No. 1, 45-64;
Vilpišauskas, Aloyzas (1992): *Visuomenės politinė sistema* (Political system of society), Kaunas, Technologija;
Vilpišauskas, Ramūnas (1998): "Lithuania's membership in the European Union: Possible effects on its external trade policy", in: *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, No. 1, 63-85;
Vilpišauskas, Ramūnas (1999): "The impact of the European Union on Intra-Baltic Economic Cooperation", in: *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, No. 3, 97-124;
Vilpišauskas, Ramūnas (1999): "Wirtschaftskooperation der baltischen Staaten und die Europäische Union", in: *WeltTrends*, No. 23, 103-120;
Vitkus, Gediminas (1992): *Politologijos įvadas* (An Introduction to Political Science), Kaunas, Šviesa;
Vitkus, Gediminas (ed.) (1990): *Studijuojantiems politologiją* (Studying Political Science), Kaunas, Šviesa;
Vitkus, Gediminas (1993): *Tarptautinės integracijos teorijų raida* (Development of theories of international integration), Vilnius, Vilniaus universitetas;
Žėruolis, Darius (1996): "Rytai tampa Vakarais?" (Is the East becoming the West?), in: *Politologija,* Vol.7, No. 1, 3-49**;**
Žilinskas, Gintaras (1998): *Vietos savivaldybės ir jų institucijos Lietuvos Respublikoje 1918-1940* (Local self-government and its institutions in Lithuanian Republic 1918- 1940), Vilnius, Vilniaus universitetas.

Table 1 Profiles of books in political science, 1990-1999

	Method and Theory (including text-books)	Political Philoso-phy	Compara-tive Politics	Political Sociology	Political Economy	National/ Area studies	Interna-tional Relations	Public Policy and Public Admini-stration	Transla-tions
1990	1	1	1			2			2
1991	3	3				2	1		1
1992	6	6				4	6	1	9
1993	2	9	1	2		2	5		8
1994	3	4		2		3	4		4
1995	6	11	1	1		5	3		8
1996	8	6	2	1	1	11	3	2	7
1997	11	6		4		8	12	2	7
1998	6	10	3	2	4	5	10		13
1999	9	6	2	1		2	5	4	4
Total:	55 (22.3%)	62 (25.1%)	10 (4.0%)	13 (5.3%)	5 (2.0%)	44 (17.8%)	49 (19.8%)	9 (3.6%)	63 (25.5%)

Table 2 Number of academic staff, students, and diplomas, 2000

Institution	Number of						
	Staff				Students		
	Professors	Associate Professors	Lecturers	Researcher s	Under-graduate	Graduate	PhD students
University of Law, Vilnius Department of Political Science		5	2		120 **	105 **	
Kaunas University of Technology, Policy and Public Administration Institute	2	7	2	1	50	28 Sociology 58 PA	3 PA 6 Sociology
Military Academy, Vilnius Department of Political Science	1	1	2		150 **		
University of Klaipėda, Department of Political Science		5	1		53	17	
University of Vilnius, Institute of International Relations and Political Science	3	18	15	3	365	86	15
Vilnius Pedagogical University, Department of Political Science and Sociology		3	2		100**	15	
Vilnius Technical University, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences	1	3	2				

Institution	Number of						
	Staff				Students		
	Professors	Associate Professors	Lecturers	Researchers	Under-graduate	Graduate	PhD students
Vytautas Magnus University, Department of Political Science	1	5 *	2		155	11	
Total:	7	47	28	4	993	320	24

* 3 of them part-time;

** number of students in introductory political science courses

Table 3 Main research orientations, linked to institutions, 2001

Institution	Method and Theory	Political Philo-sophy	Com-parative Politics	Political Sociology	Political Economy	National/ Area studies	Interna-tional Rela-tions	Public Policy
University of Law, Vilnius, Department of Political Science	X		X	X		X		X
Kaunas University of Technology, Policy and Public Administration Institute	X		X	X		X	X	X
Military Academy, Vilnius	X					X		
University of Klaipėda, Department of Political Science	X	X						X
University of Šiauliai						X		X
University of Vilnius, Institute of International Relations and Political Science	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Vilnius Technical University, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences	X		X	X		X		
Vilnius Pedagogical University, Department of Political Science and Sociology	X		X	X		X	X	X
Vytautas Magnus University, Department of Political Science	X	X	X				X	X
Total:	8	3	6	5	0	7	4	7

Table 4 Main theoretical and methodological approaches, linked to institutions, 2001

Institution	Behaviorism	Phenomenology	Existentialism	Hermeneutics	System Theory	Organizational Theory	Marxism	Rational Choice	Game Theory	Neo-Institutionalism	Hisorial Approaches	Functionalism
University of Law, Vilnius, Department of Political Science	X				X	X		X		X	X	X
Kaunas University of Technology, Policy and Public Administra-tion Institute	X				X	X		x		X	X	X
Military Academy, Vilnius	x			x							X	x
University of Klaipėda, Department of Political Science					X					X	X	X
University of Šiauliai											X	
University of Vilnius, Institute of International Relations and Political Science	X	X						X		X		
Vilnius Pedagogical University, Department of Political Science and Sociology	X				x	x		x			X	
Vytautas Magnus University, Department of Political Science	X				X						X	X
Total:	5.5	1.0	0.0	0.5	4.5	2.5	0.0	2.0	0.0	4.0	7.0	4.5

Note: X= 1.0 points, or widely used approach; x= 0.5 points, or minor approach.

Table 5 Lithuanian Political Science: Journals and Periodicals, 2002.

Institution	Newsletter	Journal	Working Series
University of Law, Vilnius, Department of Political Science	The Law Academy's Newsletter	Public Policy and Administration (a journal since 2002, together with Kaunas University of Technology)	-
Kaunas University of Technology, Policy and Public Administration Institute	-	Social Sciences; Public Policy and Administration (a journal since 2002, together with University of Law)	Materials of Annual Conferences (in a process of development)
University of Klaipėda, Department of Political Science	-	-	-
Vilnius Pedagogical University, Department of Political Science and Sociology	-	-	-
University of Vilnius, Institute of International Relations and Political Science	-	"Political Science" (Politologija, quarterly, in Lithuanian), "*Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*" (with Foreign Policy Research Center, two issues per year, in English)	The Institute publishes series of Studies Materials Materials of Annual Conferences Lithuanian Political Science Yearbook since 2000
Vytautas Magnus University, Department of Political Science	-	-	-

Table 6 Membership in national and international associations

Institution	National associations	International Associations
University of Law, Vilnius, Department of Political Science	Lithuanian Political Science Association	
Kaunas University of Technology, Policy and Public Administration Institute	Lithuanian Political Science Association	European Consortium for Political Research, European Thematic Network- Political Science, Network of Institutes and Schools of Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe (NISPAcee)*
University of Klaipėda, Department of Political Science	Lithuanian Political Science Association	
Vilnius Pedagogical University, Department of Political Science and Sociology	Lithuanian Political Science Association	
University of Vilnius, Institute of International Relations and Political Science	Lithuanian Political Science Association	IPSA, European Thematic Network- Political Science, Association of Lithuania Republic and Russian Federation Kaliningrad Region's academic institutions and non-governmental organizations, European Union Studies Association, European Consortium for Political Research
Vytautas Magnus University, Department of Political Science	Lithuanian Political Science Association	European Consortium for Political Research

* The Department of Public Administration is a member of the NISPAcee.

Stanisław Gebethner and Radosław Markowski

Political Science – Poland[1]

Discussant: Piotr Mazurkiewicz

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Abundant intellectual heritage and weak academic traditions

Political science in Poland, like Polish history, has a complicated tradition. In the first half of the 20th century, it hardly followed mainstream political debate, its main areas of interest being the state, political philosophy, normative-driven cogitation on constitutionalism, and other issues related to the system of government. One can hardly claim the existence of a separate political science discipline in the modern sense of the term – by no means an odd situation in pre-war Europe. The first Chairs of Politics (to use the names then current) were established in 1902 and 1911, at Lwów and Wilno Universities.

Modern *political and social philosophy* emerged in Poland at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. Polish thinkers contributed treaties inspired by Enlightenment ideas and attempted to save the weakening Polish state. In the 19th century, after independent Poland collapsed and was partitioned, political philosophy did not, however, vanish. Polish political philosophy reflected broad intellectual trends emerging at that time in Europe, like romanticism, positivism (e.g. the Spencerian brand of evolutionary theory), and Marxism. Throughout the period of Poland's partition (1795-1918), all Polish socio-political currents reflected the Polish intelligentsia's great concern to keep Polish culture alive, to help peasants and workers become citizens of the nation, and to modernize the economy of the country. The ultimate goal, however, remained the restitution of an independent state. That is why the military or quasi-military issues and the reconstitution of the state dominated the political agenda. Nonetheless, several genuine socio-political ideas from thinkers like Abramowski, Brzozowski, Krzywicki, and Petrażycki have been widely praised and their work fruitfully debated.

When Poland regained independence in 1918, the socio-philosophical orientations gave way to more pragmatic endeavors of party program construction and institutional state building. University professors of various political orientations had contributed to the constitution-making process and to the preparation of electoral law when Poland regained its independence after World War I. Virtually no attempt is recorded, however, to establish a university-based program resembling Western core "political science". Marginal initiatives to establish colleges oriented toward "teaching politics" emerged even before 1918, and similar attempts were pursued after 1918, but they proved insignificant. On the other hand, chairs of "History of Political Thought" appeared frequently at Faculties of Law at the reestablished Polish universities. In the inter-war period, they offered courses mainly on political doctrines, starting with Plato and moving up to modern times (with a clear emphasis on judicial political doctrines).

In the 1918-39 period, four schools of Political Science existed, in Warsaw, Krakow, Łódź and Poznań, with an umbrella institution called the Academy of Political Sciences coordinating the activities of the four schools. Enrollment in these schools remained low, and the prestige of the

[1] The first version of this text was co-authored by Włodzimierz Wesołowski (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences) and Radoslaw Markowski. It's hard to overestimate the extent to which the current version benefited from Wesolowski's insights and interpretations. As usual however, the responsibility for all its deficiencies remains with Stanisław Gebethner and Radoslaw Markowski.

Academy was moderate. During the period of independence (1918-1939), political science in Poland developed – as in other continental European countries – on the basis of the general theory of the state (*Allgemeine Staatslehre*) as well as of part of constitutional law. The University of Lwów had a Faculty of Law and Political Art. One significant contribution to modern political science was the book titled *Political Parties in the Contemporary State*, by Zenon Wachlowski[1] (University of Lwów), published in 1939, which anticipated Duverger's law on the relationship between electoral and party systems. It is an example of the accomplishments of that time. In the mid-1930s, Aleksander Hertz (who lived in exile in the USA after World War II) contributed valuable and pioneering studies on "Führer-type", militarized political parties, particularly in Italy and Germany.

Czesław Znamierowski fruitfully developed the sociological approach to the *general theory of the state* at the Faculty of Law and Economics, University of Poznań. Simultaneously, a new paramount initiative was created – the launching of a journal, *Review of Law, Economy and Sociology.* In addition, the Institute of Eastern Affairs, in Wilno, was one of the first scientific institutions focused on Soviet politics and more generally Soviet studies (Sovietology).

The same period witnessed the publication of numerous works by prominent scholars on constitutional law, among them the seminal *Polish Political Law* by Wacław Komarnicki (1922). Apart from his affiliation with the University of Wilno, Komarnicki served as a professor at the private High School of Political Science, which was founded in Warsaw, upgraded in 1939 to an Academy of Political Science, reestablished for a short period right after World War II, subsequently taken over by the state in 1946, and ultimately liquidated in 1956.

In the 1930s, prominent professors of constitutional law (Wacław Komarnicki, Konstanty Grzybowski, Wacław Makowski) published several studies on the weakness of parliamentary democracy and political parties, which contributed to the radical change of the Polish Constitution of 1935, its electoral law and, ultimately, its system of government.

Establishing political science departments at universities

Shortly after World War II, there was a chance to develop a new, modern approach to political science. Some prominent Polish scholars, among them Oskar Lange, Stanisław Ehrlich, and Adam Schaff, had created the Society of Political Science, which was admitted to the IPSA as the seventh national organization. The Society of Political Sciences, however, ceased to exist in the early 1950s. In the late 1940s, Konstanty Grzybowski, professor at the Jagiellonian University, Kraków published books on the Western democratic system of government. Zygmunt Gross and Feliks Gross published a book titled *Sociology of political parties.*

Right after the war, there was no major institutional change except for one innovation. In 1945-50, a Political Science Academy aimed at preparing cadres for diplomacy was established and existed for a few years. It was dismantled, however, when Stalinist orthodoxy and Marxist ideology took over all aspects of political life in Poland in 1949. Generally, by the end of the 1940s, the political situation had changed radically. In the climate of a Stalinist totalitarian regime and intensive indoctrination, all social sciences, including political science, were barred from Western influences and ceased to develop.

At the beginning of the 1950s, chairs of Marxism-Leninism were established at all universities, and the course in Marxism-Leninism (60 hours) was made obligatory for all students. However, after the 1956 events ("October Thaw"), Polish cultural and academic life witnessed a substantial change: a kind of controlled liberalization of intellectual life, though with some recurrence of tough orthodox politics, became the norm. Contacts and exchange between Polish and Western scholars were reestablished; many Polish scholars benefited from the fellowship programs of Western universities and other institutions. No doubt it was the first step toward the development of modern social sciences, and political sciences in particular. In 1956, a completely new society was founded, the Polish Association of Political Science. After its dismantling in

1949, the Polish Sociological Association was also reestablished in 1956; it had roots in the pre-war Polish Sociological Institute and the Polish Sociological Association of the1945-49 period).

In 1957, the mandatory courses in Marxism-Leninism (with the "Short Course of the History of the Bolshevik Communist Party" as the basic textbook) were abolished. At the beginning of the 1960s, the academic community opposed the Communist Party authorities' endeavors to restore them. A compromise was reached and, in accordance with the proposal by the Polish Political Science Association, compulsory courses in political science were introduced in the mid-1960s for all students at all universities. This crucial decision had its positive as well as negative consequences for the further development of political science in Poland. One positive effect was that political science was thereby acknowledged as a separate academic discipline. University political science departments were created with full four-year curricula. Under the auspices of the Ministry of Higher Education, the Central Methodological Unit was created, its aim familiarization with mainstream Western political science. The negative aspects were twofold. Communist Party propaganda treated the mandatory courses in political science as an instrument of ideological indoctrination. Students' evaluations of these courses were consistently rather negative. On the other hand, with few exceptions and at the Warsaw and Jagiellonian University in particular, there was an acute lack of qualified lecturers on political science; the main body of the faculty was recruited among former lecturers of Marxism-Leninism and regional party apparatchiks from propaganda departments. This particular legacy is very likely the main factor explaining why political science in Poland did not flourish after 1990 as visibly as in some of the other former socialist countries of the region, where in many instances its development started from a scratch.

In the 1960s, renowned sociologists carried out important studies that belong as much to the sociology of politics as they do to political science. As early as 1957, a seminal theoretical book by Stanisław Ossowski had appeared on theories and common perceptions of social classes. It contained a critical comparison of official ideology and real inequalities of class in the socialist system. Stefan Nowak contributed his empirical analyses of the socio-political attitudes of Warsaw students, Jan Strzelecki published essays on "human(istic) socialism", Jan Hochfeld wrote essays on parliament and its democratization, Jerzy Wiatr and his collaborators participated in international comparative projects on local government, Zygmunt Bauman wrote a historico-theoretical analysis of the working class political elite in Britain, and Włodzimierz Wesołowski published a book on class, strata, and power, to mention just a few. Stanisław Ossowski and Stefan Nowak represented an orientation of neo-positivism of the Vienna Circle type. Other authors mentioned above claimed to be "open Marxists"; a more common label for them was "revisionists".

In academic research, the influence of institutionalism as a political science approach (represented mainly by constitutional lawyers) was balanced by political scientists of a sociological (functional) leaning. The former concentrated mainly on comparative studies of the political systems of Western democracies. Analyzing and teaching about the diversity of institutional infrastructures of world polities, they influenced the open debate in Poland and hastened the implementation of some institutions, e.g. the ombudsman and the constitutional court. The latter – political scientists with a sociological background – focused mainly on political culture, socio-economic and political attitudes, and the like. It is important to note that, in terms of political orientation, the majority of them clearly and openly opposed the ancien regime.

At departments of political science, some renowned scholars dealt with the history of political ideas (Konstanty Grzybowski, Jan Baszkiewicz), the fascist state and the treaty on Science of Politics (Franciszek Ryszka), pressure groups (Stanisław Ehrlich), and Western democratic party systems (Witold Zakrzewski, Marek Sobolewski, Stanisław Gebethner, Wieslaw Skrzydło). All these authors utilized "Western" approaches and methodology in their studies. Still, orthodox Marxism dominated many departments of political science. Slowly, new trends emerged in these departments in the 1970s and after the "first" Solidarity period of 1980-81.

In the 1970s (until 1980, the "Solidarity" period) and 1980s (after the imposition of martial law), numerous centers of political debate and publishing houses were established. Circles of political opposition spread to various social and academic milieus. Discussion Clubs of Catholic Intelligentsia (KIK) had existed in Warsaw and Krakow since 1958, publishing the monthlies *Więź* (The Bond) and *Znak* (The Sign) and the *Tygodnik Powszechny* (catholic weekly). Tadeusz Mazowiecki, Stanisław Stomma, and Jerzy Turowicz played the leading role in maintaining the publications' high intellectual standards and political independence. In the late 1970s, Ruch Młodej Polski started its illegal activities in Gdańsk. Simultaneously, the Liberal Club started its debates in Krakow. At the end of the 1970s, several political underground journals were launched. The most prominent and systematically published were *Krytyka* (Critique, with Adam Michnik as editor-in-chief) and *Res Publica* (with Marcin Król as editor-in-chief). The activity of the political opposition was mostly intellectual, but for some longer periods practical-political as well (joining strikes or publishing protests and political declarations). Ultimately, in 1976, an organizational oppositional structure – the Committee for the Defense of Workers (Komitet Obrony Robotników – KOR) was established. The government and party imposed martial law in 1981, but were unable to suppress all these activities. For our purposes, one net result should be underlined. Discussions and publications of a Western-style of thinking about politics, democracy, and communism contributed to its appreciation among both the intelligentsia and politically minded workers. New generations of middle-aged and young scholars emerged as competent political commentators, critics of the communist system, and proponents of democratization within and outside of universities. But with few exceptions, departments of political science were not in the forefront of this development; it was the sociology, economics, and history departments (with all their specific biases) that were most active in the public debate about democratization and marketization. Nevertheless, an inter-university research project (coordinated by Franciszek Ryszka) on the functioning of the state and political culture is an example of endeavors of truly scientific, Western-style research undertaken despite political constraints during the post-martial climate in Poland of the 1980s.

No dramatic programmatic changes were visible in political science departments in the 1980s, but several piecemeal changes toward democratic thinking and teaching were taking place in that "politically stormy" period. The differentiation of courses and curricula depended mainly on the scholars' individual political preferences and competences. At this stage, almost all scholars and professors of political science already had access to the Western literature in the field. Scholars thus started relying more and more on Western concepts and approaches. The new ideas, theories, and paradigms came mainly from the sub-fields of liberal political philosophy, republican political philosophy, contemporary theories of democracy, politics, and the state, and political systems. Modern research designs were implemented on voting behavior and political party activities. Academics at Wrocław, Warsaw, Poznań, and Jagiellonian Universities played a leading role in this new trend.

To summarize: the socialist period saw various phases in political science's development, from almost complete nonexistence in the late 1940s and 1950s to a limited opening in the 1960s and development in the 1970s and 1980s. One caveat, however: unlike such disciplines as economics, sociology, or psychology, whose development and relative ideological independence in Poland is broadly acknowledged, political science proved much more vulnerable to political and ideological pressures from the communist regime. This does not mean that particular scholars or even departments did not develop interesting, academically sophisticated research; but this was rather limited and delayed, compared to other social science disciplines.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990 – ten years of democratic experience

Change of paradigms

As the collapse of communism approached, political science evolved toward new political theories and new methods of research. Of these, institutional analyses and statistical modeling to scrutinize new substantive issues like free elections, the role of elites, etc. have been broadly applied. The concept of change provided the general theoretical framework; and phenomena of modernization and democratization were at the fore.

Since the breakthrough in 1989, many new analyses of the Polish political life have been developing, primarily in political sociology, but also in political science. Studies on "transition" spread to social and political psychology, contemporary history, social economics, public policy, and many branches of the humanities (including the study of language as a means of communication and public relations). The main paradigmatic change was the almost total abandonment of Marxism, to the extent that this theory definitely does not receive the "normal" attention paid to it elsewhere in the world.

New institutional structures

Formally, very little institutional change occurred during the period of transformation in the 1990s. Except for the 1991 organization of the Institute of Political Studies within the Academy of Sciences structure, virtually no significant change in mainstream political science took place, although numerous think tanks and public institutes mushroomed to cover a broad range of economic, social, and political issues of the day. On the other hand, departments and institutes within university structures developed at a "normal" pace and in a "normal" manner. That is, new universities were established, and consequently new chairs of political science or departments followed.

In taking up new scholarly issues and adopting new theories and methods, departments of sociology and departments of political science at major Polish universities both played an important role. Equally important were endeavors initiated at two institutes of the Polish Academy of Sciences. The first, the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, had had some tradition in analyzing socio-political phenomena in the 1970s and 1980s (cf. longitudinal project "Poles '80, '81, '84, '88, '90"). The second was the newly established Institute of Political Studies, whose faculty was recruited among prominent sociologists, political scientists, historians, and specialists in international relations (for details, see next section).

The beginning of the 1990s witnessed a specific division of labor between universities and institutes of the Academy. Scholars of the *political science* departments were mostly engaged in modernizing and restructuring curricula for teaching. They were also preparing new textbooks, lexica, and "readers" that presented and elaborated new subject matter. *Political sociologists*, found more frequently in the Academy structure, were much more involved in empirical research. Recently this division of labor has been shrinking, due to the growing engagement of political scientists in research projects of various kinds, on the one hand, and scholars of the Polish Academy of Sciences launching teaching activities, on the other.

3. / 4. Core theoretical and methodological orientations. Thematic orientation and funding

The description that follows is based on both self-reporting from the chairs of departments of political science at major Polish universities and our own assessment. Overall information on courses introduced to curricula and research programs can be summarized as follows.

In *political philosophy*, traditionally a strong area of study at Polish universities, new themes embrace above all liberalism and republicanism – American and European. The theory and practice of contemporary constitutionalism is visible everywhere. A new wave of debate within the framework of the "theory of justice" has been opened.

In *political theory*, system analyses, neo-institutionalism, and rational choice theory have been widely introduced. Many of the efforts, however, have been limited to a presentation and discussion of Western political science, mainly of the last 30 years or so, which, of course, is an important task at the beginning.

Almost all departments and political science institutes claim to harbor *comparative politics*. One general caveat is appropriate, however. What is meant by comparative politics usually comes close to the descriptive approach characteristic of area studies. Numerous publications and articles on particular (French, German, and so on) political or party systems is the core of what is considered comparative analysis. But to our knowledge, there is almost no real comparative analysis based on comparative methodology and cross-national multiple-N comparisons of several political systems that employs statistical techniques to synchronically or diachronically test systematic relationships between variables.

Political economy is a rare domain among political science curricula. Moreover, those departments that claim such courses in fact offer basic courses in "economics for political (social) scientists". That is to say, the main paradigmatic edge of this subdiscipline, well-established in the Western world, is missing, if we mean the political economy sub-field aimed at answering the two basic questions: First, how institutions evolve in response to individual incentives and decisions, and, second, how institutions affect the performance of political and economic systems. Such an approach is likely to be found taught and discussed (but again, not perfectly applied) mostly at the Warsaw School of Economics, while research is carried out at the numerous economist-dominated think tanks. To be sure, there has been no serious attempt to analyze the political economy of Polish legislature and government formation. In a broader sense, however, works examining the impact of economic choices on the political process or, alternatively, on political behavior in the marketplace are topics of investigation among Polish scholars as well.

Things are similar with *public policy.* The dominant theoretical and paradigmatic tendency of the curricula offered and research being done at Polish universities falls within the "social policy" approach, focusing mainly on the expenditure side of welfare state policies, etc. A more holistic approach, resembling what is usually found under this heading in the West, covering both the "demand and supply" side of the socio-economic relationship and alternatives that real *public policy* deals with, has been developed at a "branch" institute affiliated with the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy, and – again – with the Warsaw School of Economics.

Paradigms for analyses of *party systems and electoral behavior* resemble mainstream Western political science approaches and have been exploited. And again, the greater part of the scholarly effort has concentrated on interpreting the formal, official data on elections and parties, whereas few innovative methodological, empirical accomplishments are available.

Some of the academic centers and university departments systematically study *political attitudes of the Polish public*, although to a large extent the numerous reasonably well functioning public opinion institutes have captured this domain. The problem with this data is that it is never subjected to enough theoretical scrutiny. Never in the last decade has the abundance of empirical data been systematically and theoretically consumed and utilized, but it remains an impressive potential source of knowledge.

Political elite studies are usually approached within theoretical frameworks developed in the West, with a strong sociological angle.

Theory of democracy follows the mainstream debate likely to be found anywhere in the world. In this respect, most of paradigmatic approaches to democracy are scrutinized. However, Polish innovative contribution to the debate and literature of the topic is modest, at best.

The issue of *nationalism and ethnic conflicts* has emerged as an important subject of study at some research centers.

The relationship between *democracy and the market economy* is a common subject of investigation by economists and sociologists, as well as political scientists.

Finally, we would like to mention the *great expansion* of studies dealing with *European integration*, globalization, and new geopolitics.

To summarize, the substantial change that came about consisted of a switch from the dominant Marxism to theories derived from the roots of liberal-democratic political philosophy. Broad implementation of Western methods of research has been steadily expanding. The growing research activities have contributed significantly to the quality of teaching. In consequence, political science departments currently put less emphasis on the general theory of the state. Political science conceived as teaching the fundamentals of political life has been complemented by many specific subdisciplines.

On the other hand, no paradigmatic switch to a more "econometric" political science (as seen in the West during the last three decades) has surfaced. The field's dominant paradigm is still rather a sociological one (among the empirically oriented political scientists) or a philosophical/juridical one (among theoretically oriented political scientists).

Political science departments at Polish universities – detailed description

Let's now move to depict the situation at universities, colleges, and schools, both state-run and newly established private, non-profit ones. First, on the state-run universities: All established Polish universities offer an MA diploma in political science. To be sure, in most of them this is the only option, since no BA degree has yet been envisaged. The normal practice is to have a 5-year program in political science that concludes with an MA degree. Only recently has the situation changed; currently, the previous 5-year period is usually broken down into a 3-year BA curricula and an additional 2-year supplementary masters program.

In the following, we base our analyses on the eight Political Science Departments of the universities listed in Table 1. Today there are two more universities (established in the 1990s). One is Białystok, founded on the basis of the previously existing Warsaw University branch in that city, and the other is Mazurian University in Olsztyn. Geographically, the whole country is more or less evenly covered, e.g. departments of political science are spatially evenly distributed.

The average *number of full and associate professors* does not vary as much as one might expect from the age of a given university or department (Table 4). There is a positive trend toward an increase in teaching staff. What varies substantially across universities is the number of specializations (subdisciplines) offered at each of them (see Table 4). One caveat is appropriate, however, at this point: Specialization differs in its depth and breadth, depending on the department.

Now let us focus on the main research and teaching areas and on dominant theoretical approaches. Details about each individual department are presented in Tables 6, 1, and 2. The overall picture reveals that the dominant areas of studies are *methods and research*, *political sociology*, and *international relations*.

The variance between preferred theoretical approaches (as listed in the Thematic Network Questionnaire) is even greater. Among the virtually nonexistent theoretical approaches at Polish universities one finds cybernetics, existentialism, and Marxism (!). At the other end of the continuum are historical approaches and phenomenology.

A more detailed glance at political science departments' curricula shows many changes in the last decade, the general trend being Westernization – or universalization, if you will. Analysis of the titles reveals substantial broadening of the field; fewer areas remain uncovered than ten years ago. In parallel, there is an increase in publications that help students learn, including monographs and textbooks written by Polish authors. Several collections of foreign "readers" have appeared in Polish as well, including major contemporary texts by Western scholars. Polish scholars have started elaborating and publishing political science "dictionaries". The new intellectual and political interests of the reading public and students have been satisfied by several publishing houses that relatively quickly translated the most important books on liberalism, republicanism, and their varieties, as well as a number of approaches to liberal democratic theory and various aspects of the functioning of a contemporary democratic system (Seymour Martin Lipset, Samuel Huntington, Robert Dahl, Giovanni Sartori, John Gray, and Robert Putnam, to name just a few). Several prominent Polish specialists in the history of political philosophy have published books on the history of ideas.

On the other hand, a search for Polish translations of or debates on such political science milestones as Elinor Ostrom's *Governing the Commons* (1990), Mancur Olson's *The Logic of Collective Action* (1965), James G. March and Johan P. Olsen's *Rediscovering Institutions* (1989), Morris Fiorina's *Retrospective Voting in American Elections* (1981), and many others must end in disappointment, since these go virtually unmentioned in Polish-language literature. Two major methodological contributions, Charles Ragin's *The Comparative Method* (1987) and Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba's *Designing Social Inquiry* (1994), remain "undiscovered". References to Anthony Downs' seminal *An Economic Theory of Democracy* (1957) are extremely rare, and these few omit the essence of the message and are usually found among sociologists, rather than political scientists.

The official data on the fields of research and specialization at most important departments of political science in Poland are reported in the publication "Polish Science". Reporting on this issue is not an easy matter, since the structures of officially designed sections as well as their grouping in larger units is not uniform at universities. To illustrate the case: the political science faculty may offer international relations as a mere subject for study within the department, or the field may be represented by an independent department of international relations under the administration of the larger, say, Faculty of Political Science and Journalism. As a consequence, international relations as a subject of study and teaching may be somewhat underestimated in all reports on "political science" activities. In reality, it is a sister discipline. The same applies to public policy, which at some universities is simply a subdiscipline within a variety of departments at the Faculty of Political Science and Journalism. Quite often, however, public policy is a huge independent department (institute) with its own course curricula and research. In this report, we mention public policy sections located within departments of political science.

One can nevertheless list the core subject matters and subdisciplines present almost everywhere. This core includes history of political philosophy and political institutions; theory of politics; political systems; political sociology; and international relations.

Among the more specialized subjects one usually finds: parties and party systems, local government, political representation, political communication, contemporary political systems of particular countries (most often the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Germany), globalization, ethnic conflict, and regional studies.

But there are still severe gaps and deficiencies that have to be overcome before it can be claimed that real, full-blown political science exists in Poland. Advanced statistical methods, the comparative approach and method, and rational choice theory are not being taught adequately, to say the least. Debate and analyses within the framework of contemporary political theory, most notably utilizing behavioral approach and neo-institutionalism, are missing. Too much emphasis is still placed on old-style constitutionalism and descriptions of cases like the "French party system", the "German party system", etc. This is not easily detected by focusing solely on the self-assessments of the main areas of teaching and research and the major theoretical approaches revealed in the responses to the questions asked in the Thematic Network Questionnaire.

Though at some universities we have specialists in several areas of study, on the whole political economy, electoral studies, comparative political systems, internal party politics, voluntary political activity, and empirical democratic theory are not covered satisfactorily.

"Methods (and theory)" are claimed to be the most popular area of study. We have to admit that the concept of methods is used in an extremely vague way here. As far as we can guess, its meaning here is closer to the concept of "paradigm" than to refined formalized or quantitative modeling.

It should be reiterated that some subdisciplines within the social sciences have a longer and stronger national tradition, and some others are weaker and less sophisticated. Political science has its roots in prewar studies of social work, unemployment studies, work conditions, patterns of consumption, and the like. During communist times, these problems were studied too, but the ideological constraints limited the depth of their study. Today some of them, for example *public administration*, have regained their impetus and intellectual independence as subdisciplines.

There are several specific courses taught in the *public policy* domain: on industrial sociology and work conditions, on unemployment, on welfare policies and the functioning of institutions of social redistribution, on feminism, on juvenile delinquency, on family incomes, and on patterns of spending and the division of labor within the family. Such interests have a longstanding tradition in Polish "domestic economics" or sociology.

The rapid development of European studies is among the most important recent developments at the departments of political science at Polish universities. They cover at least six relatively distinct areas: 1. general problems of economic, political, and cultural integration of European states – and the intricacies of the enlargement process; 2. the emergence of regions that cut across state boundaries; 3. relations between specific countries or groups of countries, e.g. Polish-German and Polish-Ukrainian, which have both historical and contemporary dimensions; 4. the individual psychological level of the integration, meaning the study of the value system and social-national identity; 5. Polish idiosyncrasies in the socio-economic adjustment process; and 6. the institutions of the European Union.

New institutions: the non-state sector

The last decade witnessed a real mushrooming of new, non-state higher educational institutions in Poland. Their formal status is differentiated; some of them are clearly private enterprises, others non-profit, still others are sponsored and run by foundations. Their common denominator is that they are totally independent of the state (except for formal stipulations on professional requirements), so the state budget does not contribute to their existence. Many of them are still in a state of becoming, and so are their curricula and degree-granting accreditation. Most offer vocational curricula only up to the BA level; others are already entitled to award MAs; still others, though still only a few, award even PhDs. Relevant provisions of the 1990 Law on Higher Education stipulate that the diplomas of these non-state schools are formally equal to those of the state-run universities. Currently there are approximately 150 such institutions, some of them attracting celebrated scholars and numerous students.

The general picture of these non-state schools and colleges is not easy to summarize, since they continue to adjust to labor market conditions and to stabilize their curricula and faculty. Most of them are business, banking, and management schools. Political science is present at some of them as a separate discipline.

Research

The existence of an institutional peculiarity, an Academy of Sciences, a characteristic feature of the academic landscape of post-communist Eastern Europe, proved resistant to change, mainly in terms of organization, structure, and finances. In the first half of the 1990s, the Polish Academy of Sciences institutes entered the educational arena (earlier, only a few of these academies offered doctoral level education). In 1972 the Committee of Political Science of the Polish Academy of Sciences was established as a consultative body, elected by the Polish community of political scientists.

Within this structure, a new entity – the *Institute of Political Studies*– was established in 1990. Its development indicates the problems raised above; even though its accomplishments are hard to overestimate, negligence of certain core political science domains is visible as well. Apart from several areas covered by recognized scholars, such as area studies, transitions to democracy, electoral behavior, elite studies, contemporary history, international relations, and political philosophy, many other substantive subdisciplines are missing (political economy, public policy, public administration, and contemporary theory and methodological problems). The institute serves as a home institution to the Polish National Election Study, launched in 1997, a multi-approach initiative aimed at explaining the phenomenon of Polish elections. On the other hand, systematic research in comparative politics and constitutionalism lags behind as well. This state of affairs is partly due to the Institute's paradigmatic capture by sociologists and historians – in a nutshell, a rather interdisciplinary community. At the Institute of Political Studies (PAS) at the end of the 1990s, there were two dominant, should we say, “branches”: contemporary history and sociology of transformation.

The Institute of Political Studies and the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology are the best-known contributors to political research conducted within the Polish Academy of Sciences. However, we would like to mention at least three additional institutes located within the framework of the Academy that also have contributed systematically to political analyses. The first is the Institute of Psychology, where important empirical projects were accomplished in the late 1980s and in the 1990s, covering themes as diversified as attitudes toward democracy, authoritarianism, youths’ political attitudes, etc., all falling under the rubric of political psychology. The second is the Institute of Law Sciences, where studies on constitutionalism, international relations, and European integration prevail. The third is the Institute of History, where projects covering contemporary Polish history and research on intelligentsia have contributed significantly to the understanding of the Solidarity revolution phenomenon, among other things.

The academic interests and practical needs that have arisen in the field of European integration influenced the expansion of European Studies at many academic, private, and governmental organizations. The Institute of European Studies working under the auspices of two institutions – the University of Łódz and the governmental Committee on European Integration – is considered one of the most competent on this problematic. Similarly, the Center of European Studies was established in the 1990s at Warsaw University. Groups of scholars affiliated with these institutions started addressing the European issue well ahead of the l989 breakthrough. Currently they work both for the academic community as well as for the government.

At the University of Warsaw, the Institute of Sociology and the Institute of Applied Social Sciences have also contributed to significant research programs’ accomplishments on socio-political phenomena since 1956. In addition, an interdisciplinary research unit was established in the early 1990s – the Institute of Social Affairs, (within the University of Warsaw structure) – which participates in many international research programs and systematically conducts the Polish General Social Survey. This longitudinal, in part internationally comparative initiative serves as a reliable empirical source of data for many political scientists as well.

5. Public space and academic debates

Outside the Academy and universities, there are several public opinion institutes. Of these, the Center of Public Opinion Research, established as early as the late 1950s, affiliated at the time with the Polish Radio and TV, is the oldest; it was a phenomenon unusual in the whole socialist camp. There, Polish sociologists of the then-young generation were able to start the practice of empirical analysis. Surveys based on national samples covered many political themes. Currently in Poland, at least 5-6 major public opinion institutes regularly monitor our political life and serve as the “empirical-technical” arm for many academic projects. Their data archives are already very rich and are being utilized by many scholars, sociologists, economists, psychologists, and political scientists.

There are also numerous independent institutions, NGOs, foundations, and the like that cover broad areas of our contemporary socio-economico-political phenomena. Among the most active is the Institute of Public Affairs (established in the mid-1990s), an independent think tank focusing its analyses on several issues of the day (European integration, Polish agriculture, constitutionalism and the rule of law, etc.) and contributing to broadening the public debate and gathering data that well serves the purposes of many scholars.

Materials of great historico-political value are collected at the center called KARTA Center Foundation , which started as a private group for collecting material on Soviet atrocities inflicted on Polish citizens. Now it has public status and a new second function. It has published documentation of congresses and other meetings of the Solidarity Trade Union since the latter's first formal recognition in 1980. It started publishing monographs on selected events during the martial law period.

The Center for Social and Economic Research (Centrum Analiz Społeczno-Ekonomicznych-CASE) is at the fore of classical political economy analyses of contemporary Polish life. Its expertise proves crucial to the ongoing political debate in the country. Predominantly oriented toward macro-economic issues, it serves the political science community very efficiently as well.

To sum up the issue of research and public debate, departments of political science at universities and research institutes affiliated with the Polish Academy of Sciences are the largest institutions that for years have been conducting basic research and providing expert knowledge to public agencies, the government in particular. They have contributed, especially in the 1990s, to the elaboration of numerous new political science projects and curricula, especially at the graduate and doctoral level. However, the *signum temporis* of the 1990s is the proliferation of public and private research and political analysis institutions that are collecting materials, participating in academic analysis, and making political knowledge available to the citizens.

Journals and periodicals

The paradox of Polish political science life may be summarized as follows: although several professional journals exist, the main exchange and the most heated politico-public debates in Poland take place on the pages of the prominent dailies (mainly *Gazeta Wyborcza*, *Rzeczpospolita*) and weeklies (mainly *Polityka*, *Wprost*), which systematically publish longer, in-depth articles on political issues: historical-comparative, theoretical, international. Problems tackled in these articles usually have general and current significance. Among monthly journals, the following have the most intellectual/academic profile: *Res Publica*, *Znak*, *Więź*, *Przeglad Polityczny* (Political Review), and *Krytyka* (which existed up to 1996).

The three major academic political science journals are *Studia Polityczne* (Sociological Studies), *Politologia*, and *Studia Politologiczne* (Politological Studies). Political scientists and political sociologists tend to publish also in sociological journals, such as *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* (Culture and Society), *Studia Socjologiczne*, and *Ekonomista* (The Economist). Specialists in international relations publish mainly in the quarterly *Studia Miedzynarodowe* (International Studies), financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Almost every department of political science at universities edits "working papers" or "series" in political sciences. These publishing activities are a very important means for disseminating research results on the particular accomplishments of a given local academic community. In the last decade, university publishers have released dozens of textbooks and readers.

On the other hand, the quality of these publications is, frankly speaking, very uneven. Numerous publications, even ones with famous university logos, call for real peer reviewing and remain highly "improvable". This is a result of their institutional location – publications are financed by a given department, publish mainly their own faculty's work, and have other local faculty serving as reviewers – a solution certainly not conducive to warranting academic quality.

Still other works employ strange habits toward quotations, requiring Western publishing houses to inspect them closely to assess whether copyrights have been violated. Finally, the substantial part of these publications comprises purely descriptive, uninventive works bordering on journalistic and anecdotal quality, hardly useful even for junior students. In a nutshell, the quality of political science publication indeed calls for substantial improvement. To be sure, this seems to be an idiosyncrasy of political science and does not apply to other social sciences, sociology and psychology in particular, in Poland.

Polish political science associations and other associations

Since its beginning in the late 1950s, the Polish Political Science Association (Polskie Towarzystwo Nauk Politycznych – PTNP) has been very active in Polish academic life. Quite early it became a member of the International Political Science Association. Many Polish scholars served as deputy chairman or as a member of the Executive Board of IPSA.

On the domestic front, political scientists have organized many academic events – workshops, seminars, or conferences – on a variety of topics. Over three decades, the programs of these conferences have been moving toward topics discussed elsewhere: local government, the distribution of political power, political attitudes, parties, various aspects of East-West relations, etc. At the very beginning, conferences were dominated by Polish participants, who were closely linked with the orthodox version of the official ideology. With the passage of time, their attitude and that of the newcomers was replaced by an "open Marxism" approach and later by a great variety of eclectic, more liberal approaches. International conferences served extremely important functions. They allowed Polish participants to get closer to Western political ideas, theories and methods. Domestic conferences served mostly other functions. They provided a forum for learning and improving standards of scientific investigation; political science has gradually been shedding its ideological function, though more slowly than other social science disciplines have.

In the early 1990s, another new Polish Society of Political Studies (Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Politycznych – PTSP) was established, but it limits its role to a kind of liberal-leaning discussion club. Hardly any serious political science debate takes place in the new association. Among numerous other organizations, private foundations (e.g. the Batory Foundation, CASE), private universities, and private research organizations (like the Institute of Public Affairs discussed above) serve the exchange of political ideas and the development of research in political science.

Publications in world languages

No periodicals in the Polish core political sciences are published in any of the world languages. Some of them (e.g. *Studia Polityczne*), however, include English-language articles. The English-language periodical that (partly) covers political science topics is *Sisyphus – Social Studies*; some of its monographic volumes have been completely devoted to Polish transformation, emerging political representation, democracy, and the like. Still, although incidentally, politological issues are present in the *Polish Sociological Bulletin*. The Polish Political Science Association and the Committee of Political Science of the Polish Academy of Sciences jointly publish the *Yearbook of Polish Political Science*. And that's basically all.

Books in world languages are numerous; needless to say, English dominates among these. Polish scholars publish in English either with Polish or with internationally renowned publishing houses or join Western scholars in co-authored or co-edited volumes.

6. Views on further development

International cooperation

Slowly but consistently, both bilateral and multilateral links are becoming part of the everyday reality of Polish political science. Polish political science departments and institutes are present mainly in international bilateral activities; some of them have already a longstanding tradition. It is hard to enumerate even the most important ones. Such themes as "political culture" (in Poland and West Germany), comparative research on "local government", or – in more recent initiatives – on "electoral and party systems" are among the most prominent.

Polish political science activities in multilateral projects are less visible; but this is not to say that Polish political scientists are not active. Many of them play an important role in these initiatives, but usually as persons invited to cooperate and serve as national specialists. Rarely are they found among the initiators or directors of these important projects. They are equally unlikely to be found among winners of grants from the EU Fifth Framework Program, the European Science Foundation, or similar institutions. Notwithstanding a few exceptions, the probability that a Polish political scientist will win a grant from a major internationally recognized foundation is rather slim, as well.

This poor international research performance is due to limited activity in the international disciplinary organizations – the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), the American Political Science Association (APSA), and the [British] Political Science Association (PSA). Members of the Polish Political Science Association (PTNP) traditionally dominate visible presence in the International Political Science Association (IPSA). The first all-European ECPR conference held in Canterbury, Kent, in September 2001 attracted only a few Polish political scientists.

At the end of the 1990s, however, the Polish Political Science Association co-founded the Central European Political Science Association (CEPSA). Many Polish political science institutions and political scientists have joined the newly established pan-European professional organization – the European Political Science Network (epsNet)

There is no simple explanation for this unsatisfactory international performance. The following phenomena may serve, however, as partial explanations: (a) the relative underdevelopment (by internal standards) of political sciences compared to sociology, psychology, and economics; (b) the relatively large internal academic market; (c) the domination of Polish political science by representatives of other social sciences.

It is hard to assess exactly the magnitude of the "brain drain" from Polish political science, although the latter's very underdevelopment means the harm cannot be that great. On the other hand, numerous political scientists of Polish origin are present at mainly US, but also Western European universities. A more detailed look at their professional background in Poland indicates, however, that the majority of them come from other social science disciplines, mainly sociology. Moreover, their individual fates indicate that most cannot be classified as classic indications of a "brain drain"; usually the Polish "real socialism" and its consequences were what drove these individuals out of the country, rather than the pure academic attractions of the West. In brief, for the majority of middle-aged and older scholars, the "push" out of Poland did more to drive this process than did the "pull" of the West.

We know little about the current, 1990s processes of the "brain drain". First, because it is not clear who has left the country "for good"; second, because opportunities to travel and stay abroad became abundant, many, especially young, scholars benefit from these new opportunities, though we cannot estimate how many of them will decide to remain in the West.

On the whole, the situation in Polish political sciences is complicated. On the one hand, there are strong, fruitful traditions that maintain an important field of study of good quality. On the other hand, there are also visible gaps and deficiencies. The latter applies most to some of the core areas of contemporary political sciences: political economy, public policy, neo-institutionalism, and methodological issues. Compared to other social sciences, political scientists can hardly be called a community: The lack of a strong, unified association that encourages academic quality and professional ethics and that boosts organizational opportunities, both at home and abroad, is a particularly sensitive problem. Publications and professional journals call for further improvement. The implementation of a transparent peer-reviewing mechanism is the essence of the problem, as we see it.

---

1 Hesitation and long debates preceded our ultimate decision not to include references of prominent historical and contemporary works published in Poland separately at the end of the chapter. The titles of important "historical" books are in the main text; contemporary authors are mentioned only by name and fields of study. There are several reasons for this: First, meritocratic – it is a difficult task to do justice to the dozens of authors and decide whom to list and whom to omit. Second, technical – the limited space allowed for each country chapter does not permit the inclusion of all publications we consider worthwhile.

Table 1 Main areas of teaching and research as reported to the Thematic Network by Departments of Political Science in Poland

University:	Method and theory	Political philosophy	Comparative politics	Political sociology	Political economy	National and area studies	International relations	Public policy
Warsaw University	X	X		X	X			
Jagiellonian University, Krakow			X			X		X
University of Curie-Sklodowska	X		X	X		X	X	
University of Mickiewicz	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
University of Silesia	X	X		X		X	X	
Szczecin University			X			X	X	X
Wroclaw University	X	X	X	X		X		
Catholic University of Lublin	X	X		X			X	

Table 2 Major theoretical approaches as reported to the Thematic Network by Departments of Political Science in Poland

University:	Behaviorism	Hermeneutics	Rational choice theory	Game theory	Neo-institutionalism	Historical approaches	Functionalism	System theory	Organizational theory
Warsaw University		X	X			X			
Jagiellonian University					X	X			
University of Curie-Sklodowska	X		X	X		X		X	X
University of Mickiewicz						X		X	X
University of Silesia			X			X	X	X	X
Szczecin University	X	X			X	X		X	
Wroclaw University	X				X		X	X	X
Catholic Univ. of Lublin					X	X	X	X	X

Table 3 Political Science Departments (Institutes) at the Major Polish Universities: Areas of Specialization

Universities	Areas of Specialization						
	Public Admin.	Political Science Theory	European Studies	Political Marketing	Political Systems	International Relations	Social Comm./ Journalism
Warsaw	X	X	X	X			
Lublin (UMCS)		X			X	X	X
Wroclaw	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jagiellonian, Krakow		X	X			X	X
Katowice		X			X		X
Poznan	X			X		X	X
Szczecin	X		X***				
Lodz*			X			X	
Gdansk**			X				
Lublin, Catholic University**		X					

* There are two separate Administrative Units: the Institute of International Relations and the Center for European Studies

** The Administrative Unit is smaller than the Department or the Institute

*** European Studies includes three specializations: Ethnic Problems, Germany and European Integration, and European Integration, in general

Table 4 Faculty at Political Science Departments: degrees and number in 1983/84, 1997/98, 1999/2000

University:	1883/84		1997/98		1999/2000	
	Professors, full and associate	Teachers with PhD	Professors, full and associate	Teachers with PhD	Professors, full and associate	Teachers with PhD
Warsaw University, Warsaw Institute of Political Science and Journalism	10	24	21	24	19	24
Jagiellonian University, Krakow Institute of Political Science	10	18	23	30	21	21
Wrocław University, Wrocław Institute of Political Science	9	20	11	32	13	30
University of Curie-Skłodowska, Lublin Institute of Political Science	6	20	19	26	17	29
University of Adam Mickiewicz, Poznań Institute of Political Science and Journalism	7	15	10	10	12	17
University of Silesia, Katowice Institute of Political Science and Journalism	6	17	15	35	14	32
Szczecin University, Szczecin Institute of Philosophy and Political Science			10	17	6	10
Catholic University, Lublin *Chair* of Political Science					2	2

Source: "Informator Nauki Polskiej" for 1984, 1998, 2000.

Table 5 Teachers and Students in Political Science Departments (Institutes), 1999/2000

University:	Professors, full and associate	Lecturers with PhD degree	Students
University of Silesia, Katowice Institute of Political Science and Journalism	14	32	573
Warsaw University, Warsaw Institute of Political Science	19	24	742
Szczecin University, Szczecin Institute of Politology	6	10	996
University of Adam Mickiewicz, Poznań Institute of Political Science and Journalism	12	17	686
Wrocław University, Wrocław Institute of Politology	13	30	620
University of Curie-Skłodowska, Lublin Faculty of Politology*	17	29	733
Jagiellonian University, Krakow Institute of Political Science	21	21	547
Mazurian-Warmian University, Olsztyn Institute of Political and Social Sciences	10	21	

* As a rule, at Polish Universities, Departments (called Institutes) of Political Science are part of the larger Faculty of "Political Science and Journalism" or of the "Faculty of Political and Social Sciences". Within Faculties, there are usually 3-5 Departments. In addition to Departments of Political Science, Departments of Journalism, of International Relations, of Public Policy, of Public Administration, etc. are frequently found.

The UMCS University, Lublin's Faculty of Politology contains eight smaller Units (chairs) of International Relations, Political Thought, Political Movements, Political Systems, Sociology of Politics, Human Rights, Journalism, and Ethnic Research.

Table 6 Summary of *areas* of study and main *theoretical* approaches at major Polish universities

Areas of study:		Theoretical approaches:	
Method and theory	6	Behaviorism	3
Political philosophy	5	Cybernetics	0
Comparative politics	5	Existentialism	0
Political sociology	6	Hermeneutics	2
Political economy	3	Marxism	0
National and area studies	5	Rational choice theory	4
International relations	6	Game theory	2
Public policy	4	Neo-institutionalism	3
		Historical approaches	7
		Functionalism	2
		Phenomenology	0
		System theory	4
		Organizational theory	4

Daniel Barbu

Political Science - Romania[1]

For the social sciences at large, the rise and predicament of Romanian political science, as important an experience as it may be for Romanian academia, is a topic fated to a certain degree of obscurity. On an individual basis, Romanian scholars may seek respectability and recognition in the international scientific community, but no one would expect them to collectively set the tone for political science. And it is only fair to say that marginality is perhaps the inescapable fate of all political science enterprises in Central and Eastern Europe. For American, British, German, French, and even Italian political sciences are not only dominant, but also self-reliant and self-sufficient. Therefore, it would be more interesting to look at what Romanian political science *is*, rather than at what it *does* or tries to do. That is to say that Romanian political science can be noteworthy only to the extent it is comprehended as a political object in its own right, regardless of the political objects it currently creates, addresses, and explores.

If we adopt Theodore Lowi's contention that the way we study politics usually conforms to the politics we study, i.e., that every regime has the inclination to produce a politics consonant with itself and that, subsequently, every regime also tends to generate a political science consistent with itself[1], then it follows that, in becoming aware of what Romanian political science tries to be, we might just learn something about Romania's post-communist polity and politics.

Seemingly, such a functional assessment does not do violence to a substantial and refined body of literature. Indeed, Romanian political science never actually existed and it is still on the fringes of existence. This explains to a large extent the popularity enjoyed after 1989 by all sorts of writings on and about politics that seem to indicate to a naive eye that the discipline itself has taken off. This statement is paradoxical only at first glance, since a science embedded in strong theoretical traditions and empirical expertise does not usually easily find popular favor. For there can be free admittance only to those intellectual territories that are not yet methodologically mapped and conceptually chartered. As soon as an intellectual terrain is colonized by a given science, admittance is regulated by a number of restrictions and exclusions. Academic clearance and scientifically approved blueprints are henceforth needed.

Indeed, if the very notion of "scientific discipline" is epistemologically weak, it is nevertheless indisputable that it has a clear social content to the extent it acknowledges the existence within the intellectual arena of a distinct group of "specialists" defined by certain rules of scientific production and reproduction. Let us take for granted that a scientific discipline is fully established when at least four criteria are fulfilled[2]: consensus on the very name and purpose of the discipline; agreement on the topics that fall within the purview of the discipline and that can be satisfactorily addressed by no other branch of science; a number of institutions of education and research recognized and legitimated by the academic community; the accumulation of a sufficient amount of resources and tools, such as journals, textbooks, publication series, colloquia, conferences, and the like.

My argument is that three of these four criteria are not yet completely met, despite the quite impressive quantity of translations, essays, commentaries, books, and articles related to politics that are currently published in Romania. First of all, there is no consensus on the appropriate name for the study of politics. *Political science*, *political studies*, *political sciences*[3], and "*politology*" are still indistinctly used, both in academia and by the media. Second, there is no accord among "specialists" on what exactly the science of politics is and does, and there is even an insidious doubt – among some sociologists, for instance – that a separate science of politics can or should

---

1 Alina Mungiu-Pippidi, of the National School of Political Studies and Public Administration in Bucharest, wrote a commentary on the first draft of this report. Some of the data she provided were helpful in enlarging the scope of my survey.

exist at all. Finally, Romanian political scientists did not begin to publish books based on original thorough empirical or theoretical research until, at the earliest, the end of the first post-communist decade; moreover, the first Romanian academic peer-reviewed journal of political science was not published until 2001. The only criterion that seems to be somehow satisfied is the institutional one, since there are several solid departments of political science and a fair number of graduates from them. Nevertheless, even on this level, it is still unclear whether political science has a name and a realm of its own. Paradoxically enough, two out of the three major departments do not teach political science as a discipline in its own right.

To wind up, a common understanding of politics and its science does not seem to exist in Romania. There are still reservations about the possibility of scientifically explaining politics on the basis of endogenous approaches, as political science claims to be able to do[4]. In the eyes of many Romanian social scientists, politics seems to be the mere anecdotal surface of otherwise deep-rooted social and economic phenomena. Politics is commonly seen as driven mainly by societal incentives and economic stimulus, as devoid of its own rationality, and virtually always as commanded by an external rationale. Therefore, it is probably safe to say that, at least in this respect, dialectic and historical materialism has probably lost much of its reputation but not all of its influence.

To be ironically faithful to Marxist teleology, this situation should be referred to as a *sublation*, meaning, as Hegel did by this term, that scientific socialism is concurrently cancelled and preserved in the make-up of post-communist political science. This survey tries to explore the reasons for this vernacular survival of an unexpectedly enduring Marxism-Leninism beyond the demise of both communism and its scientific explanation of history and society.

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

In pre-communist Romania, political science practically did not exist as an autonomous field of teaching and research. For a short time after 1918, the University of Cernăuți, an institution of higher education established under Austrian rule, inherited a political science chair held by Alexandru Papacostea, an insulated and unavailing scholar who died in 1927 with no scientific posterity. In 1924, the School of Law at the University of Bucharest created a doctoral degree in "political and economic sciences", to be granted after a two-year curriculum. As late as 1938, an Institute of Moral and Political Sciences was created within that School of Law to provide an institutional framework for PhD law students who had an academic interest in politics. The approach to politics at this Institute was merely a legal one, political science being studied as the science of the State, very much in the manner it was – and sometimes still is – practiced in the French *Facultés de Droit*. At any rate, the Institute did not live long enough to contribute to the birth of political science as an academic discipline, since it was closed down in the early 1940s. But it is worth mentioning because Ghita Ionescu, editor of the British Journal *Government and Opposition* and a distinguished scholar of communism (Ionescu, 1964, 1967) and of the political process of European integration, was educated there.

One of the reasons for political science's precarious institutional set-up in pre-communist Romania was the overall triumph of sociology, itself a newborn discipline after World War I. In the view of Dimitrie Gusti, the prominent founder and mastermind of Romanian sociology and the chairman of the Romanian Social Institute, sociology should have been and was actually considered to have become the complete – both normative and descriptive – science of the nation, which could answer all the questions raised by the social, economic, and political life of the Romanian national community. For instance, the critical legal and political question "what kind of Constitution does Greater Romania need?" was regarded as belonging to the field of an inclusive social science understood and practiced as the overall science of the nation. In this setting, even a conspicuous political object like political parties received a philosophical-sociological treatment

(Negulescu, 1926) ignorant of and indifferent to the well-established international political science literature of that time.

This particular variety of sociology, which emphasizes and investigates the national community as an indivisible structure and is therefore uninterested in and avoids the study of divisions and conflicts, owed its undisputed predominance to the mainstream intellectual tradition marshaled around the "social question". Before and after World War I, it was incumbent on any major Romanian social thinker to address the twofold issue of a resilient peasant society allegedly reluctant to give birth to a viable domestic bourgeois middle class. Constantin Dobrogeanu-Gherea, Constantin Stere, Constantin Rădulescu-Motru, Ştefan Zeletin, Şerban Voinea, Mihail Manoilescu, Virgil Madgearu, Lucrețiu Pătrăşcanu, and Dimitrie Gusti himself explored this question and its political consequences along various theoretical lines ranging all the way from orthodox and revisionist Marxism to corporatism.

As politically incorrect as it may seem today, Mihail Manoilescu was the pre-communist Romanian political author who enjoyed the widest and longest-lasting international reputation. Not only he was the leading European theorist of corporatism in the very age of corporatism (Manoilescu, 1941), but also his thinking is considered to have provided the ideological framework for the Brazilian *Estado Novo* and its subsequent authoritarian incarnations. His political economy is apparently still in use in some South American universities. Albeit an economist by training and intent, Manoilescu developed an articulate theory of party-state relations in a totalitarian regime, embedded in extensive first-hand observation. His analysis distinguished between German, Italian, and Soviet versions of totalitarianism, seeing the first as a dual political system with powers shared equally by the state bureaucracy and the party elite, the second as a state using the party for its own purposes, and the third as a state utterly controlled by the party.

To construct as accurate a genealogical table of the discipline as possible, it should be remarked that, despite the institutional monopoly of legal studies and the intellectual eminence of sociology, such authors as Marcel Ivan and Mattei Dogan nevertheless undertook proper and valuable empirical research in political science in the 1930s and 1940s, mainly in the area of electoral participation and party performance. A consummate statistician, Ivan published a highly formal survey of the electoral conduct of the political parties that emerged in the aftermath of World War I (Ivan, 1933). After authoring a comprehensive analysis of inter-war Romanian politics (Dogan, 1946), Mattei Dogan left Romania to become an outstanding voice in French political sociology (e.g. Dogan, 1982, 1990). This type of quantitative analysis, which tried to crossbreed statistics and sociology and which was as close to formal political science approaches as we find, had no follow-up in Romania.

Immediately after the communist takeover, a political school was established to ensure, first, ideological control, and later the Party's monopoly over the social sciences. Created in 1945 as the Party's training unit for its own rank and file under the name of the Ştefan Gheorghiu Academy for Training and Advancement of the Leadership Cadres of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, this institution was designed as an ideological training center for Party activists and state bureaucrats. Several types of curricula were offered. Short-term studies (usually six months) were intended for all party members selected for various responsibilities either in the Party apparatus or in public administration. More thorough post-graduate studies, including a doctorate, were offered to those who had chosen to become ideological trainers for the Party, journalists, or merely scientific socialism instructors for institutions of higher education. In 1969, an institute of economic management was attached to the Party Academy to provide professional expertise to the chief executive officers of the public sector economy.

One year later, an Academy of Political and Social Sciences was established under the authority of the Propaganda Division of the Central Committee. In the wake of the "mini-cultural revolution" of 1971, the institution's task was to explore the procedures to be followed to translate an untidy ideological control into a tight scientific monopoly. The mission was accomplished in 1975, when the new Academy held sway over all research institutes in history, law, philosophy, sociology, art history, and other social sciences previously subordinate to the old Romanian Academy. In this way, the official politics of the social sciences shifted from supplying general orientation and providing casual censorship to direct involvement in research policies, programs, planning, tools, methods, and teams.

In scale and scope, these changes in the politics of science mirrored a critical and major transformation of the official science of politics. Indeed, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the teaching of the Ştefan Gheorghiu Academy was no longer embedded in orthodox Marxism-Leninism, and prominent figures of early scientific socialism, such as Radu Florian, lost much of their influence. As the Party itself changed its methods of social mobilization and inclusion, the official ideology framed by the Party Academy became more concerned with development issues, economic management, and technological revolution. How to escape backwardness and establish a modern economy were the topics addressed by theoreticians like Mircea Maliţa and Mihai Botez, who never questioned the political monopoly of the Party, even when they turned into dissidents, as Botez eventually did. In fact, for this line of thinking, which prefigures the Chinese pragmatism of the 1980s and 1990s, politics was not viewed as being essential, but as really existing only in the form of good policies of economic growth and social improvement. This new scientific course roughly coincides with a short period of political de-Stalinization.

Some outstanding authors, however, did emerge from, if not against, this background. In the long run, the most influential of them in terms of the discipline turned out to be Vladimir Tismăneanu. Unsurprisingly, he started in Romania as a liberal student of Euro-Marxism (Tismaneanu, 1976), to later become, once reborn as an American political scientist, a scholar of civil society in Central and Eastern Europe (Tismaneanu, 1991) and a stern critic of anti-liberal and radical intellectual and political trends in the region (Tismaneanu, 1998). In the 1990s, he served as a role model and mentor for numerous Romanian political scientists. The second to deserve special mention is Pavel Câmpeanu, a communist militant in his early stages, who evolved into a significant student of Stalinism (Campeanu, 1986) and who, in the late 1980s, was the Romanian voice in the seminars that the New School of Social Research in New York opened to prominent dissidents from Central and Eastern Europe.

Three other major scholars, although not political scientists by training or vocation, bordered on the study of politics. Two of them were confessed and innovative Marxists, the third a resolute anti-Communist. Henri H. Stahl, the revered proponent of Romanian social history and of the national sociological tradition, had an original hand in the Marxist theory of the modes of production (Stahl, 1979). Zigu Ornea, a literary historian, substantiated some of the major trends of Romanian political and social thinking (e.g. Ornea, 1969). The third, the historian Vlad Georgescu, not only published invaluable quantitative studies on the framing of the public space and the evolution of Romanian political ideas (Georgescu, 1972, 1987), but also, as an émigré, headed the Romanian department of Radio Free Europe. Be it as it may, these authors did not tone up the Romanian intellectual landscape, for in the late 1970s and during the 1980s, the social sciences sagged under the weight of a hegemonic national communism. As for the study of politics, the stage belonged to theoreticians no longer disposed to base their interpretation of social and political life on classical Marxist theory or on the critique of backwardness, but on the works of Nicolae Ceauşescu, the unchallenged leader of the Romanian Communist Party. For them, politics existed only in the shape of Romanian national interest. The leading character of this cast was undoubtedly Ovidiu Trăznea, chairman of the exclusive, Party-members-only Romanian Association of Political Science, which set up in 1968. In this role, he was the official political scientist of the regime (Ceterchi, Trăznea, and Vlad, 1979).

Notwithstanding this development, the various interpretations of politics under communism shared the common belief that social life cannot be explained in political terms and that, therefore, political science had no reason to exist and that its task, whatever it may have been earlier, is far better accomplished by other sciences, above all economics. Yet, such an approach is compelled to use a rhetorical structure that finally lends itself to justifying the very presumptions it professed to deny: the autonomy of politics and the legitimacy of a science of politics. The various intellectual shapes assumed by Romanian scientific socialism (orthodox, liberal, developmental, nationalist) could not or would not abandon their Leninist roots and the revolutionary-type circular reasoning such roots entail. A sound Marxist assumption indicates that politics is closely tied to and dependent upon class structures and economic relations. On this account, politics should be meaningless in the face of knowledge. Nevertheless, Leninism assumed and indeed proved that politics might in fact invent class structures and economic relations. So what is the place of political science in this setting? Under state socialism, the science of politics equals political action itself. Its practitioner is the government, and the government alone. Political science would therefore be the self-consciousness of the government, a government that acts – in Marxist terminology – not only in itself, but also for itself. Political science was subsequently the study of Party policies and Party language, inasmuch as they tried to respond to the people's scientifically validated wants. As a consequence, the understanding of politics in Romania before 1989 was not only wants-oriented, rather then rights-based, but also verged on a perverse form of public choice theory. Curiously, if not ominously, this is the major lesson post-communist political science has learned from scientific socialism.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

If a unified paradigm is needed to give rise to a scientific discipline[5], it is unquestionable that such a broad intellectual construct, based on a series of common observations and shared assumptions, did not immediately emerge after 1989 in the Romanian academia as far as political science is concerned. On the contrary, Romanian social scientists ever since seem to follow at least two separate and contending sets of instructions on where to look for the appropriate explanations of what politics is. And they do so in a rather intuitive way. They move instinctively within disconnected "disciplinary matrices", to use Thomas Kuhn's words, according not only to the intellectual experiences they went through before 1989, but also to their different understandings of how and why scientific research should be organized. For the sake of clarity, let us call these two paradigms *post-Marxist-Leninist* and *neo-Weberian*, bearing in mind that they are not to be interpreted as evidence of a fully conscious operation of theoretical and methodological choice. Rather, these paradigms have themselves recruited their proponents, for most Romanian political scientists qualify as "unconscious thinkers" impaired by theoretical unawareness who react to the change in political regime and to the expansion of democratic politics by spontaneously resorting to "conceptual stretching"[6]: they merely strain their old methods and language to cover a broader and far more diverse array of political issues than the ones tackled a decade before.

The first stream cuts across various scientific contexts and methodological assumptions to adopt an all-inclusive public choice idiom for which politics is a dependent variable that rests upon the overriding problem of acquisition, as conceived by Marx. This is tantamount to saying that economy-based relationships and relative scarcity command the configuration of public interests as expressed in the political arena. Consequently, property ownership, deprivation, impoverishment, government performance, and party competition for control of the means of production and to appropriate the voter's consciousness become the linchpins of politics.

The second paradigm pulls several intellectual threads together to convey the overall idea, of Weberian descent, that the collapse of communism and the social deconstruction it induced should be experienced as an opportunity to establish a new political bond, if not a new social contract (*Vergesellschaftung*). Hence, politics is held to be a rationalization of public conducts within a system of meanings (*Sinnzusammenhänge*), which takes in such categories of beliefs as legitimacy, the demystification of authority, the production of and conformity to norms, and the function of the market.

And if this is the case, if indeed there are two ways of explaining what politics is all about[7], then it follows that Romanian political science, as a newborn academic field of study and research, had no real intellectual opportunity to grow into a coherent and self-sustained discipline. For the dialectics of continuity versus change not only marked the evolution of paradigms, but also largely commanded the process of the institutionalization of political science.

Even if democracy superseded state socialism quite unexpectedly, those at home in scientific socialism in its developmental-nationalist Romanian version were not caught by surprise. Not that they foresaw the event, but they were, above all, experts in the politics of social sciences. So they changed their vocabulary without unwrapping their understanding of politics from its Leninist core and, above all, without reshuffling their personnel. Trăznea was naturally re-elected to chair the Romanian Association of Political Science[8], while his younger colleagues (Vasile Secăreş, Vladimir Pasti, Cornel Codiță, Ioan Mircea Paşcu, Paul Dobrescu) immediately went to serve as advisors to the post-communist president and to the National Salvation Front leadership, while engineering the survival of the Party Academy. They spontaneously followed what might be called a logic of appropriateness, as opposed to a logic of consequence, which would have naturally eliminated them from the public square. As a group, they did not see democracy as a radical political consequence of the communist collapse. Instead, they were ready to embrace a kind of "state democracy" as an appropriate instrument to satisfy the economic and social wants that state socialism failed to fulfill. The collapse of communism did not even automatically root out all institutions linked to Marxism-Leninism and scientific socialism. They simply reshaped themselves, taking on new names and embarking on new missions, but not changing their frame of mind.

The Ştefan Gheorghiu Academy of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party is perhaps the foremost public institution that has survived, almost unimpaired, the breakdown of the communist regime. To wash away their previous commitment to scientific socialism, its teaching staff first sought to join the University of Bucharest. But they soon came to understand that there would be no *Schuldfrage* debate to question their past and that they could afford to stand up again as an influential group. Thus, in the fall of 1991, the government decided to refinance the former Academy as a public institution under the name the National School of Political Studies and Public Administration. For all intents and purposes, this institution, presided over by Vasile Secăreş, the last secretary of the communist cell of the Party Academy, and Ovidiu Trăznea, chairman of the Department of Political Science until 1996, preserved the goal and structure as well as most of the faculty of the former Party Academy. Even the institute created in the late 1960s to provide management skills to high officials of the socialist economy continued to be associated with the National School under the label IROMA (The Romanian Institute of Management). A two-year course of general training in international relations and public administration and policies was offered to candidates from various academic backgrounds to enable them to take civil servant positions. Not until 1995 did the National School of Political Studies and Public Administration start to organize undergraduate studies in political science, public administration, and journalism. Since 1998, a one-year graduate program has been added every fall, the specializations covered being gender studies, development and governance, international relations, and political anthropology. The School now has three departments – political sciences (chaired by Adrian Miroiu, a former editor of the Communist Party's own publishing house), public administration, and journalism (headed by Paul Dobrescu, the last secretary of the communist cell of the Party's official newspaper). It is currently establishing two new departments, sociology and economics.

Meanwhile, after rejecting the survivors of the Party Academy, the University of Bucharest decided to foster its own program of training and research in political science. At first, between 1991 and 1994, the department assigned to this mission was cast in the same mold as a French *Institut d'Etudes Politiques.* This explains why political science was first taught in French and why its roots lay mostly in European studies, legal studies, and political philosophy, and less in quantitative research. As of 1995, the Department of Political Science was restructured with the aim of developing three directions of undergraduate study in the major of political science:

political science, international relations, and public policy. Ever since, the methodological groundwork of the curricula is commanded by a variety of theoretical and empirical orientations, which tend to be increasingly "Americanized". As a consequence and to make this diversity of approaches more transparent, the department's languages of instruction are English, French, and Romanian. The department currently enrolls almost one thousand undergraduate and graduate students, making it the largest institution to serve the discipline. Foreign students (from France, Sweden, the United States, Switzerland, Italy, Austria, Lebanon, Turkey, Tunisia, Iraq, Albania, Cameroon, Congo, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Guinea, and Moldova) sometimes comprise 10% of this population, which is definitely unusual for Romanian higher education institutions in the field of social sciences and which tends to confirm that the department has acquired a fair international reputation. Today, most of the regular faculty members have at least one degree from a Western European university and are either recruited from research institutes or selected from among young graduates. In fact, the first generation of Romanians to hold a regular BA degree in political science graduated from the University of Bucharest in 1995.

The next generation, of 1996, was trained in the second-largest Romanian university, the University Babeş-Bolyai of Cluj-Napoca, which started its own chair of political science within the Department of History in 1992 and restructured it in 1995 as an autonomous Department of Political Science and Public Administration. This was a critical juncture for the history of the teaching of political science in Cluj, since the department gradually distanced itself from the pre-1989 chair of scientific socialism, in which it was originally based, and extricated itself from being chaired by such survivors of national-communism as Vasile Puşcaş. Cluj was privileged to mature as part of a partnership network that included mostly political science departments from American universities. Today, led by Vasile Boari, the department develops three directions of studies: political science, public administration, and journalism. Instruction is in Romanian, except for a journalism section in Hungarian. The political science faculty members come mostly from the faculties of history, law, and philosophy. The department offers undergraduate programs and an MA degree in post-communism and globalization. Since 1999, a new correspondence course program has inflated the number of students with about 100 units per year. These particular undergraduate students, usually already holding a BA and engaged in a professional career, do not physically attend courses and are supposed to get only writing credits.

Finally, in 1996, the University of Iaşi created an MA curriculum in political science within the Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences; it was devoted mainly to political theory. Chaired by Anton Carpinschi, the program developed eventually also on the undergraduate level and is very active in promoting the advancement of the discipline in its Moldavian regional setting. Also, a small political science section was established in 1998 at the University of Oradea. The same year, a political science program started within the Department of Law and Public Administration at the Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, and a Department of Political Science and Communication was established at the West University of Timişoara. So far, these institutions have few faculty members and enroll a limited number of students.

Several other departments that do not offer majors or degrees in political science claim a particular interest in this discipline. Three such cases are worth mention. First and foremost, the Chair of Politology, which is still operating within the Polytechnic University of Bucharest as a legacy of the chair of scientific socialism, which was on duty before 1989 as in all other Romanian universities. Indeed, scientific socialism, political economy, and, since the early 1980s, a fictitious discipline called "fundamental problems of the history of the Fatherland and of the Party" were mandatory courses in all institutions of higher education. Today, beginning undergraduates in technical sciences are still offered introductory courses in politics taught by instructors with teaching experience in Marxism-Leninism. Second, the Department of European Studies at the University of Cluj-Napoca offers its students a significant number of courses in political science, sometimes overlapping the Political Science Department's mission and faculty. Third, the chair of moral and political philosophy of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Bucharest avows a stake in the study of politics, though it does not offer courses or seminars even remotely related to political science, except for a master's degree program in public policies organized with the informal assistance of the National School of Political Studies and Public Administration. Four other would-be political science departments created within private universities should be added to the list, although they do not have an appropriate faculty of their own: Banatul University of Timişoara since Fall 1997, the Christian University Dimitrie Catemir of Bucharest, the Petre Andrei University of Iaşi, and the Bogdan Vodă University of Baia Mare and Cluj-Napoca since Fall 1998. A closer look at the Department of Political Science at the Bogdan Vodă University makes it a neat case study that immediately and succinctly tells the tale of how private Romanian institutions of higher education are working: its current dean and leading instructors are the former dean and the most distinguished members of the homologous department at the Babeş-Bolyai University. The same dialectics of change versus continuity seem to dictate the institutional alignments of research.

Along with the National School of Political Studies and Public Administration, the Institute of Social Theory, attached to the Romanian Academy, is a leftover from the former Party Academy. Initially led by Radu Florian, a genuine and unreconstructed veteran of Marxism-Leninism, it was created in 1990 for the overt survivors of scientific socialism. Curiously enough, in only a decade, the Institute repeated the history of its institutional predecessor. In the early 1990s, the Institute represented the core of Romanian Neo-Marxism. After Florian's death, the research team renewed not only its composition but also its interests, shifting from the intellectual left to a more nationalist vision. The Institute was thus tagged after Constantin Rădulescu-Motru, a pre-communist social thinker of extreme nationalist convictions. In December 2001, it was again renamed the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations, and, ever since, the government has seemed willing to assume a direct share in its management.

Facing this blatant expression of continuity, the University of Bucharest established in 1995 its own Center of Political Research, which became in 1999 the Institute for Political Research, acting also as the graduate school of the Department of Political Science. Two-year MA programs are available in the fields of political science, international relations, and public policies, and doctoral degrees are available in political science. As a research facility, the Institute fosters the broadest range of academic inquiries and debates in political science understood as an autonomous discipline, equipped with specific methods and approaches.

Nor is that all. The Department of Political Science at the Babeş-Bolyai University created in 1997 its own Academic Center for Social Studies, which devotes considerable effort to empirical research, undertaken with a superior methodological thoroughness and published mostly by means of the electronic journal *East-Political Science Review*. Moreover, some of the activities of a couple of Institutes of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest come close to political science. The Institute of Sociology set up a research team to explore electoral campaigns and media response to political messages, while the Institute for the Study of Totalitarianism embarked upon an extensive study of such phenomena as the collectivization of agriculture and political repression under communism.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

The end of the Cold War and the extinction of communism, both as an ideology and as a practice of government, have not only made possible an unparalleled experiment in building a democratic order in Central and Eastern Europe, but have also opened up a most extraordinary intellectual opportunity: to understand and compare what had previously been neither understandable nor comparable. Political science was established in Romania amid the debris of scientific socialism in the realization that the problems and concerns of new and old democracies are beginning to converge. Ever since 1989, Romanian scholars in the field of social sciences, intellectual history, and political philosophy have been seeking to fulfill a long-frustrated desire by extending their teaching and research interest in political issues. The result is the emergence of a growing body of scholars permeated by a sense of critical engagement with European and American intellectual and political traditions that inspired the modern notions of democracy, pluralism, political liberty, individual freedom, and civil rights. For reasons to be explored hereafter, theirs is neither an unchallenged nor a mainstream endeavor.

In the wake of the downfall of the communist monopoly over the interpretation of politics, three tendencies were immediately manifest. They should be understood against a background of complete methodological starvation, since before 1989 not only were Romanian social sciences, including history and legal studies, completely opaque to any form of correlation to Western theoretical and conceptual debates, but social scientists usually simply refrained from asking whether or not there is a method of scientific inquiry to underpin the methodological routine of their research.

First, several researchers in history, philosophy, and law tried to piece together their academic experiences and join forces with junior scholars trained in political sciences or related fields at West European or North American universities in order to lay down a solid theoretical foundation for the emergence of political science. They could not depend on any indigenous tradition, since political science was not a discipline rooted in the pre-war Romanian academic heritage and had not even been smuggled as such into Romanian social sciences during the communist period. Their endeavor was soon to be fostered by the Department of Political Science and the Institute for Political Research at the University of Bucharest. Teaching and research are undertaken here in an eclectic theoretical framework that includes mainly historical approaches, neo-institutionalism, systems theory, and rational-choice theory. Those with this tendency are usually inclined to develop teaching methods and address topics that work out and ponder the respective merits of American formal analysis of politics, German critical theory, French political sociology, and Italian theoretical approaches. Their basic assumption is that such a balanced and manifold academic training, convergent with a plurality of political science research standards, will eventually yield an intellectual overspill effect when dispensed to several generations of graduate and undergraduate students. They withstand any form of *pensée unique* in political science that would mimic the late scientific socialism's ambition to be the one and only canonical and officially approved science of politics. In addition, by themselves, the researchers affiliated with the Department of Political Science at the University of Bucharest (Daniel Barbu, the late Alexandru Duțu, Alexandra Ionescu, Filon Morar, Dan Pavel, Cristian Preda, Sorin Gabriel Sebe, Stelian Tănase, Laurențiu Vlad, George Voicu) write more than 60% of Romania's books and articles on political science.

Associated with this tendency is the work of some sociologists who tried to develop a Romanian model for the study of social capital. Focused on transition, the contributions of Dumitru Sandu from the Department of Sociology of the University of Bucharest (Sandu, 1996, 1999) as well as the teamwork of a group of young scholars (Berevoiescu 1999) so far represent the paramount pieces of solid empirical research that involves political values and behavior.

In fact, it might be alleged that the closer a political science department stands to sociology, the more developed its quantitative research. This general remark is particularly true for the Department of Political Science and Public Administration of Cluj, which over time has demonstrated the steadiest commitment to the formal methods of political analysis, conducted by a well-structured research group run by Gabriel Bădescu (co-author in Rotariu, 1999). The University of Bucharest department harbors some highly theoretical formal research, due to its policy of recruiting both sociologists and mathematicians (Sebe, 2001).

The survivors of the Party Political Academy largely embody the second trend, harbored by the National School of Political Studies and Public Administration and the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations. Incidentally, the partition of the Party Academy into a research outfit and a teaching establishment is meaningful for the evolution of one communist network in a democratic environment. The less influential representatives of scientific socialism were assigned the "theoretical" mission of further promoting the nationalist ideology that underscored the last decade of totalitarianism. Meanwhile, the better-connected members of the network were given the more pragmatic task of taking over the market of political and civil service careers. They were soon joined by a number of junior scholars who are as wedded as their seniors to the heteronomy of politics, which they tend to understand exclusively in terms of public choice, government performance, and policies of development or the lack of them.

A substantiating example of this unwillingness to attribute a theoretical identity to politics is offered by the books written by the leading instructors of the School (Pasti, 1995; Pasti, Miroiu, and Codiță, 1997). Such books make practically no reference to the major findings and authors of political science, and they candidly ignore the rules and methods of scientific research and writing. It is no accident that they even fall behind the developmental ideology of the late 1960s and the early 1970s, driven as they are by a vernacular and somewhat unconscious Marxism, impurely connected to the clerical and sometimes resourceful Marxism of their predecessors. In this capacity, they represent what might be considered a drift that emulates a local tradition, as opposed to the radical tendency that does not acknowledge an overall Romanian intellectual legacy, but only appreciation of some individual achievements in the science of politics.

Continuity and strategic intent, however, do not ensure performance, at least for research. Nor do the tactics of denial. Very much like their fellow successors of the Communist Party in the governmental and political realms, the core members of this network are, both individually and as a group, subject to what may be called a "the-emperor-is-naked" syndrome. Indeed, for reasons of democratic appropriateness, they typically reject, resent, and try to deter any reference to their pre-1989 intellectual roots and institutional affiliations. One of the most elusive paradoxes of the Romanian political and academic arenas is that, by covering up their not so remote past, the former ideological craftsmen of state socialism are the first to imply that communism does not deserve examination. Because, if the emperor were handsome, who would be bothered that he came out naked from totalitarianism?

Finally, the third major orientation surrenders itself to a form of empirical poverty. It indulges in polls, polls commentaries, and predictions, rather than proper research. Answers are usually given in the absence of any theoretical questions, though empirical social inquiry is supposed to secrete normative judgments. Nevertheless, the most popular and handy instrument in the study of politics has become the opinion survey. Regardless of any utility it might have, such an instrument can provide only shallow accounts of politically relevant dispositions. All the same, the polltakers have become the pundits of Romanian politics and of its certified interpretation. They are looked up to by politicians and the media, and typically look down on academic political scientists, whom they consider inexperienced intellectuals cut off from reality.

There are several Romanian poll firms currently engaged in surveys, some of them conducting part of their investigations in the framework and under the supervision of the New Democracies Barometer coordinated by the Paul Lazarsfeld Society in Vienna. The most reliable of these firms seems to be the Romanian Institute for Public Opinion Survey (IRSOP), chaired by Petre Datculescu and dominant in the early 1990s (Datculescu, 1999). Today, it shares the market with the Center for Urban Sociology (CURS), run by Dorel Abraham; the Center for Political Studies and Comparative Analysis of Dorel Șandor (CPSCA); the Institute for Marketing and Surveys (IMAS), owned by Alin Teodorescu and Călin Anastasiu; and a newcomer, MetroMediaTransilvania. The last firm deserves a cautionary mention, because, after constantly and aggressively predicting the overwhelming victory of the Social Democratic Party in the 2000 elections, its chief executive officer, Vasile Dîncu, a member of the faculty of sociology of the University of Cluj, became that government's cabinet minister for Public Information. The accuracy of the polls is occasionally questioned, because word and some circumstantial proof of collusion with governmental or partisan sponsors has come out in the recent years.

This orientation is maintained not only by numerous commercial pollsters, but also by quite a large population of self- or media-appointed "political analysts". Indeed, those who dedicate themselves to micro-political analysis, i.e., to current affairs and political anecdote, are often considered and always consider themselves competent scholars of politics. Renowned "political analysts" are usually only those who dedicate themselves to interpreting opinion polls, who construe for the public the outcome of recent elections, who comment on the latest political events, who seem to elucidate the behind-the-scenes connections between political parties, politicians, and big business, who bring to light corruption cases, and who denounce the abuses of the authorities and the civil service. The reputation of being a "political analyst" is in most cases earned by the fiction writer, the journalist, the essayist, and more rarely the sociologist who leaks to the media some crumbs of theoretical or empirical knowledge, especially if he or she does so in a vivid manner.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

So it is easy to feel dismay about the overall quality of Romanian political analysis. For running through it is a dangerous confounding of politics as the government of people with economy as the administration of things. Indeed, there is clear evidence of the suborning – in a post-Marxist logic – of political science by the language of economics, which has largely driven out the language of politics itself and in particular the language of constitutionalism. The sources and purposes of politics are thus neglected in favor of listing more directly discernible trends of public opinion and political behavior. That is, in favor of the political regime itself, since partisan mobilization, party competition, and electoral participation are fully authorized modes of conduct, utilized by the State to enforce its legitimacy. So political science does not provide an appraisal of the post-communist body politic in terms of legitimacy, social divisions, and conflicts of meanings, but is complacent about what the system licenses its citizens to choose, believe, and even complain about or stand against.

As a result, many observers of electoral processes and the party system are inclined to acknowledge by omission that parties neither have to identify politically and ethically desirable avenues of social change nor have to organize consent through deconstructing the mythology of the State (Mihuț, 1994; Radu, Radu, and Porumb, 1995; Radu, 2000); parties are viewed as merely political equivalents of companies offering policy products and competing for voters' preferences within an approved framework (Popescu, 1997; Bulai, 1999; Mungiu-Pippidi, 2001). By the same token, methodological uniqueness is sometimes bestowed upon empirical social inquiry, which in most cases is inspired by a belated and trivial behaviorism. This emphasis on the outcomes of policies and political choices, rather than on the process that makes decision-making itself possible, leads to an understanding of political science as a consumer of current politics, rather than a critic of the body politic and its covenants. This brand of political science claims to follow what it considers to be the mainstream canon of public choice studies, discarding from the outset the troublesome fact that the public spheres and the choices they uphold and recognize may not be alike in North America, Western Europe, and Romania. Furthermore, it takes pride in being a-theoretical and value-free, because it has no plan to develop any concept of what post-communist society really is or should be. Politics is inspected very much as if, when dealing with a text, one merely had to identify the alphabet it is written in and provide a graphological evaluation, without any reference to its language and content.

Undeniably, it might be countered that there are, after all, Romanian students of elections and political parties concerned more with the nature of the political system than with its sheer operations. And indeed there are some who refuse an insidiously post-scientific-socialism drawback of critical thinking and who do believe that politics, rather than responding to contingent popular wants, should promote and enforce rights. Still, the first attempt to theorize the structure and functions of partisanship in a democratic society pays little heed to comparative evidence and largely disregards the enormous body of literature devoted to political parties (Voicu, 1997). However, more recent studies (Morar 2000, 2001a; Preda, 2001) shed fresh and powerful light on the origins, electoral mechanics, and political rationale of the post-communist Romanian party system.

Post-communism is at any rate and not unexpectedly one of the favorite topics of political prose. Nonetheless, transition to democracy understood in a counter-narrative manner as a political process through which society mirrors its own divisions and conflicts have hardly ever received an apposite treatment in political science as such (Barbu, 1999). Instead, the most-treated topic by far is political communication as a mobilization device in electoral campaigns and beyond (Mungiu, 1995; Drăgan, 1998; Beciu, 2000). So far, the revolution as a path to democracy has been conceived in an oversimplifying manner that fails to capture its full meaning for the social sciences (Stănciugelu, 1998). Hitherto, more detailed issues of transition and democratization have scarcely been identified, let alone addressed.

One reason for this looms larger than any other. When the study of post-communism is stripped of its "current affairs" features and analyses, it has no explored ground to rest on. As a tradition of thinking and as a historical experience, research on Romanian politics is at its very beginnings. Only two major topics seem to have been explored so far: on the one hand, the foundations of modern Romanian political culture (Duțu, 1998b; Barbu, 2001a); on the other hand, political and constitutional nationalism and the making of Romanian national identity. Nationalism, construed as a mainstream political culture opposed to the intricate boost of democratic values, is central to the public debate (Roth, 1999), since it seems to be more impervious to change than any form of political tenet (Barbu, 2001b). Hence, nationalism, in its various embodiments and manifestations, is critically and systematically dismantled from an entangled multicultural, pluralist, and human rights perspective (Pavel, 1995, Voicu, 2001). A genuine liberal and coherent theoretical inquiry into Romanian nationalism is also to be noted (Preda, 1998, 1999).

In fact, it is probably safe to say that the most substantive achievements of Romanian political science are to be found in the field of political theory. But even in this respect, not all pieces of research are created equal. The group of authors linked to the Institute of Social Theory may be prolific, but their books are too methodologically confused and ideologically incongruous to rely upon (e.g. Cioabă, 1995; Nica, 1998). By contrast, well-defended essays on the purposes and limits of political thinking (Carpinschi, 1995; Miroiu, 1998) or on the conceptual junctures of political science (Mihuț, 1996) warrant the thoughtful attention of academics, while a more general audience will profit from timely reviews of authoritative Western literature on broad topics such as conservatism or liberalism (Iliescu, 1994, 1998). Furthermore, a cogent and original interpretation of the conditions of liberty in political society, based on a close and critical reading of the liberal tradition, promises to prevail (Crăiuțu, 1998; Preda, 2000), since it converges with some valuable contributions to the theory of political representation (Morar, 2001b), to the interpretation of the social contract theories (Avramescu, 1998), and to the history of Romanian political thought (Ionescu, 2001).

It would be improper to rest the case without recognizing that a sizeable share of political research remains unaccounted for, dissolved as it is in consulting reports and policy papers. Regarding public choice, think tanks are perhaps the most obvious and rewarding experience in institutional design undertaken after 1989. The spearhead of them all is the Center for Political Studies and Comparative Analysis (CPSCA), established in 1992 by Dorel Șandor, a senior advisor to the first post-communist prime minister. The second to appear was the Romanian Academic Society (SAR), created by Alina Mungiu in 1996. Stelian Tănase, with his apparently stillborn Institute for Political and Economic Research, followed their example less effectively in 1998. What is particular about these NGOs is that, with the notable exception of the Open Society Institute, they receive their funding predominantly from public agencies: governmental commissions when the government is politically friendly, as well as PHARE, USAID, UNDP, World Bank programs, and the like.

Whether funded by universities, academic institutes, or think tanks, political science research relies by and large on public funding, Romanian or not. The principal sponsor is the Ministry of Education and Research, but apart from special allowances occasionally granted to privileged institutions like the National School of Political Studies and Public Administration[9], the subsidies cover only the faculty's emoluments. Thus, and to put together an appropriate teaching or research project, each department and center has had to identify and raise supplementary financing. For instance, the Department of Political Science at the University Babeş-Bolyai of Cluj-Napoca might have been less mature and westernized were it not for the lasting support of the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX). And the Department of Political Science at the University of Bucharest was and still is largely backed by the *Agence Universitaire Francophone* (AUF), while two major awards from the World Bank and the USAID currently fund its Institute for Political Research.

Three observations can be made about the impact of funding on the content of the projects sponsored and the choice of research themes. First, as of 1995, the Ministry of Education and Research duly observes academic autonomy and refrains from any involvement in the composition of academic programs and curricula. Second, university departments normally compete for international grants with a clear view to strengthen, develop, and diversify undertakings of their own choice and within an already confirmed area of competence. Classified as governmental organizations, their proposals are often discarded from the outset. As a result, their opportunities are limited, but their research can focus on matters at hand. Third, NGOs may be comparatively better off with respect to funding, but they surely are less coherent in their research orientations, for they depend on their subsidizers' agenda, which more often than not dictates the thematic bearings of the inquiry itself. As a consequence, a handful of researchers are compelled to shift from country risk assessments to shadow economy surveys, from European integration topics to civil society issues, or from the reform of the electoral system to security and stability in the Balkans. Typically, the research goes wherever the money tells it to go.

5. Public space and academic debates

Clearly, these unprecedented developments amount to the emergence of a scale of organization of political science far removed from the nation-building and state control obsessions that underpinned both pre-communist social thinking and scientific socialism. For the new framework of teaching and research rapidly increased the public visibility of political science. Of course, if there is a morality of science, this newly acquired reputation should not be measured according to the self-assessment of many a political commentator, but ought to be consistent with the quality and meaning of those publications that meet the standards of a genuine and internationally recognizable science of politics.

Editorial policies aimed at the dissemination of political science in academia and the general public fall into five categories: the recovery of a Romanian tradition of social and political thinking; the translation of classic works of political philosophy and theory; the editing of handbooks; the promotion of Romanian authors; and the publishing of specialized journals. The most active such publishing houses are Nemira, Humanitas, and All (in Bucharest) and Polirom and Institutul European (in Iaşi). All these private companies issue series devoted to political science, the most profuse being Nemira's *Societatea politică* (The Political Society) – with forty books published over the last four years – edited by Cristian Preda.

A serious effort was made to recall several pre-communist Romanian authors from oblivion or denial. Both social-liberal theoreticians (Constantin Stere, Virgil Madgearu, Ştefan Zeletin) and reactionary thinkers (Constantin Rădulescu-Motru, Mihail Manoilescu) found a renewed place in the public sphere, and their writings are increasingly regarded as landmarks of a still scarcely explored history of Romanian political ideas.

Some classics of political philosophy, including Locke's *Two Treatises of Government* and Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, were translated into Romanian for the first time. Moreover, a whole company of political thinkers appeal to the Romanian public in its own language: Karl Popper, Norberto Bobbio, Leo Strauss, Isaiah Berlin, Hannah Arendt, Albert O. Hirschman, Friedrich von Hayek, Giovanni Sartori, Ralf Dahrendorf, Robert Dahl, and Jürgen Habermas.

Somewhat less thriving was the handbook endeavor. Standing alongside a thoughtful and seriously assembled manual of formal methods in the social sciences (Rotariu, 1999) and a useful but unfinished treatise on political science (Carpinschi, Bocancea, 1998), which may serve not only as a good introduction for the beginning student, but also as a review for those reasonably familiar with the field, are a couple of decent histories of political ideas (Duțu, 1998a; Goian, 2001). Finally, a rather uneven textbook of political doctrines, purportedly confronting the "universal" concepts with their Romanian incarnations (Mungiu-Pippidi, 1998), could have been a vastly different and better achievement if the editor had done a better job on the scope, direction, and selection of contributors[10].

The two dictionaries of "essential" political writings that were recently published fell equally slightly short of their purpose, despite the quality of several particular entries and the knowledgeability of many contributors. Although the objective and framework of such undertakings make sense intuitively, the different pieces in these works are not cogently tied together, and both volumes are padded with material that any informed reader will find irrelevant. The result is a lack of theoretical outlook and political insight in the final product, due to the poor editorial work done either by an inexpert graduate student (Ştefan-Scalat, 2000) or even by some members of the Romanian Academy (Surdu, Vlăduțescu, and Boboc, 2001).

Even if the publishing houses welcome almost any original productions by the Romanian authors who claim to write within the borders, porous as they may be, of political science, this liberality poses risks. The various university presses are underfinanced and have no national distribution, so most of the burden rests on market-oriented editors. Driven by commercial interests, they usually discourage the submission of lengthy manuscripts loaded with scholarly notes, references, and indices. They typically prefer to promote authors already present in the public mind for having been visible in politics, the media, or, as is often the case, in both. Thus, the public at large takes for reliable political scientists prolific freelancers like Silviu Brucan, a journalist of the militant years of totalitarianism and a last-minute dissident who ventured to solve in 136 pages all the questions of social change in Russia and Eastern Europe (Brucan, 1998), even though such best-selling authors have nothing to do with the rules basic to any kind of scientific research.

Certainly, in any culture there is a venue and perhaps a valid mission for commentators of current affairs and for political essayists – provided that there is also a position and an audience for political scientists and their scholarly production, which rarely seeks huge popularity. Yet, Romanian public debate echoes mainly books written by political insiders, research itself being regarded as an unredeemable enterprise undertaken by outsider intellectuals whose understanding of the political arena and stakes is purely abstract. Thus, many political scientists are willing to indulge the public's expectations and hide their scholarly work behind a more politically committed style (Pavel, 1998). Some even lose interest in any form of theoretical perspective or empirical investigation (Tănase, 1996). A dominant idiom of current affairs, which saps any ambition of political thinking, has thus become the habitual dialect not only of politicians and journalists, but also of many a political scientist. Consequently, political journalism stands out as a clear and present danger to Romanian would-be political science, because it does what a science would never do: it discloses, adjudicates, instructs, indulges in casual predictions, has no intellectual doubts whatsoever, ignores methodological deadlocks, and conveniently fits received wisdom. Political prose and political science have become hopelessly embroiled and confused.

This account would not be complete without mention of the few books written directly in international languages (French and English) by a small number of Romanian political scientists.

The topics addressed by these authors range from the sources of Romanian political culture (Duțu, 1998b; Barbu, 1998; Vlad, 1999) to political theory (Preda, 2000; Ionescu, 2001) and, of course, to democratic transition and consolidation (Bocancea, 1998; Morar, 2000). Three translations, unfortunately issued by marginal publishers, should also be noted (Pasti, 1995; Mungiu, 1995; Ornea, 1999), since they may be instrumental in promoting topics related to Romanian politics in the international arena.

Yet, since March 2001, Romanian research in political science is epitomized by the journal *Studia Politica. Romanian Political Science Review*, which is published quarterly – in English, French, German, Italian, and Romanian – by the Institute for Political Research at the University of Bucharest and printed by Meridiane Publishing House. Daniel Barbu, Cristian Preda and Alexandra Ionescu edit the journal under the auspices of an advisory board that includes Norberto Bobbio, Hans-Dieter Klingemann, Pierre Manent, Gianfranco Pasquino, Giovanni Sartori, Charles Taylor, and many other prominent political scientists. Believing that ideas do matter, the editors share a common commitment as intellectuals and scholars to try to shed light on the major political problems facing Romania and to revisit, after the demise of the totalitarian experience, the very foundations of democratic ideals and procedures. They think of the journal as a challenge and a mandate to be involved in fundamental important contemporary issues not only of the democratization of Romania's polity and politics, but also of the "great transformation" that is taking place in Central and Eastern Europe. The main topics targeted so far are the theory of democracy, the history of Romanian political thought, radical politics, and the cultures of nationalism and citizenship. The journal submits all articles to a refereeing process and has an extensive section of book reviews, both novelties in the Romanian political science setting.

The Department of Political Science at the University Babeş-Bolyai of Cluj-Napoca has published annually since 1996 *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai. Politica*, which includes mainly papers presented to seminars and conferences. The outlet of the Institute of Social Theory of the Romanian Academy is *Revista de Teorie Socială* (The Journal of Social Theory), which, suitably enough, is never quoted except by its own editors and authors, who write so far outside the rules of social research that is obvious they never possessed a reliable social science to think within. Yet, there are other journals issued by various Institutes of the Romanian Academy that are worthy of use by political scientists. The most helpful in this respect are *Revista Româna de Sociologie* (The Romanian Journal of Sociology) and *Arhivele Totalitarismului* (The Archives of Totalitarianism). Two other academic journals should not pass unnoticed, since they provide valuable tools for political scientists: *Revista de Cercetări Sociale* (The Journal of Social Research) and *Sociologie Românească* (Romanian Sociology).

Several other journals and magazines address issues in political science, but since they are edited by private organizations, their academic legitimacy is precarious; they do not print peer-reviewed articles and are often behind schedule. Among them, special mention is due *Sfera Politicii* (The Sphere of Politics), a political magazine edited by Stelian Tănase since 1992. The outlet does not fulfill most academic standards, but for many years, before plunging into current journalism, it was the only publication at hand for many political scientists. Noteworthy are also: *Polis. Revistă de ştiințe politice* (Polis. Journal of Political Sciences), published by a poll firm (IMAS) since 1994 and devoted more and more to translating articles by prominent international scholars into Romanian; *Revista Româna de Ştiințe Politice* (Romanian Journal of Political Science), published by a think tank (SAR), printing merely institutional reports and apparently vanishing after the first issues; and *The Romanian Journal of Politics and Society*, recently edited in English by the Civic Education Project with the intent of promoting papers written by junior researchers. Some of these journals – linked to institutions entirely dependent upon their initiators' public relations skills – are likely to succumb not only to a shortage of funding, but also to the fallacy of usefulness.

Though pregnant with the possibility of fair competition and confrontation among theoretical orientations, methods, and approaches, such an unmatched expansion of publications and research tools has not generated a reapportionment of public interest in political works according to the radical shifts in the scholarly population that occurred after 1989. Why has this not happened? The cause may be similar to the reason why communist-successor politicians are still in command of the governmental sphere. Because a new social contract has not been agreed upon after the breakdown of state socialism, mainstream political science remains to a large extent captive to the politics it is its mission to consider, i.e., to the outwardly reconstructed political order that defines the public sphere at large.

6. Views on further development

It is therefore no coincidence that the domestic asymmetry between the institutions of change and those of continuity is overturned in the international setting. Suffice it to say that the European Commission's General Directorate for Education assigned to the Department of Political Science at the University of Bucharest the task of coordinating the consolidation of political science as a new discipline of study in Romanian universities. Between 1995 and 1998, a Joint European Tempus Project with funds exceeding 500,000 € allowed the Universities of Bucharest, Cluj-Napoca, and Iaşi to play an internationally recognized leading role in the framing of academic political science in Romania. Each of these institutions then became able to take full advantage of the opportunities offered by the Socrates-Erasmus program for faculty and student exchanges as well as for research partnerships. Altogether, they signed almost one hundred institutional contracts with Western European universities.

Nevertheless, it looks as if they are more eager to manage their respective international contacts than to create for their own use a steadily functioning Romanian research network. Characteristically, they relate to each other primarily when involved in the same European program. For a few years in the late 1990s, the University of Cluj organized each fall a national conference on political science, but attendance never actually comprehensively covered all institutions and orientations. Nor was the European credit transfer system adopted by all of them as of 1998, a real incentive to agree upon common curricular standards, or any program to exchange students among themselves.

A decisive question about students is pending: since 1995, the several Romanian departments of political science together fed into the job market almost one thousand graduates of political science. What has become of them? A tentative survey conducted by a team from the University of Bucharest found that 20% of the graduates were offered academic positions in the higher education and research institutions or are enrolled in graduate programs in Romania or abroad. Most of those who continue their studies abroad, particularly in American universities, will not come back if they find a career opportunity in the host country. 40% work as experts or civil servants in central public institutions (mainly the Presidency, the Parliament, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defense, the Ministry of Justice, the Governmental Department of Public Information, the National Bank of Romania, etc.) or, albeit to a lesser extent, in local government (city halls, local councils, and the like). 35% work in the private sector (chiefly the mass media, but also the capital market or financial and legal audit offices). Last, 5% work as consultants within various political parties. So far, the market has been able to absorb and recognize the utility of young political scientists. Because their number will increase dramatically over the next years, the high enrollment rate in political science departments will be cause for some concern.

This escalation of the student population is not innocent, but has a number of calculating motives. First, since 1999, the Ministry of Education and Research finances the departments according to the number of students they currently enroll. "The more, the wealthier" could therefore be the new motto of Romanian higher education. Second, there are on average and in any given case five times more candidates than places available in the political science departments, generous as they may be in their recruiting policies. For a political science education is generally considered a good route to an important appointed or elected position in public service.

Romanian politics itself is more about who governs and how than why and to what end. It follows naturally that political science is commonly understood as a study of rule, apprehended as dominion rather than as norm. Notably enough, the first attempt to describe the landscape of post-communist Romanian political science (Stan, 1999) paid, maybe deservedly, more attention to power brokerage and the distribution of resources within academic and para-academic circles than to the quality and capability of research. This is because institutionalized Romanian political science is more about control, ranking, and public recognition than about scientific findings able to advance our understanding of Romania's politics and polity. For that matter, Romanian political scientists of any intellectual persuasion tend to be more involved in the politics of their discipline than in disciplining the political and scientific legacy they are supposed to think about and upgrade.

To cut a long story short, there seem to be two main reasons why Romanian political science is so slow in coming of age.

On the one hand, the institutions of continuity had and still have privileged access to public resources (funding, locals, equipment, political support). They perpetuate an approach to politics and the political largely indebted to nationalism and vulgar Marxism, and they are job-market oriented. Thus, the three universities, Bucharest, Babeş-Bolyai of Cluj, and Iaşi, which bear the burden of change, are frequently confronted with survival problems and very scarce funding for quantitative research. In fact, the political environment hardly accepts the very idea of research in political science. Beyond institutional continuity, the main heritage of the communist era may lie in the way politics is conceived: not as a legitimate object of empirical investigation and theoretical exploration, but as a series of heterogeneous events to be construed from an economic perspective. I have already emphasized how great a toll the language and reasoning of economics has taken on political argument. And this is not a mere academic worry. Indeed, in post-communist politics, the new "capitalist" superstructure (to reverse Marx's terminology) is credited at face value, while few are ready to invest in a rights-entrenched political infrastructure able to support the unprecedented dynamics of social change.

On the other hand, the pre-communist condition of political science seems to be reactivated: its legitimacy is challenged both by sociology (which claims a monopoly on empirical research on society) and by public law (whose ambition is to be the only true science of the State). Nor is that all. As in the 1920s and the 1930s, the discourse on politics runs the risk of being hijacked by freelance political journalism, which is haunted by the ambition to set the rules and the language of political analysis. Perhaps the greatest hazard for Romanian political science is to draw on and reinforce the dominant discourse of society and polity, instead of providing a critical theory of politics. Because, as Max Weber famously argued[11], a social science should rather recognize inconvenient facts, meaning those that controvert comfortably established certainties, including its own.

On balance, the Romanian science of politics suffers from a number of defects, which undermine its scientific credentials and academic integrity: the failure to eliminate inadequate theory, terminological confusion, an excess of descriptivism and current-affairism, and the temptation to resort to ideological intimidation. These pathologies are not only germane to the maladies that afflicted the larger body of social sciences twenty years ago[12], they also mimic the very diseases of post-communist politics. For Romanian political science turns out to be consistent with the professed capitalist and democratic polity it has the mission to encompass and probe: it still remains an oxymoron.

1 Theodore J. Lowi, "The State in Political Science: How We Become What We Study", in: *American Political Science Review*, 86, no. 1, 1992, 1-7.

2 E.g. Pierre Favre, "Histoire de la science politique", in: Madeleine Grawitz and Jean Leca, editors, *Traité de science politique*, I, Paris: PUF, 1985, p. 4.

3 This form has obvious interdisciplinary and eclectic connotations and could be explained in two ways: either as an abbreviation of the "political and social sciences" of the pre-1989 period, or as an acknowledgement that the label of the study of politics covers a broad association of disciplines, international relations being the most valued. Nevertheless, international relations are explicitly not taken into account in this survey, since in Romania they tend to form a self-sufficient and separate sub-discipline in terms of research teams, methods, and objectives.

4 Giovanni Sartori, "From the Sociology of Politics to Political Sociology", in: Seymour M. Lipset, editor, *Politics and Social Sciences*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1969: 65-100.

5 Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1962: 10-13.

6 I borrow these notions and their meaning from Giovanni Sartori, "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics", in: *American Political Science Review*, LXIV, no. 4, 1970: 1033-1053.

7 In approximating the two paradigms, I have followed the systematization of Andrew C. Janos, *Politics and Paradigms. Changing Theories of Change in Social Sciences*, Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1986.

8 To this day, the Romanian Association of Political Science is among the "living dead", i.e., it nominally exists, but has no activity. In 1999, a group of junior faculty and students from the Department of Political Science at the University of Bucharest Romanian Society of Political Science.

9 A classic example is the singular augmentation of the National School's patrimony by the Social Democracy Party government through an executive order issued in November 1996, after the party had lost the elections and was waiting for a new cabinet to take over.

10 Since the discipline has an optional place in the national high school curriculum, the same editor coordinated a political science manual for high schools published in 2000 by Polirom of Iaşi.

11 Max Weber, "Science as a Vocation", in: H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills, editors and translators, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1958: 147.

12 Hubert Blalock, *Basic Dilemmas in the Social Sciences*, Beverly Hill, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1984.

References

Avramescu, Cătălin (1998): *De la teologia puterii absolute la fizica socială. Finitudine şi dezordine în teoria contractului social de la Hobbes la Rousseau* (From Absolute Power Theology to Social Physics; Finitude and Disorder in the Theory of Social Contract from Hobbes to Rousseau), Bucharest, All;

Barbu, Daniel (1998): *Byzance, Rome et les Roumains. Essai sur la production politique de la foi au Moyen Age*, Bucharest, Babel;

Barbu, Daniel (1999): *Republica absentă. Politică şi societate în România postcomunistă* (The Stillborn Republic. Politics and Society in Post-Communist Romania), Bucharest, Nemira;

Barbu, Daniel (2001a): *Bizanţ contra Bizanţ. Explorări în cultura politică românească* (Byzantium Against Byzantium. An Inquiry into Romanian Political Culture), Bucharest, Nemira;

Barbu, Daniel (2001b): "From Hard Communism to Soft Populism. Remarks on the Romanian Cultures of Nationhood", in: *Studia Politica. Romanian Political Science Review*, I, No. 3, 2001, 713-731;

Beciu, Cornelia (2000): *Politica discursivă. Practici politice in campania electorală* (Discursive Politics. Political Practices in an Electoral Campaign), Iaşi, Polirom;

Berevoiescu, Ionela et al. (1999): *Feţele schimbării. Românii şi provocările* tranziţiei (The Faces of Change. The Romanians and the Challenges of Transition), Bucharest, Nemira;

Bocancea, Cristian (1998): *La Roumanie du communisme au postcommunisme*, Paris, L'Harmattan;

Brucan, Silviu (1998): *Social Change in Russia and Eastern Europe*, Westport, Conn., Praeger Publishers;

Bulai, Alfred (1999): *Mecanismele electorale ale societăţii româneşti* (The Electoral Mechanisms of Romanian Society), Bucharest, Paideia;

Campeanu, Pavel (1986): *The Origins of Stalinism. From Leninist Revolution to Stalinist Society*, Armonk, NewYork, M. E. Sharpe;

Carpinschi, Anton (1995): *Deschidere şi sens în gândirea politică* (Openness and Meaning in Political Thinking), Iaşi, Institutul European;

Carpinschi, Anton and Bocancea, Cristian (1998): *Ştiinţa politicului. Tratat* (The Science of Politics. A Handbook), Vol. I, Iaşi, Editura Universitaţii A.I. Cuza;

Ceterchi, Ion, Trăznea, Ovidiu and Vlad, Corneliu (1979): *The Political System of the Socialist Republic of Romania*, Bucharest, Editura Stiinţifică şi Enciclopedică;

Cioabă, Aristide (1995): *Democraţia. Putere şi contraputere* (Democracy. Power and Counter-Power), Bucharest, Noua Alternativă;

Crăiuţu, Aurelian (1998): *Elogiul libertăţii. Studii de filosofie politică* (In Praise of Liberty. Studies in Political Philosophy), Iaşi, Polirom;

Datculescu, Petre (1999): "Parties and Issues after 1989" and "Patterns of Voter Alignments in Present-Day Romania", in: *Cleavages, Parties and Voters. Studies from Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Romania*, Lawson, Kay, Römmele, Andrea and Karasimeonov, Georgi (eds.), Westport, CT, and London, Praeger, 169-184, 261-273;

Dogan, Mattei (1946): *Analiza statistică a 'democraţiei parlamentare' din România* (A Statistical Analysis of Romanian "Parliamentary Democracy"), Bucharest, The Social-Democratic Party Press;

Dogan, Mattei, with Pellasy, Dominique (1982): *Sociologie politique comparative*, Paris, Economica;

Dogan, Mattei, with Pellasy, Dominique (1990): *How to Compare Nations. Strategies in Comparative Politics,* Chatam, New York, Chatam House;

Drăgan, Ion et al. (1998): *Construcţia simbolica a câmpului electoral* (The Symbolic Construction of Electoral Space), Iaşi, Institutul European;

Duţu, Alexandru, (1998a): *Histoire de la pensée et des mentalités politiques européennes*, Bucharest, University of Bucharest Press;

Duţu, Alexandru, (1998b): *Models and National Identities in 'Orthodox' Europe*, Bucharest, Babel;

Georgescu, Vlad (1972): *Political Ideas and the Enlightenment in the Romanian Principalities*, New York, Columbia University Press;

Georgescu, Vlad (1987): *Istoria ideilor politice romaneşti 1369-1878* (The History of Romanian Political Ideas 1369-1878), Munich, Ion Dumitru Verlag;

Goian, Ion (2001): *De la polis la ontologia politică* (From the Polis to Political Ontology), Bucharest, Editura Institutului de Teorie Socială;

Iliescu, Adrian Paul (1994): *Conservatorismul anglo-saxon* (Anglo-Saxon Conservatism), Bucharest, All;

Iliescu, Adrian Paul (1998): *Liberalismul – între success şi iluzii* (Liberalism – between Success and Illusions), Bucharest, All;

Ionescu, Alexandra (2001): *Le bien commun et ses doubles. Deux rencontres roumaines entre ethique et politique*, Bucharest, University of Bucharest Press;

Ionescu, Ghita (1964): *Communism in Romania, 1944-1962*, London, Oxford University Press;

Ionescu, Ghita (1967): *The Politics of European Communist States*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicholson;

Ivan, Marcel (1933): *Evoluţia partidelor noastre politice 1919-1932* (The Evolution of our Political Parties 1919-1932), Sibiu, Drotleff;

Manoilescu, Mihail (1941): *Die einzige Partei als politische Institution der neuen Regime* (The Sole Party as a Political Institution of the New Regime), Berlin, Stollberg;

Mihuţ, Liliana (1994): "The Emergence of Political Pluralism in Romania", in: *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 27, 1994, 411-422;

Mihuţ, Liliana (1996): *Dilemele ştiinţei politice: incursiune în studiul conceptelor* (The Dilemmas of Political Science: an Inquiry into its Concepts), Bucharest, Editura Enciclopedică;

Miroiu, Adrian (1998): *Filosofia fără haine de gala. Eseuri de filosofie politică* (Philosophy without Attire. Essays in Political Philosophy), Bucharest, All;

Morar, Filon (2000): *La production électorale du système roumain des partis*, Bucharest, University of Bucharest Press;

Morar, Filon (2001a): *Democraţia privilegiilor: Alegerile aleşilor in Romania* (The Democracy of Privileges: Elections in Romania), Bucharest, Paideea;

Morar, Filon (2001b): *Reprezentarea politică: Actori şi autori* (Political Representation: Actors and Authors), Bucharest, Paideea;

Mungiu, Alina (1995): *Românii dupa 1989. Istoria unei neînţelegeri* (The Romanians after 1989. The History of a Misunderstanding), Bucharest, Humanitas, German translation: *Die Rumänen nach '89*, Munich, Friederich-Ebert-Stiftung, Intergraph Verlag;

Mungiu-Pippidi, Alina (ed.) (1998): *Doctrine politice. Concepte universale şi realităţi româneşti* (Political Doctrines. Universal Concepts and Romanian Realities), Iaşi, Polirom;

Mungiu-Pippidi, Alina (2001): "The Return of Populism – The 2000 Romanian Elections", in: *Government and Opposition,* 36, 2001, 230-252;
Negulescu, Petre P. (1926): *Partidele politice* (The Political Parties), Bucharest, Institutul Social Român;
Nica, Constantin (1998): *Neoloberalismul şi social-democraţia la sfârşitul secolului al XX*-lea (Neo-liberalism and Social-democracy at the End of the 20th Century), Bucharest, Editura Institutului de Teorie Socială;
Ornea, Zigu (1969): *Ţăranismul. Studiu sociologic* (Agrarianism. A Sociological Study), Bucharest, Editura Politică;
Ornea, Zigu (1999): *The Romanian Extreme Right: The 1930s*, English translation by Eugenia Maria Popescu, Boulder, Colo., East European Monographs;
Pasti, Vladimir (1995): *România în tranziţie. Căderea în viitor*, Bucharest, Nemira; English translation (1997): *The Challenges of Transition: Romania in Transition* by Fraga Cheva Cusin, Boulder, Colo., East European Monographs;
Pasti, Vladimir, Miroiu, Mihaela and Codiţă, Cornel (1997): *Romania – starea de fapt* (Romania – the Fact of the Matter), Bucharest, Nemira;
Pavel, Dan (1995): *Etica lui Adam* (Adam's Ethics), Bucharest, Du Style;
Pavel, Dan (1998): *Leviatanul Bizantin. Analize, atitudini şi studii politice* (The Byzantine Leviathan. Analyses, Attitudes, and Political Studies), Iaşi, Polirom;
Popescu, Liliana (1997): "A Change of Power in Romania: the Results and Significance of the November 1996 Elections", in: *Government and Opposition,* 32, 1997, 172-186;
Preda, Cristian (1998): *Modernitatea politică şi românismul* (Political Modernity and "Romanianism"), Bucharest, Nemira;
Preda, Cristian (1999): *Occidentul nostru* (Our Occident), Bucharest, Nemira;
Preda, Cristian (2000): *Le libéralisme du désespoir. Tradition libérale et critique du totalitarisme dans les années 1938-1960,* Bucharest, University of Bucharest Press;
Preda, Cristian (2001): "Sistemul politic românesc dupa patru scrutinuri" (The Romanian Political System after Four Elections), in: *Studia Politica. Romanian Political Science Review*, I, No. 1, 2001, 217-246;
Radu, Alexandru (2000): *Nevoia schimbării: Un deceniu de pluripartidism in România* (The Necessity of Change: A Decennium of Multi-Partiysm in Romania), Bucharest, Ion Cristoiu;
Radu, Alexandru, Radu, Gheorghe and Porumb, Ioana (1995): *Sistemul politic românesc – un sistem entropic?* (The Romanian Political System: An Entropic System?), Bucharest, Editura Tehnică;
Rotariu, Traian et al. (1999): *Metode statistice aplicate în ştiinţele sociale* (Statistical Methods in the Social Sciences), Iaşi, Polirom;
Roth, Andrei (1999): *Naţionalism sau democratism?* (Nationalism or Democratization?), Târgu Mureş, Pro Europa;
Sandu, Dumitru (1996): *Sociologia tranziţiei. Valori şi tipuri sociale in România* (The Sociology of Transition. Social Values and Types in Romania), Bucharest, Staff;
Sandu, Dumitru (1999): *Spaţiul social al tranziţiei* (The Social Space of Transition), Iaşi, Polirom;
Sebe, Sorin Gabriel (2001): "Une extension théorique de l'echelle de Taagepera", in: *Studia Politica. Romanian Political Science Review,* I, No. 1, 2001, 195-204;
Stahl, Henri H. (1979): *Traditional Romanian Village Communities: The Transition from the Communal to the Capitalist Mode of Production in the Danube Region*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press;
Stan, Lavinia (1999): "Romanian Political Science since 1989", in: *European Journal of Political Research,* 35, 1999, 507-532;
Stănciugelu, Ştefan (1998): *Violenţă, mit şi revoluţie. De la violenţa rituală la violenţa simbolică şi donjuanismul politic al democraţilor* (Violence, Myth, and Revolution. From Ritual Violence to Symbolic Violence and the Political Don Juanism of the Democrats), Bucharest, All;
Ştefan-Scalat, Laurenţiu (ed.) (2000): *Dicţionar de scrieri politice fundamentale* (A Dictionary of Essential Political Writings), Bucharest, Humanitas;
Surdu, Alexandru, Vlăduţescu, Gheorghe and Boboc, Alexandru (eds.) (2001): *Enciclopedia operelor fundamentale ale filosofiei politice moderne* (The Encyclopedia of Essential Works in Modern Political Philosophy), Bucharest, Editura Institutului de Teorie Socială;
Tănase, Stelian (1996): *Revoluţia ca eşec: Elite şi societate* (The Revolution that Failed: Elites and Society), Iaşi, Polirom;
Tismaneanu, Vladimir (1976): *Noua stânga şi Şcoala de la Frankfurt* (The New Left and the Frankfurt School), Bucharest, Editura Politică;

Tismaneanu, Vladimir (1991): *Reinventing Politics. Eastern Europe from Stalin to Havel*, New York, Free Press;
Tismaneanu, Vladimir (1998): *Fantasies of Salvation. Democracy, Nationalism and Myth in Post-Communist Europe*, Princeton, New York, Princeton University Press;
Vlad, Laurențiu (ed.) (1999): *Pouvoirs et mentalités. Textes réunis à la mémoire du Professeur Alexandru Duțu*, Bucharest, Babel;
Voicu, George (1997): *Pluripartidismul. O teorie a democrației* (Multi-Partyism. A Theory of Democracy), Bucharest, All;
Voicu, George (2001): "Radical Temptations and Cultural Idols. Reflections on a Polemic", in: *Studia Politica. Romanian Political Science Review,* I, No. 1, 2001, 249-260.

Darina Malová and Silvia Miháliková

Political Science – Slovakia

Discussant: Andrej Školkay

Introduction

The emergence of political science as an academic discipline in Slovakia has been long and difficult. For reasons of historic timing and institutional context, the process has been slower than in other Central and Eastern European countries. The development of this discipline after 1989 has been influenced by institutional and cultural legacies inherited from the past.

Since the collapse of the communist regime in the former Czechoslovakia, several simultaneous changes took place in Slovakia with respect to the establishment of political science. The very fundamental but preliminary findings presented in this report indicate that there are several general trends in the development of this social science discipline. First, we argue that the almost complete lack of political science traditions meant this discipline had to be built from scratch and that this has crucially shaped its present "state of the art'. Second, institutional development (the foundation of the political science association, university departments, and research institutes) is a precondition for the establishment of political science per se. Third, political science in Slovakia has depended and still partly depends on the potential (human and institutional) of other social science disciplines, such as sociology, history, psychology, philosophy, and law. In other words, the process of redefining boundaries between social sciences disciplines continues, and there are occasional discussions about the qualification and status of the political scientist in general and with respect to academia, politics, and the mass media. Fourth, political science research focuses almost exclusively on the study of Slovakia, including modern political history, the development of political institutions, the analysis of policy-making, foreign policy, and political culture and behavior. There is very little comparative political science research; a comparative approach is used more in teaching than in research. Finally, there is a journal of political science, but contributions are not reviewed and there is a general lack of academic debates. So it is difficult to talk about developed paradigms and methodological schools in Slovakia. Instead, political scientists in Slovakia are accustomed to presenting their interpretation of basic concepts, such as civil society, human rights, constitutionalism, or democracy, in newspapers and popular weeklies dealing with politics, culture, and economics. We try to explain all these general characteristics of political science in the country mostly on the basis of historical legacies and the continuing lack of qualified academic staff and institutions.

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

The evolution and development of political science in Slovakia should be understood on two analytically separate but closely connected levels: the first conforms to the general trend observable in European and Western nations since the late 19th century and involves the gradual emancipation of systemic social and political inquiry from the tutelage of the legal sciences and its gradual transformation into discrete social science disciplines – political science being one of the last to claim its independence. The second level relates to the Slovak historical experience and to the ways in which delayed social and political development combined with the dynamics of nation- and state-building in this country to determine the particular trajectories the social sciences and especially political science traveled on their way to eventual emancipation.

Politics first became an object of intellectual interest thanks to the individual efforts of a few authors who distinguished the idea of political activity from the full range of social actions. We can find ideas and activities related to political science in works by Štefan Osuský, Ján Papánek, and Milan Hodža, who were leading politicians and diplomats. The latter advocated in his writings the necessity to establish a School for Politics and Social Sciences; this was realized shortly after 1945 in Prague. Their special interest in the subject led these authors to separate politics from the fields in which it had traditionally been included: moral philosophy, history, or law. At the same time, the emergence of politics as a field of knowledge was opposed to, or at least differentiated from, the skill necessary to engage in politics, which continued to be considered an "art", a subject of discussion, or a matter of opinion impervious to scientific treatment.

During the period of "building communism", which lasted 41 years, neither politicians nor social scientists favored the theoretical approach to politics. Political science did not actually exist. Instead there was scientific communism, which dealt with particular events of politics, interpreting them within the framework of Marxism-Leninism. However, the pre-communist era in the first Czechoslovak Republic was remarkable for its various scientific institutions, including the Czechoslovak Institute of Public Opinion, which was founded early in 1946 in Prague and quickly achieved high professional standards. Gordon Wightman, for example, highly esteemed the work of this institute.[1] Surveys from that time are available that include preferences for historical political personalities who played important roles in the history of the Czech and Slovak nations.

Western social scientists' intensified interest in political issues in the 1950s and 1960s was not echoed among scientists in Eastern Europe. The theoretical and empirical research (explanatory framework) of politics that stressed cross-national comparisons did not fit the requirements of Marx-Leninist ideology. The political and social atmosphere was more open and tolerant during the late 1960s, when the study of the humanities was strongly influenced by Western approaches in social sciences, for example new methods in quantitative analyses, behaviorism, and New Left ideology. The short period of "socialism with a human face" allowed the creation of research institutes dealing with components and attributes of Western concepts of politics. For example, at the Institute of Public Opinion (Inštitút pre výskum verejnej mienky) in Slovakia, there were attempts to undertake marketing analyses and political prognoses. During these years, several research programs were carried out that could be considered as falling within the theoretical and empirical framework of politics. Nevertheless, researchers did not use the label "political science" except briefly from 1968-69.

Political science in Slovakia is not one of the older-established university disciplines. The nonexistence of political science as a university subject is clear if we consider that the first attempt to introduce this discipline began in the late 1960s at Comenius University (Univerzita J.A. Komenského) in Bratislava. The first group of students who started to study political science in 1966 graduated with diplomas as scientific communists following the Soviet intervention in August 1968. Teachers there were mostly historians, philosophers, and lawyers who had studied before the communist regime at home or at Western universities, former teachers of historical and dialectical materialism, and enthusiasts coming from other departments. The so-called normalization period after August 1968 meant that the whole country was effectively centralized both economically and politically under the control of the Communist Party. Political science as an academic subject completely disappeared and was labeled "bourgeois pseudo-science".

The most valuable works relevant to political research were books and essays written by dissidents – Milan Šimečka and Miroslav Kusý. These books were published abroad or as *Samizdat* accessible to very limited audience. As part of Czechoslovakia, Slovakia was one of the most rigid communist regimes, and access to the work of Western scholars was the exception. However, even the short-lived foundation of political science in Czechoslovakia in the 1960s stimulated the translation of Western literature to be used as textbooks, including *Pýcha moci* (*The Arrogance of Power*) by James William Fulbright, *Nervy vlády* (*Nerves of Government*) by Karl Deutsch, and many others. But later all these translations were denied the public and stored in the banned sections of libraries.

A number of journals and informative materials dealing with the Catholic religion were produced in the form of *Samizdat* since the mid-70s. At the end of the 1980s, Catholic dissent groups launched new activities; publications, the distribution of photos of arrested Catholics, and the organization of pilgrimages, the most visible and internationally known of which was the *Candle Demonstration*, which asked for religious freedom in March 1988. Catholic dissent in Slovakia was able to build and use its own printing house with a bookstore during the more than 20 years of the "normalization" period.

Civic and political opposition in Slovakia was weak and disorganized compared with Czech opposition – the only exceptions being a group of people publishing the journal *Fragment* (later called *Fragment K*, then only *K*) and a large series of book translations (Huxley, Guardini, Beckett, Orwell, etc.) and a small community of dissidents who produced a monthly journal *Kontakt* (Contact); only a few Slovaks signed Charter '77. Activities of environmental groups have focused on restoring devastated churches and monasteries in the countryside, renovating traditional architecture, publishing studies criticizing air and water pollution in Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia, and rejecting the project of building the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros dam. These groups have collected and published several documents on the devastation of town districts, cemeteries, monuments, and environment; the print run was very low, almost in the form of minutes of their meetings. All these activities took place in what was called the *gray zone* – the societal space between official and underground life, a kind of parallel culture and society.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

The development of political science in Slovakia required first and foremost the establishment of an institutional framework – university departments and research centers – before any substantial theoretical and methodological change could take place. Thus, new institutional structure is a prerequisite for the search for a new paradigm.

The most significant change after the collapse of communism has been the establishment of basic education and research institutions in political science. The main obstacle in the process was a lack of teachers, scholars, and experts educated in the field. The former dissident and previously professor of philosophy at Comenius University, Miroslav Kusý, became a leading figure in the development of political science in Slovakia. He was elected the first Chairman of the refounded *Slovak Political Science Association* (Slovenské združenie pre politické vedy), as well as the Head of the *Political Science Department at Comenius University* (Katedra politológie Univerzity Komenského). Former departments of Marxism-Leninism or scientific communism at all universities were transformed in 1990/91 into institutes or departments of social and political sciences. These departments specialize in teaching basic courses in political science, and their main activity is the teaching process; their research projects and grants are concentrated in the pedagogical framework. Gradually, teachers and scholars from other social sciences – mainly converted Marxist-Leninists, philosophers, sociologists, historians, and lawyers – came to join education and research in the field of political science. A number of them completed their education in political science through Western scholarships and study trips abroad.

Institutional development, i.e., the foundation of various research and education institutes, was a prerequisite for the establishment and development of political science. So the theoretical and methodological orientation of political science in Slovakia has been influenced by the peculiarities of institutional, political, and personnel circumstances. We argue that there is no dominant paradigm beyond the general rejection of Marxism-Leninism, no clear orientation toward any other theoretical paradigm. Instead, there is only a partly manifested divergence in publications and research. The first current is driven by liberal and democratic values, while the second focuses on nationalist rhetoric and the protection of vaguely defined national interests. This split copies the pattern of party competition in Slovakia and in general undermines the development of political science and the discussion of political science issues. Senior professors and researchers usually tend to manifest these differences publicly in newspapers and at conferences.

The Slovak Political Science Association (SPSA) was re-established in 1990. The Slovak Political Science Association existed for a short time between 1968-69 and was incorporated in the officially recognized Czechoslovak Political Science Association that worked during the communist period of so-called normalization from 1969 to 1989. The SPSA is the Slovakia-based successor association and was accepted as a collective member of International Political Science Association (IPSA) in 1994. Nevertheless, there are persistent problems with delayed payment of membership fees to IPSA. SPSA is a member of the East Central European Network in Political Science, which was officially established as a special body of IPSA in April 2000. The SPSA was established to help develop, support, and spread the understanding of political science in the Slovak Republic and abroad. Since political science has no tradition in Slovakia, it was necessary to start with education, retraining courses, and building a research network.

Today, the SPSA has more than 130 members, including scholars, researchers, and students in Political Science, Sociology, History, Law, Journalism, International Relations, Economics, and other disciplines and professions. Many members are active in subfields like comparative politics, modern history, social policy, political sociology, public administration, human rights, and conflict resolution. Interest in membership is increasing as political science continues to develop at Slovak universities and research institutes.

The SPSA collaborates with a number of institutions in the Slovak Republic and abroad to establish research and professional teams and groups; to organize lectures, seminars, conferences, workshops, retraining courses, and summer schools; to prepare joint research projects with other institutions and legislative, governmental, and public bodies; and to support and share in independent editorial activities. In the past four years, the SPSA organized a number of seminars and workshops for its members and the broad public comparing recent political developments in Slovakia with neighboring countries, as well as organizing discussions with representatives of the Slovak parliamentary political parties and arranging presentations by prominent foreign scholars.

Most political science activity takes place in the universities, where teaching and research are traditionally combined. A distinction must be drawn between universities that offer only basic courses in political science within the framework of a compulsory minimum in the humanities and social sciences and those that offer political science as a major with a diploma. At present, five universities offer a major and conduct research in political science. There are two so-called old universities (founded with the status of university before 1989) – the most internationally known Comenius University in Bratislava and the *Prešov University* (Univerzita v Prešove), formerly a faculty, which split from the *University of P. J. Šafárik in Košice* (Univerzita P. J. Šafárika v Košiciach). After 1989, three new universities were founded: first, *Trnava University* (Trnavská univerzita) in 1991, then *Matej Bel in Banská Bystrica* (Univerzita M. Béla v Banskej Bystrici) in 1995, then the *University of Constantinus Philosopher in Nitra (*Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre) in 1997, and then the second university based in Trnava, the *University of Cyril and Methodius*, (Univerzita Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave), in 1998. This proliferation of new universities is not a response to the relatively low number of people with higher education, but a consequence of struggles within the political and intellectual elite.

The composition of faculty members at the Department of Political Science, Faculty of Arts, Comenius University provides a good example of a gradual change of intellectual elite and of the mixed composition of academics coming from different social science disciplines. Some members of the current staff were hired from the previous Department of Scientific Communism, some came from various institutes of Marxism-Leninism, some from other university departments, and there are already also young academics returning to Slovakia after finishing their studies abroad or in Bratislava. Faculty members have a research agenda oriented toward specific theoretical concerns and research topics, especially those connected to the promotion of democracy and human rights and to security studies in our region. However, most of these research projects are "supply-driven", i.e., Slovak academics conduct research as members of international teams, usually collecting and interpreting data on specific aspects of politics and government in the country. Numerous research projects under way or recently completed at the Department include: "The Role of Political Culture in the Transition of Post-Communist Countries" (in cooperation with C.N.R.S. Paris), "Strategies of Collective Protest in Democratizing Countries" (Harvard University), "Local Candidate Recruitment and Party Formation in the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Slovakia" (Strathclyde University), "The Process of Institutionalization of Parliamentary Democracy in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia" (Leiden University), "Socio-Economic Development and Regional Policy: Belgium and Slovak Experiences" (Leuven University), "Europe Agreements" (Institut für Europäische Politik, Bonn), and the curriculum development projects "Curriculum Development in the Field of Human Rights Education", "Curriculum Development in the Field of Comparative Regional Studies" (Manchester Metropolitan University), "National Security Education" (Groningen University), and "Political Symbols in Post-Communist Europe" (University Leipzig). However, there are no clear theoretical and methodological orientations, only different research topics.

The *Department of Political Science at Prešov University* in eastern Slovakia exhibits a similar composition of academic staff – academics crossing from different social science disciplines to political science. There are six full-time lecturers along with one part-time and three external teachers. This department had to fulfill political science study's academic guarantee in regard to faculty composition. Academic capacity concentrates first of all on logistics – the "Prešov's Politological Days" conferences are organized yearly, and complete presentations are published afterward (in Slovak).

The *Faculty of Political Science and International Relations* (Fakulta politických vied a medzinárodných vzťahov) in Banská Bystrica is part of the wave of newly established university centers. Although the new Faculty did not completely fulfill the formal criteria of academic qualification for teaching staff, the Accreditation Committee of Ministry of Education entitled the Faculty in 1998 to award Master and Doctoral degrees in Political Science and International Relations. Research activities are quite limited and mainly based within the framework of the grant system offered by the Slovak Ministry of Education and concentrated in the field of education, writing basic textbooks, and dictionaries of political science. Researchers here prefer rather formal partnerships to concrete research projects. The Faculty publishes a quarterly journal *Politické vedy* (Political Sciences) in collaboration with the *Institute of Political Science at the Slovak Academy of Sciences* (Ústav politológie Slovenskej akadémie vied).

The Department of Political Science and European Studies (Katedra politológie a európskych štúdií) was established at the University in Nitra in 1998. The Department offers a Masters Degree in Political Science and European Studies. Most research activities are pedagogical, attention is paid to teaching methods in civic education at secondary schools, and the Department publishes the journal *CIVITAS* for civic education teachers twice a year.

There are two competing universities in the city of Trnava, both offering the study of Political Science. The first, the University of Trnava, was established in 1991 and has had a BA program in Political Science from the beginning. Later, in 1998, the Department was also accredited for the MA degree. The second university in Trnava, the University of Cyril and Methodius, was founded in 1998. Its Department of Political Science is located within the Faculty of Philosophy and offers an MA degree. In its research, the academic staff of the both departments deals mainly with international relations, comparative politics, and political sociology.

The Institute of Political Science was founded at the Academy of Sciences in 1990; it focuses on projects related to modern political history, geopolitics, and some selected topics on the party system and the electoral system. The core research is on political history, mainly the study of the former regime, since the leading founder of the Institute is a historian who was not allowed to work and publish in the field under the communist regime. Originally, a special commission for the investigation of political development during the Prague Spring was established at the Institute.

This commission collected valuable original documents, interviews, and other resources and has made them available to academics and the public. This Institute cooperates closely with departments of political science at a number of universities.

A small number of independent political research institutions have been established in addition to university-based political research. The *Institute for Public Affairs*, also known as IVO (the acronym of its Slovak name, Inštitút pre verejné otázky), is an independent public policy research institute founded in February 1997 and located in Bratislava. The Institute's mission is to analyze social, political, economic, foreign policy, legal, cultural, and other issues of public interest; to conduct research on public policies and their consequences, to publish and disseminate its findings widely, and to make practical recommendations for improved government policy; and to study, document, and help to promote Slovakia's transition to a free, democratic, and open society; to stimulate public debate on important issues through lectures, seminars, workshops, and round tables; and to promote the active involvement of informed citizens in public life. Although research fellows of the Institute have no regular teaching obligations, there is cooperation between research and academic institutes and universities. Prominent research fellows conspicuously accept time-limited, teaching positions at universities, often unpaid at financially strapped educational institutes.

The universities differ in the subjects taught as well as in their entire political science study design. There is a wide variety of courses, including History of Political Thought, Introduction to Politics, Theories of Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, International Politics, European Integration, Public Policy and Public Administration in Slovakia, Theories of Democracy and Democratization, and Methods in Political Science. In addition to core courses, departments offer a variety of courses in subfields and a series of optional courses: Human Rights, Women's Studies, Public Opinion Research, Demography, Political Geography, Regional Studies, History of Sociology, Political Sociology, and History of Slovak Political Thought.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

Due to the focus on the study of Slovakia, we have not yet been able to identify any well-developed theoretical and methodological orientations. Articles in journals, chapters in edited volumes, and all other publications focus on gathering, presenting, and interpreting data on Slovakia. Research is highly fragmented; there is a lack of coordination and cooperation and limited human resources. Slovak scholars able to communicate in foreign languages participate in diverse research teams, and their research focuses mostly on collecting data, so they are rarely involved in theoretical and methodological debates. They are also often extremely busy, participating in several research projects, not to mention their further obligations in education and administration.

If any change of paradigm has occurred in Slovakia, it involved the departure from Marxism-Leninism to a rather eclectic and selective use of different concepts and methods, including rational choice (strategic and security studies), the qualitative method (research on national identity, symbols, political culture), content analysis (collective protest), quantitative studies (political orientations of the elite, party members, and citizens), and the institutional approach (study of the constitution, parliament, cabinet, constitutional court, electoral and party systems, etc.). All this enterprise has been marked by selection of the method that seemed the most "appropriate" to the topic (i.e., selected by team leaders), and this has not stimulated debate about methods or paradigms among the Slovak political scientists. Political science is in its first, beginning phase, in a period of collecting data in various areas subfields, without any vital discussion about fundamental approaches.

Slovakia has no library with a systematic collection of books on political science. One of the main reasons is the limited financial resources for buying new books, especially from abroad. There are very few departments or institutes building their own libraries through grant sources or donations from individual colleagues abroad, or collecting copies of basic textbooks, studies, and teaching materials. The lack of scientific books and journals in Bratislava is often compensated by borrowing books from Viennese libraries.

The Internet has become a valuable source of academic information and a basic vehicle of network building, especially among the younger generation of scholars and students. It is quite obvious that an increasing number of students are using Internet references in their diploma theses and are utilizing Internet information on vacant jobs, PhD study, and summer school opportunities. No data archive of existing information sources from sociological and political surveys has been established in Slovakia yet. The most extensive databases are located at the *Institute of Sociology at the Slovak Academy of Science* (Sociologický ústav Slovenskej akadémie vied) and at the Institute for Public Affairs.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Researchers' choices of themes depend mainly on the availability of funding or focuses on the "hot" political issues in Slovakia. Most of the research projects deal with political institutions in Slovakia or provide an informative comparative overview of institutional arrangements available abroad. For example, before almost every national election, there has been a proliferation of conferences and publications on various electoral systems. Mainly lawyers took part in such enterprises, and only a few political scientists were "accepted" as partners for such debates. The second major thematic orientation is toward political actors and their opinions and behavior on both the elite and mass level. The third orientation is toward international relations, including Slovak foreign policy, security studies, and EU enlargement. Fourth, the recent public administration reform has led to an increase of interest in the study of public administration and public policy reforms. Further, several political scientists working at the Institute of Political Science at the Slovak Academy of Sciences have focused on the study of modern political history and political thought in Slovakia. Finally, there are a lot of studies and research projects dealing with human and minority rights. In general, political science in Slovakia is highly fragmented, and many political scientists have the "exclusive" position of being the country's only specialist in their respective field. This situation hinders academic debates on methodology and theoretical approaches.

Since the establishment of independent Slovakia in January 1993, most of the country's studies have focused on explaining this "problematic" case of post-communist democracy. The main streams of democratization scholarship include various attempts to explain the Slovak case. The first group of explanations links the problems of democratic consolidation to structural factors, such as the lower level of socio-economic development, rather late modernization and industrialization, authoritarian political culture, etc. (Szomolányi, 1995; Miháliková, 1997; Krivý, 1996). The second set of reasoning examines institutional design, including executive-legislative relations, the electoral system, the shape of parties and the party system (Kubín et al., 2000; Malová, 1998; Malová-Rybář, 2000; Malová, 2001; Učeň, 1999). The third type of research aims to account for Slovakia's deficit of democracy in terms of elite configuration (Szomolányi, 1997).

Slovak scholars have practiced two modes of the institutional approach. On the one hand, a group of lawyers (Barányi, 1996; Kresák, 1996; Zavacká, 1997) studied the constitution-drafting process and analyzed constitutional rules. On the other hand, political scientists focus on the study of the impact of Slovakia's hastily drafted constitution on the consolidation of democracy, arguing that the constitutional rules proved to be unsatisfactory in leading political actors, and thus aggravated many political conflicts over interpretation of the Slovak constitution. Several authors (Malová, 2001, Rybář, 2001, Láštic, 2000) studied the discrepancies between formal and informal rules, which latter include practices at variance with the constitution. Such studies suggest that the preponderance of informal rules has impeded the institutionalization of formal rules and thus undermined constitutional government in Slovakia.

Studies or reports using a broadly defined political-culture approach assume the proposition that not everything can be encompassed by conventional rationality. Various processes, ideas, values, mechanisms, and so on remain hidden from customary modes of scrutiny and yet have significant implications for the way in which individuals and collectivities live. In the search to diagnose Slovak political culture, the historical perspective plays a decisive role, and the main research topics are historical events, personalities, prejudices, and grievances connected with the absence of Slovak statehood. There are two major research questions: first, why was Slovakia regarded as the exception among the four Visegrad countries (at least until 1998/99), the anomaly in Central Europe with an uncertain path and an unpredictable future; and second, how can Slovakia catch up with Europe and modernize and overcome the traumatic character of nation-building after several centuries of stateless, survival-oriented existence under the Hungarians and further foreign interventions?

To understand current electoral behavior in Slovakia, traditional political patterns are explained on the basis of regional comparative quantitative data (e.g. Vladimír Krivý). As in other post-communist countries, it is still difficult to establish criteria for measuring the degree and intensity of democratic attitudes in the population. Research institutes (e.g. IVO) and opinion poll agencies, e.g. MVK, FOCUS, The Market Review Institute GfK, and Markant Agency, provide a number of mass survey data, using internationally standardized questionnaires with internationally comparable techniques of analysis. Despite a widespread search for deeper insights into the dynamics of change in political culture, the combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods is weak and undeveloped.

Nevertheless, it has become a habit of political scientists in Slovakia to measure domestic political developments by Western yardsticks. In this sense, anything that broadly approximates “the Western way” has come to be perceived as normal, standard, or systemic, while whatever deviates from Western norms and practices is seen as strange, unorthodox, or nonsystemic. Many political science reports and commentaries have been written in this spirit.

The problem with this conceptualization is that it is not only very vague, but also that it ignores the dynamic nature of the benchmark (i.e., the Western capitalist system in general). Furthermore, it embodies the ethnocentric notion that all countries diverging from the direct path towards political plurality and a free market economy are abnormal. This last tendency often results in a masochistic self-abasement in the face of nonconformity with the blueprint that Western neoliberal enthusiasts (and reformers in the East) drew at the dawn of the “post-communist” era – a blueprint completely rejecting communism and, with it, all social or planned arrangements. In this sense, the negative reflex reaction to anything perceived as non-Western stems from the deprivations of living on the “wrong” side of the Iron Curtain.

Political scientists focusing on the political-culture approach concluded that, several years after gaining independence, Slovakia finds itself locked in a paradox: while the transformation to a market economy has been relatively successful (despite problems), there is a far greater ambivalence and even dissatisfaction about democratization and the way power is exercised. There is less of this since the political changes in 1998, but the contrast remains. General hopes for a continuous and linear unfolding of democracy were certainly frustrated through the mid-1990s by chronic political instability, constant conflict among political elites, and tensions between the state institutions. This tale is told in the studies of Vladimír Krivý, Zora and Martin Bútora, Oľga Gyarfášová, Silvia Miháliková, Soňa Szomolányi, and others.

One of the main research questions remains: After sharing a common starting point with the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland, why did Slovakia follow such a different path?

The simplest answer is that, in 1993, Slovakia had to start building state institutions from scratch. The new state was different in terms of economic development, ethnic homogeneity, and proximity to the West, and it definitely lacked the Poles’, Czechs’, and Hungarians’ experience in governing and administering foreign and military affairs. While all these factors undoubtedly play a role, attention to the societal and political *culture* is perceived as necessary to understand the tensions within Slovak society, as well as between Slovakia's representatives and international bodies. The conviction is strong that, in the post-communist countries and particularly in Slovakia, there are few traditions of pluralist democracy and that the rule of law is subject to the interpretations of party elites. In addition, most citizens of Slovakia who were 80 or older in 1993 had experienced seven state formations and eight constitutions without changing residence. Of five regimes in their lifetime, only two could be considered democratic.

Studies of contemporary Slovak political culture stress the need to identify its roots and describe its main features. This means, first, examining the country's undemocratic traditions. Like other post-communist states, Slovakia has a mixed tradition of democracy and authoritarianism with roots not only in the socialist period, but going back at least to the early 19th century and the Slovak emancipation movement. Researchers in this field combine quantitative and qualitative approaches to identify the dominant symbolic framework of the Slovak transition period and show how culture works in processes of social and political change. Times of regime changes or crisis are opportunities to reaffirm, rethink, and reformulate not only fundamental values but also myths and rituals in which those values are encoded. As a new state in the post-communist period, Slovakia is an excellent example demonstrating the way political symbols, myths, and rituals are invented, revived, and reconstructed.

Research activities are funded by several substantial grants from domestic and outside agencies and foundations. These grants have also provisioned new departmental libraries with computer resources (including e-mail) for students. The grant system of the Slovak Ministry of Education with its very limited financial sources, the British Council, and Slovak branches of several foreign foundations, (e.g. the Ford Foundation, the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, Charter '77, the Jan Hus Foundation, etc.) have also supported developments in the political science community. The European Union with its TEMPUS program has played a very positive role, too, mainly with respect to teaching political science. A number of professors, academics, researchers, PhD students, and graduate and undergraduate students enjoyed the new opening of boundaries between West and East in academic life. Although the TEMPUS program was generally perceived as extremely bureaucratic, its provisions contributed to the widespread conviction that the academic community in particular could benefit from involvement in European integration. Diverse provisions in a wide variety of foreign grants allowed political science departments and research institutes to buy such basic technical facilities as PCs and copy and fax machines and to install e-mail.

The Slovak branch of Soros' Open Society Foundation (OSF) played a very positive role in such developments by providing both information and necessary financial resources for teachers, scholars, and students to attend courses, summer schools, seminars, workshops, and conferences around Europe, in the US, and in Canada. In addition, the OSF grant system allowed the purchase of a number of basic Western textbooks published in recent decades, as well as recent publications, periodicals, journals, and the necessary empirical databases from international comparative surveys. Individual and collective research grants awarded within the "Research Support Scheme" (later the Open Society Institute) were incentives to build international research teams, particularly in the field of comparative politics, and served also as an impetus to a domestic scientific competition unusual under the old regime. The possibility of receiving grants that would significantly improve one's individual or family budget attracted several young scholars and PhD students to join university departments and research institutes and stimulated interest in the study of political science among undergraduate university students. The variety of grant systems offered (library grants, travel grants, modern arts, social sciences, translation, PhD programs, curricula building, teaching) greatly contributed to teaching students how to write CVs and research grant applications and how to get research money through Western-style fundraising.

Increasing demand among international research networks competing for the latest data and first-hand information from the post-communist world meant that the majority of Slovak political scientists who speak foreign languages became members of those research teams. However, the question remains whether political scientists from former communist countries merely serve as information sources and a formal fulfillment of a grant requirement or if Western scholars accept them as equal research partners.

5. Public space and academic debates

Political scientists in Slovakia have not yet institutionalized any regular space of their own to discuss development of research and teaching in the field. Although there is a journal *Politické vedy* (Political Sciences) published by the Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, it does not attract the participation of the whole Slovakian political science community. Nor do scientific referees review contributions published in the journal. Consequently, newspapers, weeklies, and journals dealing with other social science disciplines or published in the Czech Republic often substitute for a national political science journal in Slovakia.

There were three attempts to organize a public debate on the state of the art of political science in Slovakia. The first dealt with the status of a political scientist in Slovakia in relation to the mass media and politics. The second was the conference organized by the Department at Comenius University to celebrate the 10th anniversary of its foundation with the aim to map and reflect on the development of political science in Slovakia. Although not many political scientists participated in the conference, the published collection of the papers presented at the conference indicates that political science in Slovakia is indeed at the stage of the empirical collection of data and of testing different ways of interpreting that data.

The third attempt to spark debate was the seminar organized by the Slovak Political Science Association on November 23, 2001. Representatives of almost all Slovak educational and research institutions participated. The positive outcome seems to be an attempt to break down existing partisan barriers between political scientists and an expressed common will to improve the quality of the political science journal *Politické vedy* so that it can serve the whole political science community in Slovakia from year 2002 on. As a further positive step improving mutual communication among political science departments at the universities and research institutes, an address book will be prepared and an exchange of curricula and research plans has been promised.

Conclusion

As mentioned above, political science in Slovakia became fragmented very soon for various reasons. The most important was the political polarization of the whole society, which led to the existence of two sets of universities and political science departments – those that claimed to be politically independent (mostly in opposition to the former government of Prime Minister Mečiar – e.g. Comenius University, Trnava University) and those that were established directly by and were therefore loyal to the former government (Matej Bel University, Nitra University, University of Cyril and Methodius in Trnava). Moreover, the politics of the ruling coalition (1994-1998) led to the creation of universities in almost every provincial capital. With a population of about five million, Slovakia now has ten universities that teach political science, meaning small humanities departments that try, with inadequate funds and personnel, to cover at least basic knowledge in political science. The Slovak educational system's financial resources have traditionally been very limited, but recent fragmentation has led to even less efficient use of material and human resources.

Another consequence of fragmentation is a lack of contact between universities and limited communication among political scientists in different universities and research institutes. Nor does the discipline have a tradition of scientific discussion, although the Slovak Political Science Association is doing its best to serve as a forum for such a discussion. There is also a growing danger of inbreeding. Academics usually teach and conduct research at the university where they received their training and are not usually stimulated to acquire professional experience at other universities or abroad. As a result, except for members of the Department of Political Science at Comenius University, Slovak political scientists often take only limited part in conferences, seminars, workshops, or similar events organized by the international political science community. One reason for this might be the generally bad command of foreign languages, especially among the older generation of teachers and scholars outside Bratislava.

Political Science as an academic discipline did not become a fully integrated part of Slovak academic teaching and research until after the end of communism. In recent years, political science studies have gone through a rapid expansion, following an increase in the number of universities and students. The majority in the academic community, among higher education authorities, and among the student population have welcomed this expansion, but its effects on the discipline and on teaching are at least ambiguous. In some, mostly the newly established universities, students see political science as a “second (or third) best” major, after law and economics. As for staff, the need to cope with expanding demand and teaching duties has led to improvisation and inadequate training of personnel, who are mainly converted former Marx-Leninist teachers. So the composition of the professional body in teaching is balanced between elderly lecturers and young, recently graduated students.

In spite of all these problems, some departments and research groups are already able to compete in the international arena, as evidenced by the exchange programs and international research projects in which they are involved.

Taking 1990 as the date of new start for political science in Slovakia, it appears that a first stage has been completed – official university degrees, discipline recognition, increased staff recruitment, the organization of departments and institutes, first steps in international collaboration, the organization of professional associations, etc. But there still remains much to be done; a solid foundation must be given to these recent developments and some problems caused by the country’s late development must be solved. Many tasks lie entirely in the hands of the academic community in Slovakia, other are more dependent on the good will and help of foreign colleagues and institutions and of international research networks. One of the most important questions is developing curricula to achieve compatibility with basic scientific standards in political science education in Europe. One cannot expect progress in this field without continuous staff and graduate training, since there is still a need to bring the Slovak political science community into the mainstream of political science.

---

[1] In the book edited by Archie Brown and Jack Gray (1979)

References

Barány, Eduard (1995): “Zdroj nestability politického systému SR” (The source of instability in the Slovak political system), in: *Parlamentná demokracie a formovanie občianskej spoločnosti* (Parliamentary democracy and civil society), Prešov, FFUK, 5-12;

Bilčík, Vladimir (2000): “EU enlargement after the Helsinki summit and Slovakia at the start of negotiations”, in: *Slovak Foreign Policy Affairs*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2000;

Bútora, Martin and Butorová, Zora (1999): “Slovakia‘s Democratic Awakening”, in: *Journal of Democracy*, Vo1. 25, No. 2;

Brown, Archie and Gray, Jack (eds.) (1979): “Czechoslovakia: Revival and Retreat”, in: *Political Culture and Political Change in Communist States*, London, Macmillan Press;

Gyarfášová, Oľga, Krivý, Vladimír, Velšic, Marián et al. (2001): *Krajina v pohybe. Správa o politických názoroch a hodnotách ľudí na Slovensku* (Changing country: The report on political attitudes in Slovakia), Bratislava, IVO;

Hodža, Milan (1930-1934): *Články, reči, štúdie I-VII . Selected articles and speeches*, Praha;

Hodža, Milan (1942): *Federation in Central Europe*, London, Jarrolds Publishers;

Kresák, Peter (1996): "Forma vlády v Slovenskej republike: pokus o porovnávaciu analýzu" (Form of government in SR: Comparative analysis), in: *Aktualní problémy parlamentarismu* (Problems of parliamentarism), Brno, Nadace Mezinárodního politologického ústavu, 27-47;
Kresák, Peter (1998): "Chabé ústavné základy ako korene krízy?" (Weak constitutional rule – The source of crisis?), in: *OS-Fórum občianskej spoločnosti* (CS-Civil Society Forum), No. 4, Bratislava, 49-50;
Krivý, Vladimír, Feglová, Viera and Balko, Daniel (1996): *Slovensko a jeho regióny. Sociokultúrne súvislosti volebného správania* (Slovakia and her regions. Social and cultural context of electoral behavior), Bratislava, Médiá;
Kusý, Miroslav and Šimečka, Milan (1980): *Velký bratr a Velká sestra: o strate reality v ideologii reálneho socialismu* (Big brother and big sister: The loss of reality in the real socialism), Toronto;
Kusý, Miroslav and Šimečka, Milan (1984): *Európska skúsenosť s reálnym socializmom* (European experience with the real socialism), Toronto;
Malová, Darina and Rybář, Marek (2000): "The Troubled Institutionalization of Parliamentary Democracy", in: *Politicka misao. Croatian Political Science Review*, Vol. 37, No. 2, 99-115;
Malová, Darina and Láštic, Erik (2000): "Higher Education in Slovakia: A Complicated Restoration of Liberal Rules", in: *East European Constitutional Review*, No. 9 (3), 100-104;
Malová, Darina (2001): "Slovakia: From the Ambiguous Constitution to the Dominance of Informal Rules", in: *Democratic Consolidation in Eastern Europe: Institutional Engineering*, Vol. 1, Zielonka, J. (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 347-377;
Miháliková, Silvia (1996): "Understanding Slovak Political Culture", in: *Political Culture in East Central Europe,* Plasser, F. and Pribersky, A., Vermont, Ashgate Publishing Company, 167-179;
Papánek, Ján (1923): *La Tchecoslovaquie. Historie politique et juridique de sa creation*, Praha;
Papánek, Ján (1945): *Czechoslovakia – The World of Tomorrow*, New York;
Šimečka, Milan (1985): *Kruhová obrana* (The Full Resistance), Cologne, Index;
Szomolányi, Soňa (1995): "Central European Transition Paths, Parallels and Differences: The Case of Slovakia", in: *Sociology* (*Slovak Sociological Review*), Vol. 27, No. 7- 8, 17- 29;
Szomolányi, Soňa (1999): "The National Elite and Democratic Deficit in Slovakia", in: *The Rule of Law in Central Europe: Reconstruction of legality, constitutionalism and civil society in the post-communist countries*, Young, K. and Přibáň, J.(eds.), Aldershot, Dartmouth Publishing Company Ltd., 118-138;
Šimečka, Milan (1984): *The Restoration of order. The normalization of Czechoslovakia 1969 – 1976*, London, Verso;
Učeň, Peter (1999): "A Decade of Conflict Within Slovak Polity: Party Politics Perspective", in*: Success or Failure? Ten Years After,* Dvořáková, V. (ed.), Praha, CPSA and SPSA;
Zavacká, Katarína (1997): "The Development of Constitutionalism in Slovakia", in: *Slovakia's Political Regime Seven Years After,* Szomolányi, S. and Gould, J., Bratislava, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung and SPSA, 157-167.

Selected Bibliography

Bilčík, Vladimír (2000): "EU enlargement after the Helsinki summit and Slovakia at the start of negotiations", in: *Slovak Foreign Policy Affairs*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2000;
Bilčík, Vladimír, Bruncko, Martin, Duleba, Alexander, Lukáč, Pavol and Samson, Ivo (2000): "Foreign and Defence Policy of the Slovak Republic", in: *Slovakia 2000. A Global Report on the State of Society*, Mesežnikov, Grigorij, Kollár, M. and Nicholson, T. (eds.), Bratislava, 233-296;
Bilčík, Vladimír, Bruncko, Martin (2001): *Európska únia dnes. Súčasné trendy a význam pre Slovensko* (European Union and its impact on Slovakia), Bratislava, SFPA and IVO;
Bútora, Martin, Mesežnikov, Grigorij and Bútorová, Zora (1998): *Who? Why? How? Slovak Elections in 1998*, Bratislava, IVO;
Bútora, Martin, Mesežnikov, Grigorij, Bútorová, Zora, Fisher, Sharon (1999): *The 1998 Parliamentary Elections and Democratic Rebirth in Slovakia,* Bratislava, IVO;
Bútora, Martin and Bútorova, Zora (1999): "Slovakia's Democratic Awakening", in: *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 25, No. 2;
Bútorová, Zora (1998): *Democracy and Discontent in Slovakia: A Public Opinion Profile of a Country in Transition*, Bratislava, IVO;
Civitas, Journal published by Nitra University;

Delmartino, Frank, Versmessen, Elke, Miháliková, Silvia and Falťan, Ľubomír (1998): *Nové podoby verejnej* správy (New public administration), Bratislava, SÚ SAV;
Dostál, Ondrej (1998): "Minorities", in: *Slovakia 1996-1997: A Global Report on the State of Society*, Bútora, Martin and Skladony, Thomas W. (eds.), Bratislava, Institute for Public Affairs, 39-45;
Duleba, Alexander (1997): "Democratic Consolidation and the Conflict over Slovakian International Alignment", in: *Slovakia's Political Regime Seven Years After*, Szomolányi, Soňa and Gould, J., Bratislava, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung and SPSA, 209-230;
Duleba, Alexander and Samson, Ivo (2001): *Slovensko a NATO: Bezpečnosť prostredníctvom spolupráce* (Slovakia and NATO: Security via cooperation), Prešov, SFPA and Úrad NATO pre informácie a tlač;
Gyárfášová, Oľga (1995): "Slovakia After the Split: Dilemmas of the New Citizenship", in: *Citizenship East and West*, Liebich, Ander and Warner, Daniel (eds.), London and New York, Kegan Paul International;
Gyárfášová, Oľga (2000): "The Slovakian National Party", in: *Rechtsextreme Parteien - eine mögliche Heimat für Frauen?*, Amesberger, H. and Halbmayer, B. (eds.), Wien, Institut für Konfliktforschung;
Gyárfášová, Oľga (2001): "From Defense Against the „Others" to the Formulation of its own interests", in: *National and European Identities in EU Enlargement*, Drulák, P. (ed.), Prague, 39-56;
Gyarfášová, Oľga, Krivý, Vladimír, Velšic, Marián et al. (2001): *Krajina v pohybe. Správa o politických názoroch a hodnotách ľudí na Slovensku* (Changing country: The report on political attitudes in Slovakia), Bratislava, IVO;
Horváth, Peter (2000): *Funkcia prezidenta v ústavných systémoch* (The position of president in the selected constitutions), Bratislava, IVO;
Hronský, Marián (2001): *The Struggle for Slovakia and the Treaty of Trianon*, Bratislava, Veda;
Jablonický, Jozef (1990): *Povstanie bez legiend* (The Slovak National Uprising without legends), Bratislava, Obzor;
Jablonický, Jozef (2000): *Podoby násilia* (Faces of Violence), Bratislava, Kalligram;
Katuninec, Milan (2001): *Dejiny slovenského kresťanského odborového hnutia* (History of the Slovak Christian Labor Movement), Bratislava, Teologická fakulta TU;
Katuninec, Milan (2001): "Sozialpartnerschaftliche Strukturen in der Slowakei", in: *Gesellschaft und Politik,* Vol. 37, No. 3, 16-19;
Kmeť, Norbert (2000): *Postavenie cirkví na Slovensku 1948 – 1951* (Churches in Slovakia), Bratislava, Veda;
Koganová, Viera, Leška, Dušan and Mesežnikov, Grigorij (1996): *Demokracia a ochrana ľudských práv - teória, prax, medzinárodná úprava* (Democracy and the protection of human rights), Bratislava, Interlingua;
Krivý, Vladimír, Feglová, Viera and Balko, Daniel (1996): *Slovensko a jeho regióny. Sociokultúrne súvislosti volebného správania* (Slovakia and her regions. Social and cultural context of electoral behavior), Bratislava, Médiá;
Krno, Svetozár (1998): *Politické strany západnej Európy* (Political parties in Western Europe), Nitra, FF UKF;
Krno, Svetozár (1999): *Politické strany krajín východnej Európy* (Political parties in Eastern Europe), Nitra, FF UKF;
Kubín, Ľuboš and Velšic, Marián (1998): *Slovensko a jeho volebné pravidlá* (Electoral system in Slovakia), Bratislava, Veda;
Kulašik, Peter and Tóth, Rastislav (1998): *Úvod do politológie* (Introduction in Political Science), Banská Bystrica, UMB;
Kusý, Miroslav (1996): "Slovak Exceptionalism", in: *The End of Czechoslovakia,* Budapest, CEU Press, 183-203
Kusý, Miroslav (1998): *Čo s našimi Maďarmi* (What to do with our Hungarians?), Bratislava, Kalligram;
Malíková, Ľudmila and Miháliková, Silvia (1995): *Localities and Politics in the Transformation Process - The Slovak and Czech Experiences*, Bratislava, NOVA 17;
Malíková, Ľudmila (1995): "Local Government in Slovakia", in: *Public Administration in Transition*, Jabes, J. and Vintar, M. (eds.), Bratislava, NISPAcee;
Malíková, Ľudmila and Buček, Ján (1996): "The Changing Attitudes of Local Authorities: A Case Study of Mayors in Slovakia", in: *Developing Organisations and Changing Attitudes: Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe*, Jabes, J. (ed.), Bratislava, NISPAcee, 194-213;
Malíková, Ľudmila, Buček, Ján (1998): "Case Studies in Corporate Merger and Privatization: Slovak Law and Practice", in: *Introduction to Competition and State Aid Law of the European Union,* London, Esperia Publications, 249-254;

Malíková, Ľudmila and Staroňová, Katarína (2001): "Politico-Administrative Relations: The Case of Slovakia", in: *Politico-Administrative Relations: Who Rules*?, Verheijen, T. (ed.), Bratislava, NISPAcee, 268-295;

Malová, Darina (1995): "Parliamentary Rules and Legislative Dominance", in: *East European Constitutional Review*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 71-77;

Malová, Darina and Siváková, Danica (1996): "The National Council of the Slovak Republic: Between Democratic Transition and National State-Building", in: *Journal of Legislative Studies, Special Issue on The New Parliaments of Central and Eastern Europe,* No. 2 (1), 108-133;

Malová, Darina and Rybář, Marek (2000): "The Troubled Institutionalization of Parliamentary Democracy", in: *Politicka misao. Croatian Political Science Review*, Vol. 37, No. 2, 99-115;

Malová, Darina (2000): "Konstituciojnyj sud v Slovakii: politicheskij vzgliad", in: *Konstitucionnoje pravo: Vostochjevropejskoe obozrenie*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 26-37;

Malová, Darina and Krause, Kevin (2000): "Parliamentary Clubs and the Institutionalization of Political Parties in Slovakia", in: *Parliamentary Party Groups in European Democracies: Political Parties Behind Closed Doors,* Heidar, K. and Koole, R. (eds.), London and New York, Routledge, 195-213;

Malová, Darina and Mego, Paul (2000): "Slovakia: National Consciousness from Denied Autonomy", in: *European Nations and Nationalism: Theoretical and Historical Perspectives,* Hagendoorn, L., Csepeli, G., Dekker, H. and Farnen, R., Aldershot (UK), Ashgate, 333-372;

Malová, Darina (2001): "Slovakia: From the Ambiguous Constitution to the Dominance of Informal Rules", in: *Democratic Consolidation in Eastern Europe: Institutional Engineering,* Vol. 1*,* Zielonka, Jan (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 347-377;

Malová, Darina and Haughton, T. (2002): "Making Institutions in Central and Eastern Europe and the Impact of Europe", in: *West European Politics*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 99-118;

Mesežnikov, Grigorij et al. (eds.) (1994-2001): *Súhrnné správy o stave spoločnosti* 1994-2001 (Global reports on the State of Society in Slovakia), Bratislava, IVO, Institute for Public Affairs;

Mesežnikov, Grigorij and Bútora, Martin (eds.) (1997): *Slovenské referendum '97: Zrod, priebeh, dôsledky* (The Slovak referendum '97: Its genesis, course and consequences), Bratislava, Inštitút pre verejné otázky;

Mešťan, Pavol (2000): *Antisemitizmus v politickom vývoji Slovenska (1989–1999)* (Anti-Semitism in Slovak politics), Bratislava, SNM - Múzeum židovskej kultúry;

Miháliková, Silvia (1996): "Legal and Political Status of Minorities in the Former Czechoslovakia", in: *Ethnic Minority Rights in Central Eastern Europe,* Opalski, M. and Dutkiewicz, P. (eds.), Ottawa, Canadian Human Rights Foundation and Forum Eastern Europe, 73-83, 131-149;

Miháliková, Silvia (1996): "Abrechnung mit der Vergangenheit auf slowakisch", in: *Öffentliche Konfliktdiskurse um Restitution von Gerechtigkeit, politische Verantwortung und nationale Identität*, Mänicke-Gyöngyösi, K. (ed.), Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang Verlag, 183-203;

Miháliková, Silvia (1996): "A l´ Est: Flux et reflux de la culture politique", in: *Repenser L Europe*, Teló, M. and Magnette, P. (eds.), Bruxelles, Université de Bruxelles, 139-147;

Miháliková, Silvia (1996): "Understanding Slovak Political Culture", in: *Political Culture in East Central Europe,* Plasser, F. and Pribersky, A. (eds.), Vermont, Ashgate Publishing Company, 167-179;

Miháliková, Silvia and Mesežnikov, Grigorij (1998): "Autoritäre Tendenzen kontra Rechtstaat in der Slowakei", in: *Recht und Kultur in Ostmitteleuropa*, Bremen, Edition Temmen, 47 – 498;

Miháliková, Silvia (1998): "The Hungarian Minority in Slovakia: Conflict over Autonomy", in: *Managing Diversity in Plural Societies. Minorities, Migration and Nation-Building in Post-Communist Europe,* Opalski, M. (ed.), Ottawa, Forum Eastern Europe, 148-165;

Miháliková, Silvia (2000): "Das politische System und die Strukturen der Interessenrepräsentation in der Slowakei nach 1993", in: *Revolution und Recht. Systemtransformation und Verfassungsentwicklung in der Tschechischen und Slowakischen Republik,* Marko, J., Ableitinger, A., Brostl, A. and Hollander, P., Berlin, Peter Lang Verlag, 417-447;

Miháliková, Silvia (2001): "Die politische Kultur der Slowakei – ein Hindernis für demokratische Entwicklung?", in: *Kultur als Bestimmungsfaktor der Transformation im Osten Europas. Konzeptionelle Entwicklungen – Empirische Befunde,* Höhmann, H.H. (ed.), Bremen, Edition Temmen, 274 – 293;

Pekník, Miroslav (ed.) (1998): *Dokumenty slovenskej národnej identity a štátnosti*, zv. 1-2 (Documents on the Slovak national identity and statehood), Bratislava, Národné literárne centrum, Dom slovenskej literatúry;

Pekník, Miroslav (ed.) (2000): *Pohľady na slovenskú politku (Overview of Slovak politics)*, Bratislava, Veda;

Pešek, Ján and Szomolányi, Soňa (eds.) (2000): *November 1989 na Slovensku: Predpoklady a dôsledky* (November 1989 in Slovakia), Bratislava, Nadácia Milana Šimečku;

Pichler, Tibor (1999): *Národovci a občania* (Nationalists and citizens), Bratislava, Veda;

Politické vedy. Časopis pre politiku, najnovšie dejiny, medzinárodné vzťahy (Political Sciences. Journal for politics, modern history and international relations), Banská Bystrica, quarterly published by Slovak Academy of Sciences and Matej Bel University;

Samson, Ivo (2001): "Slovakia: International and Transnational Factors", in: *Democratic Consolidation in Eastern Europe*, Vol. 2, Zielonka, Jan and Pravda, A., Oxford, Oxford University Press;

Slovak Foreign Policy Affairs, published by the SFPA, Review for international politics, security and integration;

Sýkora, Peter (2000): *Európska integrácia. Úvod* (Introduction in European Integration), Bratislava, Univerzita Komenského;

Szomolányi, Soňa (1994): "Structuring Party System and Political Stability in Slovakia", in: *Konfliktregulierung durch Parteien und politische Stabilität in Ostmitteleuropa*, Segert, D. (ed.), Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang Verlag, 73-94;

Szomolányi, Soňa and Mesežnikov, Grigorij (1994): *The Slovak Path of Transition - to Democracy?*, Bratislava, Interlingua and SPSA;

Szomolányi, Soňa (1994): "Nationale Eigenstaatlichkeit - eine historische Notwendigkeit? Der Fall Slowakei", in: *Nationalismus - Identität - Europäertum*, Kurucz, Gyula (ed.), Berlin, BerlinVerlag GmbH, 48 – 67;

Szomolányi Soňa and Mesežnikov, Grigorij (1995): *Slovakia Parliamentary Elections 1994*, Bratislava, Interlingua;

Szomolányi, Soňa and Wightman, Gordon (1995): "Parties and Society in Slovakia," in: *Party Politics*, Vol. 1, No. 4, 609-618;

Szomolányi, Soňa and Mesežnikov, Grigorij (1996): "Das Parteien System der Slowakei", in: *Parteiensysteme in Postkommunistischen Gesellschaften Osteuropas*, Segert, D., Stoss, R. and Niedermayer, O. (eds.), Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag, 135-156;

Szomolányi, Soňa and Gould, John (1997): *Slovakia's Political Regime Seven Years After,* Bratislava, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung and SPSA;

Szomolányi, Soňa (1999): *Kľukatá cesta Slovenska k demokracii* (Slovakia's road to democracy), Bratislava, Stimul;

Szomolányi, Soňa (1999): "The National Elite and Democratic Deficit in Slovakia", in: *The Rule of Law in Central Europe: Reconstruction of legality, constitutionalism and civil society in the post-communist countries*, Young, K. and Přibáň, J.(eds.), Aldershot, Dartmouth Publishing Company Ltd., 118-138;

Szomolányi, Soňa (1999): "Political Elites and Institution Building in Slovakia", in: *Institution Building in the New Democracies*, Heinrich, Hans-Georg (ed.), Budapest, Collegium Budapest, 249-278;

Szomolányi, Soňa and Gould, John (1999): "Elite Division and Convergence in Slovakia", in: *Elites After State Socialism: Theories and Analyses*, Higley, J. and Lengyel, G. (eds.), Boulder CO, Rowman & Littlefield, 47-69;

Školkay, Andrej (1996): "Journalists, Political Elites and the Post-Communist Public: The Case of Slovakia", in: *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, No. 12 (4), December 1996;

Školkay, Andrej (1996): "The Fight over Public Broadcasting in the First Year of Slovak Independence", in: *South East European Monitor*, No. 3 (5), 1996, 23-31;

Školkay, Andrej (1999): "Political Science in Central and About Central Europe", in: *Politické vedy*, No. 2 (4), 231-250;

Školkay, Andrej (1999): "An Analysis of Media Legislation: The Case of Slovakia", in: *International Journal of Communications Law and Policy*, 20 January, http://www.digital-law.net/IJCLP/1_1998/index.html;

Školkay, Andrej (2000): "The Media and Political Communication in Slovakia in the late 1990s", in: *Communication Culture in Transition*, Schleicher, N. (ed.), Budapest, Akadémia Kiadó, 155-186;

Školkay, Andrej (2001): "Personality, Ideology and Economic Policy of Václav Klaus", in: *Politologická revue*, No. 1, in Slovak, English summary, 27-51;

Tóth, Rastislav (1993): *Politické režimy súčasného sveta* (Political regimes in the modern world), Bratislava, MC;

Tóth, Rastislav (1997): *Základy politológie* (Elements in political science), Bratislava, SPN;

Tóth, Rastislav (1998): *Komparatívna politológia* (Comparative politics), Banská Bystrica, UMB.

Danica Fink-Hafner

Political Science – Slovenia

Discussant: Zlatko Šabič

Introductory remarks

This text aims to present a brief historical overview of political science in Slovenia, the characteristics of its contents and its methodological and institutional developments. In brief, we note the following three processes: 1. development from knowledge relevant to political science toward a modern and internationally more comparable political science; 2. from knowledge and science within supranational states to political science within an independent state seeking new international integration; and 3. from state-centered and later self-management orientations toward the modern pattern of thematic diversification of the political science field and its research methods and techniques. The overview relies on previously published reviews of political science developments in Slovenia and the former Yugoslavia, data gathered at the Faculty of Social Sciences (Fakulteta za družbene vede) in Ljubljana, information drawn from the Internet (COBISS – researchers' online bibliographies, Slovenian political science institutions' web pages), and comments made by experts from several political science sub-fields.[1]

1. Anaysis of the pre-1989 situation

Pre-World War II traditions and the foundations of modern political science

Slovenian pre-World War II traditions relevant to political science were developed within broader supranational states (Austria, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, pre-World War II Yugoslavia, socialist Yugoslavia). Only since the early 1990s has political science started to develop as a science in an independent Slovenian state. There was little Slovenian political science tradition before the 1960s. Several texts by historians and literati from the second half of the 17th to the end of the 19th century (including Anton Tomaž Linhart, Fran Maselj Podlimbarski, and Janez Vajkard Valvasor) described constitutional life, administrative practices, other political phenomena, and political thought in the area where Slovenian ethnicity and later the Slovenian nation developed. Some of the first modern analyses of political institutions and phenomena carried out on Slovenian territory were written by lawyers and sociologists. Pitamic (1927) wrote on the state, Ogris (1926) on political parties, and Goričar (1959) on the history of political theories.

Political science foundations after World War II

Some political science traditions developed from the end of the 1930s to 1948 as a strong reflection of Soviet literature. After the political split between Tito and Stalin in 1948, political elites sought to create a distinctive political science in Yugoslavia. The ruling party of the socialist regime took the initiative to establish political science in Yugoslavia (and in Slovenia as part of Yugoslavia) at the end of the 1950s. The 1958 League of Communists of Yugoslavia program included a special statement on the development of political science. Namely, "the developed social and political sciences" were considered "a strong factor in progressive social development

1 I am grateful to my colleagues Zlatko Šabič, Drago Zajc, Igor Lukšič, Vlasta Jalušič, and Ljubica Jelušič for their comments on earlier drafts of the text. The text is structured according to guidelines outlined by the editors to allow international comparisons; unfortunately, this does not permit the author to fully respect all of the referees' comments and suggestions.

and the development of human existence". There were two aspects of the initially *top-down* development of the political science infrastructure at the start of the 1960s. On the one hand, this assisted the early start of political science's development compared with many other socialist countries. On the other hand, it created a problem by developing political science as a relatively autonomous field of scientific teaching and research activities. The first staff to teach political science consisted mainly of lawyers who had become interested in political science after graduating or having practiced as judges.

After the split with Stalin, political thought became extremely critical of Stalinist "dogmatism" and "stereotypes of socialism and the socialist state" (Djordjević in Political Science in Yugoslavia: 6). The ideological orientation of political theory and the subject of political science interest changed. This transformation can be illustrated as a shift away from the dominant role of the state toward the "decline of the state" and the construction of "socialist society". At the core lay an idea of democracy that was considered not merely an intermediary mechanism but simultaneously a social structure and political form of management of society in which relations were defined by social ownership and by the direct role of workers and other people in politics. In socialist times, many of political science's subjects of inquiry and much of its terminology remained undefined.

The emerging academic political science community underwent hard times in establishing the new science in Slovenia (as in other former Yugoslav republics). On the one hand, there was the typical sheer denial of any reason for political science to exist and, on the other hand, the political elite's expectations were high that the newly developing political science would support political programmatic currents. Criticism extended from the notion that a division into specific social sciences is quite unacceptable ("there is only one science – the science of history") to the opinion that "everybody can talk politics – therefore everybody is a political scientist" (Bibič, 1982:5, 13). Especially in the nascent stage (the *College for Political Science* – Visoka šola za politične vede – was established in Ljubljana in 1961) and during the period of stronger authoritarian pressure (in the 1970s, called the "leaden years"), the political voices seeking to deny a role to political science gathered strength. The Slovenian political scientist Adolf Bibič fought vigorously in public to maintain it as an academic discipline in Yugoslavia. In the struggle for an autonomous space, the emerging political science community used the term "politology" (instead of "political science") to stress the distinction between political practice and political science as academic education about and scientific research on political phenomena.

Despite political pressure to rein in political science, it started developing into new sub-fields. In cooperation with the more empirically oriented sociology, it created an institution (the College of Political Science, Sociology and Journalism) that was able to become a member of the University of Ljubljana in 1970. The process of establishing new fields of teaching and research was very dynamic. In 1963, the College began to offer the study of journalism and in 1966 the study of sociology, while in 1975-76 a special study of *Splošna ljudska obramba* (General People's Defense) and, a year later (1977), an interdisciplinary (sociological and politological) course on "self-management and the basics of Marxism" were introduced. The key aim of this last course was to educate teachers of social science subjects at institutions of higher education to teach a special subject "*samoupravljanje"* ("self-management"), which was introduced in the 1970s (already mentioned); it was later abandoned. Most students in this program earned the title "professor of sociology" after their BA degree. In the reform of university studies in the 1980s, a more autonomous position for International Relations was also created.

Despite this diversification, the development of political science in Slovenia was marked by an *institutional monopoly.* Namely, it was closely linked with just one education and research institution – the Faculty of Social Sciences (and its predecessors) in Ljubljana. It is difficult to identify all of the important factors leading to this concentration of political science institutions in the national capital without a thorough investigation. Perhaps one factor is the initial political will to have an important (initially "political") school in the very center of political power. During the

1970s and 1980s, when political science was quite often confused with politics, the number of regular students was so small that even the already established Department of Political Science in Ljubljana had problems maintaining the entire program developed in the framework of the Faculty of Sociology, Political Science, and Journalism. Judged by the number of graduates, the political science field shifted from an important course of study (about 50 graduates a year from 1963 to 1968) to a minor study at the Faculty (some 20 graduates annually at the beginning of the 1980s). Staff numbers also fell as members took on political roles or positions at other institutions (including other faculties within the University of Ljubljana and the University of Maribor). During the last decade, there have been several new initiatives for institutional development, but so far they have had little impact on institutional monopoly.

Research and teaching subjects pressured by political expectations

In socialist times, Slovenia was one of the three Yugoslav centers of academic political science (Ljubljana, Zagreb, Belgrade), with Belgrade having the most influence as the center of the federal political science community in Yugoslavia and holding the presidency of the Union of Political Science Associations of Yugoslavia for a long time. In Slovenia and the other northwestern republics of former Yugoslavia, it is generally believed that Yugoslav and Slovenian political science in socialist times was much more "Western" and open to currents in the modern world than in other socialist countries and that this helped political science in Slovenia become aware of the need to develop into an autonomous field, a profession distinct from other social sciences, and a science distinct from pragmatic politics.

Still, the development of political science was closely linked to the development of the system of self-management. The goal was to "liberate" Yugoslav political science from the "Eastern sin" (Djordjević, 1979: 14). Early discussions focused on issues like the essence of politics, the multi-dimensionality of self-management, relations between the social structure and political institutionalization, the difference between self-management's direct democracy and traditional representative and parliamentary democracy, relations between political government and self-management spheres, relations between civil society and the state, national questions and their resolution in socialism, the study of political institutions (the delegate system), and gradually also comparative political systems and international political relations. The key theoretical and methodological weaknesses already noticed by political scientists at the end of the 1970s were: 1. the descriptive orientation and lack of real theory; 2. the tendency of political science to support the political needs of a certain political course; and 3. the focus on describing political institutions and structures without developing any methodology for critical empirical research on power and "cratology", as well as a lack of specialization in modern sub-fields of research such as policy-making processes, elections, intermediary organizations, and political behavior (Djordjević, Bibič, Pašić, Rodin, Tomić, Stanovčić in Political Science in Yugoslavia). It is thus not surprising that only a few Slovenian political scientists (Vlado Benko, Adolf Bibič, Anton Bebler, Ernest Petrič, Bojko Bučar) were able to publish abroad before the end of the 1980s. In this respect, Ljubljana was comparable to both Zagreb and Belgrade. Of course, many of the fields mentioned could only have been developed in a context permitting political competition.

University teaching used mainly books by Slovenian and other Yugoslav authors written in the Serbian or Croatian languages. Eastern and Western political theories and debates were presented mainly through the interpretations of domestic political scientists. However, "Western" influences also filtered into Slovenian society and political science during socialism in various ways: through the relatively open borders and mass media communications to the north and west, particularly with Italy and Austria; and by exposure to Western literature – especially political science journals and through international professional activities, particularly within the IPSA. The library of the Faculty of Social Sciences (and of its predecessors) was, fortunately, provided with Western social science journals, particularly in the field of political science, even during the economic crisis of the 1980s, when the state lacked the foreign currency needed to provide funding for foreign books.

Since even then university students were familiar with English, foreign literature was accessible, albeit not compulsory reading. Still, the domestic political system, its features, and the Yugoslav role in international relations (especially the non-alignment movement) formed the core focus of studies. Of course, under socialism there was also censorship of non-journal publications in the Faculty's library. Paradoxically, it was more difficult to get publications written by Yugoslav regime critics (e.g. Djilas) from the library than to get Western literature extremely critical of socialism. Slovenian like other Yugoslav political scientists regularly participated in International Political Science Association (IPSA) activities and were able to get in touch with current literature and debates in political science.

Compared with political science studies in many other socialist countries, Slovenian political science was distinctive for involving a combination of competition and collaboration with sociology within the same education and research institution. Political science has profited from this collaboration in at least two ways: 1. sociologists, who were more advanced in the field of empirical research, taught methodology to political science students; and 2. political scientists collaborated with sociologists and researchers in communication in the interdisciplinary longitudinal survey of Slovenian public opinion since 1968. With a time lag, they started their own empirical research (such as research on the delegate system in the 1970s and local political elites' attitudes to political changes at the end of the 1980s).

Still, Slovenian political scientists mostly adhered to the political thought defined by official party ideologists. From the point of view of self-management ideology, they criticized political theories coming from either East or West as not being democratic enough. Western political systems and non-Marxist Western political thought were criticized as being "alienated from citizens" and Eastern systems and thought as being too state-centered and authoritarian. The official ideology of "pluralism of self-management interests", developed at the end of the 1970s (most prominently represented in Edvard Kardelj's "The Development of the Political System of Socialist Self-Management", first published in 1976 and revised in 1977), was to some extent adapted to accommodate oppositional pressures and the liberalization of politics in the Slovenian republic during the 1980s. A little more space was opened for pluralist political thought, albeit still within the moving political limits in Slovenia, which prohibited free party competition for power until the end of the 1980s.

The critical points redefining political science were the new wave of criticism of Stalinism and the *debate on civil society* in the 1980s. While the most prominent political scientists mainly defended the idea of a "socialist civil society", younger opponents coming primarily from political philosophy and sociology (especially Tomaž Mastnak) gradually identified the incompatibility of the expressions "socialist" and "civil society" in modern liberal democratic terms and supported competitive political pluralism. Oppositional political science activities in this sense were not particularly visible in the 1980s. Several younger political scientists did become interested in researching oppositional social movements in the first half of the 1980s, but in general, political scientists were cautious and opened the issues of political pluralism and competition after a certain time lag. Few were active in the discussion of the alternative constitution in Slovenia or took an active role in the newly emerging oppositional political parties. Political scientists tended to be neither oppositional opinion leaders nor vigorous defenders of the old system.

Political scientists participated in public debates in the 1980s and analyzed liberalization and democratization in Slovenia and diverse transition processes within and at the federal level of the Yugoslav state in the light of literature on democratic transitions and following democratic changes in East-Central European socialist countries. This gradually socialized them toward *liberal* political thinking. At the end of the 1980s, discussions also brought the idea of "*Europeanization"* into the political science discourse. So political science was not developing into a "value-free" or "ideologically-free" science.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990: from one periphery to another?

The process of gradual democratic transition in Slovenia was accompanied by the creation of the independent state in 1991. Political science in Slovenia was part of both processes. Gradually it accepted new foundations of political thought closely linked to practical and theoretical criticism of the limits the one-party system puts on human rights and liberal democracy. Former Yugoslav political scientists were involved in political cleavages in debates on reforming the federal state. To an important extent, political science associations in the federal units followed their republics' political attitudes in these debates. So political conflicts were also brought into the Union of Political Science Associations of Yugoslavia. In the period of democratic transition in Slovenia (a multi-party system was legalized solely in this Yugoslav republic in Autumn 1990) and in the creation of an independent Slovenian state (independence was declared in June 1991), political science in Slovenia identified with the liberal conception of democracy and with the new Slovenian state-building. The Slovenian Political Science Association joined the process of federal disintegration. Like several other confederate members, it declared independence and left the Union of Political Science Associations of Yugoslavia in November 1991. The International Political Science Association soon accepted it as an independent member association. In the 1990s, separate professional associations developed in the field of international relations (the Society for International Relations) and in the field of defense studies (the Society for Defense Studies). Political scientists have also been active in the Society for International Law and in the Atlantic Council Society.

Redefining political science in Slovenia in the 1990s was many-sided:

- It initially re-oriented its links from Belgrade as the political science center to more diversified and more internationalized links with political science centers in developed capitalist countries as well as in post-socialist countries. In 1992, the Faculty of Social Sciences became the first academic institution in any socialist country to become a member of the European Consortium for Political Science (ECPR). Slovenian political scientists participate in IPSA, the Trans-European Policy Studies Association, the European Research Group on the Military and Society, the Central and East European International Association, and many other relevant international professional associations, including the European Community Studies Association. They also participated in establishing the Central European Political Science Association. Over the last decade, some cooperation has also developed between post-socialist academic political science communities (projects coordinated by Budapest, Prague, and Ljubljana; cooperation among Central European political science associations). There have also been some attempts to revitalize academic contacts with some former Yugoslav republics, particularly Croatia (bilateral cooperation on the basis of agreements between the two countries), some individual political scientists from Serbia, Macedonia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina (recently a formal basis for bilateral cooperation has been established), but these contacts are still not very well developed.
- The need to build a new Slovenian state and to find a place in the international community led to a substantial redefinition of the subject of teaching and inquiry. In the process of Slovenia's integrating with the EU, more EU issues have been included in existing curricula (EU issues and dimensions included in existing subjects, new subjects included in undergraduate and graduate studies) while some new graduate program have been developed at the Faculty of Social Sciences (such as Master's programs in Policy Analysis – European Aspects, Public Administration, American Studies, and World Studies, as well as European Studies Master's program, which is in the making with the support of Tempus. Several research projects have been financed with European funds (such as Phare ACE, COST, 5th Framework Programme). National research policy has also encouraged projects on EC/EU issues.
- Building up the new state called for new professions (at the intersection of political science, policy analysis, and public administration) as well as more cadres from specific already existing study programs, previously mostly reserved for education institutions in Belgrade

(international relations, defense studies). At the end of the 1980s, debate on curriculum reform ensued with the goal of developing political science to be more useful in managing the increasingly modern society. The reform introduced at the beginning of the 1990s included further specialization in policy analysis and public administration, international relations, and defense studies. Adaptation to new circumstances also involved enrolling more and more students during the 1990s, partly to provide the missing cadres for the new state apparatus, while also temporarily solving the problem of unemployment and the relatively low share of the population with a university education. Unfortunately, these “mass” studies have not been accompanied by a proportionate growth of the teaching staff; new problems of educational quality are arising.

- Under the pressure of official policy on research and stricter rules for habilitation at the University of Ljubljana, requirements for teachers and researchers have become stricter, especially with regard to the need to publish and teach abroad in order to be able to earn and maintain one’s teaching and research position. The scope and quality of research publications have been growing.
- Old textbooks were largely replaced by new books published by Slovenian authors, including fresh information on theories, concepts, and research findings from developed political science, as well as foreign textbooks (mainly in English). Joint publications by Slovenian and established Western scholars started to appear in English.
- The generational change (retirements, deaths) and shifts of older-generation political scientists into politics (diplomacy) had a significant impact on teaching and research staff. At the beginning of the 1990s, “pure” political scientists (graduates in political science who had also completed their Master’s and PhDs in political science) started to join the teaching staff. At the moment, they are the leading generation in teaching and research. Fortunately, this generation also had many more opportunities to develop their political science knowledge abroad (in the USA and Western European countries, including Scandinavia). The generation that was taught political science after the end of the socialist system is now at the stage of writing their Master’s and PhD theses and is expected to gradually join the existing political science academic teaching and research community. Slovenia had no significant dissident political scientists who could be rehabilitated or repatriated, but there is a trend for young political scientists to continue their studies abroad and possibly find careers there.
- Growing international opportunities have been offered, especially to younger scholars and students, who are now more often exposed to teaching and research abroad (mainly using opportunities within the European Consortium for Political Science Research, various EC/EU and European University grants, or grants from the USA, Scandinavian countries, and Japan).

Institutions in the fields of teaching and research

The development of the new curricula brought about some organizational changes within the Faculty of Social Sciences and within the Department of Political Science, which remains the key political science institution in Slovenia. Currently, the Department includes the following chairs: 1. political theory and analysis; 2. policy analysis and public administration; 3. international relations; and 4. defense studies. In their fields, these chairs organize undergraduate studies, graduate studies (international relations, defense studies, policy analysis – European aspects, public administration, American studies, World studies, and – in the making – European studies), and post-graduate courses, as well as two specializations (in international relations and defense studies). The strongest identification with political science can be found within the first two chairs, which in fact emerged from the previous chair for the socio-political field of political science studies. The two other chairs have quite distinct internal identities, including separate professional associations and external publics with which to cooperate. The Faculty of Social Sciences also has three research centers (mainly involving staff from the aforementioned chairs, since research is usually only a part-time job) for political research, international relations, and defense studies.

The problems encountered in establishing new departments, faculties, and universities in Slovenia since the early 1990s (when "mass" studies started to develop) have largely been caused by a lack of teachers with proper habilitation, the prevalence of centralization tendencies in many policy fields in Slovenia, and the lack of resources available for new investments in university education. Still, there are some institutions (besides the Faculty of Social Sciences in Ljubljana) doing research and teaching relevant to political science. These include: the Faculty of Arts – Filozofska fakulteta (involving several individual researchers in the field of nationalism, gender and politics, and political history), the Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis – Graduate School of Humanities (Fakulteta za podiplomski humanistični študij), and the *Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts* (Slovenska akedemija znanosti in umetnosti – SAZU) – both mainly developing political philosophy. The Institute for Ethnic Studies (Inštitut za narodnostna vprašanja) does not publicly identify itself with political science and is composed of researchers from other social science fields or humanities (anthropology, ethnology, history, information science, linguistics, law, psychology, socio-linguistics, and sociology), but occasionally also publishes on the constitutional and political regulation of ethnic relations and conflicts. The Peace Institute (Mirovni inštitut), **founded in 1991** by a group of independent intellectuals**,** has centers for contemporary political studies, gender and politics, cultural policy, the study of violence and conflict resolution, civil society, media policy, and East-East cooperation.

The *Diplomatic Academy* (Diplomatska akademija) can hardly be understood as an institution competing with university programs either in terms of its educational goals or in the structure of its students or staff. Namely, the Diplomatic Academy is an education program organized within the framework of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Part of the DA program is carried out in cooperation with the Faculty of Social Sciences (specialization in international relations).

To some extent, research activities in the field of *sociology* overlap political sociology/political science, albeit they are predominantly perceived as activities by sociologists within sociological organizational units (e.g. public opinion surveys conducted by the Center for Public Opinion and Communications (Center za raziskovanje javnega mnenja in množičnih komunikacij) at the Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Social Sciences in Ljubljana as well as research on issues like political elites, youth, and political modernization by sociologists and social psychologists).

While in the international arena "*public administration"* is often classified within political science, in Slovenia administrative studies are traditionally close to law and are not defined as part of political science. The School of Public Administration (Visoka uprvna šola) in Ljubljana does not present itself publicly (including on the Internet) as a political science institution in the field of teaching, because its orientation is toward providing knowledge and skills in administrative, legal, and economic fields, as well as in organizational and financial areas to the students, civil servants, and members of local boards who attend its seminars. It develops consulting projects for public administration and the business sector, rather than academic research. Its staff members generally do not fulfill the Ministry of Education, Science, and Sport's administrative requirements for heads of research projects.

In the last few years, some inter-institutional and interdisciplinary developments have emerged. The School of Public Administration, a member of the University of Ljubljana, started to develop a new graduate program called Management in Public Administration. Since the school does not fulfill the academic and administrative requirements to organize such studies and since every new program has to be approved by the University, the initiative has developed into an interdisciplinary and inter-institutional graduate program involving the Faculty of Law (Pravna fakulteta), the Faculty of Economics (Ekonomska fakulteta), and the Faculty of Social Sciences – mainly the Department of Politics (all members of the University of Ljubljana). The program has earned the status of a university program (organized on the university level, not on the level of individual faculties). It is supposed to be funded by private and public sources.

Recently, some new initiatives have emerged to develop new social science programs (initiatives to establish a new university on the Slovenian coast as well as initiatives to start a graduate program on “management in public administration” and “state studies”), although they are not defined as political science programs. They are based on law, administration, communications, economics, or other social sciences.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

Research has developed significantly since the end of the 1980s. The new features are: 1. the growing modernization of research methods and research subjects – qualitative methods have been accompanied by quantitative ones, and more profound methods of statistical analysis have started to be employed; 2. the opening of the research community to international assessment and cooperation; 3. the development of applied research; and 4. action research studies and projects (the latter being mainly outside of the university).

Recent key thematic areas covered in published works include the following (unfortunately there is not enough space to fully list the publications – complete information on researchers’ bibliographies is available online at the cited reference – Izum-Cobiss):

1. The former Yugoslavia and its disintegration:
   - analysis of the former Yugoslav system of self-management (Ferfila in cooperation with Phillips) and Yugoslav federalism (Bebler);
   - nationalism, national identity, racism, extremist politics (Rizman, Kuzmanić, also the social psychologist Mirjana Ule and researchers at the Institute for Ethnic Studies);
   - war in the former Yugoslavia, the disintegration of the federal state, refugees (Bebler, Grizold, Jalušič, Bučar, Fink-Hafner, Malešič, and Kuzmanić in cooperation with Truger, Fink-Hafner in cooperation with Robbins, Jelušič), and propaganda and discourses on war (Malešič, researchers at the Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis);
   - stabilization in the Balkans after the war (Brezovšek, Bučar, Jelušič, Prebilič);
2. Democratic transition:
   - Slovenian democratic transition and the formation of the state (Fink-Hafner, Žagar, Bibič, Fink-Hafner in cooperation with Robbins, Kuzmanić, Prunk, Jalušič, Zajc, Lukšič, Bučar, Bebler, Jelušič, also sociologists – Frane Adam, Pavel Gantar, Niko Toš);
3. Civil society – state relations:
   - research on civil society, political participation, and political culture (Južnič, Jalušič, Bibič, Kuzmanić, Igor and Andrej Lukšič, Fink-Hafner, Brezovšek, Kurnik, also the sociologists Tomaž Mastnak and Pavel Gantar);
   - interest groups, NGOs, social movements, social capital, lobbying, and policy networks (Bibič, Bibič in cooperation with Graziano, Fink-Hafner, Lukšič Igor and Andrej, Kropivnik, Jalušič, also the sociologists Tomaž Mastnak, Frane Adam, Zinka Kolarič);
4. Political institutions and political behavior:
   - the development of political parties, party identification, party cleavages (Fink-Hafner, Krašovec, Kropivnik, also the sociologists Niko Toš, Urban Vehovar);
   - the Slovenian political system (Lukšič Igor, Brezovšek);
   - research on parliament (Zajc – also in cooperation with Longley, Kropivnik) and interest group influence on parliamentary decision-making (Fink-Hafner);
   - elections (Kropivnik, Zajc, Lukšič Igor, also the sociologists Frane Adam, Niko Toš, Slavko Gaber and the lawyer Franc Grad);
   - public administration in Slovenia and from a comparative perspective (Brezovšek, Haček, Bučar);
   - political values and political behavior of the adult population and especially youth (mainly the sociologists Niko Toš, Ivan Bernik, Samo Uhan, Brina Malnar and the social psychologists Mirjana Ule and Vlado Miheljak);

- gender and politics (Jalušič, Fink-Hafner, Krašovec and the sociologists Milica Antić, Maca Jogan, and Silva Mežnarić and the social psychologist Mirjana Ule, researchers at the Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis);
- political elites have remained in the sociological domain (Frane Adam, Anton Kramberger) with the exception of research on local elites' attitudes at the end of the 1980s (Kranjc and Fink-Hafner) and research on Slovenian MPs (Zajc);

5. Defense and security:
   - defense restructuring, civil-military relations, and Slovenian national security policy (Bebler, Grizold, Kotnik, Jelušič in cooperation with Selby as well as in cooperation with Manigart, the Peace Institute researchers);
   - security issues from the European and global perspectives, NATO, OSCE (Bebler, Jelušič, Grizold, Prebilič, Malešič);
6. International relations and comparative research:
   - theories in the field of international relations (Benko, Brglez);
   - comparing Slovenia with selected Western countries (Bučar in cooperation with Kuhnle, Fink-Hafner in cooperation with Cox, Ferfila in cooperation with Philips);
   - comparing Slovenia with selected post-socialist countries (Fink-Hafner and Haček);
   - research on contemporary political systems and on international and European institutions (Bebler in cooperation with Seroka, Šabič);
   - small states (Svetličič, Šabič in cooperation with Bukowski);
   - sub-national regions in international affairs (Bučar);
   - minorities (Roter).
7. Global and EU integration processes:
   - comparative view of the economy, economic public policies in transitional countries, and globalization (Ferfila, Svetličič in cooperation with Artisien, Rojec, Ferfila in cooperation with LeLoup);
   - EU integration processes from the Slovenian point of view (Fink-Hafner, Brinar, Svetličič, Bučar, Ferfila in cooperation with Phillips, Zajc);
8. Political theory:
   - liberalism, pluralism, corporatism, Gramsci's and Foucault's thought, the history of political ideas (Bibič, Rizman, Igor Lukšič, Kurnik, Prunk, Zver);
   - politics, the state, collective identities and democracy in postmodernism, political ecology (Pikalo, Kurnik, Lukšič Andrej, researchers at the Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis);
   - relations between philosophy and politics as a philosophical issue (researchers at the Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis);
9. Policy analysis:
   - foundations of policy analysis (Fink-Hafner);
   - the development of evaluation research (Fink-Hafner, Kustec, partly also the researchers at the Peace Institute and the sociologist Srna Mandič);
10. Political science:
    - the development of political science in Slovenia (Bibič, Fink-Hafner);
    - comparative research on election studies in post-socialist countries (Fink-Hafner).

4. Funding

The political science developments described here occurred in the still predominantly state-based political science, despite some very unfavorable factors in the environment during the 1990s. Research has been one of the most politically contested ministerial positions. Ministers have frequently been replaced. The problem has been that each new minister started quite a different reform in managing the research sub-system, shifting from entirely financing 1- to 3-year research projects to nearly complete institutional financing. At the same time, long time lags in state financing due to problems in adopting annual state budgets complicated the organization of serious research work and made it difficult to keep full-time researchers employed. All of these factors were exacerbated by a drop in the share of the state budget available for research (from 1.7% in 1995 to 1.4%), which happened despite Parliament's resolution to increase the proportion of the state budget available for research (Slovenia in Figures, 1999). The result within the university was to *force full-time researchers into teaching* or to look for a job outside the university.

While in the past university studies and research were primarily state funded, in the 1990s several forms of private funding and additional state funding were developed. Private funding included tuition fees at the undergraduate level (for part-time students who do not meet the standard requirements to be enrolled within the state-funded quota) and graduate and postgraduate levels (on this level, Slovenia has only part-time students, since there is no system of graduate and postgraduate scholarships). The tax system does not stimulate private sector donations to education and research. The 1990s brought the practice of "applied research" (co-financed by state institutions other than the Ministry of Science) as well as financing from EU research funds (such as COST, 5th framework). Private foreign funds have been quite limited in Slovenia (the Open Society recently even shut down its office and transferred to the Peace Institute its Media, Civil Society, and East-East Cooperation programs).

5. Public space and academic debates

Debates and publications

Political scientists have been involved in public debates in several ways: a) as individual experts helping prepare bills and parliamentary statutory rules and as expert discussants in the mass media; b) as researchers in privately and publicly funded research organizations; c) as professional collectives (through professional associations' activities); and d) as representatives of individual political parties. The most publicly visible were debates on writing a new constitution (adopted in 1992), the electoral system, xenophobic events, women's participation in politics, the role of the Constitutional Court in politics and policy-making, election outcomes, new (anti-globalist) social movements, terrorist attacks, drug policy, and, more recently, joining NATO.

The Slovenian Political Science Association (established in 1968), the oldest professional association in the field of political science, has been an ever-present factor in the popularization and development of political science in Slovenian society since the end of the 1980s. It has organized regular annual meetings and the publication of proceedings from Slovenian and international scientific conferences organized in Slovenia in cooperation with the IPSA, regional Central European political science associations, and newly established European thematic networks and associations. Public topics the Slovenian Political Science Association has debated at its annual meetings include: political pluralism and the democratization of public life (1989); (con)federalism, majority decision-making, consensus (1990); parliamentarianism: dilemmas and perspectives (1991); the emergence of the Slovenian state (1992); problems in the consolidation of democracy (1993); political parties and partisanship (1994); interest groups and lobbying (1995); conflicts and consensus; pluralism and neo-corporativism in new and old democracies in the region (1996); democracy: governing and public administration (1997); the Europeanization of Slovenian politics (1998); processes and problems of democratic consolidation (1999); horizontal and vertical responsibility (2000); and ten years of Slovenian statehood (2001).

The data available on Slovenian political scientists' publications displays the trends of a growing amount of published material: a) in general; b) in world languages, published in Slovenia; c) in the West; and d) a still relatively weak trend of articles, books, and journals in world languages published in the East. Before the 1980s, only a few Slovenian political scientists had presented papers at international conferences, and they had nearly no publications in Western journals or books. The 1980s and 1990s saw articles appearing in international journals such as the *Journal of Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, the *International Defense Review*, the *Journal of European Public Policy*, the *European Journal of Political Research*, the *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, *Armed Forces and Society*, *Res Publica*, the *Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift*, the *Journal of Peace Research*, *Nationalities Papers*, *Canadian Slavonic Studies*, *Development and International Cooperation*, *Balkan Forum, Cultural Studies*, the *International Journal of World Peace*, and the *International Social Science Review*. The *Journal of International Relations and Development* (edited by Zlatko Šabič) was launched at the Faculty of Social Sciences in Ljubljana to encourage political scientists from post-socialist countries to publish high-quality articles in English.

Given the size of the Slovenian political science community (Slovenia has somewhat less than 2 million inhabitants and about 35 active academic staff with PhDs in political science), there are quite a lot of Slovenian political science journals, academic publication series, and periodicals (Table 1). Here, it should be noted that Slovenian political scientists also publish in other journals in the broader field of social sciences in Slovenia, especially in the *IB journal*, *Družboslovne razprave* (Sociological Debates), and *Javna uprava* (Public Administration).

Databases

The databases of political science empirical research (such as surveys of Slovenian MPs, members of the National Council, and interest groups) have been prepared for presentation in a publicly accessible form with the technical support of the *Social Sciences Data Archive* at the *Faculty of Social Sciences* in Ljubljana (Arhiv družboslovnih podatkov). Recently, a database on political systems and democratic transitions in Central European post-socialist countries and countries in the territory of former Yugoslavia was started at the *Center for Political Research* (Cener za politološke raziskave). Among the valuable empirical sources for political science research (also available in the Social Science Data Archives mentioned above) is the database of the longitudinal research project Slovenian Public Opinion Poll, 1968-2001 (headed by Niko Toš), which is also involved in several international comparative survey projects such as the World Value Survey and International Social Science Project and occasionally focuses on specific political issues.

6. Views on further development

The expansion and academic development of political science disciplines are closely linked to the democratic transition in Slovenia; the strengthening of links and activities within the international political science community; new opportunities for studying and teaching abroad; the growing role of a new generation of staff (educated as political scientists proper); the system of university academic promotion that demands scientific activity abroad (publishing and teaching abroad); the expansion of undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate studies within the university system; and new infrastructure (a new Faculty of Social Science building opened in the 1999/2000 academic year, offering modern teaching techniques, improved working conditions, a better library, and computer infrastructure for students and staff).

Despite the growing burden on staff in the university environment (“mass studies”) and the tendency to develop research in Slovenia, state funding has not been increasing proportionately (funding for research even dropped in the middle of the 1990s). At the same time, it is difficult to obtain any substantial private financing. It can be expected that in the next few years the currently nonexistent “market” of young political scientists with PhDs and MAs will start to emerge. At the moment, no “brain drain trend” is visible. It may be that initiatives for new universities in Slovenia will absorb some of the young qualified political scientists in the future, but it is difficult to predict whether this absorption will actually prevent a “brain drain”.

Some features of current and possible future political science development are unfavorable: 1. the government is oriented toward the development of “mass” studies on the university level without appropriately increasing the proportion of the state budget devoted to and the number of staff involved in teaching; 2. so far, attempts to reform social science studies have failed to introduce a credit system; this delay has not only already caused practical problems in crossing disciplinary boundaries, but also in international student exchanges; 3. Slovenian authors' input to international political science still consists predominantly of presenting "the Slovenian case" without any ambition to contribute original ideas, approaches, or concepts; 4. comparative research has also only started to develop in the last few years; and 5. the majority of researchers are involved in research only part-time (their primary job being teaching), due to research funding cuts in the 1990s and shifts from research to teaching positions. Full-time researchers are the exception and there is little opportunity for young graduates and postgraduates to be hired as research assistants; these facts are becoming obstacles to any further lively development in this field.

In general, political science's development in Slovenia (particularly in the last decade) has been a step from an ideologically overburdened and weak discipline toward one more autonomous and internationally comparable in the fields of teaching and research. However, much remains for both the academic community and the state to do.

Selected Bibliography:

(selected first political science and political science sub field founding books in Slovene and Slovenian political science publications in World languages only)

Adam, Frane (ed.) (1993): *Volitve in politika po slovensko* (Elections and Politics in the Slovenian Way*)*, Ljubljana, Znanstveno publicistično središče;

Bebler, A. and Seroka, J. (eds.) (1990): *Contemporary Political Systems: Classifications and Typologies*, London, Boulder (CO), Lynne Reinner;

Bebler, Anton (1992): *The Yugoslav Crisis and the Yugoslav people's Army*, Zürich, Forschungsstelle für Sicherheitspolitik und Konfliktanalyse, ETH Zentrum;

Bebler, Anton (1993): "Yugoslavia's Variety of Communist federalism and her Demise", in: *Communist and Post-Communist Studies,* Vol. 26, 72-86;

Bebler, Anton (1994): "The Role of Military in the Dizintegration of Yugoslavia", in: *The Military in the Service of Society and Democracy*, Ashkenazy, Daniella (ed.), London, Westport (Connecticut), Greenwood Press, 129-135;

Bebler, Anton (1996): "Civil-Military Relations in Slovenia", in: *Civil-Military Relations in the Soviet and Yugoslav Successor States,* Danopoulos, Constatine P. and Zirker, Daniel (eds.), Boulder, Westview, 195-211;

Bebler, Anton (ed.) (1997): *Central-Eastern Europe and Euro-Atlantic Security*, proceedings of the international conference, Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences, Centre for Defence Studies;

Bebler, Anton (ed.) (1999): *The Challenge of NATO Enlargement*, Westport (Connecticut), London, Praeger;

Bebler, Anton (ed.) (2001): "Corruption among the Security Personnel of the Central and East Europe," in: *Army and State in Postcommunist Europe*, Betz, David and Löwenhard, John (eds.), London and Portland (OR), Frank Cass, 129-145;

Benko, Vlado (1970): "Integracija socioloških, politoloških in novinarskih ved v univerzo" (Integration of Sociological, Politological and Communication Studies into University), in: *Teorija in praksa*, No.11, 1506-1510;

Benko, Vlado (1977): *Mednarodni odnosi* (International Relations), Maribor, Obzorja;

Bibič, Adolf (1981): *Za politologiju* (For Political Science), Zagreb, Centar za društvenu djelatnost;

Bibič, Adolf (1993): "The Emergence of Pluralism in Slovenia", in: *Communist and Post-communist Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 4, 367-386;

Bibič, Adolf (1996): "The Development of Political Science in Slovenia: Democratisation and Transformation of the Discipline", in: *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 29, No. 4, 425-450;

Bibič, Adolf and Novosel, Pavao (eds.) (1971): *Politička znanost: predmet i* metode (Political Science: Subjects and Methods), Zagreb, Naprijed;

Bibič, Adolf and Graziano, Gigi (eds.) (1994): *Civil Society, Political Society, Democracy*, Ljubljana, Slovenian Political Science Association;

Brezovšek, Marjan (1997a): “Changing Attitudes towards Political Representation”, in: *Javnost - The Public*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 105-118;
Brezovšek, Marjan (1997b): “Peacekeeping Plans in the Light of (Con)federal Models of Bosnia and Herzegovina”, in: *Journal of International Relations,* Vol. 4, No. 1-4, 183-196;
Brezovšek, Marjan (2000): “The Restructuring of Slovenian State Administration”, in: *EU Enlargement to the East: Public Administration in Eastern Europe and European Standards,* Warszawa, Politeja, 71-79;
Brglez, Milan (2001): “Reconsidering Wendt's Meta-theory: Blending Scientific Realsim with Social Constructivism”, in: *Journal of International Relations and Development,* Vol. 4, No. 4, 339-63;
Brinar, Irena (1996): “Slovenia's Way into Europe”, in: The Challenge of Europeanization in the Region: East Central Europe, Budapest, Hungarian Political Science Association and Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 111-134;
Brinar, Irena (1999): “Slovenia: From Yugoslavia to the European Union”, in: *Back to Europe: Central and Eastern Europe and the European Union*, Henderson, Karen (ed.), London, Philadelphia UCL, 241-257;
Bučar, Bojko (1990): “Emerging New Criteria for the Recognition of States”, in: *Journal of International Relations,* Vol. 4, No. 1, 73-83;
Bučar, Bojko (1993): “Der Bürgerkrieg in Jugoslawien”, in: *Ostmittel- und Südeuropa im Umbruch*, Grothusen, Klaus-Detlev (ed.), München, Südeuropa Gesellschaft, 129-139;
Bučar, Bojko (1997): “The Emergence of New States, Borders and Minorities”, in: *Kollektive Identität in Krisen: Ethnizität in Religion, Nation, Europa,* Hettlage, Robert and Deger, Petra (eds.), Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag, 226-233;
Bučar, Bojko (1999a): “Lessons of Accession and Experiences from the European Union's Latest Newcomers”, in: *Journal of International Relations and Development,* Vol. 2, No. 2, 126-135;
Bučar, Bojko (1999b): “The Issue of the Rule of Law in the EU Enlargement process: Aspects of Slovenian-Italian Relations”, in: *Development and Developing International and European Law,* Benedek, Wolfgang, Isak, Hubert and Kicker, Renate (eds.), Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 341-353;
Bučar, Bojko (2000): “The Invasion of Privacy of Public Officials in Early United States Jurisdiction”, in: *Javnost - The Public,* Vol. 7, No.1, 91-106;
Bučar, Bojko (2001): “Die Bedeutung des Stabilitätspaktes für den Balkan”, in: *Völker- und Europarecht,* Kicker, Renate, Ginther, Konrad, Benedek, Wolfgang and Isak, Hubert (eds.), Wien, Verlag Österreich, 48-54;
Bučar, Bojko and Kuhnle, Stein (eds.) (1994): *Small States Compared: The Politics of Slovenia and Norway*, Bergen, Alma Mater;
Ferfila, Bogomil (1991): *The Economics and Politics of the Socialist Debacle: The Yugoslav Case*, Lanham (Maryland), University Press of America;
Ferfila, Bogomil (1994): “Slovenia in the World” in: *Small States in Transition: The Case of Slovenia. Transformation Processes in a Small Post-socialist Society*, Adam, Frane and Tomc, Gregor (eds.), Special issue of *Družboslovne razprave*, Vol. 10, No. 15-16, 161-180;
Ferfila, Bogomil and Leloup, Lance (1999): *Budgeting, Management and Policymaking,* Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede;
Ferfila, Bogomil and Phillips, Paul (1993): *The Rise and Fall of the Third Way: Yugoslavia 1945-1991*, Halifax, Fernwood Publishing;
Ferfila, Bogomil and Phillips, Paul (1999): *Slovenia and Canada*, Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede;
Ferfila, Bogomil and Phillips, Paul (2000): *Slovenia: On the Edge of European Union*, Lanham (Md), New York, Oxford, University Press of America;
Fink-Hafner, Danica (1998): “Organized Interests in the Policy-making Process in Slovenia”, in: *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 285-302;
Fink-Hafner, Danica (1999a): “Dilemmas in Managing the Expanding EU: The EU and Applicant States' Point of View”, in: *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 6, No.52, 783-801;
Fink-Hafner, Danica (1999b): “The Left in Slovenia”, in: *The Return of the Left in Post-communist States*, Racz and Bukowski (eds.), Northampton (MA), Edward Elgar, 107-129;
Fink-Hafner, Danica (2000): ”The Case of Slovenia”, in: *Transformation Processes in the Yugoslav Successor States between Marginalization and European Integration*, Riegler, Henriette (ed.), Baden-Baden, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 11-43;
Fink-Hafner, Danica and Cox, Terry (eds.) (1996): *Into Europe? Perspectives from Britain and Slovenia,* Znanstvena knjižnica FDV, Ljubljana;

Fink-Hafner, Danica and Robbins, John, R. (eds.) (1997): *Making a New Nation: The Formation of Slovenia*, Aldershot, Brookfield (USA), Singapore, Sydney, Dartmouth;
Goričar, Jože (1959): *Oris zgodovine političnih teorij* (History of Political Theories), Ljubljana;
Grizold, Anton (1992): "Der Krieg in Jugoslawien 1991-1992", in: *Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift*, Vol. 21, No. 5, 359-411;
Grizold, Anton (1996): "Attitudes of the Slovenian Population towards National Security", in: *Future Roles, Missions and Structures of Armed Forces in the New World order: The Public View,* Manigart, Phillipe, (ed.), Commack, Nova Science Publishers, 147-157;
Grizold, Anton and Kotnik, Igor (1996): "The Present and the Future of the Military Profession in Slovenia," in: *The Present and the Future of the Military Profession - Views of European Officers,* Kuhlman, Jürgen (ed.), Ergomas, Forum internationales, Band 18, Sozialwissenschaftliches Institut der Bundeswehr, 181-228;
Grizold, Anton and Jelušič, Ljubica (1998): "Slovenian Security in a European Perspective", in: *Security in Central and Eastern Europe: Problems - Perceptions - Policies*, Luif, Paul (ed.), Brussels, Österreichisches Institut für internationale Politik;
Jalušič, Vlasta (1990): "Zivile Gesellschaft, neue soziale Bewegungen und Politik. Das Beispiel Slowenien", in: *Mitteleuropäsche Perspektiven*, Truger, Arno and Macho, Thomas H. (eds.), Wien, Verlag für Gesellschaftskritik, 107-116;
Jalušič, Vlasta (1992): "Kriegsziel Demokratie?", in: *Krieg in Europa: Analysen aus dem ehemaligen Jugoslawien*, Gaisbacher, Johann (ed.), Frankfurt am Main, Sandkorn, Linz, DIPA, 84-98;
Jalušič, Vlasta (1998): "Die Geschlechterfrage und die Transformation in Ostmitteleuropa: Kann das Geschlechtparadigma zur 'Transformation des Politischen' beitragen," in: *Geschlechterverhältnisse in Kontext politischer Transformation*, Kreisky, Eva and Sauer, Birgit (eds.), PVS, Sonderheft, Jg. 38, 450-474;
Jalušič, Vlasta (1999): "Women in Interwar Slovenia" and "Women in Post-socialist Slovenia" , in: *Gender Politics in the Western Balkans: Women, Society and Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav Successor States,* Ramet, Sabrina (ed.), Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania State University, 23-51 and 51-66;
Jalušič, Vlasta, Antić-Gaber, Milica (2001): *Women, Politics, Equal Opportunities: Prospects for Gender Equality Politics in Central and Eastern Europe*, Ljubljana Peace Institute;
Jelušič, Ljubica (1998): "Die Kosten des NATO-Beitritts Sloweniens", in: *Die Debatte über die Kosten der NATO-Osterweiterung. Demokratie, Sicherheit, Frieden*, Bd. 119, Pradetto, August and Alamir, Faouzieh Melanie (eds.), Baden-Baden, Nomos, 194-206;
Jelušič, Ljubica (2000a): "Nationalism against Lost Legitimacy: Slovenes versus the Yugoslav Military", in: *Handbook of Global International Policy*, Nagel, Stuart S. (ed.), New York, Basel, Marcel Dekker, 185-201;
Jelušič, Ljubica (2000b): "Farewell to the Balkans: The Slovenian media's coverage of the war in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (March-June 1999)", in: *International Security, Mass Media and Public Opinion*, Malešič, Marjan (ed.), Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences, 82-92;
Jelušič, Ljubica and Selby, John (eds.) (2000): *Defence Restructuring and Conversion: Sociocultural Aspects*, Brussels European Commission;
Jelušič, Ljubica and Prebilič, Vladimir (2001): "Between Old Ties and New Challenges: Slovenian Policy towards Crisis Situation in South-Eastern Europe", in: *Ten Years after: Democratisation and Security Challenges in South East Europe*, Trajkovski, Boris (ed.), Vienna, Institut für Internationale Friedenssicherung, 69-79;
Jelušič, Ljubica and Manigart, Philippe (eds.) (2001): *European Defence Restructuring: Military and Public View*, Brussels, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities;
Južnič, Stane (1973): *Politična kultura* (Political Culture), Maribor Obzorja;
Kranjc, Stane (1992): *Razvoj strank in strankarskega pluralizma na Slovenskem 1988-1991* (The Development of Parties and Party Pluralism in Slovenia 1988-1991), Ljubljana, Centre for Political Research, Faculty of Social Sciences;
Krašovec, Alenka (1999): "Party and State in Democratic Slovenia", in: *Party Development and Democratic Change in Post-Communist Europe: The First Decade* (Democratization studies), Lewis, Paul G. (ed.), London and Portland, Frank Cass, 93-106;
Kropivnik, Samo (1997): "Voting Behaviour in Slovenia", in: *Conflicts and Consensus: Pluralism and Neo-corporativism in New and Old Democracies in the Region*, Kropivnik, Samo, Lukšič, Igor and Zajc, Drago (eds.), 77-88;

Kropivnik, Samo (1998): "Analyzing Slovenian parliamentary parties' "ideological" positions and their mutual relations", in: *The New Democratic Parliaments: The First Years*, Zajc, Drago and Longley, Lawrence D. (eds.), 181-193;

Kropivnik, Samo and Mrvar, Andrej (1996): "An Analysis of the Slovene Parliamentary Parties Network", in: *Developments in Data Analysis: Proceedings of the International Conference on Statistical Data Analysis and Data Collection, Bled, 1994, September 19 - 21,* Ferligoj, Anuška and Kramberger, Anton (eds.), Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede, 209-216;

Kropivnik, Samo, Lukšič, Igor and Zajc, Drago (eds.) (1997): *Conflicts and Consensus: Pluralism and Neo-corporativism in New and Old Democracies in the Region*, *Proceedings of the third regional conference of the Central European Political Science Association*, *Bled, 1996*, Ljubljana, Slovenian Political Science Association;

Kuzmanić, Ante (1991): "Yugoslav Statehood and Subnational Conflicts in Yugoslavia", in: *New Challenges for Europe after 1989,* Jensen, Jody (ed.), Budapest, The Center for European Studies, 49-59;

Kuzmanić, Ante and Truger, Arno (eds.) (1992 and 1993): *Yugoslavia War,* Ljubljana and Schlaining, Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution;

Kuzmanić, Ante (1994): "Strikes, Trade Unions and Slovene Independence", in: *Independent Slovenia: Origins, Movements, Prospects,* Benderly, Jill and Kraft, Evan (eds.), London, Macmillan, 159-179;

Kuzmanić, Ante (1997a): "The Experience of War in Former Yugoslavia", in: *Toward Racism? The Bosnian Example* and in: *A Better Future for Europe and Humanity: On Conflict prevention and Building Democracy from Below,* Farfer, Ali M. (ed.), Vienna, Jamahir Society for Culture and Philosophy, 69-74;

Kuzmanić, Ante (1997b): "Slovenia: From Yugoslavia to the Middle of Nowhere?" in: *Democratization in Central and Eastern Europe,* Kaldor, Mary and Vejvoda, Ivan (eds.), London, Cromwell, 121-134.

Lukšič, Andrej (1999): "Rizična tehnologija: izziv demokraciji: k politični ekologiji" (Risk Technology: Challenge of Democracy: Towards Political Ecology), in: *Časopis za kritiko znanosti*, thematic issue, Vol. 27, No. 193, Ljubljana, Študentska organizacija Univerze v Ljubljani, Inštitut za ekologijo;

Lukšič, Igor (1996a): "Social Partnership in Slovenia", in: *Austro-corporatism: Past, Present, Future*, Bischof, Günter and Pelinka, Anton (eds.), New Brubswick, London, Transaction Publishers, 164-169;

Lukšič, Igor (1996b): "Liberal Traditions on Slovene Territory: First Steps of Liberalization," in: *Im Zeichen der liberalen Erneuerung,* Gerlich, Peter, Glass, Krzysztof and Serloth, Barbara (eds.), Poznań and Wien, Österreichische Gesellschaft für Mitteleuropäische Studien and Wydawnictwo Fundacji dla humanistyki Humaniora, 195-208;

Lukšič, Igor (1996c): "Political Culture in Slovenia", in: *Political Culture in East Central Europe*, Plasser, Fritz and Pribersky, Andreas (eds.), Aldershot, Avebury, 91-104.

Lukšič, Igor (1999): "Politische Rituale und Symbole als Mittel der Identitätsstiftung in Slowenien," in: *Symbole und Rituale des Politischen: Ost- und Westeuropa im Vergleich*, Pribersky, Andreas, Unfried, Berthold (eds.), Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 175-183.

Lukšič, Igor and Kurnik, Andrej (2001): "Slovenia", in: *Direct Democracy: The Eastern and Central European Experience*, Auer, Andreas and Bützer, Michael (eds.), 192-204;

Malešič, Marjan (ed.) (1993): *The Role of Mass Media in Serbian-Croatian Conflict,* Stockholm Psykologyskt Forsvär;

Malešič, Marjgan (ed.) (2000): *International Security, Mass Media and Public Opinion*, Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences;

Mastnak, Tomaž (1992): *Vzhodno od raja: civilna družba pod komunizmom in po njem* (East of Eaden: Civil Society under Comunism and after), Ljubljana, Državna založba Slovenije;

Mastnak, Tomaž (1994): "From Social Movements to National Sovereignty", in: *Independent Slovenia: Origins, Movements, Prospects*, Benderly, Jill and Kraft, Evan (eds.), London, Macmillan;

Ogris, Albin (1926): *Politične stranke* (Political Parties), Ljubljana, published by the author;

Petrič, Ernest (1977): *Mednarodnopravno varstvo narodnih manjšin* (Ethnic Minority Protection in International Law), Maribor, Obzorja;

Petrič, Ernest (1984): *Pravica do samoodločbe* (The Right to Self-determination), Maribor, Obzorja;

Prunk, Janko (1996 and 2000): *A Brief History of Slovenia,* Ljubljana, Založba Grad;

Pitamic, Leonid (1927): *Država* (State), Ljubljana;

Rizman, Martin Rudi (1999): "Radical Right Politics in Slovenia", in: Ramet, Sabrina, ed. *The Radical Right in Central and Eastern Europe since 1989*, University park, PA, The Pennsylvania State University Press;

Rizman, Martin Rudi (2000): *Uncertain Path, The Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation in Slovenia*, doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts, Harvard University, Cambridge;

Roter, Petra (2001): "Locating the 'Minority Problem' in Europe: A Historical Perspective", in: *Journal of International Relations and Development,* Vol. 4, No. 3, 202-21;

Svetličič, Marjan (1993): "Globalization, Economic Integration, and Political Disintegration", in: *Development and International Cooperation,* Vol. 16, No. 9, 99-119.

Svetličič, Marjan (1996): "Challenges of Globalisation and Regionalisation in the World Economy", in: *Global society*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 107-123;

Svetličič, Marjan, Artisien, P. and Rojec, Matija (1993): *Foreign Investment in Central and Eastern Europe,* New York, St. Martin's Press;

Svetličič, Marjan and Brinar, Irena (1999): "Enlargement of the European Union: The case of Slovenia", in: *Journal of European public policy*, Vol. 6, No. 5, 802-821;

Šabič, Zlatko (1995): *International Parliamentary Organs in European Institutional Organising: Selected Cases,* Ljubljana, CIR Publication;

Šabič, Zlatko (1999): *Voting in International Organisations: Mere Formality or a Matter of Substance?*, Ljubljana, Scientific Library, Faculty of Social Sciences;

Šabič, Zlatko and Bukowski, Charles (eds.) (2002-forthcoming): *Small States in the Post-Cold War World. Slovenia and NATO Enlargement*, Westport, Preager Publishers;

Toš, Niko (1993): "Social Change and Shift of Values: Democratization Processes in Slovenia", in: *Nationalities Papers,* Vol. 21, No.1, 23-41;

Toš, Niko et al.(1968-2001): *Slovenian Public Opinion Poll*, longitudinal research project, Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences (data available in Social Science Data Archive at the same faculty, internet sources cited below);

Zajc, Drago (1996a): "A Reconsideration of the Role of the ECE Parliaments in the Process of Europeanization", in: *The Challenge of Europeanization in the Region: East Central Europe*, Budapest, Hungarian Political Science Association, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Institute for Political Sciences, 163-172;

Zajc, Drago (1996b): "Legislative Developments in a New Democracy: The Case of Slovenia", in: *Parliaments and Organized Interests: The Second Steps*, Ágh, Attila and Ilonszki, Gabriella (eds.), Budapest, Hungarian Centre for Democracy Studies, 380-394;

Zajc, Drago (1998a): "Slovenia", in: *The Handbook of Political Change in Eastern Europe*, Berglund, Sten, Hellén, Thomas and Aarebrot, Frank H. (eds.), Cheltenham (UK) and Northampton (MA), Edward Elgar, 275-293;

Zajc, Drago (1998b): "The Electoral System in Slovenia", in: *Electoral Systems, Political Stability and Viable Government in Europe's New Democracies - Achievements, Failures and Unresolved Issues*, *proceedings of a seminar at the Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 22-25 November 1998*, Heinz, Wolfgang and Klein, Harald (eds.), Sankt Augustin, Comdok, 128-130;

Zajc, Drago and Longley, Lawrence (eds.) (1998): *The New Democratic Parliaments: The First Years*, Appleton (USA), Research Committee of Legislative Specialists International Political Science Association, Lawrence University;

Zver, Milan (1992): "Korporativizem v slovenski politični misli v 20. in 30. letih," (Corporatism in the Slovenian Political Thought in the 1920 's and 1930's), in: *Časopis za kritiko znanosti*, Vol. 20, No. 7-8, 694-702;

Žagar, Mitja (1992): "Status and Protection of National Communities: Ethnic Minorities in the Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia", in: *Gradivo in razprave*, No. 26-27, 5-20.

Other Sources:

Bibič, Adolf (1982): *Politologija in vloga politologov v naši družbi* (Political Science and the Role of Political Scientists in our Society), research report, Ljubljana, Faculty of Sociology, Political Science and Journalism, 107;

Djordjević, Jovan (1979): "The State and Course of Development of Political Science in Yugoslavia", in: *Political Science in Yugoslavia*, 5-18;

FSPN (1961-1981) (1981) Ljubljana, Visoka šola za politične vede (College for Political Science);

Political Science in Yugoslavia. Selected Works (1979), Belgrade, Union of Political Science Associations of Yugoslavia;
Poročilo o delu Visoke šole za politične vede (1962-1967) (1967), Ljubljana;
Slovenia in Figures 1999 (1999), Ljubljana, Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia.
- individual researhers' bibliographies availabe on-line (COBISS): http://www.izum.si
- Social Science Data Archives, (Arhiv družboslovnih podatkov), Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana http://www.adp.fdv.uni-lj.si/

Table 1 Slovenian Political Science Journals, Academic Publication Series and Periodicals

Publishers	**Journals**	**Academic press (books)**	**Annual publications (books)**
Faculty of Social Sciences	Theory and Practice (*Teorija in praksa*)	*Scientific Library* (Znanstvena knjižnica)	
		Teorija in praksa (Theory and Practice)	
Faculty of Social Sciences, Center of International Relations	Journal of International Relations and Development (in English)		
Slovenian Political Science Association*			Slovenian Political Science Association annual conference proceedings (various political science issues; some publications in English)
Peace Institute Publications	Intolerance Monitor**	"Politike" series*** and EU monitor	
Student Organization of Ljubljana (Študentska organizacija v Ljubljani)	*Časopis za kritiko znanosti* (Journal for Criticism of Science)		

Note: The above publications are published in the Slovenian language except where otherwise stated in the Table.

* For more on the Slovenian Political Science Association's publications, see the subsection on its activities.

** The Peace Institute publication is set to qualify as a journal in 2002.

*** Texts in each book in the *Politike* series are published in both Slovenian and English. The Peace Institute also publishes the Media Watch series.

Sociology

Pál Tamás

Followers or Activists? Social Scientists in the Reality Shows of Transformation

In the 1990s, social research in the transformation countries appears to face an impasse. On the one hand, the need for cross-cultural research has never been greater. On the other hand, the so-called "crises of representation" in the social sciences prompted by the institutionalized bias of research traditions weakly related to the post-socialist realities has complicated the interpretation of the new environment. Most social scientists have reacted to this in one of two distinct ways. One group has simply retrenched behind seemingly safe disciplinary barriers. This is not a surprisingly new situation. "The anthropologist writes about extraordinary locales that have color and vividness, in contrast to the sociologist's greater proclivity for the matter-of-fact and the prosaic," remarked Gouldner (1973: 344-45). The second group has fallen back upon a prudent localism that focuses almost exclusively on peripheral types of modernity. Elias (1987) called this "the retreat of sociologists into the present"; it is even more a retreat into their own cultural life-worlds (Kurosawa, 2000: 12).

Institution building in the knowledge sector

Groups of new social scientists of the 1990s (new generations and researchers moving toward central positions from the margins of the research system) entering into knowledge production are challenged by an old/new program of institution building and power constitution. What is better for them, to occupy the old institutions or to build new ones? Their decisions were influenced by four factors:

1. How strong are the institutional or regulatory defense lines of the old academic elite? Or in other worlds, how is the old academic power structure constituted? In those countries and research sectors where some forms of academic autonomy were already constituted in the 1980s and where the academic elite of that time already used that autonomy against the late communist bureaucracy, the same instruments and regulations were applied after 1989 in an almost natural form against the new academic groups who attacked the established positions of traditional institutional academic leaders. So newcomers had difficulties taking over the latter's' positions. In other countries or sectors, where the elite of social research was better integrated in the ideological infrastructure of the former regime, it was now easier to use political force against them.
2. Major foreign donors for social research in the region, like the Open Society Institute (George Soros' philanthropy) and other programs or projects of "democracy building", usually had only limited trust in state institutions that were inherited from communist times. On the one hand, the donors were dissatisfied with their low efficiency and high overhead, and on the other hand, until the late 1990s, the liberal funds and programs were simply not interested in cooperation with their elite, which had already begun during the socialist decades.
3. From the early 1990s on, important groups of the social science intelligentsia got involved in practical social reforms or even parliamentary politics. Those programs used the most active or pragmatic part of the research community, the people who in other circumstances would or could be the organizational leaders of academic renewal. Starting in the mid-1990s, the majority of these enthusiasts for practical social reforms usually left the political scene, but the power structure already stabilized by that time made it almost impossible for them to get involved now in academic reforms.
4. Using foreign grants and research contracts, active parts of the community left the region in the period of 1988-1996. Again, groups of potential institution-builders and founders of scientific schools are overrepresented in migration flows. With low academic incomes and the

low attractiveness for many academics of better paid local jobs in the market-oriented applied research centers, many fine researchers saw work abroad as a quality-of-life and professional alternative. Fewer groups in the social sciences than in the natural sciences were involved in this process. But the losses were significant, especially in the younger age groups and in countries more deeply affected by socio-economic crises than the successful "Visegrad" establishments.

Under the cumulative impact of these factors, reformers forgot for almost a decade the "old academic sector" in countries where the positions of the old academic elite were more strongly defended and limited resources were redistributed from the state budgets. The new, ambitious, dynamic groups of social researchers and projects concentrated in other places and organizations. At the same time, the new centers and educational programs emerging beyond the traditional academic sector are usually dependent on ongoing fragmented funding from different projects, rather than being integrated in larger systems, and do not provide existential certainty for professional careers.

A different model was developed in the more successful reform countries, i.e., in Poland and Hungary. Here the intellectual and organizational modernization of the available infrastructure, i.e., of state-supported or state-financed institutions, became the mainstream. Thus, in these countries, there has been no serious dualization – no isolation of old and new research in separate networks. After some compromises, modern social research was integrated in the major academic institutions.

Re-institutionalization of scientific schools

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the scientific schools remained central elements of the organizational landscape of the social sciences. Old institutions disappeared, new ones were created outside of basic research, and many intellectuals who in the communist years believed that the research system was the only safe place to survive and to defend their personal autonomy in a hostile environment now left it and started to discover the zones of intellectual and professional existence outside of research. So the remaining centers of excellence in research and education started to be based on informal contacts, intergenerational alliances, and networks again. They saw the role of scientific schools where they still existed – mainly in economics, but also in sociology and political science – as especially important. But the structure of these schools changed significantly. Formally, they were patriarchal institutions centered on strong "fatherlike" personalities. The professional concepts and scientific worldview of the respective "Great Old Men" were transferred to the young through the school's middle-aged generations. With minor changes, this basic structure remains almost intact in the humanities, but began to change dramatically in the 1990s in the "hard" social sciences. The force of international research contacts seems to have been central in this process. The structure of schools whose founders possessed international merit was modernized, but not transformed totally. But in most cases, even if he was a brilliant scholar, the Maestro, the central personality, was not really involved in international networking, and in the 1970s-1980s, this factor just wasn't yet a major chunk of institution building in the internationally isolated "socialist" social sciences. Consequently, in the new internationalized order of social research, the Great Old Men lost important parts of the organizational power to the middle-aged strata, who were usually better prepared for international networking than the founder of the school. The really young entering the research enterprise usually searched for integrators to help incorporate them in networks with resources available for them. They often considered middle-aged scholars more capable of integrating them and therefore as having more organizational power than the Maestros.

In some cases, members of that middle-aged generation were unable to make the necessary compromises in the internal power game, and their school soon collapsed. But others pursued their interests and were able to stabilize their schools in new environments. The new school concept, however, was no longer centered on continuing or further elaborating the master's thoughts, but sought a discursive framework to maximize the availability of grants. In this respect, the school could be understood as a framing institution packaging available intellectual resources for international and, in very special cases, for national trade as well. Naturally, schools in these situations usually did conserve the disciplines. Especially in resource-intensive research areas, the availability of grants was really limited for young scientists with approaches, methods, and views different from those of the established center. At the same time, international research careers channeling the central personalities of existing or would-be centers to academic positions in the West had negative impacts on the established scientific schools in the region. Students were usually unable to follow their Masters to world centers. The Internet improved that situation in the last 5-6 years to a certain degree, but didn't change it dramatically. Only a very few new schools with distinct international merits emerged in the region.

Experts and advisors

In the 1980s in the region, before the transition started, economists used to have more experience than sociologists or political scientists in policy consulting. Experts in collecting and interpreting data for policy decisions were better established in their sectors than in areas directly related to ideology, where other social scientists could be used. Overpolitization of decision-making played a role here as well, but, formally, the policy community tried to follow international patterns in many sectors of macroeconomics. The available roles of sociologists were more divided. Sociologists broadly used and interpreted social statistics, but policy makers understood or interpreted their independent intellectual role in a much narrower way. Critical sociologists investigating substantial questions of transformation were not put in expert roles either before or after the changes started. On the one hand, the social policy administrators – the former partners of sociologists in expert positions – didn't disappear after 1989. Established contacts survived both in cognition and in personal communication. On the other hand, practical advisory roles for political scientists at existing centers are new. Behind the scenes, ideologists of the late state socialism were already frequently using research data and other sorts of social science information formatted in accordance with international standards. But either the policy makers or the experts of that time survived after the transitions started. Very few enlightened party apparatchiks of that time occupied important positions, even in those countries where strong socialist parties dominated the political landscape of the 1990s. The majority of them, especially the "Agitprop" people (the party communicators), whose social science concepts were once in relatively high demand, simply disappeared from public view. Something similar also happened to their former advisors, the political science experts, but with more compromises. In the opinions of the new political class, segments of the research community that were closer to the pre-1989 power structure were therefore illegitimate. Elements of personal trust play an important role everywhere in this business, but the advisory roles around the former communist elite were especially removed from the public eye and based on personal relations. So the new political clients were not interested in the services of those who served the former rulers, despite the qualifications of some people in that circle. Later, in the 1990s, these experts were usually very successful in marketing research and other areas of expertise outside of politics.

During the transformation, new policy makers and new experts emerged on the scene. Both groups were just learning their roles, and in such a transient situation the communication between two inexperienced entities is especially complicated. Former dissident intellectuals occupied important niches in some countries and political movements until the mid-1990s, but that didn't generate genuine demand for closer relations between reformers and social researchers. Some of the new policy makers had once been researchers, and understanding themselves and their former professional careers as part of the contemporary social science community and therefore as "experts" in their respective sectors, they were not interested in other experts, much less advisors from the community, except for the purpose of buying fresh social data.

The dynamics of the relationships between politicians and social science in public opinion and the media followed another trajectory. In comparison with the 1980s, the role of the political analyst, commentator, or chronist on the TV screen became much larger, or at least more visible. And popular opinion usually overestimated the impact on decision-making of the social scientists who were presented to the public on these programs. With significant delay, in the late 1990s, politicians utilized this particular mode of perception, as well. Those social scientists with high public visibility were often presented to the audience as partners or allies of given political movements or governments, but they were used neither in forming broader concepts of reforms, nor in supplying new social data. A new expert model – the role of virtual advisors – is emerging. Because this group is highly visible to potential voters, the decision-makers want to demonstrate its availability to politics as a further source of their legitimacy, though they are not interested in its concrete advice or knowledge.

However, social scientists produced remarkable changes in utilizing concrete knowledge in the 1990s. At the beginning of transformation, many intellectuals and of course many social scientists took personal part in campaign planning and in political communication. Of course, the people involved in these activities were not professional political technologists. Most of the concrete tasks were performed by researchers from the academic sectors, paid case by case for their performances. These researchers' additional income depended on the fees their political customers paid. But the major organizational problem of the 1990s in this area was the growing discrepancy between the step-by-step, systematized or accumulated "technological" skills of involved researchers as individuals, on the one hand, and the limited efforts in infrastructure building for them, on the other. The creation of organizational frameworks for knowledge generation usually lagged behind the cumulated personal experience of would-be political technologists formally still occupying academic jobs. The political system in most countries of the region in the late 1990s started to suffer from the low effectiveness of this system. In these years, the policy intellectuals without proper infrastructure started to be marginalized on the markets of political expertise; in the end, they were replaced by consulting firms more or less similar to their Western functional counterparts. This change had two consequences. The first is connected to the structure of research, the second is related to the self-images of the social science elite. At the very end, the upper strata of academic social researchers enjoyed the dual job market of the 1990s very much. On the one hand, they used to receive higher consulting fees as experts, but on the other hand, they continued to play the high-status roles of academic gurus on the intellectual attention markets. Also, their informal or only poorly formalized contacts with the political elite could be understood – both by the public and in their own role interpretations – as continuous involvement in the reforms and a kind of direct personal impact on the process of change in society. The latter was especially important for those social scientists who continued to be prisoners of the old role models of the East European intelligentsia. For these public intellectuals, the availability of advisory positions was interpreted as an organic role or as a continuation of regional tradition. They were ready to accept them as part of their illusory involvement in political decisions. They continued to perceive these illusions as reality, even in indefensible situations.

But in the late 1990s, they were forced to choose. Either they became practical consultants with real job descriptions and real income, accepting the asymmetries of service professions. Or they continued to serve in the academic sector, while being quickly marginalized by professional policy consultants. Academic incomes in most countries continued to grow during the 1990s, but even where they did, this replacement meant financial losses for these "dual" professionals.

Politicians also interpreted the new professional structure of experts as quite ambivalent. On the one hand, the services offered by the new commercial consulting sector may have been more professional than the previous ones. But in the absence of academic interference, they were less stimulating for building concepts. Cooperation was more hierarchical, based on clear dependencies between services and their clients; the tasks were formulated in a more simple language; and the asymmetries grew rapidly.

But the neo-etatist politicians of the late 1990s were not interested in legitimizing themselves by taking the intellectuals' sides anymore, and in general terms they were afraid of multifunctional players on the political scene (including the dual role of academic advisors), who make that scene more complex to calculate.

The end of transformation or "system change" is interpreted for different groups of the society in different frames and by different signs. For some, the end of the process is signaled by the end of privatization or by the multinational firms' opening of mass production facilities. Academic social scientists could interpret the end of politicians' intensive use of them as consultants or advisors as the turning point.

Think tanks and transformation

Most social researchers on transformation do not take part in guiding the change individually, but rather integrated in various think tanks, searching for access to policy communities to inject new ideas into current debates. A policy community is all potential actors who share a common "policy" focus and, sooner or later, succeed in shaping policy. In these networks, think tanks provide organizational and communication links between the different audiences. The first waves of policy institutes of the region, which had already been established during state socialism's technocratic attempts at modernization in the 1970s, usually disappeared or collapsed in the first period of transformation, due to their close ties to the old party and the state apparatus. But a significant number of their members were able to cross the river, incorporated in international bodies or academic institutions. The second wave emerging in the late 1980s to early 1990s primarily served international donor organizations, aid agencies, and philanthropic foundations operating in the region. The third wave of the 1990s consists of business consultants, political advisors, and communication experts tied to the new national elite. However, until recently a large share of this third wave remained state-focused, given the sources of financing and the local character of their audiences. Relatively few think tanks of this generation pursue research agendas or interact cross-nationally with one another on a regular basis. The first wave served the national elite of its time, while taking part in the global confrontational game. The second wave was forced to be international (due to its clients' interests, it networked in the region more intensively than its predecessors did in the state socialist decades). The third wave is more local, using international data and helping to interpret external impulses in its systematic comparative effort.

Social criticism and the new elite

Let us pose the simplest question: How is critical analysis, especially radical interrogation of one's own society and historical period, accomplished? For our purposes, a good answer distinguishes between involvement and detachment (Elias, 1987a). An involved critique employs another state or system of reference as a normative guide to interpret or even to change the existing social order (i.e., using contrasts like opacity and transparency, is and ought, etc.). On the other hand, detachment aims to achieve historical or cultural distance from the investigator's social context. So a detached critique can be either genealogical (historical) or intercultural (anthropological).

The first defamiliarizes the present by establishing a temporal gap with a past used to contrast and compare ongoing events, the second "goes abroad" to search for different models of human conditions (Kurasawa, 2000: 13). In a similar situation, in his well known "Traditional and Critical Theory", Horkheimer (1972: 207) appeals to history, where the questioning of the existing social order must be informed by an understanding of the sociohistorical conditions at its roots. In other transitional situations, the historical wing has predominated in sociological circles, and detachment has also been realized cross-culturally. In the post-1989 situation, there have been surprisingly few studies devoted to surviving fragments of the state-socialist past or to revitalized pre-modern traditions in the current Eastern European environment.

Social research's cross-cultural tendency has contributed to the self-criticism of Western modernity by stepping beyond the confines of our frameworks of thought and action. The distancing effect produced by encounter and engagement with other sociocultural formations questions the modern West's points of references. At the same time, the existential references of the 1990s in Eastern Europe question the apparent givenness or naturalness of existing modern Western beliefs and practices (which are commonly perceived as removed from the sociohistorical domain). The Balkans create and keep alive a sort of short-distance Otherness for Western Europe (there is a rationale for distinguishing between short-distance and the long-distance Otherness in analogy to how post-Soviet politics distinguishes between the "near abroad" and the "far abroad"). In these situations of transition, borrowing Castoriadis' terminology, the "self-institutioning of society" creates and institutionalizes modes of conduct and systems of belief. If the founders of the sociological discipline cultivated unabashedly cross-cultural interests for the internal relativization of Western worldviews and experiences, post-1989 sociology was forced to do the same for the external relativization of the same experience. A sort of ethnological counter-current could be identified as part of a New Critique, perhaps in a post-Bourdieu fashion.

Have scholars taken part in local democratic transitions?

Traditional, mainstream studies of social transformation in East-Central Europe at this point either apply conflict-theoretical approaches or try to apply models borrowed from descriptions of post-Soviet transformation processes. It might be fruitful to add to them Latin American models that contribute to understanding the precise nature of sociopolitical change during processes of democratization. Two of these are regime analysis and cultural studies. The first focuses on interpretation of elite behavior during institutional changes, and the second evaluates cultural changes among the population at large. The focusing on central issues presents alternating explanations for theoretical problems of transition (issues of clientelism, normative concepts of democracy, and the identification of relevant sociopolitical actors). Munck (1998) gave regime analysis its name; cultural studies approach originally developed by British Marxist-Gramscian sociologists in the 1960-1970s to explain the peripheral transformation in Latin America could be related to Alvarez et al. (1998). The minimalist definition of democracy advanced by Schumpeter (1942) – "the democratic method (or) institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide via a competitive struggle for the people's vote" – has created an elite model of democracy approaching this and other procedural specifications. Regime analysis concentrates on the emergence and stabilization of these procedural rules. Studying the institutionalized rules of constitutional reform and political transition, this literature recognizes the constraints of democratic stabilization on the periphery mostly derived from the longstanding traditions of oligarchy and the heavy legacies of authoritarian rule (Krische, 2000). For this, Garreton (1994) used the term "authoritarian enclaves"; O'Donnell (1998) recently recognized that polyarchical regimes can coexist with a properly democratic regime of law and that a solely regime-based focus is insufficient. Therefore (Munck, 1996) the political regime should be disaggregated into its procedural and behavioral dimensions. The first establishes the new "rules of the game" for the transition to democracy. The second, behavioral dimension means the strategic acceptance of these rules by all major political actors and the lack of normative rejection of these rules by all major political actors. It's very clear: collectivist or reductionist conceptions of the political regime ignore the independent importance of institutions. In this approach, the normative component only appears in the actor's behavioral dimension "ex negations". Now for Eastern Europe there is a commonplace, which the Latin Americanists underline for their own regime: their "hybrid" character, the importance of "another institutionalization" – that of clientelism, particularism, and corruption. Of course, it is an open question whether widespread informal cultural and institutional practices threaten the consolidation of liberal ideas of democracy, or if, vice versa, they are the basis for its survival. But at any rate, the two-dimensional desegregation of the political regime helps to raise the fundamental question for the policy situation of the exact definitions of the science-based advisor's strategies: WHO are the regime's real political actors? In this situation it is important that those claiming to hold a purely strategic point of view often lapse into a "quasi-moralistic" account of Weberian categories, i.e., clientelism is often used more as an argument of authority, which deploys it as a heuristic category (Krischke, 2000).

The cultural studies approach, on the other hand, prefers to look at the unfolding of a nonlinear cultural process of political and social change, in which "ambiguity" is a keyword (Alvarez et al., 1998). In these frameworks, social actors are responsible subjects and interpreters of the meanings and political relevance of their actions within their specific national contents. In this respect, the policies are cultural policies, and this a central strategic element for the policy experts self-identification. And these cultural policies can be interpreted as processes enacted when sets of social actors shaped by and embodying different cultural meanings and practices come into conflict with each other. When movements deploy alternative concepts of social justice, nature, equality, democracy, and technological progress that unsettle dominant cultural meanings, they enact cultural politics (Alvarez et al., 1998). In this sense, as a policy advisor, the social scientist of transformation is part of particular cultural formations, which are results of discursive articulations originating in existing cultural practices – never pure, always hybrid. The lack of differentiation between the public and private (like social authoritarianism), where political relations are perceived as extensions of private relations, regards favoritism, clientelism, and paternalism as normal or at least regular practices of politics. Alternative concepts of democracy and knowledge representation, which would be related to new role sets of experts, would view democratic struggles as encompassing a redefinition not only of the political system, but also of economic, cultural, and scientific practices, to engender a democratic ordering for society as a whole. The social scientist in this situation could became part of "subaltern counterpublics" (using the term of Nancy Fraser, 1993: 14). This can be defined as parallel discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counter-discourses, so as to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities and interests. Continuing this line, the social scientist's role can be reinterpreted in terms of a new concept of "social citizenship", which is different from the liberal interpretations and conceived as active participation in the collective action of dialogue and negotiations related to the whole of society and its inequities (Krischke, 2000: 119).

Historians and/or judges – are these alternative role sets for social researchers during the transformation decade?

Participating as an active player in the processes of transformation, the social scientist may play two traditional roles – that of the judge or that of the historian, an author of annals of change. These roles can't be confronted simply as active or passive, near or distant, present- or future-oriented. The affinities imply convergence as well as divergences. In the classical tradition (Ginzburg, 1991, 1980), historical writing had to vividly present characters and situations. The historian, like the judge, was expected to make a convincing argument by communicating the illusion of reality, exhibiting evidence he or someone else adduced. The tradition based on moral and political court speeches, followed by condemnations, has gone on for a long time and has been integrated in social researchers' modern role sets. A sort of judicial model is deeply incorporated not only in sociology, but also in historiography. In the last two decades – everywhere, and not only in the transformation countries – words like PROOF or even TRUTH have acquired an unfashionable ring in the social sciences. This extreme antipositivist attitude turns out to be a sort of inverted positivism (Ginzburg, 1991, 1983). How should an expert position himself in such a situation? The diametrically opposed assumptions – theoretical naiveté and sophistication – share the same assumption, taking the relationship between reality and evidence for granted.

Policy impacts in theory building

The processes of institution building and problems of political communication had significant impact on professional languages. We do not think primarily about the transformation of discourse or the change in semantics, but about basic structural problems like fragmentation and eclecticism. Those new professional languages of social sciences in the post-communist world are mixtures of technical termini, fragments of Western theories that were fashionable 15-20 years ago, and Marxist terms isolated from their original intellectual or theoretical environments. The "Western" paradigms of these disciplines and research areas are also fragmented or partial, but the new "Eastern" professional concepts and languages are much more eclectic. The most important point here is probably that the "Western" and "Eastern" concepts and keywords used in the new local concepts are, in the final analysis, equally isolated from their original systematic intellectual environments and alienated from their own primary traditions. Maybe for many the major value of the new system of termini that are not context-dependent is related to its neutrality, but in the end those concepts are just badly suited for the systematic interpretation of post-socialist transformation as a whole. Naturally, the picture is even more complicated by the different national mixtures in adaptation of Western theories and organizational strategies of the research system.

Four major theoretical problems reflecting this situation are:

1. Many of the projects (practically all in the beginning, in the early 1990s, but even now many) interpret the transformation as the confrontation of antagonistic systems, the Bad and the Good Society, "totalitarianism" and "democracy". This normative approach is politically understandable, but makes the manifest descriptions and interpretations of continuous processes and structures hard to interpret or even invisible.
2. International research cooperation functions as a strong thematic filter for systematic interpretations of that reality. Almost every international project in the region in the early 1990s used questions developed by the "transitology" of that time, especially its American versions. So the societies of transformation were described in close comparison. Again, two different approaches can be observed in this context. The first is interested in the typology, or at least in the morphology of transforming societies and can be termed the Arboretum approach. The second one is the Assembly Line model, which believes in the existence of only one socio-political technological line of Westernization. Descriptions of the given societies could be constructed according to the speed and character of their divergence from ideal types of the Western model. In these years, almost no work is available that compares the transitional societies with real Western societies or societal processes.

   From the late 1990s on, the dominant trend has been just the opposite. Researchers in the region were invited to take part in large European programs of social science cooperation. But in practically every case, both the coordinators and the basic questions formulated as starting points in the projects were presented by West European research centers. These projects are usually not interested in the dynamics of transformation in the East, but only in the "Eastern" equivalents of problems formulated by the coordinators in their Western European social and research environments. The "Eastern" researcher is interested in joint activities and therefore tries to do his best, identifying local analogues of the "central" problems of the projects offered. Investigations of transition are consequently marginalized in these projects. The work emerging here may be interesting or even original, but usually only weakly related to local intellectual traditions and cultural environments; and cross-national comparative accents or efforts will normally be absent here.
3. The structure of East-Central European social order is usually determined by specific institutional roles and informal ties and mentalities. In the classical political theories, however different the forms and compositions they take may be, both elements are almost equally present; but in their Eastern variants, they are different. Usually, the institutional approaches are more student-like, focused on events around institutional transfer, and rarely show high-level analytical skills in analyzing the local institutional mix. The most interesting local work is in the other area: describing informality, hidden mentalities, the political culture, and networks of trust or distrust. The world of informality is more interesting than that of

institution building for the local research community. The research process thus simply mirrors the processes in the "real" social settings.

4. There are significant differences in the structures of social theories, as well. Current theories on the international markets nowadays are non-philosophical, and usually their moral or normative elements are marginal. The dominant style of theories developed in Central Europe is just the opposite: even now it is very philosophical, and its normative elements are still very central. Concepts tied to new social players (feminism, theories of social movements, the risk society, and problems of social justice) are still insignificant. Research focuses on the presentation of general value systems. In the region, the projects perceived as leading are the qualitative or distribution-oriented ones, rather than those focused on behaviorist, game theorist, or discursive languages. The region's middle-range theories for special analytical purposes are still underdeveloped, so macroanalytical approaches are used to explain in areas where they remain too general, and therefore inefficient. The theoretical mix is usually supported by methodological eclecticism.

References

Alvarez, Sonia et al. (eds.) (1998): *The Cultures of Politics and the Politics of Culture-Re-Visioning. Social Movements in Latin America*, Boulder, Westview Press;

Berman, Edward H. (1983): *The Ideology of Philantrophy. The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy*, Albany, State University of New York Press;

Castoriadis, Cornelius (1997): "Anthropology, Philosophy, Politics", in: *Thesis Eleven*, Vol. 49, 99-116;

Elias, Norbert (1987): *Involvement and Detachment*, Oxford, Blackwell;

Elias, Norbert (1987): "The Retreat of Sociologists into the Present", in: *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol. 4. No. 2-3, 223-247;

Fischer, F. and Forester, J. (eds.) (1993): *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, London, UCL Press;

Fraser, Nancy (1993): "Rethinking the Public Sphere. A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy", in: *The Phantom Public Sphere*, Robbins, Bruce (ed.), Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press;

Garreton, Manuel A. (1994): *La Faz Sumergida del Iceberg. Estudios Sobre la Transformation Cultural*, Santiage, CESOC/LOM;

Ginzburg, Carlo (1991): "Checking the Evidence. The Judge and the Historian", in: *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 18. No. 1, 79-93;

Gouldner, Alwin (1973): *For Sociology. Renewal and Critique in Sociology Today*, London, Allen Lane;

Horkheimer, Max (1972): *Critical Theory. Selected Essays*, New York, Seabury;

Krischke, Paulo J. (2000): "Problems in the Study of Democratization in Latin America", in: *International Sociology*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 107-125;

Kurosawa, Fuyuki (2000): "The Ethnological Counter-Current in Sociology", in: *International Sociology*,Vol. 15, No. 1, 11-33;

McGann, Jim and Weaver, Kent R. (eds.) (2000): *Think Tanks and Civil Societies - Catalysts for Ideas and Action*, New York, Transaction Press;

Munck, Gerardo (1996): *Disaggregating Political Regime - Conceptual Issues in the Studies of Democratization*, Kellogg Institute Working Paper 228;

Nelson, Paul J. (1997): "Conflict, Legitimacy and Effectiveness - Who speaks for Whom in Transnational Networks Lobbying the World Bank?", in: *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 4, 421-441;

O'Donnell, Guillermo (1998): *Polyarchies and the (Un)rule of Law in Latin-America*, Kellogg Institute Working Paper 254;

Rose-Ackerman, Susan (1997): "Altruism, ideological entrepreneurs and non-profit firm", in: *Voluntas*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 127-48.

Schumpeter, Joseph (1942): *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, New York, Harper and Row;

Stone, Diana, Denham, Andrew and Garnett, Mark (eds.) (1998): *Think Tanks Across Nations - A Comparative Approach*, Manchester, Manchester University Press;

Stone, Diana (2000): *Think Tank Transnationalization and Non-Profit Analysis, Advice and Advocacy*, Coventry, University of Warwick, Department of Politics and International Studies, (www.csv.warwick.ac.uk)

Telgarsky, Jeffrey and Ueno, Makiko (eds.) (1996): *Think Tanks in a Democratic Society - An Alternative Voice*, Washington DC, Urban Institute.

Nikolai Genov

Sociology – Bulgaria

Discussant: Svetla Koleva

The key issue facing present-day Bulgarian sociology is the need to develop coherent conceptualizations and explanations of social dynamics. The ensuing task is to elaborate precise descriptions of processes on various structural levels of Bulgarian society in the context of global and regional trends. The major reason why sociologists are preoccupied with the description, explanation, prediction, and management of social development is found in social reality itself. Both everyday life and deep social structures in Bulgarian society are in flux because of the society's overall transformation and the influence of all-embracing global trends. They put the patterns of hierarchical government in question and demand the introduction of flexible forms of governance. The dynamics of governance on various systemic levels of social reality casts doubt on sociology's traditional focus on national society. Organizational structures *in* the societal system, as well as regional and global processes, attract the attention of research in their own right. Last but not least, trends of the destruction of social systems and cases of social disintegration demand that fundamental attitudes, values, norms, and behavior be rethought in terms of the requirements for sustainable development.

This new social and intellectual situation (Genov, 2001) raises intense challenges to the social sciences. What are the implications for sociology? How do Bulgarian sociologists react to them? What are the intellectual and institutional prospects of the Bulgarian sociological community? The answers cannot be well founded without referring to the country's tradition of sociology.

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

The establishment of the Bulgarian Sociological Association in 1959 and the first large-scale sociological surveys carried out during the 1960s mark the belated beginning of the national sociological tradition. These activities paved the way for the decision to hold the 7th World Congress of Sociology in Varna in 1970. The event was the turning point in the institutionalization of sociology in Bulgaria. The Congress signaled the end in Eastern Europe of ideological prejudices against sociology and other modern sciences.

New opportunities for research and teaching in the field of sociological theory and research were recognized and created by dedicated scientists. Živko Ošavkov organized the first national sociological studies on religiosity (1962) and on towns and villages in Bulgaria (1968). The latter study was based on the newly developed concept of the sociological structure of society. It focused on the interchange between four subsystems in the societal system: the production of material goods, the social reproduction of individuals, the production of culture and social management, and communications (Ošavkov, 1970; Ošavkov, 1976). This conceptual innovation was later praised as the mainstay of a Bulgarian school of sociological theory and empirical research. The claim was exaggerated, but the new concept helped to reach the level of intellectual coherence and professional self-identification needed for the institutionalization of the new discipline in the local environment. Consequently, some specific features of the national sociological tradition appeared in the Eastern European context (Dobriyanov, Stavrov, and Genov, 1978; Genov, 1989):

First, the leading Bulgarian sociologists from the first generation made productive efforts to relate empirical studies to theoretical frameworks as consistently as possible.

Second, their research projects showed a clear preference for national representative empirical studies based on the concept of societal system (the concept of the "sociological structure of society", which some sociologists call the "sociological system").

Third, from the very beginning of modern sociology in Bulgaria, attempts were made to make explicit the potential socio-technological implications of sociological studies and to facilitate the practical use of their results.

These were the major orientations in theory and research at the Institute of Sociology of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (established in 1968) and at a number of other research centers active during the 1970s and 1980s. The Institute of Trade Union Problems, the Institute of Youth Studies, the Institute of Culture, and other organizations carried out high-quality sociological and interdisciplinary studies that received international recognition. Sociology was gradually introduced to university curricula. The first Chair of Sociology was established at Sofia University in 1976. Sociological book series appeared at the major publishing houses. Two journals – *Sociologičeski problemi* (Sociological Problems) and *Sociologičeski pregled* (Sociological Review) – played an important role in the rapid institutionalization of sociology. In the mid-1980s, membership in the Bulgarian Sociological Association reached its highest level at about 1,500. Industrial and agricultural enterprises, major state institutions (the Ministries of Culture, of Defense, of Science and Higher Education, etc.), and political organizations maintained research groups of social scientists, primarily sociologists and psychologists.

Reality was certainly more complex and complicated than this brief outline of the institutionalization of sociology in Bulgaria might suggest. Powerful efforts were made to ideologically direct sociological research and to use and abuse results of sociological studies for political purposes. Administrative means were used to promote the official ideology in research establishments and in higher education. However, sociologists managed to adapt to the authoritarian regime by strengthening their professional identity. The regime was also forced and able to develop a certain level of tolerance toward innovations and objectivity in the social sciences. Sociologists were usually involved in the preparation of political decisions on various organizational levels. Outstanding representatives of the professional community were promoted to the top of the party and state hierarchy, where they could influence decision-making on the industrialization and urbanization of Bulgarian society. They were able to shield the discipline politically, but at the same time exposed it to the potential critique of political submissiveness. Large-scale research projects were specially funded to substantiate major state decisions. The follow-up publications (Minkov, 1984; Kyuranov, 1987) showed just the tip of the iceberg. In 1990, the results of more than 700 research projects were recorded in the National Archive of Sociological Studies.

Due to the rapid institutionalization of sociology and the relatively liberal political regime in the country during the 1970s and 1980s, Bulgarian sociologists were quite active on the international scene. They occupied positions in international organizations and helped to open up the country scientifically and culturally well before 1989. National delegations regularly attended the meetings of the International Sociological Association, the International Social Science Council, the International Federation of Social Science Organizations, and other international organizations of social scientists. Bulgarian sociologists were the organizers of the International Varna Sociological School, which facilitated cooperation between sociologists in Eastern Europe.

The legacy of Marxism-Leninism

Bulgarian society has a tradition of influential left-wing intellectual life and politics. It would therefore be inadequate to interpret the ideological domination of Marxism-Leninism in the country as only imposed by force after 1944. Marxism's stress on the role of technological and economic factors in social development was widely regarded as a valid explanatory scheme long before. As an ideology, it was seen as a factor fostering belated modernization. The simplified version of Marxism-Leninism corresponded to traditional statist preferences, while its appeal for social equality and social justice guaranteed its positive resonance in the poor and egalitarian Bulgarian society.

This historical background helps us understand the predominance of Marxism in Bulgarian sociology before 1989. Most of the founding fathers of the national sociological traditions were sincere followers of this ideology. Živko Ošavkov undoubtedly belonged to them, notwithstanding his schooling at the Sorbonne before the Second World War, or because of it. The analysis of his intellectual evolution, however, reveals that his ideas increasingly deviated from the orthodox visions of technological and economic determinism. His conceptual scheme of the sociological structure of society emphasized the interplay of technological, economic, political, cultural, and even personal factors in social processes. So it was not by chance that his efforts to legitimate sociology understood in this way met fierce resistance from orthodox followers of Historical Materialism.

It is difficult to assess the real influence of the Marxist theoretical legacy on present-day Bulgarian sociology, given the quick theoretical re-orientation of large parts of the sociological community. But patterns of this legacy can be identified in various publications. Moreover, trends of social differentiation in present-day Bulgarian society might even increase the use of Marxist ideas as explanatory tools – if not explicitly, then at least implicitly.

Pre-war conditions

The first society of sociology was established in Bulgaria in 1932 and continued its sporadic activities until the outbreak of World War II. Lectures in sociology were also sporadically offered at Sofia University. Most of the heated debates waged in the influential journal *Filosofski pregled* (Philosophical Review) during the 1930s were basically sociological and less philosophical in nature. But there was no systematic research, teaching, and publication guided by an articulated disciplinary vision. Nevertheless, some roots of modern Bulgarian sociology are found in the pre-war conditions. For instance, the unique accomplishments of Ivan Hadžiyski in the 1930s deserve special attention. A lawyer by education, he carried out valuable ethnographic and ethno-psychological studies on the Bulgarian family, craft, peasantry, military, etc. Although his research was not guided by any systematic sociological methodology, after his studies were rediscovered in the 1960s (see Hadžiyski, 1974), they became a continual source of inspiration for sociologists whose research orientation was sociographic or phenomenological.

Although quite different in their intellectual style, the two most influential intellectuals during the 1930s, Dimiter Mihalchev and Todor Pavlov, facilitated debates with strong sociological ingredients. Both were indebted to Historical Materialism for their approaches to social reality. In the Russian edition of his “Theory of Reflection” (1936), Todor Pavlov described sociology as the major science of society. Underdeveloped as it was, this view still became an important reference point for younger scholars during the heated debates on the specifics of sociology that were waged in the 1960s and 1970s.

The impact of Western theories

The influence of Marxism came to Bulgaria via both Russian and German sources. Thus, Bulgarian sociology has firm roots in the European Enlightenment. More directly, the influence of Western (American and Western European) sociological ideas arose in the very process of the emergence of the Bulgarian national sociological tradition. There is no doubt that the famous conceptual scheme Živko Ošavkov developed on the components of the sociological structure of society and their interaction was greatly influenced by the then-fashionable school of structural functionalism. During the 1970s and 1980s, ideas of Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, Talcott Parsons, Alfred Schütz, and other classical or contemporary thinkers became increasingly known in the expanding Bulgarian sociological community (Genov, 1982). Rare as they were, fellowships at Western European and North American universities facilitated the transfer of sociological ideas. The major libraries in the country were relatively well equipped with sociological books and journals. Participation in international meetings of sociologists was conducive to the flow of professional expertise to the Bulgarian sociological community. Valuable information was transmitted in university courses. As a result, modern theoretical ideas and methods of empirical research guided studies of social development, social inequality, the family, science, communications, the quality of life, social rationality, etc.

Nevertheless, although dozens of Bulgarian sociologists were pretty well informed about trends in Western theory and research, until 1989 the majority of the national disciplinary community did not have first-hand access to the intellectual resources of world sociology. One important reason for this was the lack of command of Western languages. There were regular translations in the journal *Sociologičeski problemi,* but these could not fill the information gap. For large segments of the national sociological community, the influence of Western ideas came through secondary sources and in some cases in a rather distorted form.

Oppositional activities

In some Eastern European countries, sociology developed as an oppositional force against the dominant ideology and politics after World War II. This was not the case in Bulgaria. The emerging sociology was basically supportive of the regime, despite frictions at the beginning of the discipline's institutionalization. Moreover, Bulgarian sociology seemed to be well domesticated by the ruling elite, which was willing to support it in exchange for political conformity and for the use of sociological expertise. Some limited oppositional activities involving sociologists started as late as the very end of the 1980s in the context of looming environmental debates. Indeed, even at the end of the 1980s, Bulgarian sociologists typically favored change in the framework of the existing social order. The delay of *perestroika* was still the relevant issue for the country's intellectuals. There was practically no organized opposition seeking to change the political and economic system immediately and profoundly. Some sociologists were persecuted at the end of the 1980s, not because of their professional but because of their political activities. The lack of real intellectual or political opposition among sociologists as professionals is indirectly proven by the fact that practically every professional manuscript could be published before 1989 in one way or another.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

The weakness of the internal opposition notwithstanding, processes in the small Bulgarian society could not help but follow the rapid disintegration of the old regime all over Eastern Europe after 1989. Under the given circumstances, the nation was not prepared for such a dramatic change in the patterns of orientation, decision-making, and action. A decade of political instability, economic crisis, and far-reaching value-normative disorientation followed the euphoria that accompanied the beginning of the new social experience. The man in the street was faced with rapid economic differentiation, a rise in crime, and a general destabilization of everyday life (Genov, 1994a; Vladimirov et al., 1998).

This controversial development deeply affected sociology and sociologists. There are certainly no more political and ideological limitations on sociological studies. There are no topics that can be regarded as taboo, as the topic of inter-ethnic relations was in the 1980s. Sociologists may freely exchange information with colleagues from abroad. Provided there is funding, everybody can publish books and journals or organize any kind of scientific events. Sociology is present in the curricula of all universities. The newly established private universities in Sofia, Varna, Bourgas, and Blagoevgrad are open to the social sciences. Relying on generous funding from abroad, private agencies for the study of marketing, public opinion, and political processes have conquered markets and attracted public attention. They are usually presented as agencies for sociological studies. Seen from this point of view, one can claim that sociology has become a real factor in shaping public opinion and decision-making on various levels.

But the changes have their other side, too. Important research centers from the period before 1989, e.g. the Institute of Youth Studies, no longer exist. Other research centers, like the former Institute of Trade Union Problems, still exist under a different name, but with reduced research capacities. Sociologists in enterprises were among the first to lose their jobs at the start of the reforms. State subsidies for science in general and for social sciences in particular have declined sharply. Only in very exceptional cases can local public money make it possible to conduct a major empirical study or participate in a scientific meeting abroad. The supply of foreign scientific literature has become scarce, and scientists are poorly paid. The prestige of scientific organizations and of the science profession has declined. It is difficult to attract talented young people to the professional career of academic sociology. Thus, new questions have arisen whose theoretical and practical relevance cannot be underestimated: What are the real moving forces behind the current transformation of Bulgarian society? How can sociological knowledge contribute to the rational management of the transformation of society?

If there is any consensus concerning the transformation, it is the shared understanding that evolutionary differentiation was already urgent needed in the 1970s and 1980s. To put the point in Durkheimian terms, the growing complexity of the advanced division of labor could no longer be managed by the mechanical solidarity of political overcentralization. Efforts to achieve this result before 1989 were futile. It was necessary to distribute initiative and responsibilities legally in the way characteristic of modern organic solidarity. The most important feature in the new round of modernization was therefore differentiation between economy, politics, and culture, as well as a change in focus from the satisfaction of collective needs to the satisfaction of specific individual needs. Sociology has to conceptually cope with the emerging institutionalized individualism, which has to resolve the acute problems of individual initiative and responsibility.

This consensus notwithstanding, it became clear during the 1990s that the transformation was much more complicated than Bulgarian sociologists had assumed at the beginning of the reforms. Facing this new challenge, they went through an intense learning process.

The change of paradigms

The understandably naïve vision of a fast and smooth adjustment of Eastern European institutions to Western European institutional patterns soon turned out to be an illusion. The individual and collective actors learned that the concept of clearly defined paths and goals in a basically universal transition from state socialism to a market economy and democratic politics was a simplification, if not merely a metaphor. The technological, economic, political, and cultural starting points of the changes differed from one specific Eastern European society to another. Even more important for the ensuing divergences were decisions that introduced far-reaching changes in deep structures of each of these societies. They developed increasingly differentiated patterns of adjustment to dynamic domestic and international environments. In some national cases, the geostrategic situation was conducive to the reforms; in other cases, this influence was obviously detrimental (Genov, 1996).

Seen from another angle, sociologists learned that the countries of Western Europe and North America exhibited a large number of different national patterns of market economy and democratic political institutions. Therefore, a new conceptual framework had to be formulated in order to reproduce the new experience, which was marked by growing complexity, vagueness, and high risks. This is why it was not the concept of transition, but rather the concept of a multi-dimensional macrosocial transformation that corresponded to this new theoretical and practical situation of multi-faceted and rapid social development. In the theoretical context of the transformation, various ideas and research projects focusing on changes in microsocial structures and processes arose as well.

Systemic and action dimensions of the transformation

The task of elaborating on the transformation concept and of applying it as a heuristic tool was therefore the same all over Eastern Europe. However, Bulgarian sociologists had to be especially perceptive in this respect for two reasons. First, the country's GDP sank to dramatic lows in the mid-1990s and improved only slightly at the end of the decade. This negative experience was closely connected to interruptions in the continuity of political life, which culminated in several abrupt changes of government during the decade. Second, the practical pressure to rethink the concept of transition also stemmed from the need to carry out a precise diagnosis of the ongoing processes, especially in terms of the changing conditions of human achievements and human deprivation (Georgieva, 1997; Nikolov, 1999; Todorova, 1999; Krämer and Stojanov, 1999).

In the course of these social and intellectual developments, it turned out that the old conceptual framework of the *sociological structure of society* was excessively oriented toward system integration. On the other hand, the phenomenological approaches adhered too rigidly to structures of subjective experience. Thus, the task was to establish and maintain a productive conceptual balance between knowledge of objective and subjective structures, between ideas concerning integration and innovation, between system and action, and between structures and actors. There was an urgent need to work on the meta-theoretical foundation, descriptive capacities, and explanatory potential of this balance.

Against the background of accumulated cognitive and practical experience, four major dimensions of the ongoing transformation of Bulgarian society have been distinguished to date. The first is the need to adjust the national complex of production and services to the technological and intellectual trends of the informationalization of all spheres of activity. The second is adjustment to the globalization of markets of goods, services, capital, and labor force. The third type of restructuring is the adjustment of national politics to the worldwide trend toward the rationalization of government and governance by means of democratic decision-making and control. The fourth dimension of the transformation is the cultural adjustment of Bulgarian society to the global universalization of value-normative systems. The decisive point here is the deeper grounding of local values and norms in the principle of the universal rights of individuals. In addition to the concept covering the above systemic aspects of the transformation, other differentiated concepts were introduced to cover the action parameters of the profound changes taking place in Bulgarian society. They included the special focus on the advancement of modern competitiveness, meritocracy, and mechanisms of innovation (Genov, 1999a).

Given the complexity of the transformation and the simultaneous nature of all types of restructuring along systemic and action lines, it is reasonable to assume a high intensity of risks in the course of the profound changes. Whatever their theoretical assumptions, underlying methodology, or practical orientations, empirical studies provide abundant evidence to support this point. That is why it is not surprising to see that the concept of risk became a major pivotal point of theory and empirical research in Bulgarian sociology during the 1990s. Some stimuli came from the Western European debate on the risk society. However, in the Bulgarian context of technological backwardness, economic decline, weakening political institutions, and value-normative disorientations, the debate on risks and the risk society helped introduce theoretical innovations. They aimed at the differentiated cognitive reproduction of dynamic macrosocial problem situations, precise measurement of public perception of various risks, and consistent analyses of strategies and practices of actors developed to cope with risks. The results of the conceptualizations and empirical studies on risks can be systematically turned into socio-technological proposals for dealing with unemployment, poverty, crime, etc. (Genov, 2000). Closely connected with this intellectual development is the special interest in the structure and dynamics of conflict situations (Dimitrov, 1999). On various occasions, changes and conflicts were articulated by means of concepts of modernization theory or in the framework of the idea of post-modernity.

The United Nations Development Program's project preparing annual Human Development Reports for Bulgaria provided a targeted boost for dealing in an interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary manner with major aspects and risks of transformation. The project mobilized resources mostly of sociologists, but also from many other fields of social science. The crucial conceptual innovation was the emphasis on sustainability – more precisely, on the interplay between environmental, technological, economic, political, and cultural dimensions of sustainable development (Bulgaria 1995). The debate on sustainability focused on two crucial issues. The first was the inherited deviations from the ideal of sustainable development, which had to be streamlined in the course of the current transformation. The second was the potential and actual deviations from the ideal of sustainability caused by the current transformation itself. This focus on strategic issues in national development gave the series of national reports a noticeable impact on political debates. The reports also influenced decision-making on various structural levels of government.

Since the national studies on human development were prepared in the context of the global reports published annually by the UNDP, they fostered the conceptualization of trends in national social development in the framework of global trends (Genov and Krasteva, 2001). Practical incentives for dealing with global trends also came from the discussion on preparing Bulgarian society for accession to the European Union. Thus, after the beginning of the transformation in 1989, the studies on the country's participation in regional and global processes were placed on a stable theoretical and empirical footing. The topics of globalization and regionalization became fashionable in the international scientific community during the 1990s, creating a favorable environment for this development. More important, however, was that this new conceptual and empirical shift concerned basic changes in social reality itself. The results to date are encouraging, since the current situation and future prospects of the small Bulgarian society can hardly be discussed in a meaningful way outside of the context of global and regional processes (Genov, 1997).

Following the outcome of the intense debates on globalization that were conducted in the international social science community, a great deal of attention was paid to some crucial global trends. Because of the specific need to deal with the local transformation, these selected trends included upgrading the rationality of social structures and processes, individualization, the spread of instrumental activism, and the universalization of value-normative systems.

The focus on organizational rationalization

In addition to the differentiation *of* economics, politics, and culture, there is another major aspect of the current push toward modernizing Bulgarian society, i.e., the continuing differentiation *in* each of these three major spheres of social action. Both processes are local manifestations of the universal trend to upgrade the rationality of organizational structures and processes. As is usually the case, the second side of the same process is the search for new patterns of social integration.

Both aspects of the ongoing rationalization are most obvious in the field of politics. The formalized politics of the one-party state dominated the social and economic system before 1989. This is why the major outcome of the rationalization of government and governance is the withdrawal of the state from its previous massive involvement in the economy and culture. No doubt this is a step toward the modernization of Bulgarian society. Each sphere of action is expected to develop and maintain its own mechanisms of innovation and control, thus contributing to continuous innovation and to the need to constantly re-integrate society.

Studies carried out during the 1990s revealed substantial deviations from the abovementioned optimal path of modernization through organizational rationalization. The key issue is the role of the state. Due to the predominant neo-liberal ideology of reforms at the beginning of the 1990s, strong opinions were voiced advocating the rapid and complete withdrawal of the state from the economy, culture, education, health care, research and development, social protection, etc. There were some beliefs that the emerging civil society would take the lead in managing the profound changes (Dimitrov, 1998; Fotev, 1998). In the meantime, state institutions were weakened for many domestic and international reasons. The results were the protracted inefficiency of the economy, the criminalization of social life, and the loosening of social safety nets in times of high unemployment and mass poverty (Atanasov et al., 1994; Genov, 1999b).

The theoretical implication of this conclusion was the re-evaluation of the role of the state in the process of privatization, in the establishment of competitive politics, and in the pluralization of culture. The outcome is the understanding that rational management of the complex and complicated transformation calls for intense involvement by a "small" but efficient state. The state is the only actor possessing the organizational capacity to manage the process by taking account of the needs of other actors as well as of the requirement to maintain and enrich the common good. Since the weakened state was unable to meet these requirements, the result was the flourishing of social pathologies during the 1990s. In various ways, individuals and groups neglected or looted the common good of the inherited state-owned property. "Pyramidal" economic structures and cleverly designed crimes in the banking system robbed people of their savings. Politicians dealt irresponsibly with national security. New patterns of organizational alienation flourished and undermined social solidarity and organizational integration (Bulgaria, 1997).

The conclusion sociologists drew from the above analysis is that, without stabilizing the state, society could not be successfully transformed. In practical terms, the introduction of the Currency Board in 1997 was precisely public recognition of the Bulgarian state's failure to manage the transformation. It was also an expression of the need to strengthen the ties between political decisions and the management of economic processes. In this way, politicians took account of recommendations from international financial institutions and, implicitly, of the results of numerous studies carried out by sociologists and other social scientists. According to these studies, the market by itself is unable to create discipline, transparency, and efficiency in economic processes (Čavdarova, 2000).

The studies of the internal differentiation, structures, and functioning of the new democratic political system arrived at similar sobering results. On the one hand, the establishment and regular functioning of competitive political institutions mark very important steps toward the rationalization of political decision-making and control. Bulgarian society has basically resolved this task. It passed through critical points in its political development during the 1990s by overcoming ideological, ethnic, and economic tensions and conflicts. On the other hand, the social costs of the serious political confrontations and the inefficient functioning of political parties, parliament, and other political bodies are very high. The quality of political life in Bulgaria still deviates from the desirable rationalized standards of modern politics. Clientelism and nepotism are strong, and corruption is part of everyday life (Minev, 2000).

The problems connected with the efficiency of the political system are all the more important and acute in the context of Bulgaria's increasing association with the European Union. Another critical dimension of the processes is the need to politically manage a rather unstable regional situation. The 1990s saw some intense ethnic and religious tensions and conflicts in Southeastern Europe, which developed into domestic and international military clashes. The rationalization of Bulgarian foreign policy in this complicated regional context has been the subject of careful examinations by sociologists (Yanakiev, 2000).

Thus, the controversial path of reforms involves two key parameters of the current rationalization of organizational structures and processes. First, it has to cope with unfavorable objective and subjective, domestic and international conditions for the transformation. On the other hand, it is now clear that rationalization itself is marked by severe internal tensions, which often lead to conflicts and social pathologies. Current conceptualizations refer to this trend in the form of evolving dilemmas of upgrading social rationality. The debates address the range of potential choices that may or may not materialize and whose impact on social systems and patterns of action may be constructive or destructive.

This issue has a number of dimensions, since the ongoing democratization of decisions and control involves all spheres of social life. During the 1990s, there were numerous opportunities to foster democratic participation in the privatization and management of enterprises, in local government, and in the life of political parties. On the other hand, sociologists identified a large number of practices that, intentionally or unintentionally, preclude democratic decision-making, abuse it, or undermine the mechanisms of democratic legal control (Naumova, 2000).

Individualization as evolutionary achievement and source of tensions

One major dilemma in the current transformation concerns the complex and dynamic relationships between *individual* and *collective* rationality. No doubt the state socialist economic and political system put too much emphasis on the rationality of collective actors. It neglected the need to tolerate and remunerate the rationality of individuals. On the other hand, the expansion of individualization during the 1990s all too often came at the expense of collective rationality. All efforts to reveal the causes, reasons, and effects of the looting of state property in Bulgaria lead to the conclusion that unrestricted adherence to individualistic rationality has destructive consequences. How can it be balanced by revalorization of collective rationality? This is both a theoretical and a practical challenge and will certainly guide theory and research in the social sciences in Bulgaria in the decades to come. The topic is existentially relevant for the societal community, since no stable social order can be established and maintained by the interaction of actors adhering to the value-normative orientations of extreme individualism.

The high tide of crime in Bulgaria during the 1990s is a clear illustration of this point (Mantarova, 2000). It accompanied rapidly rising expectations of new opportunities for personal development and realization. Expectations that personal abilities would make these new opportunities bear fruit were also high. In reality, the rise in expectations met declining material resources as per capita GDP plunged dramatically in Bulgaria during the 1990s. Lower GDP was also distributed more and more unevenly than at the beginning of the decade. Thus, the discrepancy between the rise in expectations and the shrinking pool of resources to realize them became a major factor in the criminalization of social life. Another crucial factor was the weakening of state institutions, exemplified in the inefficient functioning of courts. Public opinion polls provide abundant evidence of the critical assessment that the courts failed to protect basic human rights.

The weakening of state institutions and the general criminalization of the economy paved the way for sophisticated intellectual crimes motivated by greed rather than need. In the vast majority of cases, however, crime is closely linked to unemployment and poverty. Indeed, the development of Bulgarian society during the 1990s confronted sociologists with an entirely new and vitally important topic, namely unemployment. It is new because there was practically no unemployment in the country before 1989. It is vitally important because the appearance of mass unemployment and especially widespread long-term unemployment is a clear indication of dysfunctions in the social system. These are due to depressive trends in the Bulgarian economy. Seen from another perspective, unemployment is a heavy blow to fundamental human rights. Studies reveal its destructive impact on individuals' professional qualification, living standards, habits, respect for the law, self-esteem, etc. There is also a specific ethnic dimension of unemployment, for the Roma ethnic group is the most affected by unemployment and the ensuing poverty (Genov, 1999b).

At the beginning of the transformation, the prospects for successful individual economic, political, and educational development were envisioned mostly in close connection with the development of a numerous, stable, and influential middle class. Subsequent developments refuted this vision. Contrary to expectations, no distinct macrosocial group of thriving small-scale proprietors and entrepreneurs has established itself in Bulgaria. Small producers and merchants in towns and cities suffer from the stagnation of domestic markets and heavy taxation. After the administrative dissolution of agricultural cooperatives, small farmers developed a kind of survival economy that has no chance against international competition (Kožuharova, 1998). Some groups whose possession of educational or cultural capital enabled them to satisfy their needs quite well during the 1980s lost their relative advantage. They joined the approximately 80% of the Bulgarian population who experienced a decline in their living standard during the last decade. Whatever the reasons in particular cases, the result was a reduction in this part of Bulgarian society's capacities for personal development and self-realization. This is a process clearly contradicting the global trend of individualization. Of equal theoretical and practical importance is that the weakness of the middle class in Bulgaria poses serious questions about the long-run stability of democratic political institutions (Tilkidzhiev, 1998).

Given the relevance of the above issues, studies of the global trend to individualization and its local manifestations will play an increasingly important role in the conceptual development of Bulgarian social sciences, as well as in science-based socio-technological projects. One of the main reasons for researchers' interest in this subject is the strong statist tradition that still hinders personal initiative and responsibility in institutional and value-normative terms. Unemployment and mass poverty will also remain important stumbling blocks in the path of individualization. The economic plight of large segments of Bulgarian society and the underdevelopment of civil society restrict the scope for implementing the constitutionally guaranteed rights of individuals. The result is the spread of anomic tendencies closely connected to extremes in the ongoing individualization.

Controversial value changes

The profound cultural changes include a shift in the balance between *ultimate* and *instrumental* values in the ongoing rationalization. Ideologically, state socialism was very much oriented toward the ultimate values of equality and solidarity. Everyday reality was certainly different from the ideological clichés, since it focused on the satisfaction of basic needs (Mihailov, 2000). Both in ideology and in practice, the current transformation is mainly concerned with the stabilization of market rules in all aspects of social life. However, market transactions are instrumental in principle. Profit can be interpreted as an ultimate value only in very exceptional cases. The tradition of the social sciences provides abundant evidence supporting the thesis that no stable social order can be established and maintained on the basis of instrumental values alone.

It can therefore be taken for granted that the balancing of ultimate and instrumental values in social action will remain one of the major issues attracting sociological research in Bulgaria in the long run. The empirical findings are unmistakeably clear in this respect. The changes in the 1990s resulted in a strong instrumentalization of social action due to the commercialization of basic social norms. The result is an undermining of the social relevance of such ultimate values as social solidarity, justice, and beauty and an increase in various forms of alienation (*Socialnite nauki*, 1998).

This issue is closely related to tensions in the relationships between the *short-term* and *long-term* rationality of action. In value-normative terms, at least in the first decades after World War II, state socialism was preoccupied with the long-term (strategic) aims of human action. These aims included visions of the economic well-being of society and strong collectivist solidarity. They turned out to be unattainable under the historical conditions of the time. The irony of the following development lies in the well-established fact that introducing market mechanisms after 1989 did not broaden the time perspective of everyday activity. On the contrary, the transformation increased the general insecurity of life, leading to a greater reduction of the orientations and actions of large groups in Bulgarian society. This metamorphosis of social time and the concomitant social pathologies provide a broad field for intriguing theory constructions and informative empirical research.

The rapid instrumentalization of social life by means of market mechanisms raises one more issue connected with *Weltbeherrschung* in Weberian terms. There is no doubt that the *spread of instrumental activism* represents a key dimension of the current transformation of Bulgarian society. It is also clear, however, that the exploitation and pollution of the environment cannot continue without jeopardizing the country's life support systems. This is why the concept and various practices of sustainable development offer promising ways to cope with extremes of instrumental activism. Given this context, sociology has to play an important role in supporting sustainability, since the phenomena of social isolation and marginalization as well as social solidarity and integration have a very strong impact on the materialization of sustainable development.

A special field of research in this context is the appearance of an entirely new group of social actors during the 1990s, namely private entrepreneurs. Prior to 1989, private entrepreneurship was only marginally possible within the framework of the exclusive predominance of state ownership of productive assets. Like the whole societal system, private entrepreneurship developed its own patterns of orientation, decision-making, and activity by moving through contradictions and extremes in the 1990s. The major issues here were the lack of clear legal standards and the lack of domestic capital. For both reasons, private entrepreneurship was often equal to criminal or quasi-criminal structures and activities during the first half of the decade. In many specific cases, it still operates in the gray zone between what is legally acceptable and what is economically necessary or desirable (Manolov, 1995; Rakadžiyska, 2000).

No doubt the problems and prospects of private economic activity will increasingly occupy a central position in sociological theory and research. They are closely connected with other fundamental problems in Bulgarian society, e.g. the de-industrialization and tertiarization of the economy, economic and political integration in the European Union, changing demographic and educational structures, etc.

As was the case all over Eastern Europe, the disappearance of isolationist barriers has strengthened the local manifestations of another global trend, i.e., the *universalization of value-normative systems.* This trend is strongly anchored in the new Constitution of Bulgaria (1991). Its core is the importance attached to the universal rights of the individual. This vision is expected to lead to increasing integration of the country's various communities. But even the most sophisticated legal regulations cannot resolve the social, political, and cultural problems evolving together with the economic isolation and marginalization of important social groups. In the long run, the processes of social disintegration due to ethnic differences will be highly relevant, since social distances along ethnic lines are well-established and deeply rooted in the country.

In more general terms, the new patterns of social and economic differentiation offer questionable prospects of value-normative universalization and integration. Given this condition, it is entirely realistic to debate scenarios in which various divisions foster the stabilization of particularistic values. If facilitated by social isolation and marginalization, these processes might become critical for the integration of Bulgarian society. The precarious situation of the Romany population notwithstanding, there is currently no other clear trend in this respect. However, the potential for destructive developments is already present in the effects of the deepening divisions along educational lines (Zakharieva, 1996). It is still difficult to precisely interpret trends that may lead to increasing gender inequalities. But the issue is quite intriguing for sociologists, since these inequalities were neglected in previous decades (Dimitrova, 1998).

Change of elites

The change of elites is a major research field in conditions of societal transformation (Pachkova, 1996). In spite of the reasonable expectation that the profound changes in the economy, politics, and culture would immediately be reflected in changes in intellectual elites, this did not happen in the Bulgarian sociological community. Continuity is predominant in its intellectual as well as organizational leadership. Elites from research institutions that were closed or that suffered personnel cuts found their way to other research or educational institutions in the public or private sector and usually developed leadership positions there.

New institutional structures

The major institutional change was the establishment of private agencies for public opinion and marketing research. For instance, most of the personnel of the dissolved Institute of Youth Studies moved to this field of activity. In only a few years, Gallup International, Sova-Harris, MBMD, GfK, Vitosha Research, Alpha Research, ASSA-M, Market Test, and other private research agencies were established. Some of them are branches of international networks. Competition between these agencies for the small Bulgarian market and to acquire clients from abroad is fierce. Most probably, only some of them will survive in the long run. Political forces usually have strong preferences for "their own" agencies for polling purposes. It is difficult to judge the extent to which political links play a conducive or detrimental role in the development of the actors involved in this business. One thing is sure: there have been obvious cases of political distortion of data. This created an attitude of general suspicion toward sociology and sociologists, since broad circles do not distinguish between sociology and public opinion polls.

The National Center for Study of Public Opinion was established at the beginning of the 1990s to serve the information needs of the democratically elected Parliament. Since the Center is underfunded, it cannot compete with the dynamic private agencies working in the same field.

In academic sociology, the new institutional structures include the establishment of new Chairs of Sociology, initially shared with other disciplines.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

The highly praised paradigm of the sociological structure of society has practically disappeared from public debate. This is often regarded as evidence of its ideological and political bias. No doubt the explicit intention underlying this theoretical paradigm was to serve the needs of central planning. The major reason for the disappearance of the paradigm is not just the collapse of the centralized economic and political system, however. The background assumptions of the concept of sociological structure of society were connected with the social system of the nation-state, which has been the major point of reference for sociology both in the East and in the West. Now we can see the demise of this linkage in world sociology. In the local context, the process is controversial. In spite of its deficiencies, the concept of the sociological structure of society provided the Bulgarian sociological community with an integrating theoretical and methodological orientation. This strong point turned out to be a weakness because of the rapid pluralization of Bulgarian society and of the national sociological community. Consequently, issues of conceptual incoherence and eclecticism mark the country's present state of sociological theorizing and research.

New approaches

The solution to the problem could not be sought in the revival of pre-war sociological tradition, since Bulgaria had none. There were no influential Bulgarian sociologists abroad to return after 1989 and become a major reference point under the new conditions. The remaining option was the hasty import of influential ideas from abroad and efforts to apply them to local processes. However, this could be done in a more or less coherent manner in only a few cases. The widely predominating pattern is either the theoretical and methodological inconsistency of explanatory schemes or explicit eclecticism.

At the beginning of the changes, the idea of civil society seemed to be a promising candidate for the theoretical focus of studies on transition. But the influence of this idea turned out to be short-lived, since social processes have not supported it. The revival of the modernization theory also raised a series of questions, because in crucial sectors (agriculture), things moved toward de-modernization in terms of technology and organizational rationality. Given this cognitive and practical experience, the idea of a risk society and the concept of risk seem to be an appropriate guiding framework for descriptive and explanatory purposes (Genov, 1994). Another candidate is the Durkheimian idea of anomy, since Bulgarian society clearly went through a period of normative instability (Vladimirov et al., 1998). It is difficult to draw the conclusion from these and similar cases that any specific theoretical and methodological approach has established itself as a long-term research program in Bulgarian sociology attracting broader attention in the professional community and in the public at large.

New East-West asymmetries

The newly emerging East-West asymmetries do not necessarily have to do with the issues of theoretical and methodological coherence. Currently, sociology in Western Europe and North America is also going through a period of excessive pluralization. Some exceptions of theoretical integration seem to be the ideas of social capital and rational choice; these will probably find stronger footing in Bulgarian sociology. The major East-West divide concerns funding and organized skepticism as a control mechanism in the scientific community.

While the issue of funding is a long-term one and can be resolved only step by step and with the involvement of Western European and North American resources, the issue of organized skepticism is mostly a domestic matter. Experience so far teaches that the Bulgarian sociological community still lacks control mechanisms able to prevent extremes of mood and behavior of the "everything goes" type. This situation cannot last for long, since the geostrategic trend is toward the country's accession to the European Union. The process will undoubtedly lead to efforts to increase the quality of scientific research by strengthening the professional community's control mechanisms. As a result, the East-West asymmetry in this area will probably be reduced step by step. The opposite scenario of deepening disparities within the emerging common European research area would be counterproductive to the very idea and practice of European integration.

Quantitative and qualitative empirical research approaches

Quantitative research strongly predominated in Bulgarian sociology both before and after 1989. The specific sociological contribution to social science knowledge is typically understood in the country as consisting in carrying out public opinion polls and presenting aggregated results. This type of activity is widely interpreted as "sociology". Consequently, the agencies for public opinion polls are widely regarded as the outstanding representatives of the discipline, since they regularly publish quantified findings about political attitudes, the level of satisfaction with incomes, education, health care, transportation, housing, etc.

Debates on methods of quantitative research focus mostly on issues of sampling and on the reliability of primary data. The statistical sophistication of data analysis usually remains at the level of frequency distribution or significance analysis. This is, in fact, the level of understanding of potential consumers interested in the results of public opinion polls. Systematic cluster analysis and regression analysis are carried out for purposes of academic publications. If published in Bulgarian, they have rather limited circulation and impact. This makes sophisticated statistical analysis less attractive even for sociologists who have the knowledge and skills to carry it out (Atanasov et al., 2001).

Some types of qualitative research, like in-depth interviews, the analysis of biographies, and participant observations were often applied in Bulgarian sociology before 1989, but the flourishing of methodological pluralism thereafter gave them a strong impetus. Together with various phenomenological approaches and interviews with focus groups, they are currently used in studies of multiple and changing identities and in defining status and roles in the fields of education, management, ethnic differences, etc. (Grekova, 1996). Some new developments in this field are connected with sociologists' broader use of methods typical for anthropological studies and with the latter's application in interdisciplinary research projects.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

At first glance, thematic orientations became much broader and free of administrative restrictions after 1989 than before. This is only partly true, given the sources and procedures of funding. During the 1970s and the 1980s, there were generalized thematic orientations for research; these were incorporated in the annual and five-year centralized plans. These orientations were broad enough to accommodate a wide range of studies. Their funding was never sufficient, but there was funding, especially for research on youth, trade unions, and cultural issues. Currently, state planning imposes no restrictions, but the state budget also provides no funding for sociological research. Universities' research funding is in an especially precarious situation. The major national agency for financing science is the National Fund for Scientific Research. It started at the beginning of the 1990s with a high level of organizational and financial autonomy and an acceptable level of financial coverage of selected projects, which made the Fund attractive. Currently it finances three to four sociological studies per year at a level of funding that is completely inadequate.

This makes the thematic orientation of sociological studies very dependent on occasional funding by extra-budgetary sources and on commercial considerations. The result is that sociologists are too preoccupied with studying election campaigns. These studies are mostly funded by domestic political parties, but also by foreign sources. For all other serious studies, Bulgarian sociologists are basically dependent on funding from abroad, which means on the thematic orientation and political and commercial preferences of foreign funding agencies.

Choices of themes

In this situation, the range of thematic choices is broad enough. But the selection of themes for research is often not determined in the country or with the clear intention of serving the interests of the national sociological community. Moreover, the guiding idea of the studies is rarely the cumulative development of scientific knowledge. The themes for research are typically determined by international funding organizations, for instance UNESCO, UNDP, ILO, the World Bank, the European Union, or others like USAID, the Open Society Foundation, the Friedrich Ebert Foundation, etc. This funding situation explains why the issues of civil society development and ethnic issues, together with studies on political institutions and the dynamics of political preferences, are clearly over-represented on the research agenda.

The impact of thematic orientations on institutional structures

In fact, it is more relevant to speak about the impact of institutional structures on thematic orientations. The major divide in this respect is between academic sociology and sociological research carried out by institutions outside of academia. The academic institutions orient their research more and more toward such European Union educational and research programs as Tempus, Copernicus, Socrates, or the IVth and Vth Framework Programmes for scientific research. By contrast, private research agencies are mostly interested in serving specific needs of international customers who are guided by commercial or political interests.

Private vs. public funding

Thus, it is difficult to distinguish private from public funding with a view to the funding from abroad. A large proportion of it is taxpayers' money. With negligible exceptions, academic institutions receive this type of funding, although there are projects supported by foreign private foundations as well. The private agencies are typically unwilling to disclose their sources of funding, and there is no legislation obliging them to do so. But unofficially, one gets the information that they receive foreign funding, both public and private, in proportions varying substantially from agency to agency and from year to year.

Funding from domestic sources is also difficult to calculate. Funding that serves political campaigns is usually not made public. Here, too, there is a wide variety of patterns of funding that change from agency to agency and from year to year.

5. Public space and academic debates

Sociologists and sociology are well represented in the public space, mostly because of public opinion polls. Sociologists regularly conduct exit polls and count votes in parallel during local, parliamentary, and presidential elections. Massive public interest and debates focus on the success and failure of sociologists in their prediction of election outcomes.

True academic debates among professional sociologists are rare, however. Also, few academic discussions organized by sociologists have attracted public attention. The preparation and presentation of the annual Human Development Reports is one important exception to this rule. Although the teams preparing the Reports are multidisciplinary, in most cases sociologists are leading figures.

Debated themes, problems, methods

Only the presentation of research results covering electoral attitudes, electoral behavior, or the functioning of major political institutions draws tangible public interest. These topics and related substantive, methodological, and organizational problems attract broader interest from professionals. Occasionally, some studies on education, health care, employment and unemployment, public participation in decision-making and control, etc., meet public interest as well.

Few publications provoke internal debates on thematic orientations, conceptual backgrounds, operationalizations, and methods of sociological research in the sociological professional community itself (Genov, 2001). However, the trend is clearly toward a more intensive self-reflection on sociological research work.

Principal academic journals

During the 1990s, only one academic sociological journal survived, namely *Sociologičeski problemi* (Sociological Problems). The journal has a small circulation and is published irregularly and with substantial delay. Publication of the second journal, *Sociologičeski pregled* (Sociological Review), which was the subject of intense interest in the professional community during the 1980s, was put on ice because of lack of funding.

Selection of publications in world languages

Representative selections of texts by outstanding Bulgarian sociologists were published on the occasions of the World Congresses of Sociology held in Bielefeld in 1994 and in Montreal in 1998 (Genov, 1994b; Mitev, 1998). Some other publications in English also seem to be representative enough of the thematic orientations of sociological studies in Bulgaria during the 1990s (Fotev, 1998; Genov, 1999a; Genov, 1999b; Genov, 2000; Genov and Krasteva, 2001). There are occasional publications in German and in French (Krämer and Stojanov, 1999; Boucher, Fotev and Koleva, 2001).

New manuals. Databases

There have been substantial changes in the content and organization of university teaching since 1989. New manuals serve the needs of the reformed educational system (Fotev, 1993; Mihailov and Tilkidzhiev, 1996; Genov, 1998; Dimitrov, 2001). Translations of classical and modern sociological texts serve the same purpose of fostering the cognitive integration of sociological education.

The situation with databases is rather different. The Bulgarian sociological community is a long way from the very desirable development of commonly accessible data banks. So far, institutional and commercial interests have been quite efficient in preventing the materialization of this widely debated idea.

6. Views on further development

As the above brief outline of achievements and problems shows, the professional community of Bulgarian sociologists is mature enough to cope with the conceptual and practical challenges of the continuing transformation of Bulgarian society. The researchers have to cope with them under conditions of institutional instability, rather limited state subsidies for science, and a lack of interest in science on the part of the emerging domestic private sector. Nevertheless, one can note the innovative pluralization of paradigms in sociology coupled with the introduction of a number of new topics and methods of research. Seen from another point of view, the clear orientation of studies along commercial lines makes sociology eclectic and too prone to control through market forces.

In the light of this controversial situation, three requirements seem especially relevant for sociology at present.

First, the thematic orientation of research work in sociology should continue to be enhanced by studies that try, in conceptual and methodical terms, to link the transformation of Bulgarian society to the changes in its regional context and to global trends. In broader terms, this means that the cross-national and cross-cultural comparative orientation of sociology should continue to be encouraged.

Second, this result can be achieved if current theoretical deficiencies are reduced step by step. The most pressing need is for systematic conceptualizations of the continuing transformation. There is also an urgent need to consistently operationalize and test the theoretical schemes already available.

Third, to facilitate more efficient comparative, interdisciplinary, and practically relevant studies in the field of sociology, it is essential to reach a new level of reflexive accumulation of theoretical ideas, methodological instruments, empirical data, and socio-technological expertise.

Under these conditions, one can expect a rapid increase in the cognitive achievements, practical relevance, and social prestige of sociology in Bulgaria. Recent experience with the cognitive and practical flexibility of sociologists under precarious conditions indicates it can be assumed that the sociological community has the intellectual and organizational potential to cope with the challenge.

International cooperation

The following international comparative research projects seem to have been the academically most productive in the 1990s:

- "Personal and Institutional Strategies for Coping with Transformation Risks in Central and Eastern Europe" (UNESCO-MOST, Nikolai Genov);
- "Justice and Economic Rationality"(SOCO, Duhomir Minev);
- "Poverty and Ethnicity" (Ilona Tomova).

The impact of accession

The impact of EU accession is most visible in the teaching in higher education. Some projects in the field are outstanding, like "Transformations in a Comparative European Perspective" in the framework of the Socrates Programme. As the statistics of the European Union show, no coordinators of EU-funded sociological research projects are from Eastern Europe. This situation will probably change in the foreseeable future.

The impact of research in the public sphere

The thematic orientation of risk research and the efforts to manage social risks have moved sociology into the tension-ridden field of relationships between the rationality of *cognition* and the rationality of *action.* In fact, sociologists became more practically oriented during the 1990s. Funding from foreign agencies requires practical results, greatly contributing to this change. However, the special focus on market research and public opinion research has not necessarily expanded and consolidated the theoretical substance of sociology. In addition, the obvious political bias of results from public opinion polls carried out by private research agencies has undermined the prestige of sociology. In the most general terms, however, the boom in market research and public opinion polls also increased cognitive value. They contributed to the methodological sophistication of sociological research and to the transparency of social structures and processes. This became obvious in the course of preparing the annual *Human Development Reports*.

The direct political involvement of sociologists in Bulgaria has not been as extensive as in other Eastern European countries. In some specific cases, it cast doubt on the objectivity of the discipline. In other cases, this involvement strengthened the scientific basis of politics and provided sociologists with valuable practical experience.

The major field in which the practical relevance of sociology became apparent was social policy. In fact, this was the field in which substantial institutional innovations had to be introduced in dealing with the entirely new issue of unemployment, the new schemes of health protection, pension funds, and many other issues. These far-reaching institutional changes had to be introduced under conditions of economic crisis, mass poverty, and political instability, which were undermining social solidarity. Scientific expertise was urgently needed in this context. But the unique opportunity to carry out practically relevant research did not always materialize.

The experience from this institutional transition is controversial. The same holds true for the policies themselves, whose basic aim was to encourage economic initiative and responsibility. In reality, under the given economic and cultural conditions, they mostly provided financial support to underprivileged groups (Georgieva, 1997).

The problem of the "brain drain"

With few exceptions, well-established Bulgarian researchers and university teachers of sociology remained in the country, despite the temptation to migrate to Western Europe and North America. Few of the junior staff left the country, as well. However, personal observations indicate that the younger sociologists who received their education during the 1990s are much more mobile. There are no statistics that confirm or refute this assumption.

References

Atanasov, Atanas, Todorova, Saša, Toneva, Zdravka and Georgieva, Bogdana (1994): *Zaetost i bezrabotica v gradovete v Bãlgariya* (Employment and Unemployment in the Towns of Bulgaria), Sofia, Alya;

Atanasov, Atanas, Molhov, Maxim, Sãikova, Svetlana, Čengelova, Emiliya and Georgieva, Veselina (2001): *Izsledvaniyata na obštestvenoto mnenie v Bãlgariya 1996-1999* (Studies on Public Opinion in Bulgaria 1996-1999), Sofia, Institute of Sociology;

Bãlgarinãt i Častniya Biznes. Meždu razočarovanieto i nadeždata (The Bulgarian and the Private Business. Between Disappointment and Hope) (1994), Sofia, Slavika –RM;

Boucher, Jacques L., Fotev, Guéorgui and Koleva, Svetla (eds.) (2001): *Mutations de société et quête de sens. Une rencontre entre des sociologues bulgares et québécoi*s, Sofia, Lik;

Boyadzhieva, Pepka (1998): *Universitet i obštestvo* (University and Society), Sofia, Lik;

Bulgaria 1995. Human Development Report (1995), Sofia, National and Global Development;

Bulgaria 1997. Human Development Report (1997), Sofia, UNDP;

Čavdarova, Tanya (2000): *Neformalnata Ikonomika* (The Informal Economy), Sofia, Lik;

Chalãkov, Ivan (1998): *Da napravish holograma* (To Create a Hologram), Sofia, Academic Publishing House "Prof. M. Drinov";
Dimitrov, Dimitãr (1999): *Sociologiya na konflikta* (Sociology of Conflict), Sofia, Racio-90;
Dimitrov, Georgi (2001): *Universitetski kurs po sociologiya* (University Course in Sociology), Sofia, University Press "St. Kl. Ohridski";
Dimitrov, Rumen (1998): *Graždanskiyat sector* (The Civil Sector), Sofia, Lik;
Dobriyanov, Velichko, Starov, Boris and Genov, Nikolai (1978): *Sãvremennata sociologiya v Bãlgariya* (Contemporary Sociology in Bulgaria), Sofia, Bulgarian Sociological Association;
Fotev, Georgi (1993): *Istoriya na sociologiyata* (History of Sociology), Vol. 1, T. 2. Sofia, University Press "St. Kl. Ohridski";
Fotev, Georgi (1998): *Ethnicity, Religion and Politics*, Sofia, Academic Publishing House "Prof. M. Drinov";
Genov, Nikolai (1982): *Tolkãt Parsãnz i teoretičnata sociologiya* (Talcott Parsons and Theoretical Sociology), Sofia, Publishing House of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences;
Genov, Nikolai (ed.) (1989): *National Traditions in Sociology*, London, Sage;
Genov, Nikolai (ed.) (1994a): *Riskove na prehoda* (Risks of the Transition), Sofia, Nacionalno i globalno razvitie;
Genov, Nikolai (ed.) (1994b): *Sociology in a Society in Transition*, Sofia, Regional and Global Development;
Genov, Nikolai (ed.) (1996): *Society and Politics in South-East Europe*, Sofia, National and Global Development;
Genov, Nikolai (ed.) (1997): *Bãlgariya – dnes i utre* (Bulgaria – Today and Tomorrow), Sofia, Friedrich Ebert Foundation;
Genov, Nikolai (1998): *Sociologiya* (Sociology), Sofia, Regional and Global Development;
Genov, Nikolai (1999a): *Managing Transformations in Eastern Europe*, Paris and Sofia, UNESCO-MOST and Regional and Global Development;
Genov, Nikolai (ed.) (1999b): *Unemployment – Risks and Reactions*, Paris and Sofia, UNESCO-MOST and Friedrich Ebert Foundation;
Genov, Nikolai (ed.) (2000): *Continuing Transformation in Eastern Europe*, Berlin, Trafo;
Genov, Nikolai (ed.) (2001): *Perspectivi pred sotsiologiyata v Bãlgariya* (Prospects of Sociology in Bulgaria), Sofia, Sofia University Press "St. Kl. Ohridski";
Genov, Nikolai and Krasteva, Anna (eds.) (2001): *Recent Social Trends in Bulgaria 1960-1995.* Montreal & Kingston, London, Ithaka, McGill-Queens University Press;
Georgieva, Bogdana (1997): *Konfliktite v sferata na socialnata politika* (The Conflicts in the Sphere of Social Policy), Sofia, Sofia University Press "St. Kl. Ohridski";
Grekova, Maiya (1996): *Az i drugiyat* (Me and the Other), Sofia, University Press "St. Kl. Ohridski";
Hadžiyski, Ivan (1974): *Izbrani proizvedeniya* (Selected Works), Vols.1-2., Sofia, Nauka i izkustvo;
Kertikov, Kiril (ed.) (2001): *Bãlgariya-Makedoniya: Predizvikatelstva na promenite* (Bulgaria-Macedonia: Challenges of the Changes), Sofia, Institut po sociologiya;
Krämer, Hans Leo and Stojanov, Christo (eds.) (1999): *Bulgarien im Übergang. Sozialwissenschaftliche Studien zur Transformation*, Bergisch Gladbach, Edwin Ferger Verlag;
Kyuranov, Čavdar (ed.) (1987): *Sãvremennoto bãlgarsko semeystvo* (The Modern Bulgarian Family), Sofia, Nauka i izkustvo;
Kožuharova, Veska (ed.) (1998): *Bãlgarskoto selo i predizvikatelstvata na noviya vek* (The Bulgarian Village and the Challenges of the New Century), Sofia, Academic Publishing House "Prof. M. Drinov";
Manolov, Karamfil (1995): *Novoto bãlgarsko predpriemačestvo v prehodniya period* (The New Bulgarian Entrepreneurs in the Transition Period), Sofia, Academic Publishing House "Prof. M. Drinov";
Mantarova, Anna (2000): *Prestãpnost i socialna transformaciya* (Crime and Social Transformation), Sofia, Institut po sociologiya;
Mihailov, Stoyan (2000): *Stalinistkiyat totalitarizãm* (Stalinist Totalitarianism), Sofia, M-8-M;
Minev, Duhomir (ed.) (2000): *Promenyaštite se lica na demokraciyata – ikonomičeska, industrialna, političeska* (The Changing Faces of Democracy – Economic, Industrial, Political), Sofia, IFPS;
Minkov, Minko (ed.) (1984): *Harakteristika na bãlgarskoto naselenie* (Characteristic of the Bulgarian Population), Sofia, Nauka i izkustvo;
Mitev, Petar-Emil (ed.) (1998): *The Bulgarian Transition: Challenges and Cognition*, Sofia, Lik;
Naumova, Stefka (2000): *Sociologiya na pravoto* (Sociology of Law), Sofia, Yurispres;
Nedelčeva, Tanya (2001): *Vreme i identičnost* (Time and Identity), Sofia, Lik;
Nikolov, Stefan (1999): *Blagotvoriyaštiya sector* (The Philanthropic Sector), Sofia, RIK Letera;

Ošavkov, Živko (1970): *Sociologiyata kato nauka* (The Sociology as a Science), Sofia, Nauka i izkustvo;
Ošavkov, Živko (1976): *Sociologičeskata struktura na săvremennoto bălgarsko obštestvo* (The Sociological Structure of Contemporary Bulgarian Society), Sofia, Publishing House of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences;
Pačkova, Petya (1996): *Elitat v svetlinata na izborite* (The Elite in the Light of the Elections), Sofia, M-8-M;
Petev, Todor (2001): *Komunikaciya i socialna promyana* (Communication and Social Change), Sofia, Sofia University-Department of Journalism and Mass Communications;
Rakadžiyska, Temenuga (2000): *Trud, biznes, efektivnost* (Labor, Business, Efficiency), Sofia, EON;
Socialnite nauki i socialnata promyana (Social Sciences and Social Change) (1998), Sofia, Academic Publishing House "Prof. M. Drinov";
Tilkidjiev, Nikolai (ed.) (1998): *The Middle Class: As a Precognition of a Sustainable Society*, Sofia, AMCD;
Todorova, Elka (1999): *Realnata pomošt* (The Real Help), Varna, VSU "Černorizec Hrabar";
Tomova, Ilona (1995): *Ciganite v prehodniya period* (The Gypsies in the Transition Period), Sofia, IMIR;
Vladimirov, Želyu, Kacarski, Ivan, Todorov, Todor and Badžakov, Momčil (1998): *Bălgariya v krăgovete na anomiyata* (Bulgaria in the Circles of Anomie), Sofia, Sofilos;
Yanakiev, Yantsislav (2000): *Military Co-operation in Southeastern Europe and the Future of Multinational Peace Support Operations*, Rome, NATO Defense College;
Zakharieva, Mariana (1996): *Inovacii v obrazovanieto* (Innovations in Education), Sofia, Nacionalno i globalno razvitie.

Michal Illner

Sociology – Czech Republic

Discussant: Ivo Možný

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

It would be impossible to discuss the present state and recent development of Czech sociology without at least a short flashback. The reader interested in a more detailed retrospective is referred to specialized works (Havelka, 1995; Macků, 1996; Možný, 1996; Urbánek 1995; etc.). This paragraph has been inspired by an unpublished presentation on the development of Czech sociology given by Jiří Musil at the ISA XV World Congress of Sociology (Musil, 1998).

The beginnings of Czech sociology can be dated back to 1882, when teaching in the Czech language was renewed at Prague University. The development of the discipline in the next hundred years can be divided into four periods that, rather significantly, copy the turns in the political development of the country: 1. the formative period, 1882-1918, 2. the period of expansion, 1918-1948, 3. the period of destruction, renewal, and stagnation, 1948-1989, 4. the period of another renewal after 1989. Although discontinuity prevailed over continuity, some general common features can be distinguished throughout the 120-year history of Czech sociology – see below.

The founder of Czech sociology is considered to be Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, a professor of philosophy at the Czech university in Prague who later, in 1918, became the first president of Czechoslovakia. In his habilitation thesis (1879), he analyzed suicide as a mass phenomenon of modern times (Masaryk, 1881); his best-known later writings dealt with the *Social question* (Masaryk, 1895) and the *Czech question* (Masaryk, 1898). The growth of industry and the rapid urbanization of the Czech Lands, with a simultaneously strong role of agriculture, stimulated other authors' interest in urban and rural studies. As in other industrializing and urbanizing countries, attention focused on social pathology, poverty, and social policy.

The second period, 1918-1948 (with the exception of the years of the 1939-1945 Nazi occupation) was an organic continuation of the formative years. New accents were called for by the establishment of the independent state of Czechoslovakia in 1918, and political themes became important, particularly the theory of democracy and issues of the nation and nationalism. Masaryk again and also Edvard Beneš, his collaborator and later his follower in the presidential office (who studied sociology in France and was influenced by Émile Durkheim), wrote on themes of democracy. The literature dealing with the national question was partly a continuation of the historically oriented pre-war discussion of the "Czech Question" and partly shaped by studies of the relationship between Czechs and Germans. Emanuel Rádl's study on "War of the Czechs against the Germans" (Rádl, 1928, the title is not to be taken literally) can serve as an example. The most extensive series of empirical research projects consisted of studies of the living conditions of poor families in Prague and of the urbanization process in Prague suburbia (Ullrich, 1938), monographs on rural communities, and studies on specific social strata. Sociological theory did not flourish. Josef Ludvík Fischer, a professor at Palacký University in Olomouc, was the only exception. In the late 1930s, he was able to formulate an original structuralist-functionalist theory of society, different from the Parsonian theory.

Sociology was also developing in institutional terms, and the political elites supported its development. There were two independent chairs of sociology in the inter-war period, as parts of the faculties of arts in Prague and Brno held by Josef Král and Inocenc Arnošt Bláha. Two sociological journals – *Sociologická revue* (Sociological Review) and *Sociální problémy* (Social Problems) – were published, and foreign literature, mainly French and American, was translated. German sociology, including Max Weber, remained outside the focus of Czech sociologists of that time. This promising period was interrupted by the Nazi occupation of the Czech Lands in March 1939 and by the closing of Czech universities soon thereafter. The short, more or less liberal post-war interlude from 1945-1948 was dominated, also in the universities, by heated debates between the liberal democratic, social democratic, and communist intellectuals about the future political and social system of the country. There was little space left for academic work. The communist takeover in February 1948 abruptly closed this transitory stage.

From the perspective of the development of sociology, the 40-year period of the communist regime can be divided into three rather different stages in regard to the political environment for the social sciences. After the communist coup, sociology in Czechoslovakia disappeared. The chairs of sociology were closed down and the teachers emigrated or were expelled from universities, unless they were Marxists or quickly converted to Marxism. Many students met the same fate. Sociological journals were banned, access to sociological literature in libraries was prohibited, and foreign and international books and journals were not available. As Musil (cf above) remarked: in contrast to Poland, where after 1948 the teaching of sociology at universities and even sociological reviews survived, the Czechoslovak situation was an intellectual blackout.

A partial renewal of sociology took place in the middle of the 1960s when, as part of the destalinization of the regime, a more liberal political atmosphere temporarily began to prevail. At that time, the *Czechoslovak Sociological Association* (Československá sociologická společnost) was founded and sociology – its Marxist version – was once again taught at universities. In the Academy of Sciences, the *Institute of Sociology* (Sociologický ústav Československé Akademie věd) and the *Institute of Public Opinion Research* (Ústav pro výzkum veřejného mínění Československé Akademie věd) were established and the Czech-language *Sociologický časopis* (Sociological Journal) was founded. However, the Communist Party and the state power watched the development of sociology with suspicion and tried to control it. In spite of restrictions, the five years from 1965 to 1969 saw remarkable development in the discipline. As Musil mentioned, its main protagonists were Marxist revisionists who hoped that sociology could help to modernize the rigid and stagnating society. To establish a distinction between sociology and historical materialism and to protect sociology from the incursions of this ideological discipline, the empirical component of sociology was stressed and the methodology of social research was developed. Functionalist schools enjoyed great sympathy. The main themes of extensive research were concerned with the modernization of socialist society. The main topics were social stratification – Pavel Machonin headed an extensive research project (whose results were published in Machonin, 1969), and Radovan (Richta, 1966) headed research on the social and cultural context of scientific and technological development (or revolution). Research on social stratification was highly professional and helped to educate a number of young sociologists who later became some of the key personalities of Czech sociology. Traditional sociological disciplines were able to regain their formal position, and contacts with Western and international professional organizations were renewed. Methods of social research were studied and applied to local conditions (Lamser, 1966).

The occupation of the country in August 1968 by the Warsaw Pact states and the establishment of the *"normalization*" regime in 1969 once again decimated Czech sociology. This time, as Musil observed, people were more targeted than institutions. The chance to survive was greater for people on the institutional and thematic periphery of the discipline. Some research programs survived, but under strict ideological control. The leading positions at universities and in the Academy's newly founded *Institute of Philosophy and Sociology* (Ústav pro filozofii a sociologii Československé Akademie věd) were predominantly occupied by second-rate persons. The *Sociologický časopis* (Sociological Journal) survived. Sociological research continued, but mostly outside the Academy and universities. No new concepts or thoughts incompatible with Marxist political orthodoxy could be publicly presented. Gradually, however, an informal sociology developed in the form of discussion groups, applied research teams, etc., often under odd institutional roofs, where more open discussions could take place. However, this semi-legal sociology was limited to critical comments. Several Czech sociologists were actively engaged in anti-communist dissent (and suffered the consequences), but the discipline as such did not play a very important role in the protest movement. This period in the history of Czech sociology was terminated in November 1989. The fourth and so far last stage, which started with the fall of the communist regime, is the subject of the next parts of this report.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

After 1989, the situation of Czech sociology changed fundamentally. The most conspicuous development occurred in the political environment of the social sciences. All political restrictions and regulations on what can be investigated, how, by whom, and with what results have been lifted. A liberal atmosphere has been introduced regarding researchers' choice of themes and theoretical and methodological approaches. Until recently, the state even dropped any effort to specify any preferred programs of common interest. The limits to research, if any, were financial, but definitely not political.

The subject structure of post-1989 sociology has been mostly influenced by the processes of societal change that have been shaking Czech society. For most of the 1990s, the dominant themes of sociological research have been the post-communist transformation and its economic, political, social, cultural, and socio-psychological aspects. The transformation and transformation-generated problems were a gold mine of research topics. It took some time before the fascination with the uniqueness of transformation phenomena and with their specific Czech features began to give way to the understanding that such phenomena are part of a more general process of societal change, which has been taking place on a broader historical and geographical scale. Multinational comparative research projects, usually covering all or some of the four East-Central European countries – the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and the Slovak Republic – and sometimes extending further to the east or southeast, provided ample material for broader generalizations.

The institutional structure of social science has changed profoundly in four ways (Illner, 1999): organizational diversification and fragmentation, the dismantling of monopolies, the strengthening of university-based social sciences, and the emergence of private and commercial research. The hierarchical system of social science institutions supervised by the Communist Party and the state bureaucracy was dismantled. The majority of applied research institutes linked to ministries ceased to exist as well. Both the universities and the Academy of Sciences underwent fundamental reorganization; the Academy's size was reduced by almost 50%, and any formal hierarchical relationship between it and the universities disappeared. University social science, the weaker partner until 1989, was substantially strengthened as new institutions of higher learning – social science faculties, departments, or centers – were established, some in the regional capitals, and began to teach sociology, the most important new institutions being the *Faculty of the Social Sciences* at Charles University (Fakulta sociálních věd Univerzity Karlovy) and the *Faculty of Social Studies* at Masaryk University (Fakulta sociálních studií Masarykovy univerzity). The research capacities of universities were also upgraded. In the Academy, the new *Institute of Sociology* was founded in 1990, reviving the tradition of the Academy's first sociological institute, which the communist regime had dissolved for political reasons in 1970. The *Institute of Public Opinion Research*, until 1989 an organization serving almost exclusively the Communist Party's Central Committee, was totally reorganized and began to collect as well as to regularly publish data on political and other attitudes. In 2001, the Institute was incorporated in the Institute of Sociology at the Academy.

A new system of financing research from public money was established, with grant agencies as its core element and peer reviews as the basic mechanism of evaluation (cf below). Systematic measurement of the scientific output of individual scientists as well as of research groups and organizations has been introduced, and output criteria started to play an important role in the allocation of public resources, although not in a consistent way throughout the whole structure of social science. Public databases of research projects and their outputs were established.

Besides the public sector institutions, a plethora of private social science educational, research, and consulting organizations also emerged – schools, polling and market research agencies, consultation firms, think tanks, etc. Competition developed between the public sector and private institutions as well as within each of the two groups for research themes, finances, human resources, foreign links, and attention from the media and politicians.

The thematic and organizational transformation of social science has been accompanied by a tremendous mobility of research and pedagogical personnel. Several significant currents of mobility can be distinguished: 1. The compromised former communist elites, partly voluntarily, partly under pressure, left their positions and frequently also their organizations, moving mostly to jobs in the private sphere, into retirement, or just to lower-level jobs within their original home institutions. The so-called "*screening law*" preventing former top communist nomenclature cadres from occupying leading positions in public sector institutions (those of directors, deputy directors, and departments heads) played a secondary role in this context. 2. Sociologists whom the communist regime had expelled from universities and research bodies for political reasons after 1968 were offered the chance to return to their positions as part of the *rehabilitation* process. 3. Human resources were redistributed between public sector institutions and newly emerging private ones – clearly in favor of the latter. A number of talented younger-generation sociologists left the Academy's institutes and university departments to establish or accept jobs in private research firms, taking with them the professional knowledge and inside information of their home institutions as a professional "dowry". 4. Some redistribution of personnel also took place between institutes of the Academy of Sciences and universities; its main stimulus was a massive downsizing of the Academy in 1993 and new openings in the institutions of higher learning.

On the other hand, the mobility of social scientists into and away from the country did not reach significant dimensions: so far, external "brain drain" has not been a frequent phenomenon in the social sciences and the number of returning expatriate sociologists has also been small, partly because of the modest size of the Czech sociological émigré community. Those who returned or kept visiting the country repeatedly, offering their help in rebuilding Czech sociology, include Václav Bělohradský, Ernest Gellner, Miroslav Disman, Jiří Kolaja, Jaroslav Krejčí, Jiří Nehněvajsa, Zdeněk Strmiska, Zdeněk Suda, and Ilja Šrubař.

Unfortunately, the post-1989 organizational and personnel changes in Czech sociology have never been systematically mapped and researched, so no quantification of these changes is available.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

Revival and adaptation of major pre-war traditions

The fifty years that passed with the Nazi occupation of the Czech Lands and the closing of Czech universities in 1939, the end of all academic research, and the fall of the communist regime in 1989 were much too long a period to permit the preservation of any direct and organic link between pre-war and contemporary Czech sociology. Most of the people who, under normal conditions, could have spanned the two periods as university teachers, authors, and representatives of schools of thought had been expelled from their academic jobs and not permitted to do any research or to publish. Some emigrated, some were imprisoned, some disappeared into private life. The two periods of relative freedom in 1945-1948 and 1965-1969 were too far apart and too short to be able to restore the tradition. With some exaggeration, we can say that Czech sociology had to start anew three times since the war – in 1945, 1965, and 1989 – each time with new themes and approaches.

However, on a general level, some *more lasting features* can be recognized in contemporary Czech sociology reaching back as far as the pre-war time or even the 19th century: empiricism and aversion to abstract theory, theoretical eclecticism, emphasis on practical application, and policy uses of social science knowledge. Jiří Musil, after recently surveying the last hundred years of Czech sociology, suggested seven clusters of themes, or rather thematic orientations, that he thinks recur in Czech social thought: 1. The national question and problems of nationalism and identity (a theme also represented by historians and political scientists). 2. Problems of the welfare state, social policy, and the theory of applied social science; social problems, poverty, and social pathology. 3. Problems of social modernization, often seen as a part of socio-ethical issues. 4. Urban and rural sociology. 5. The social stratification of Czech society, viewed from the perspective of the social conflicts it can cause. 6. The theory of democracy and of the political system – efforts to balance liberalism and socialism. 7. Social theory – the weakest link within this series (Musil, 1998).

Another pre-war feature of Czech sociology that was revived after 1989 has been its spatial concentration in *two major academic national centers* – one in Prague around the Faculties of Arts and of the Social Sciences of the Charles University and the Institute of Sociology at the Academy of Sciences, the other in Brno, the cultural center of Moravia, around the Faculty of Social Studies of Masaryk University. The two centers, representing the bulk of Czech sociology's capacities and output, are locked together in symbiotic cooperation and competition, each trying to define its own turf. Although it is still too early to make a final judgment, it looks like "Prague" and "Brno" schools of sociology are emerging in the Czech Lands, just like before the war.

Past and present inspirations

Czech sociology, a relatively modest scientific enterprise now as before the war, has always taken its theoretical and methodological inspiration from abroad – in the inter-war period mostly from French and American authors, under communist rule from the Soviet Union. The Soviet link, mostly a channel of ideological control, was not always detrimental: particularly in the 1980s, some Soviet social science personalities and institutes were sometimes more liberal than their official Czech counterparts.

After 1989, the window to the West was opened and Czech sociology was exposed to the plurality of theoretical and methodological currents and thematic orientations of world sociology. Eclecticism prevailed. It is difficult to name any theoretical and methodological current that influenced Czech sociologists in a way as distinctively as the hermeneutic, post-modern approaches, which attracted a closely-knit group of adherents. Other schools of thought that found some resonance among Czech sociologists were theories of modernization, of social and cultural capital, and of path-dependency, as well as neo-institutionalism. Prominent sociologists whose works were translated and published in recent years in the Czech Republic and who, among contemporary personalities of world sociology, have had the chance to influence the Czech social science community include Zygmunt Bauman, Peter Berger, Pierre Bourdieu, Ernest Gellner, Anthony Giddens, Jürgen Habermas, Thomas Luckmann, and Robert Merton.

The once exclusive and obligatory connections with official Soviet institutions that the communist authorities forced on Czech sociologists ceased to exist almost immediately after 1989; they were never substituted by links with the new post-Soviet social science bodies established in Russia since then. Neither side was interested; for both, Western connections were now of primary importance. Moreover, for Czechs, Russian contacts still smack of the former paternalism. Although understandable, this breakdown of contacts is regrettable: both the new Russian sociology and the changing Russian society are sufficiently interesting to deserve attention.

The traditionally well-established and predominant quantitative approaches to research methodology have been paralleled in the 1990s by a trend that promotes, sometimes in a somewhat doctrinaire way, qualitative and particularly biographical methods as the way to analyze social phenomena. However, the quantitative vs. qualitative dichotomy has developed solely on the academic level. In problem-oriented, applied research, quantitative and qualitative methods have been successfully combined.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Transformation (transition) as an object of study

Societal transformation – its causes, manifestations, mechanisms, forms, and impacts on the various segments of social life – was, in a general sense, the main subject of interest of Czech sociological investigations after 1989. However, much research was thematically linked to the transformation merely as the relevant societal environment of the concrete phenomena under investigation. In fact, any study of contemporary Czech society conducted in the 1990s had to take transformation into account, even if transformation was not its immediate subject. While there was scarcely any aspect of social life not affected by transformation, the number of studies dealing explicitly and primarily with societal transformation, e.g. with its theoretical models and interpretations, was modest. Contributions of this kind included, for example, Možný's essay offering an original micro-sociological interpretation of the communist regime's collapse (Možný, 1991), studies viewing transformation as a belated modernization of Eastern and Eastern-Central European societies (Machonin, 1997), Kabele's attempt at a theory of societal change (Kabele, 1998), discussions about the conceptual difference between transition and transformation, and discussion about which of the two better captures the processes taking place in the former communist countries.

As mentioned, the bulk of transformation-related studies tackled concrete individual aspects and manifestations of the process, often with an explicit policy orientation. By the end of the 1990s, the pivotal role of transformation as an integrative concept began to recede and the frequency of transformation issues has been gradually falling. Joint problems shared by many European industrialized countries – like globalization, problems of the information and knowledge-based society, aging and its consequences, family behavior, international migration, nationalism, minorities, unemployment, postmodern values, etc. – and lately also issues of European integration, none of them transformation-specific, have been gradually increasing in number.

The choice of themes

Although broadly represented, transformation issues did not entirely dominate Czech sociology in the 1990s. Other themes were discussed as well. Beside the themes mentioned above, Czech sociology was also rediscovering and evaluating its historical heritage. It retrospectively analyzed and evaluated socialist society and, reflecting on the current state, discussed the problems, the institutional framework, and the infrastructure of the discipline. Many contributions, including efforts to translate the most relevant foreign-language sociological works and make them accessible to the Czech public, aimed to overcome the consequences of Czech sociology's long intellectual isolation from world social science. The *characteristic features* of Czech sociological studies in the 1990s were

- their thematic, theoretical, and methodological diversity, starkly contrasting with the regimented and uniform profile of official, pre-1989 sociology,
- their retreat from Marxist approaches (and sometimes the adoption of other ideological paradigms – neoliberal, conservative, radical "green", etc.),
- their inspiration by theoretical concepts developed by Western – mostly American, British, German, and French – authors; the post-modern paradigm became particularly popular among part of the young generation of sociologists,

- the strong representation of empirically-based and policy-oriented studies and, on the other hand, the under-representation of original Czech theoretical writings,
- the coexistence of the well-developed, traditional quantitative research methodology and the rapidly expanding qualitative, particularly biographical, methodology, and
- the uncertain disciplinary identity of many studies due to the thematic and methodological interpenetration of sociology and its adjacent disciplines – political science, economics, demography, social geography, and social anthropology; often, the author's home institution or the journal where the study is published is all that helps to solve the identity problem.

A survey of the contents of the ten volumes from 1991 till 2000 of *Sociologický časopis*, the only Czech-refereed academic sociological journal, and of books published by Czech authors during the last twelve years offers a partial picture of the thematic structure of Czech sociology in the 1990s and permits us to estimate the frequency of specific themes. Four clusters of themes were distinguished and ranked according to their frequency.

The following paragraphs characterize in detail only the first, most frequent thematic cluster; with the rest, we have to content ourselves with a brief enumeration of the main themes.

Cluster A

This set of the most frequent themes has to do with the basic structural changes of Czech society after 1989. It covered the following fields of study:

The post-communist transformation as a general problem

Studies dealt with the process of transformation on a more general level. The issues discussed were the social, economic, and political roots of the changes, the role of the pre-communist and communist heritage during the transformation, and continuities and discontinuities; the mutual relationship and timing of the economic and social components of transformation, as well as of its structural and cultural components and the tensions between them; the actors of transformation – their interests, roles, and strategies; the role of the market and of the state; and the specific features of transformation in the Czech Republic.

The dynamics of social structure and stratification

The emerging new social structure and stratification were studied, including the new class relations, the new mechanisms of social mobility, and the role of various factors that determine the stratification system – with special attention to the influence of meritocratic factors and to the role of the social and cultural capital accumulated during the communist regime. In this context, the problem of the circulation and reproduction of the former communist elite was studied and research on the new post-communist elite was conducted. Considerable attention was paid to the formation of the new middle class. Another group of studies focused on social inequalities created by the transformation process, on identifying the winners and losers of transformation, and on related issues of social justice. Attitudes of the public toward the new structures were studied, possible conclusions about their social legitimacy were drawn.

Socio-economic changes and the social aspects of the economic transformation

This body of research is closely connected with the previous one, as well as with parallel investigations of similar issues conducted by Czech economists. One group of themes includes the role of the market in the transforming society, social aspects of the post-1989 privatization process, and the new capitalists and managers. Another set of themes are the new income and property differences and inequalities, their social and demographic determinants, their distribution and consequences, their perception by the general public, and their legitimacy. Still another field of study was the changes and distribution of the living standard, especially studies of poverty. Another set of studies covered problems of the labor market, unemployment, and the unemployed. Another represented topic was the transformation of the welfare state. In the second half of the 1990s, social aspects of the housing market became another important research subject.

Social problems and social policy issues
Investigations covered social aspects and (often negative) social consequences of the systemic changes. Viewed as social problems, such issues were frequently approached from the social policy perspective. The key issues were social exclusion and the marginalized groups defined by poverty, ethnicity, and other social or cultural criteria, as well as systems, methods, and instruments of social policy and social work aimed at coping with social problems. Analysis of various social policy systems and discussion of their applicability in the transforming societies were frequent themes.
The new political and administrative system
A major field of studies at the boundary between political sociology, on the one hand, and political science and administrative science, on the other. The disciplinary identity of many studies is ambivalent. Investigations cover the socio-structural determinants and differentiation of political behavior, in particular of various forms of political participation: electoral behavior, party membership, participation in social movements, and political extremism. Another set of studies is concerned with political attitudes and identities, their structure, and their social determinants. Yet another major theme is the formation and representation of interests by political and non-political institutions, including NGOs and social movements. In this context, the controversial concepts of civil society and of "non-political politics" were discussed. The structure and dynamics of public policy were studied. The Czech Parliament was the object of intensive research at the end of the 1990s. Research on the political elite was conducted, mostly as part of a more broadly conceived elite research. Some research was done on political culture and political values and also in the field of political geography. The new local democracy, local self-government, local politics, and the more general issues of decentralization were intensively studied from the sociological perspective. An independent field of interest was the social aspects of the legal system and its functioning.

Cluster B

Four sets of themes fall into this cluster:
Research on socio-demographic phenomena
- Social aspects of population development
- New patterns of partnership and family

Gender studies
Research on attitudes, values, and mentalities
Methodology of social research
- General methodology and methods of qualitative research
- Methods of quantitative social research.

Cluster C

The third-most frequent set of research themes was a rather heterogeneous group:
- Studies of socio-spatial and environmental issues
- Studies of sociological aspects of ethnicity
- The sociology of law and studies of social pathology
- Sociology as a discipline and as an institution

Cluster D

The fourth cluster comprises a number of weakly represented themes:
- Transformation in and of economic organizations
- Retrospective analyses of Czech society under the communist regime
- Development of human potential
- Problems of the information society and of information technology
- Problems of globalization
- Sociological aspects of European integration

- Lifestyle research

It is annoying to find among the weakly represented topics themes that will probably be of great importance for the further development of Czech society and that deserve much more attention.

A specific type of outputs were *social reports* aimed at presenting a synthetic picture of societal (or social) development in the Czech Republic in the 1990s or of some of its components; these sometimes also offered a scenario of what is to come.

The impact of thematic orientations on institutional structures

As mentioned above, the 1990s witnessed the growth and diversification of the originally underdeveloped institutional structure of Czech social research. New universities and research organizations, both public and private, mushroomed; the old ones were transformed or disappeared. The former division of labor, which was sometimes decreed from above, broke down. Individual researchers and institutions sought to find and to optimize their positions on the emerging market (or rather markets) of research themes, projects, foreign cooperation, and funding opportunities. It took most of the 1990s before the situation began to stabilize and a new division of labor started to take shape.

In academic sociological research, thematic orientations have to some degree spontaneously divided among four main institutional centers. The *Faculty of Social Sciences at Charles University* is the main locus of biographic sociology and qualitative research, as well as of studies of sociological theories, the history of sociology, and the sociological aspects of public policy. In this faculty there is the *Center for the Social and Economic Strategies (Centrum pro sociálni a ekonomické strategie)*, whose goal is to identify and analyze key issues, developmental barriers, and opportunities for the social, economic, and political development of the Czech Republic. The *Faculty of Social Studies at Masaryk University* is the strong point for social policy studies and research on social problems, minorities, ethnic and marginalized groups; it has a well developed program in family, children, youth, and seniors' research; and its department of political science runs projects in political sociology. The Faculty is host to a branch office of the Research Institute of Labor and Social Affairs. The *Department of Sociology at the Faculty of Arts, Charles University (Sociologický Ústav Akademie Véd České Republiky)* (Katedra sociologie Filozofické fakulty Univerzity Karlovy), has a stake in research on criminality and other social pathologies, in the sociology of labor, and in the history of sociology and sociological theories. The *Institute of Sociology at the Academy of Science of the Czech Republic* is a focal point for quantitative comparative research of social structure, social inequalities, and social justice, for studies of modernization, economic sociology, and socio-spatial issues including local politics, and for gender research and demographically-based family research and political sociology – particularly parliamentary studies, studies of political attitudes, and opinion research. It harbors the *Center for Public Opinion Research* (Centrum pro výzkum veřejného mínění) and the *Sociological Data Archive* (Sociologický datový archiv) – units of national relevance.

The two hitherto separate institutional orbits – the universities and the Academy of Sciences with its individual institutes – grew closer over time and have established numerous channels of cooperation, both in research and in the training of students. During the 1990s, prominent universities were able to expand their research capacities and thus to make headway in catching up with the Academy of Sciences. The top universities now tend to position themselves as *"research universities"* whose main thrust is doctoral studies, while the Academy's institutes and individual scholars became extensively involved in teaching, particularly in postgraduate studies.

A system of *periodic evaluation* of state-financed research facilities has been introduced, based on peer reviews. The system still needs further refinement, and a discussion of the merits and limits of scientometric criteria in the social sciences is under way.

Funding

Like the institutional structures, the funding of academic sociology – concentrated almost exclusively in public institutions – was diversified after 1989. The most relevant source of financial means has been the state budget. These funds are distributed through two basic channels, either as *"institutional funds"* assigned to institutions according to diverse need-based criteria, such as the number of students, employees etc., or as *"targeted funds"* distributed as a rule on a competitive basis in the form of grants. The weight of this second channel has been growing and the government's policy is to support this trend also in the future.

Several grant agencies and similar bodies were set up to be responsible for the distribution of the targeted funds; researchers can submit research proposals to these bodies. The largest and most relevant is certainly the *Grant Agency of the Czech Republic* (Grantová agentura České republiky), which commands the largest chunk of the targeted state funds. Other grant agencies, established by individual public institutions, specialize in supporting research in particular fields related to their own activities. These include the *Grant Agency of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic* (Grantová agentura Akademie věd České republiky), the *Grant Agency of the Charles University* (Grantová agentura Univerzity Karlovy), and grant agencies or similar units of individual ministries, some of which also sponsor social research. Recently, the state system of support for research and development has been further diversified by opening two new channels. One is support for newly established *Research Centers*, aimed to merge the research capacities of universities and non-university institutions and focusing on cross-sectional themes; the other is the financing of institutional *Research Plans*, intended to support long-term research on complex problems. A *National Program of Targeted Research* is being prepared. The culture of private sponsoring of social sciences and humanities is not developed in the Czech Republic.

Another source of finances has been foreign and international institutions, including Western governments, the European Commission, and diverse foundations supporting the re-creation and development of social sciences after 1989. Sizeable funds were received to support libraries, scholarships, training, publications, conferences, and also research activities. Universities could enjoy support within the European *Copernicus, Eureka*, and other funds. The particularly supportive foundations have included the *Open Society Fund* and several other agencies funded by George Soros, the *Friedrich Ebert Foundation*, the *Volkswagen Foundation*, the *British Know How Fund*, the *Ford Foundation*, and the *Rockefeller Brothers Fund.* During the second half of the 1990s, the generosity of external donors gradually receded in the Czech Republic as their activities moved eastward. By the end of the 1990s, the European Commission's *Framework Program* became a potential source of funding. For sociology, the Framework Program has been more a promise than an effective source of financial means. So far, only teams and researchers willing to climb the bandwagon of their West European partners have had a real chance to participate in the European grants.

The next, though not yet very strong source of funding, has been the *for-profit activities* of public academic institutions – commissioned research, expertise, paid courses, etc. This source is, of course, the most important one for private organizations doing research and training in sociology. Since Czech legislation has recently permitted the establishment of private institutions of higher learning, it is to be expected that this type of resources will become more important in the future.

5. Public space and academic debates

Genuine academic debates, i.e., interactive exchanges of views, have not been very frequent among Czech sociologists.

- One that did take place concerned *post-modern thinking* and the theoretical and methodological challenges it represented for Czech sociology. The post-modern paradigm, including the narrative and biographical methodology, invaded Czech social sciences after 1989, finding quite a number of adherents, who launched a critique of the so far dominant analytical, quantitative, and more or less positivist approaches. However, no deeper conflict between the post-modernists and the "traditionalists" has developed. This is partly because a kind of "third way" was found accommodating both sides, partly because the "hard" post-modernists were able to find their own institutional niches.

- Another debate concerned *the concept and the theories of modernization* – their scientific status and their usefulness in conceptualizing and explaining the post-communist transformation. Some Czech sociologists, trying to find a suitable theoretical framework for explaining the post-communist transformation, were inspired by the writings of Rudolf Andorka, Wolfgang Zapf, Samuel N. Eisenstadt, and others and found the answer in modernization theories. Others, however, questioned the usefulness of these theories, pointing to the directionality and the cultural bias of the modernization approach.
- The *transformation versus transition dispute* concerned the nature of the post-1989 societal changes in the Czech Republic and in other former communist countries. Should these changes be viewed as a transition to the "standard" economic and social patterns as they exist in the capitalist societies of Western Europe, or do they constitute a new quality – a system "sui generis"?
- Another debate focused on the *new middle class* emerging after 1989. Does it really exist? What is its origin, structure, size, dynamics, and its social and political role? Has it gained from the transformation?
- *Civil society and "non-political politics"* – the phenomena and the concepts. The theoretical tenability of both concepts, the very existence of these phenomena and the role civil society plays and should be playing in social life and in politics. This heavily loaded debate took place mostly in the media, outside of the academic sphere, but with social scientists' participation.
- *Internal problems of Czech sociology and its public role*. Discussions concerned the state of contemporary Czech sociology as an institution and as a system of knowledge, its thematic orientation, its ability to cope with the scientific challenges brought by the post-1989 transformation, its professional status and productivity compared with world sociology and with other social science disciplines, methods of measuring its outputs, and its other problems. The public role of sociology was discussed – the obligation and ability of sociologists to act outside of the academic sphere, to take part in public discussions, to comment on relevant social issues, and to explain them to the general public.
- *The public role of opinion polls*. The quality of their results and methods; the impact of published results on political preferences and voting behavior of the general public as well as on the behavior of politicians; the polling agencies' and the media's culture of reporting their results.

6. Views on further development

International cooperation and the expected impact of EU accession

During the fifty years preceding the fall of the communist regime in 1989, with the exception of short windows of opportunity in 1945-1948 and 1965-1969, Czech sociology was isolated from world social science. Dogmatic political control rendered its *isolation much more thorough* than that of Hungarian and Polish sociology. The barrier fell in 1989, and international links were gradually rebuilt over the following twelve years in many forms: Czech researchers' participation in bilateral and multinational research projects, co-authorship of publications with foreign colleagues, lectures abroad and participation in international conferences, lectures by foreign professors at Czech universities, Czech sociologists' membership and offices in international scientific associations, their involvement in informal scientific networks, scholarships for Czech students at foreign universities, study visits by foreign students and researchers to Czech academic institutions, the organization of international conferences and meetings and the hosting of foreign social science institutions in the Czech Republic, participation in governmental as well as non-governmental programs, etc. There is no list or map of all the forms and instances of international cooperation. Initially formal inter-institutional links have frequently developed into informal interpersonal ones, and these later helped to facilitate a new generation of formal cooperative endeavors.

Yet in terms of worldliness, Czech sociology still lags behind its Polish and Hungarian sisters, even with all this busy networking. Twelve years have not been enough to make up for the initial difference; and Czech sociology, unlike Polish sociology in particular, could not count on massive support from compatriots abroad, because the Czech expatriate community was much smaller and less influential. This is not to deny the importance of the selfless and effective help of the Czech émigré sociologists who offered their support after 1989 (cf above).

Probably one of the most important factors to influence the international cooperation of Czech sociology in the coming years will be the country's integration in the European Union and a new quality of its participation in the Union's research programs. Modest so far, this participation is likely to intensify, partly because Western European scholars and institutions will want to learn about societies in the new member states, partly because the rules of the *6th Framework Program* encourage Western European authors of research proposals to include scholars from the candidate countries as participants in their projects, and partly because Czech sociologists will themselves actively seek such cooperation. Motivated by economic, political, or purely scientific reasons, this will lead Czech sociology to conduct more collaborative research and to orient itself much more toward all-European and global problems. Another factor pointing in the same direction is the development of the *"European Research Area"* in the social sciences, based on networking among institutions, research teams, and individual researchers.

On the Czech side, the prerequisite to such increased cooperation is, of course, professional competence and work discipline, language and social skills, and a healthy portion of cosmopolitanism – qualities that have not been in sufficient supply so far among the older generation of Czech sociologists. Contacts with the outside were the matter of a still relatively narrow set of "ambassadors". The number of competent communicators is, however, rapidly growing, and there is a fair chance that the situation will be different for the young generation.

On the "European" side, the fruitfulness of cooperation with Czech and other Eastern-Central European partners will depend on Western scholars' familiarity with the Eastern-Central European stage, on their sensitivity to the specific cultural and economic circumstances of the respective societies, and particularly on their ability to maintain partnership relations with Eastern-Central European colleagues even in intrinsically asymmetrical material situations. An unhappy scenario of European cooperation – though there is nothing to suggest that it will materialize – would be to concentrate European-level research capacities and their management in a limited number of Western academic centers, leaving the Central European partners with only auxiliary roles as suppliers of rough data and of talented young researchers.

The "EU connection", although strengthened, will not and should not undermine Czech sociologists' cooperation with their partners in other European countries and in other parts of the world. One of the important links here is and will certainly remain that with Slovak, Polish, and Hungarian sociologists. These three countries, with which the Czech Republic has shared a common or similar fate over the last fifty years and, hopefully, will also share in the years to come, are the natural partners for cooperation and for comparative research – already within the EU. Slovenia and Estonia can be included. Cooperative links have also been established and should continue with U.S. and Japanese partners. Re-opening a window to Russia is a matter for future development.

The impact of sociological research in the public sphere

In recent years, sociology and sociological research, whatever people understand them to mean, became popular among the general public, and the image of a sociologist as a professional who is competent to analyze society and comment on his findings became established and accepted. This was not so much the merit of the sociologists themselves as of journalists who discovered that some sociological themes and particularly the results of opinion polls are a readable and audible material, suitable to cover the pages of newspapers' weekend issues or to feed TV and radio discussions. In the process, the media sometimes reduced sociology to just a couple of attractive themes and often identified it with opinion research. Sociologists who managed to penetrate into the media have undoubtedly played a role in shaping public opinion and have had the opportunity to present some relevant issues for public discussion. Equal opportunities for men and women, tendencies of demographic development, the functional literacy of the Czech population, the dynamics and factors of income distribution, regional disparities, housing problems, ethnic issues, lifestyles, and political attitudes were just a few such attractive themes.

Sociology's impact, if any, on "big" politics and the central politicians has been less visible and more indirect. The one social science discipline that strongly influenced the sphere of politics, particularly during the first half of the 1990s, was economics, not sociology. This was partly because some the leading politicians of the time were themselves economists; many of them dismissed sociology as a kind of soft and, in their opinion, intrinsically leftist subject unsuccessfully competing with economics in explaining the functioning of society. Moreover, sociology was often identified with its skewed pre-1989 version. This situation changed somewhat at the end of the 1990s when, as a contribution to the public debate on the problems and developmental orientation of Czech society, several social reports were published, including a series of UNDP-sponsored Human Development Reports. The government invited a group of sociologists to participate in drafting background materials for the *Social and Economic Strategy of the Czech Republic*. A government-sponsored unit – The *Center for Social and Economic Strategies* – was established in the Faculty of Social Sciences at the Charles University to pursue this work. The first outputs of this team attracted attention. For more information refer to the Selected Bibliography.

The branch of social investigations that definitely did have an impact on both the general public and the politicians has been public opinion research. Results of the polls have been closely watched and reacted upon, in spite of voices questioning their validity. The organizations conducting opinion surveys and providing data on politically and socially relevant issues were thus highly relevant contributors to public debates. The media have regularly published and commented on their findings (a list of the most important polling agencies is in the appendix).

Sociology's involvement was more prominent on the level of policy formation. Czech sociologists contributed numerous research reports, pieces of expertise, recommendations, etc. dealing with various policy issues to state authorities, local governments, NGOs, etc. For example, the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, the Ministry of Education, Youth and Physical Culture, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of the Interior, and the Ministry of Regional Development commissioned such cooperation. Sociologists took part in drafting the Strategic Plan for the Development of Prague, etc.

Human resources in sociology and the problem of the "brain drain"

Czech sociology and social sciences in general experienced a surge of interest among the young generation after 1989. The numbers of young people interested in sociological studies and applying to the universities rose dramatically, exceeding the available educational capacities. At the same time, the labor market was interested in the social science professions, mainly for practice-oriented jobs, i.e., in market and opinion research, the media, advertising and publicity agencies, human resources management, social services, and public administration. The academic sphere – new social science departments and research institutes – also demanded a new labor force, but offered entirely incompetitive salaries. So academia was the loser in the ensuing competition: private firms and public administration were able to offer salaries much higher than university departments and institutes of the Academy. Often, after spending some time in an academic setting to acquire more skills in research methods, data analysis, and foreign languages, young and gifted researchers have taken these better-paid jobs. The kind of job opportunity that has attracted, at least temporarily, young sociologists, in spite of being poorly remunerated, was work in charities and other institutions providing beneficial public services. The feeling of being directly useful and employing one's knowledge to solve social problems has been a strong motive for some young sociologists, leading them away from the more abstract and more cognitive game of academic social science.

Unlike this internal *"brain drain"*, Czech sociology has not so far experienced any substantial outflow of human resource abroad. This situation may change in the future, as the national labor market in the social science professions becomes saturated, leading the new cosmopolitan and "exportable" generation of young sociologists to start to seek opportunities abroad.

Note

In this contribution, given its limited scope, we preferred to concentrate more on trends and the characteristic features of Czech sociology than on factography. The reader seeking factographic information is referred to the institution CD and to the Selected Bibliography. Shortly after completion of this paper, a monothematic Czech-language issue of Sociologický časopis / Czech Sociological Review was published, devoted completely to the recent development, present state, and problems of contemporary Czech sociology (Sociologický časopis / Czech Sociological Review 2002). It neatly complements this overview with further information and insight. The two formerly separate journals Sociologický časopis and Czech Sociological Review were merged in 2002 with the composite name "Sociologický časopis / Czech Sociological Review". The journal is now a bimonthly, with two of the six yearly issues published in English and four in Czech.

References

Geist, Bohumil (1992): *Sociologický slovník* (The Dictionary of Sociology), Praha, Victoria Publishing;

Havelka, Miloš (1995): „Tschechische Soziologie in Gesellschaftswandel. Zur Sozial- und Geistesgeschichte der Entstehung und Entwicklung der tschechischen Soziologie bis 1989" (The Czech Sociology and Social Change – On the Intellectual History of the Origin and Development of Czech Sociology Until 1989), in: *Jahrbuch fur Geschichte der Soziologie*, 223-253;

Illner, Michal (1999): „Post-Communist Transformation and the Development of Social Sciences – The Czech Case", in: *Europe: Expectations and Reality. The Challenge for the Social Sciences*, Falťan Lubomír (ed.), Bratislava, Institute for Sociology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 36-43;

ISA XV World Congress of Sociology 1998 (Special Session on Heritage of Sociology);

Kabele, Jiří (1998): *Přerody. Principy sociálního konstruování* (Transformations. Principles of Social Constructivism*)*, Praha, Karolinum;

Lamser, Václav (1966): *Základy sociologického výzkumu* (Foundations of Sociological Research), Praha, Svoboda;

Macků, Jan (1996): „Sociologie česká do r. 1948" (Czech Sociology Until 1948), in: *Velký sociologický slovník*, Praha, Karolinum, 1041-1043;

Machonin, Pavel (ed.) (1969): *Československá společnost. Sociologická analýza sociální stratifikace* (Czechoslovak Society. A Sociological Analysis of Social Stratification), Bratislava, Epocha;

Machonin, Pavel (1997): *Social Transformation and Modernization*, Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;

Masaryk, Tomáš Garrigue (1881): *Der Selbstmord als soziale Massenerscheinung der modernen Zivilisation* (Suicide as a Mass-Phenomenon of the Modern Civilisation), Wien, Konegen;

Masaryk, Tomáš Garrigue (1895): *Česká otázka* (The Czech Question), Praha, Čin (4th edition in 1936);

Masaryk, Tomáš Garrigue (1898): *Otázka sociální* (The Social Question), Praha, Čin (new edition in 1936);

Možný, Ivo (1991): *Proč tak snadno ... Některé rodinné důvody sametové revoluce* (Why so Easy… Some Family Reasons of the Velvet Revolution), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;

Možný, Ivo (1996): „Sociologie česká v létech 1948-1994“ (Czech Sociology in the Years 1948-1994), in: *Velký sociologický slovník*, Praha, Karolinum, 1043-1046;
Musil, Jiří (1998): *„Hundred Years of Czech Sociology“*, paper presented at ISA XV World Congress;
Rádl, Emanuel (1928): *Válka Čechů s Němci* (The War of Czechs Against the Germans*),* Praha, Melantrich (new edition 1993);
Richta, Radovan (1966): *Civilizace na rozcestí. Společenské a lidské souvislosti vědeckotechnické revoluce* (Civilization at the Cross-Roads. Social and Human Implications of the Scientific and Technological Revolution), Praha, Svoboda;
Sociologický časopis. Czech Sociological Review, 38 (2002), 1;
Ullrich, Zdeněk (1938): *Soziologische Studien zur Verstädterung der Prager Umgebung* (The Sociological Studies on the Urbanisation of Prague's Environs), Praha, Státní tiskárna;
Urbánek, Eduard (1995): Ups and Downs in Czech Soziology, in: *Eastern Europe in Transformation. The impact on sociology*, Mucha, Janusz and Keen, Mike F., Greenwood Press, Westport and London, 79-87;
Velký sociologický slovník (The Great Dictionary of Sociology) (1996)*,* Praha, Karolinum;

Selected Bibliography (1990 – 2002)

Introductory note:

As mentioned elsewhere in this report, boundaries of sociology as a discipline are rather fuzzy in the Czech Republic and it is often difficult to decide on the disciplinary identity of individual publications. The present selection of publications is not much restrictive in this respect.

The list has been limited to books with academic content, authored or co-authored by Czech writers, presented by established publishers and generally available. Publications of 'grey' literature (i.e. publications with limited circulation - e.g. internal prints of institutions, working papers, reports etc. have not been included. This rule has been relaxed in the case of social reports some of which were not on sale in public bookshops.

A selective bibliography, such as the present one, can suffer from structural imbalancies and omission of important items. Although we tried to minimize such a risk by controlling for the important themes as well as the relevant authors, such deficiencies cannot be excluded. The author will appreciate suggestions which would help to remove such imperfections.

Alan, Josef and Machonin, Pavel (ed.) (1992): *Jak se rodí sociologický výzkum. K problémům výzkumu transformace sociální struktury československé společnosti* (Birth of a Sociological Investigation. On Investigating the Social Structure of the Czechoslovak Society), Praha, Karolinum;
Alan, Josef (ed.) (1995): *Dialogy o občanské společnosti* (Dialogues About the Civil Society*),* Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Alan, Josef and Petrusek, Milan (1996*): Sociologie, literatura a politika* (Sociology, Literature and Politics), Praha, Karolinum;
Alan, Josef et al. (2001): *Alternativní kultura. Příběh české společnosti 1945-1989* (An Alternative Culture. The Narrative of Czech Society 1945-1989), Praha, Nakladatelství Lidové Noviny;
Blažek, Bohuslav (1998): *Venkov-město-media* (Country-Cities-Media), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Brokl, Lubomír et al. (1997): *Reprezentace zájmů v politickém systému České republiky* (The Representation of Interests in the Political System of the Czech Republic), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Buriánek, Jiří (1993): *Systémová sociologie: problém operacionalizace* (A Systemic Sociology: The Problem of Operationalization), Praha, Karolinum;
Disman, Miroslav (2000): *Jak se vyrábí sociologická znalost*, Praha, Karolinum;
Fialová, Ludmila, Horská, Pavla, Kučera, Milan, Maur, Eduard, Musil, Jiří and Stloukal, Milan (1996): *Dějiny obyvatelstva českých zemí* (History of Population of the Czech Lands), Praha, Mladá fronta;
Fialová, Ludmila, Hamplová, Dana, Kučera, Milan and Vymětalová, Simona (2000): *Představy mladých lidí o manželství a rodičovství* (Young People's Perception of Marriage and Parenthood), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Foretová, Věra and Foret, Miroslav (1996): *Komunikující město* (A Communicating City), Brno, Masarykova univerzita;

Friedlanderová, Hana and Tuček, Milan (2000): *Češi na Prahu nového tisíciletí* (Czechs on the Threshold of the New Millenium), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství a Median;

Gabal, Ivan et al. (1999): *Etnické menšiny ve střední Evropě. Konflikt nebo integrace* (Ethnic Minorities in Central Europe. Conflict or Integration), Praha, G&G;

Geist, Bohumil (1992): *Sociologický slovník* (Dictionary of Sociology), Praha, Victoria Publishing;

Gellner, Ernest (1994): *Encounters With Nationalism*, Oxford, Blackwell;

Hartl, Jan and Haberlová, Věra (1999): *Česká společnost 1998* (Czech Society 1998), Praha, Management Press a STEM;

Havelka, Miloš (2001): *Dějiny a smysl. Obsahy, akcenty a posuny „české otázky" 1895-1989* (History and Sense. The Contents, Accents and Shifts of the „Czech Question" 1995-1989), Praha, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny;

Heitlingerová, Alena and Trnková, Zuzana (1998): *Životy mladých pražských žen* (Lives of theYoung Prague Women), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;

Holý, Ladislav (1996): *The Little Czech and the Great Czech Nation: National Identity and the Post-communist Transformation of Society*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press;

Hrčka, Michal (2000): *Sociální deviace* (Social Deviations), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;

Hubík, Stanislav (1999): *Sociologie vědění* (The Sociology of Knowledge), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;

Human Development Report. Czech Republic 1996, Pavlík, Zdeněk (ed.), Praha, Faculty of Sciences, Charles University;

Human Development Report. Czech Republic 1997, Illner, Michal (ed.), Praha, Institute of Sociology AS CR;

Human Development Report. Czech Republic 1998, Praha, Prague Economic University;

Human Development Report. Czech Republic 1999, Kroupa, Aleš and Mácha, Martin (eds.), Praha, Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs;

Illner, Michal (ed.) (1993): *Czech Republic – Transformations After 1989 and Beyond. Scenario of Change Until the Year 2005*, Praha, The Institute of Sociology AS CR;

Illner, Michal, Baldersheim, Harald, Offerdal, Audun, Rose, Lawrence and Swianiewicz, Pawel (eds.) (1996): *Local Democracy and the Processes of Transformation in East-Central Europe*, Boulder, WestView Press (in the publication, authors` names are indicated in the alphabetic order);

Illner, Michal, Gorzelak, Grzegorz, Ehrlich, Éva and Falťan, Lubomír (eds*.): Central Europe: Towards EU Membership*, Warsaw, Scholar Publishers (in the publication authors' names are indicated in the alphabetic order);

Janišová, Helena (1998): *Zdeněk Ullrich. Příspěvek k dějinám československé sociologie let 1945-1949* (Zdeněk Ullrich. A Contribution to the History of Czech Sociology 1945-1949), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;

Janošová, Pavlína (2000): *Homosexualita v názorech současné společnosti* (Contemporary Society's Viewes on Homosexuality), Praha, Karolinum;

Jeřábek, Hynek (1997): *Paul Lazarsfeld a počátky komunikačního výzkumu* (Paul Lazarsfeld and Origins of the Communication Research), Praha, Karolinum;

Kabele, Jiří (1998): *Přerody. Principy sociálního konstruování*, (Transformations. The Principles of Social Constructivism), Praha, Karolinum;

Kapr, Jaroslav (1991): *Co je to demokracie* (What Is Democracy), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;

Keller, Jan (1991): *Úvod do sociologie* (Introduction to Sociology), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;

Keller, Jan (1992): *Nedomyšlená společnost* (An Illconsidered Society), Brno, Doplněk;

Keller, Jan (1995): *Dvanáct omylů sociologie* (Twelve Fallacies of Sociology), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;

Keller, Jan (1996): *Sociologie byrokracie a organizace* (Sociology of Bureaucracy and Organization), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;

Keller, Jan (2000): *Vzestup a pád středních vrtstev* (The Ascent and the Fall of the Middle Class), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;

Komenda, Antonín (1999): *Sociální deviace. Historická východiska a základní teoretické přístupy* (Social Deviation. Historical Background and the Main Theoretical Approaches), Olomouc, Univerzita Palackého;

Konopásek, Zdeněk (1998): *Estetika sociálního státu. O krizi reprezentace (nejen) v sociálním zabezpečení* (The Esthetics of the Social State. On the Crisis of (not only) Representation in Social Welfare), Praha, G&G;

Konopásek, Zdeněk (ed.) (1999): *Otevřená minulost. Autobiografická sociologie státního socialismu* (An Open Past. Autobiographic Sociology of the State Socialism), Praha, Karolinum;
Konopásek, Zdeněk (ed.) (2000): *Our lives as database: doing a sociology of ourselves: Czech social transitons in autobiographical research dialogues*, Praha, Karolinum;
Kostelecký, Tomáš (2002): *Political Parties After Communism. Developments in East-Central Europe,* Wahington, D.C. and Baltimore, Woodrow Wilson Center Press and The John Hopkins University Press;
Krejčí, Jaroslav (1993): *Society in a Global Perspective*, Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Krejčí, Jaroslav and Machonin, Pavel (1996): *Czechoslovakia 1918-92. A Laboratory for Social Change,* Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London, Macmillan Press Ltd.;
Labáth, Vladimír et al. (2001): *Riziková mládež* (The Youth at Risk), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Lapka, Miloslav and Gottlieb, Miroslav (2000): *Rolník a krajina. Kapitoly ze života soukromých rolníků* (Farmer and the Country. Chapters from the Life of Private Farmers), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Librová, Hana (1994): *Pestří a zelení. Kapitoly o dobrovolné činnost* (The Motley and the Green. Chapters About Voluntary Initiatives), Brno, Veronica;
Lužný, Dušan (1997): *Nová náboženská hnutí* (New Religious Movements), Brno, Masarykova Univerzita;
Machonin, Pavel (1997): *Sociální transformace a modernizace* (Social Transformation and Modernization), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Machonin, Pavel, Tuček, Milan et al. (1996): *Česká společnost v transformaci* (Czech Society in Transformation), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Machonin, Pavel (1997): *Social Transformation and Modernization*, Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Machonin, Pavel, Šťastnová, Pavlína, Kroupa, Aleš and Glasová, Alice (1997): *Strategie sociální transformace české společnosti a jejich úspěšnost v parlamentních volbách 1996* (Strategies of Social Transformation of the Czech Society and their Success in the 1996 Parliamentary Elections), Brno, Doplněk;
Machonin, Pavel, Adamski, Wladyslaw, Bunčák, Jan and Martin, Dominique (1999): *System Change and Modernization. East-West in Comparative Perspective,* Warsaw, IFIS Publishers (in the original publication authors are indicated in the alphabetic order);
Machonin, Pavel, Mlčoch, Lubomír and Sojka, Milan (2000): *Economic and Social Change in Czech Society After 1989. An Alternative View,* Praha, Karolinum;
Mansfeldová, Zdenka, Kitschelt, Herbert, Markowski, Radovan and Tóka, Gábor (1999): *Post-communist Party Systems*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press (in the publication, authors' names are indicated in the alphabetic order);
Mareš, Petr (1998): *Nezaměstnanost jako sociální problém* (Unemployment as a Social Problem), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Mareš, Petr (1999): *Sociologie nerovnosti a chudoby* (Sociology of Inequality and Poverty*),* Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Mareš, Petr et al. (2001): *Dávky sociálního státu* (The Welfare State's Benefits), Brno, Masarykova univerzita a Nakladatelství Georgetown;
Maříková, Hana (ed.) (2001): *Proměny současné české rodiny. Rodina – Gender –stratifikace* (Transformations of the Contemporary Czech Family. Family – Gender – Stratification), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Matějů, Petr, Vlachová, Klára et al. (2000): *Nerovnost, spravedlnost, politika. Česká republika 1991-1998* (Inequalities, Justice and Politics. The Czech Republic 1991-1998), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Matoušek, Oldřich (1997): *Rodina jako instituce a jako vztahová síť* (Family as an Institution and as a Network), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Matoušek, Oldřich (1998): *Mládež a delikvence* (Youth and Delinquency), Praha, Portál;
Mišovič, Ján (2001): *Víra v dějinách zemí Koruny české* (The Role of Faith in the History of the Crown Lands of Bohemia), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Mlčoch, Lubomír, Machonin, Pavel and Sojka, Milan (2000): *Ekonomické a společenské změny v České společnosti po roce 1989 (alternativní pohled*) (The Economic and Social Changes in the Czech Republic After 1989. An Alternative View), Praha, Karolinum;
Možný, Ivo (1991): *Proč tak snadno ... Některé rodinné důvody sametové revoluce* (Why so Easy… Some Family Reasons of the Velvet Revolution), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Možný, Ivo (1999): *Sociologie rodiny* (The Sociology of Family), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Možný, Ivo (2002): *Česká společnost* (Czech Society), Praha, Portál;

Možný, Ivo and Mareš, Petr (ed.) (1991): *Nezaměstnanost – nizozemská zkušenost a československá realita* (Unemployment – The Dutch Experience and the Czechoslovak Reality), Brno, Masarykova Univerzita;
Mucha, Ivan (2000): *Symboly v jednání* (The Role of Symbols in Human Action), Praha, Karolinum;
Mueller, Karel (2001): *Industriální zdroje, ekonomický růst a sociální změna* (Industrial Resources, Economic Growth and Social Change), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Munková, Gabriela (2001): *Sociální deviace. Přehled sociologických teorií* (Social Deviation. A Synopsis of Sociological Theories), Praha, Karolinum;
Musil, Jiří (ed.) (1995): *The End of Czechoslovakia*, Budapest-London-New York, Central European University Press;
Nohejl, Marek (2001): *Lebenswelt a každodennost v sociologii Alfreda Schutze* (Lebenswelt and the Everyday Life in the Sociology of Alfred Schutz), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Nováček, Pavel (1999): *Křižovatky budoucnosti. Směřování k udržitelnému rozvoji a globálnímu řízení* (Crossroads of the Future.Towards the Sustainable Development and Global Management), Praha, G&G;
Pechačová, Zdeňka, Hraba, Joseph and Lorenz, Frederick O.: *Deset rodin po 10 letech* (Ten Families Ten Years Later), Praha, Academia (in the publication, authors' names are indicated in the alphabetic order);
Petrusek, Miloslav (1990): *Sociologie a literatura* (Sociology and Literature), Praha, Československý spisovatel;
Petrusek, Miloslav (1992): *Alternativní sociologie* (Alternative Sociology), Praha, Klub osvobozeného samizdatu;
Petrusek, Miloslav (1993): *Teorie a metoda v moderní sociologii* (Theory and Method in Modern Sociology), Praha, Karolinum;
Petrusek, Miloslav, Linhart, Jiří, Vodáková, Alena et al. (ed.) (1996): *Velký sociologický slovník* (The Great Dictionary of Sociology, Praha, Karolinum;
Potůček, Martin (1997): *Nejen trh. Role trhu, státu a občanského sektoru v proměnách české společnosti,* (Not Only Market. The Role of the Market, Government and the Civic Sector in the Development of Post-communist Societies), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Potůček, Martin (1997): *Not only market. The role of the market, government and the civic sector in the development of post-communist societies*, Budapest, Central European University Press;
Potůček, Martin (ed.) (1999): *Česká společnost na konci tisíciletí* (The Czech Society at the End of the Millenium), Praha, Karolinum;
Potůček, Martin (1999): *Křižovatky české sociální reformy* (Cross-roads of the Czech Social Reform), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Průvodce krajinou priorit pro Českou republiku (Guide to the Priorities for the Czech Republic) (2002), Praha, Gutenberg;
Přibáň, Jiří (1996) : *Sociologie práva. Systémově teoretický přístup k modernímu právu* (The Sociology of Law. A System-Theoretic Approach to Modern Law), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Přibáň, Jiří (1997): *Suverenita, právo, legitimita* (Sovereignty, Law, Legitimacy), Praha, Karolinum;
Přibáň, Jiří (2001): *Disidenti práva* (The Dissidents of Law), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Rabušic, Ladislav (1995): *Česká společnost stárne* (The Czech Society is Ageing), Brno, Masarykova univerzita a Georgetown;
Rabušic, Ladislav (2001): *Kde ty všechny děti jsou? Porodnost v sociologické perspektivě* (Where Are All the Children? Natality in the Sociological Perspective), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Sak, Petr (2000): *Proměny české mládeže. Česká mládež v pohledu sociologických výzkumů* (Transformation of the Czech Youth. Czech Youth in the Light of Sociological Surveys), Praha, Petrklíč;
Schmeidler, Karel et al. (1997): *Sociologie v architektonické a urbanistické tvorbě* (Sociology in Architecture and Urbanism), Brno, PC-DIR – Nakladatelství;
Sirovátka, Tomáš (2000): *Česká sociální politika na prahu 21. století. Efektivnost, selhávání, legitimita,* (Czech Social Policy on the Threshold of the 21st Century. Effectiveness, Failures, Legitimacy), Brno, Masarykova univerzita;
Szaló, Csaba (ed.) (1998): *On European Identity: Nationalism, Culture and History*, Brno, Masaryk University;
Šanderová, Jadviga (2000): *Sociální stratifikace. Problém, vybrané teorie, výzkum* (Social Stratification. The Problem, Selected Theories, Research), Praha, Karolinum;
Šubrt, Jiří (1998): *Kapitoly ze sociologie veřejného mínění* (Chapters from the Sociology of Public Opinion), Praha, Karolinum;

Šubrt, Jiří (2000): *Problém času v sociologické teorii* (The Problem of Time in Sociolgical Theory), Praha, Karolinum;
Šubrt, Jiří (2001): *Postavy a problémy soudobé teoretické sociologie. Sociologické teorie druhé poloviny 20. století* (Personalities and Problems of the Contemporary Theoretical Sociology. Sociological Theories of the Second Half of the 20th Century), Praha, ISV nakladatelství;
Tuček, Milan, Bunčák, Ján and Harmagyová, Valentína (1998): *Strategie a aktéri sociálnej transformácie a modernizácie v Českej a Slovenskej republike* (Strategies and Actors of Social Transformation and Modernization in the Czech and the Slovak Republics), Brno, Doplněk;
Tuček, Milan and Friedlanderová, Hana (2001): *Evropa na Prahu sjednocení* (Europe on the Threshold of Integration), Praha, Median;
Večerník, Jiří (1996): *Markets and People. The Czech Reform Experience in a Comparative Perspective*, Aldershot, Avebury;
Večerník, Jiří (ed.) (1998): *Zpráva a vývoji české společnosti 1989-1998* (Report On the Development of Czech Society 1989-1998), Praha, Academia;
Večerník, Jiří (1998): *Občan a tržní ekonomika. Příjmy, nerovnosti a politické postoje v české společnosti,* (The Citizen and the Market Economy. Incomes, Inequalities and the Political Attitudes in the Czech Society), Praha, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny;
Večerník, Jiří and Petr Matějů (eds.) (1999): *Ten Years of Rebuilding Capitalism: Czech Society After 1989,* Praha, Academia;
Večeřa, Miloš (1993): *Sociální stát. Východiska a přístupy*, Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Vize rozvoje České republiky do roku 2015 *(The Vision of the Czech Republic's Development Until 2015), (2001), Praha, Gutenberg*;
Vodáková, Alena (1998): *Viníci a soudci* (Culprits and Judges), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Vymazal, Jiří (1991): *Koncepce masové komunikace v sociologii* (Sociological Approaches to Mass Communication), Praha, Karolinum;
Znebejánek, František (1997): *Sociální hnutí* (Social Movements), Praha, Sociologické nakladatelství;
Zumr, Josef (ed.) (1999): *Emanuel Chalupný, česká kultura, česká sociologie a Tábor* (Emanuel Chalupný, Czech Culture, Czech Sociology and Tábor), Praha, Filosofia.

Journals, Bulletins, Encyclopaedic Works

Journals

Sociologický časopis (Czech Sociological Review)
Academic bi-monthly published by the Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. Four issues in the Czech language and two issues in English are published each year. English summaries are available in the Czech language issues. The journal is reviewed by the Institute of Scientific Information and is impacted.
Biograf
Czech language journal specializing in biographic and reflexive sociology. Published by the Virtual Institute (cf. below) both in a printed and an electronic on-line form. Three issues are published annually.
Sociální politika (Social Policy)
A Czech language journal published monthly by the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs. Devoted to social policy issues.
Pohledy (The Views)
A Czech language journal was published bi-monthly by the the Czech Confederation of Trade Unions. The journal was devoted to social problems, social development and social policy issues. Recently its publication has been interrupted.
Sociologické texty (Sociological Papers)
A series of Czech or English language studies, published irregularly (annually about ten issues) by the Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. The series presents outcomes of the Institute's research.
Sociální studie (Social Studies)

A series of Czech language studies published irregularly by the Faculty of Social Studies of the Masaryk University. The series presents results of research conducted by the Faculty's staff and students.

Bulletins

Data&Fakta (Data and Facts)
A Czech language bulletin published irregularly – about ten issues annually - in the electronic form by the Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. Presents short reports on the Institute's recent research findings.
Gender. Rovné příležitosti. Výzkum (Gender. Equal Opportunities. Research)
A Czech language bulletin published quarterly by the Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Dept. Gender and Sociology. Issues concerning equal opportunities of men and women in the Czech Republic are discussed.
SDAInfo
A Czech language bulletin published quarterly by the Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, its Sociological Data Archive. It presents outlines of the Archive's available services, overviews of stored data and research projects, provides references to other sources of social data and is dedicated to promoting secondary data analysis.

Eencyclopaedic works

The 90s enriched Czech sociology with three encyclopaedic publications (see also above the Bibliography):
Sociologický slovník (The Dictionary of Sociology)
by Bohumil Geist (Geist 1992)
Velký sociologický slovník (The Great Dictionary of Sociology)
Edited by Miloslav Petrusek, Jiří Linhart, Alena Vodáková et al., with contributions by more than two hundred Czech authors (Petrusek et al. 1996). A major original Czech encyclopaedic work (in two volumes). The Dictionary represents a major collective accomplishment of Czech sociology of the 90s. It contains 2350 entries covering the history of sociology, sociological schools, sociological theories and concepts, general methodology, research methods and techniques, sociological disciplines, sociology in individual countries as well as a biographical annex covering 2700 personalities of world and Czech sociology. The Dictionary embraces also a wide range of entries referring to adjacent disciplines. Available are English, French, German and Italian equivalents of the entries. As a spin-off were published, in separate volumes, three mono-thematic collections of some of the Dictionary's entries devoted to sociological schools and paradigms, to social deviation, sociology of illness and of medicine, and 3. social and cultural anthropology.
Sociologický slovník (The Dictionary of Sociology)
by Jan Janďourek has been the latest contribution to the family of dictionaries (Janďourek 2001).

Mikk Titma

Sociology – Estonia

Discussant: Mikko Lagerspetz

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Sociological studies in Estonia started in 1960 at the same time as in Leningrad and Moscow during what was called the "Khrushchev thaw" (Keen and Mucha, 1994). Estonia was more opened to the West, and Western ideas penetrated more easily than in the rest of the Soviet Union. Estonia also had a relatively open ideological atmosphere and its authorities were more tolerant than those in other places in the Soviet Union. Kaariku seminars organized by Ülo Vooglaid turned out to be major discussion places for leading Soviet sociologists like Juri Levada, Vladimir Yadov, Igor Kon, and others. Those seminars very effectively spread sociological paradigms in Soviet social science.

The Laboratory of Sociology at Tartu University, founded by Vooglaid in 1967, played a leading role in the development process of Estonian sociology. It developed the school of mass communication research that is still one of the foremost directions of sociological research. In its heyday, the Laboratory had more than 20 permanent staff members and was closely linked with the Leningrad school (Yadov) of sociology. Its empirical basis of research was initially the local newspaper "Edasi" and later Estonian Radio and Television. Beginning in 1970, Estonian Radio collected audience information four times a year. Regular data collection about the audience allowed Estonian Radio to establish the first electronic database in the USSR in the 1960s and an all-Estonian network of interviewers. In addition to regular data collection, a quite sophisticated methodology of content analysis was used.

The Laboratory of Sociology also played a prominent role in Estonian public opinion in re-establishing national consciousness, which brought its activities in conflict with the Communist Party leadership. As a result, the Laboratory was forced to close down in 1975. This diminished the organizational capacities of the Vooglaid school, but this school now plays one of the leading scientific roles in Estonia; Lauristin and Vihalemm are the most prominent mass communication analysts.

Youth studies in Tartu University began in the mid-1960s and were developed by Titma. He took ideas and a questionnaire from Morris Rosenberg's study of high school graduates and started his own longitudinal study of secondary school graduates in 1966 with 2260 respondents (50% of that year's graduates). Follow-ups were carried out in 1969, 1973, 1979, and 1991 (Titma, Silver, and Anderson, 1996). The last follow-up was conducted with US NSF grants and also included children of the original respondents and native speakers of Russian. This project still has good potential, since the respondents are of retirement age and can provide good data about the older cohort's ability to cope with the radical change in the macrosocial environment, from a Soviet party-state to the Estonian market-based democracy. In 1982, a new longitudinal project was developed on the basis of this one.

Titma started the new project "Paths of a Generation" (Titma and Tuma, 1995) as an informal college with intensive training and help for researchers from different parts of the USSR. The first stage of fieldwork was carried out in 15 regions of the Soviet Union and encompassed 45,000 respondents. The basic finding of the first wave was that structural aspects of life, starting with the school system, were radically different in different regions of the Soviet Union and demanded different policy. The first follow-up was conducted from 1987-1989 (Titma, 1989). It focused on the age cohort's entrance to adult life. The second follow-up was conducted in 1992-1993 and included Belarus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, 3 Kazakhstan regions, Moldavia, 4 Russian regions, 6

Ukrainian regions, and Tajikistan. For the first time, it was centrally financed by the Jacobs Foundation, and the quality of the data collection radically improved. This follow-up focused on the differentiation of young adults' life careers in the first years of independence of post-Soviet countries. The third follow-up was conducted in 1997-1998 with a US NSF grant and focused on the age cohort's use of opening opportunities in the transitional society.

Sociological research groups worked in various institutions and gradually developed the skills to collect various kinds of data. The formation of the Baltic branch of the Soviet Sociological Association gave a strong boost to research. Since 1978, Baltic sociologists have attended meetings of the International Sociological Association and have prepared English-language publications for it (Sociological Research in the Baltic 1982; 1986). Joint research projects covering the Baltic region were also developed. Most important was the comparative "student study" in 1977/1978, in which Estonia and Lithuania were part of an international study with Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and the Soviet Union (Adamski and Titma, 1985). Finnish and Estonian teams conducted several comparative studies on families and deviant behavior (Haavio-Mannila and Rannik 1985; Narusk 1992). The same group developed studies of culture in 1966 with a five-year interval.

At the same time, most researchers avoided practical research, because sooner or later it caused political trouble. Basically, for those who understood it, the data spoke for itself. Until the second half of 1980s, any direct conclusion that would have questioned the status quo was politically dangerous.

The main institutions providing opportunities for sociological research were the Academy of Science (Rannik), Tartu University (Lauristin, Tiit, Titma), Estonian Radio, and Tallinn Polytechnic Institute (Pavelson). All this research activity produced and descriptively analyzed relatively good quality data. The primary cause of methodological weakness was the lack of university education in sociology. Analyses were done on mainframe computers, so Estonian sociology was up-to-date in the framework of Soviet conditions. But when personal computers arrived at the end of the 1980s elsewhere, Estonian sociologists faced a lack of resources and lost ground in comparison to other centers in Eastern Europe.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

Since 1990, sociological research was strongly influenced by political changes. First, the re-establishment of Estonian independence redefined the object. Instead of examining social processes in Estonia in the context of the Soviet Union, sociologists' research object was a small country. Many social phenomena were presented quite individually in the context of a small society. First, socio-economic processes started to depend on a limited number of social actors and the stochastic base of processes diminished radically. In a small society, the role of the elite became especially evident. A small number of people managed to use shock therapy successfully, turning the command economy into a market economy. The inevitable loss of heavy industry and jobs as a result of separation from the Soviet Union was compensated by effective use of Estonian transit capacities. In 1993, Estonia temporarily took sixth place in the world in the export of non-ferrous metals – without mining them. Estonia was also one of the main transit corridors through which Russia imported goods from the West. These favorable conditions of robber capitalism lasted some years and allowed the Estonian economy to grow from 1994 on. With the re-orientation of the economy, people's whole outlook changed and the labor market emerged with strong entrepreneurial bases, weak labor organization, and correspondingly cheap labor. Funding for science and education was cut dramatically.

This individualistic market-oriented spirit directly influenced a small community of sociologists (60 researchers). Previously, the state had provided stable positions and resources for scientific research; now, transitional conditions demanded entrepreneurial activity from most sociologists. For sociologists, the first marketization opened opportunities for market research.

Two major market research companies emerged. *AS EMOR* (http://www.emor.ee/eng/) established itself successfully as the dominant market researcher in Estonia. With its own interviewer network and 30 researchers, it is a major institution carrying out data collection and preliminary analyses of data. It is networked with the European Gallup system and works with the major US market researcher, Nielsen-Anderson. As a private company, it does not make public the data it collects and conducts limited scientific analyses.

The second company, *SAAR Poll* (http://www.saarpoll.ee/English.htm), is many times smaller; many researchers use it as an institution providing data-collecting service. It is much more oriented toward public opinion and election studies. Alternative political parties usually use EMOR and SAAR Poll in election studies. A major part of the budget comes from public opinion and political polling. SAAR Poll is linked with EuroBarometer and other international surveys. The third competitor in public opinion and market research is *ES Turu-uuringute AS* (ES Market Research) (http://www.turu-uuringute.ee). It is developing rapidly and shares 2nd and 3rd place in the polling market. One-third of its turnover comes from abroad and one-fifth from the public sector.

In 1990, most sociologists worked in universities or the Academy of Science and were confronted with a sharp decline in their salaries and a complete lack of resources for research. In this situation, their survival depended on two alternative activities. The first and definitely wealthier sources of funds were all kinds of foreign grants and research opportunities. Since the Baltic countries are small and easily accessible with relatively normal data-collection abilities, many international projects like the World Value study and all kinds of nationality studies collected data in Estonia. Scandinavian researchers in particular collected massive amounts of data. Collaborative work with Western sociologists hugely improved the qualification of Estonian sociologists. This work mainly had to do with data collection and the sociological understanding and interpretation of data. This interest in Estonia as a field for studying transitional society is diminishing. More lasting is interest in ethnic relations and Estonia as a reference for Scandinavian researchers. As in most post-Communist countries, Soros and some other international institutions supported sociologists and helped them survive the first years after the collapse of Communism.

The main avenue for survival was the private organization of education. Privately organized university-level education and vocational training developed rapidly and enlarged to previously unimaginable proportions. Estonia, a country with 10,000 secondary school graduates annually, had at one point almost 40 universities. These institutions recruited substantially more students annually than there were secondary school graduates. This not only provided survival to sociologists, it also forced them to learn about Western sources to keep audiences satisfied with the knowledge offered them.

After some years, Estonia started to intensively orient itself toward integration in the European Union; this substantially increased the demand for good data about the state of affairs in many socio-economic processes. For social scientists, it provided the opportunity to participate in the development of official statistics. It is natural that the leading role in this development was in the hands of the Statistical Office of Estonia. Estonian statistics started to correspond to EU statistics and their quality increased substantially. The Statistical Office of Estonia has good population statistics and a register of the population whose quality corresponds to that of the Scandinavian countries. The Statistical Office of Estonia also provides services in data collection. It participates in Eurostat surveys and carries out its own regular surveys of income, the labor force, households, etc. In 2000, it carried out the first census after the re-establishment of Estonian independence. All this provides good and broad opportunities for empirically oriented research on Estonian society.

Today, the major *institutional bases* of sociology are three: universities, market research/polling firms, and state organs.

Universities are the first type. In 1989, sociology began to be taught in Tartu University. Now, most professionally working sociologists are graduates of this university. 15 bachelors and 5 masters graduate annually from Tartu University. Teaching is oriented toward quantitative sociology and is relatively strong in methodology. A major development in methodology is Estonian sociologists' ability to use causal analyses. At Tartu University, Liina Tooding teaches up-to-date methods for causal analyses, and students graduating from the department are able to carry out data analyses using these methods. This provides opportunities to test verifiable hypotheses on the methodological level that is now standard among the world's sociological community.

Tallinn Pedagogical University started to train sociologists later and recently graduated its first class of bachelors. Teaching is more oriented toward the practical use of sociological skills. The Institute of International Studies and Social Science (RASI) developed from the Academy of Science. It barely survived initial difficulties. Now it is merged with Tallinn Pedagogic University and is one of Estonia's serious sociological research centers.

Tallinn Technical University also teaches sociology, but not as a major. Some private universities also provide courses in sociology. The most prominent among them is the Estonian Institute of Humanities, which accepts half a dozen students yearly. Estonia has limited opportunities for sociologists, especially at universities, and in the near future only one or two universities will be able to provide sociology as a major.

In 1993, a team of sociologists, psychologists, political scientists, and human geographers from Tartu University formed an initiative group to create a social sciences databank and began to work out a strategy for saving and using the research materials collected by Estonian social scientists in previous decades. The databank was officially formed as an interdisciplinary center of the Faculty of Social Sciences in early 1996, and it began to function as a national social science databank – the Estonian Social Science Data Archives (ESSDA). In 1997, ESSDA became a full member of the Council of European Social Science Data Archives – CESSDA. It was certainly a significant institutional development owing much to the personal efforts of ESSDA managing director Murakas.

ESSDA's data collection consists of the materials of more than 200 Estonian empirical social studies carried out between 1971 and 2000 and covering research areas like opinion polls, youth and media studies, entrepreneurship, rural sociology, and many more. More representative studies include the Estonian Longitudinal Survey 1966-1991 and "Paths of a Generation: A comparative longitudinal study of a cohort from 1983-1998 in 7 successor states of the USSR", the Estonian Youth Survey 1996-98 (samples of all Estonian counties), and EMOR's surveys of political attitudes.

Estonian academic institutions and policymakers increasingly use ESSDA materials. Assistance from the German data organization GESIS enabled ESSDA to translate a number of descriptive materials from significant studies into English. With the help of the Open Estonia Foundation, ESSDA began to compile the first Estonian social science electronic journal "*Estonian Social Science Online".* Due to the chronic lack of finances in 1999 and 2000, ESSDA could only continue the description, systematization, and cataloguing of studies. The second issue of the electronic journal "*Estonian Social Science Online"* has also come out. ESSDA's Internet page has been steadily improved and supplemented.[1]

The second institutional basis of sociology is market research and polling firms, as mentioned above. 2-3 market research and polling firms seems to be the limit for Estonian institutional development in this direction. Competition for resources between these firms and universities may even reduce the number of both types of institutions.

The third institutional basis for Estonian sociology is the state. Many state organizations need sociological expertise and are starting to organize their own databases and research units. The Statistical Office of Estonia initiated the first development in this direction. It has now analytic units and its own competent set of interviewers covering the country as a whole. The Ministry of Education has a developing databank identifying individual students and tracking their educational paths. The Ministry of Social Affairs is also developing research units. Other state organs are providing resources for surveys needed for work.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

Before 1990, Estonian sociology was clearly empirically oriented, and this tradition survives. However, as the object of research changed, there was a remarkable shift in *quantitative and qualitative methodology*. Estonian society is small and needs to study only a relatively small number of cases to detect social processes or trends. This is even truer about the macro and micro levels of social life, which sustain the social fabric. Social engineering needs access to the mechanics of development, and in a small society they are very concrete and often visible without massive data. This requires good qualitative studies.

On the other hand, the Estonian sociological community is small and still covers the whole area of sociological knowledge. This means that few people are really knowledgeable about their colleagues' work. As a whole, the sociological community is a professionally weak reference group for any specific scholar. Even worse, Estonia has no sociological journal. There is a journal, "Trames", covering social science as a whole. This means that a sociologist expresses his work to society through public articles in newspapers or general journals. This is a way to introduce the scholar to wider reference groups in society.

Public demand for sociological knowledge, as mentioned above, is very concrete and ignores purely scientific long-term effort. State and private institutions provide resources for pragmatic tasks. This is an additional factor motivating sociologists to use small samples and to interpret them with "soft", sometimes anthropological methods. This work is not always very professional or truly qualitative. Lagerspetz, in particular, has a good international reputation with his qualitative sociology (1993; 1998; 2001). The Lauristin and Vihalemm school uses the qualitative approach massively in media analyses (Hoyer, Lauk, and Vihalemm, 1993; Vihalemm 2001; 2001).

The qualitative approach allows the satisfaction of the needs of a small society, where the role of stochastic macro-processes does not have to be traced empirically and the need for very specific knowledge about micro-processes is much more important. Knowledge about macro-processes is basically transferred to the Estonian context as a general product of world or, more specifically, European social science. This trend is presented very widely, and works by Becker, Coleman, Giddens, Goldthorpe, Offe, Habermas, Berger, Luckmann, and others are used in teaching. Like the Scandinavian countries, Estonia uses English as a lingua franca. The penetration of these general approaches hugely increased the social understanding of society. Theories like human, social, and cultural capital; social interaction; social network; action theory; and others are common frameworks used in the presentation of sociological analyses.

The quantitative approach is presented through international projects and, in the few instances where the state provides enough resources, by taking representative samples for sociological analyses. One area that the Estonian state funds well is the study of interethnic relations. The VERA project "Integration of Non-Estonian Youth in Estonian Society" provided massive resources for 4 years. Under the leadership of Heidmets, Jarve, and Lauristin, many sociologists worked to produce two books in Estonian: Russian Youth in Estonia (Avita, 1997) and Multicultural Estonia (Tartu, 1998).

The Statistics Committee has carried out a representative survey of the labor force, households, and income. International projects using the quantitative approach incorporate Estonian researchers on various levels, depending on their skills. Most common is cooperation in which Estonian researchers are in charge of data collection in Estonia and participate in some common publication. Estonian sociologists are rarely PAs or co-PAs in an international project.

Estonian sociologists increasingly take the international sociological community as a reference point. When electing professors or lecturers, Tartu University demands publications in professional sociological journals and uses citation indices as the criteria for judgment about a scholar's professional level. This helps to raise the professional level of the Estonian sociological community. Better opportunities to study abroad allow younger sociologists to become engaged in the international sociological community already at the beginning of their scholarly careers and to gain skills needed for publication in the world's leading sociological journals.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

After Estonia gained independence, Estonian sociology's thematic orientation changed mainly to fit the practical needs of society. During Soviet times, the function of the officially accepted social science was ideological: it served the propagandistic justification of the ideological line and policy the party followed at a particular time. Social engineering was unimaginable under the declining Brezhnev regime, in which loyalty in the chain of command was the supreme principle. It may sound strange, but a scholar had a lot of freedom to do research, as long as he did not challenge existing policy or the people executing it. Resources for science were given through the bureaucratic chain without actually checking the results. This situation changed dramatically after 1990.

First, resources became available to study new phenomena that had to be developed in Estonian society. The *Estonian transition* to a market-based democracy was the broadest theme for researchers. In the first couple of years, market research had more resources than all other sociological research. Next, sociological research expanded to cover elections and party politics. At first, resources came mainly from abroad, but now the government and political actors provide resources to study the political process. Both the market and democracy needed to be established as major phenomena. So popular opinion had to be surveyed.

There was a need to construct a general picture of the transitional process and to investigate certain processes happening in it. Lauristin and Vihalemm, with Rosengren and Weibull, wrote the influential monograph, "Return to the Western World: Cultural and Political Perspectives on Estonian Post-Communist Transition". Using a number of theoretical approaches, they presented a picture of the transitional process in Estonian society. The monograph in English that described the 40-year-old age cohort's entrance to the Estonian nation-state in 1991 raised a specter of problems emerging in the process of the re-establishment of independence and the transition to the market economy (Titma, Silver and Anderson, 1996). Lagerspetz raised problems of social construction in the transition process (Lagerspetz, 1998; 2001). Eamets (1994), Varblane (1999) and Terk (2000) studied economic aspects of the transition.

Discussion of the transition process continues as Estonian society is heavily politicized between small elite groups that are fighting for control of the state to benefit from power. The population is considerably alienated from the political process. The political elite has monopolized the decision-making process, ignoring even the scientific community, entrepreneurs, the media, and the local elite.

In the second stage of the transition process, Estonian society needed empirical knowledge and scenarios to solve concrete social problems. The most acute of these was the problem of *interethnic relations* in the re-established nation state. The resources to study this process came at first from the European Union. Some leading scholars abroad – David Laitin, Michael Kennedy, Anderson, Silver and others – used grants to investigate ethnic relations in Estonia, which was the only post-Soviet country where blood was not spilled during the complicated departure from the Soviet Empire. It is also the smallest Baltic country, so it is relatively easy to take a representative sample of it. Kennedy, Helemae, and Voormann have conducted comparative analyses of Estonia, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

Kirch published on the changes in ethnic relations between Estonians and Russian-speakers (Kirch and Geistlinger, 1995; Kirch and Kirch, 1995; Kirch, Kirch, and Ott, 1996).

Klara Hallik and Vihalemm studied cultural aspects of ethnicity problems (1999). Aarelaid–Tart looked more broadly at Estonians' cultural roots (2000; Aarelaid, Johnston Hank 2000; Aarelaid-Tart and Tart, 1995). Kulu covered migration (1998; 2000; 2000).

In Estonian sociology, media research has strong traditions going back to the school of Lauristin and Vihalemm. Now the center of these studies is the Department of Journalism and Communication at Tartu University. The tradition begun in 1960 is followed, and mostly content analyses are used to analyze the role of the media in transitional society (Lauristin, 1998; Vihalemm, 2001). The project "Development of the Baltic countries" is building up comparative media analyses in the Baltic countries. The most important project was "BALTICOM: Changing Values and Orientations in Baltic Sea Countries"; the results are presented in a monograph (Lauristin et al., 1997).

Social stratification attracted considerable interest from Estonian sociologists in the 1970s (Yanovitch and Fisher, 1976), but deeper analyses of stratification processes did not become realistic until after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The Soviet authorities regarded this topic as politically highly sensitive, and it was impossible to go beyond rough data. Titma and Tuma (1993) carried out a theoretical analysis of the specificity of stratification in the former Soviet state, where deeper stratification existed between institutions, rather than between individuals.

After 1990, Estonian society went through a rapid social differentiation process, and social inequality deepened considerably. The deepest inequality emerged on the ascriptive lines of age and gender. Voormann (1996) and Narusk (1996) studied gender inequality. Age differentiation was not addressed directly, but the frame of the longitudinal study "Paths of a Generation" (Titma, Tuma, and Silver, 1998; Tuma, Titma and Murakas, 2001) examined young adults' advantages and factors facilitating them in the early 1990s.

The transitional process hit old and middle-aged people the most severely. International agencies were again the first to provide resources to study poverty. NORBALT 1 and 2: "Living Conditions in Baltic countries 1993-2001" gave a group headed by Kutsar the opportunity to look into the differentiation of living conditions and the increasing poverty in Estonia (Kutsar, 1993, 1995, 1997). Now this research has deepened in the framework of the project IPROSEC: "Improving Policy Responses and Outcomes to Socio-Economic Challenges: changing family structures, policy and practice".

Much more discussed are social mobility and the social stratification emerging on the lines of classical social cleavages. Social stratification is the main research topic at the Department of Sociology at Tartu University and at the Institute of International and Social Studies at Tallinn Pedagogic University (Saar and Helemae, 1995; 1997). Conceptually, the stratification approach followed by Titma (strata approach) argues that a society as small and service-based as Estonia is unlikely to create class cleavages and corresponding division of society. Saar and Voormann argue that the major part of society is below the poverty line and that social inequality is so deep that there is real chance that class structure will emerge in society. Both teams are trying to test corresponding claims empirically. Publications are basically on social mobility as a classic topic, but the labor force survey permits a view of social status from multiple angles.

Youth studies have a long tradition in Estonia, starting with longitudinal studies in 1966, when secondary school graduates were surveyed. More recently, Saarniit headed youth research with many samples of university students (1990) and school students (1992; 1996-1998). This research was one of the foundations for an international book (Helve et al., 2000) comparing Estonians with their Finnish, German, Italian, and Swedish peers. Closely tied to youth studies, research on the sociology of education is also carried out. Saar is a leading education researcher with publications in the "European Sociological Review" (Titma and Saar, 1995; Saar, 1997). She uses multinomial analyses to study the predictors of educational achievement.

Since 1970, the family has been a focus of sociological analysis. Ene Tiit formed a research group at Tartu University, and now Kutsar is following the tradition. Separately, in cooperation with Finnish colleagues, family research was done in Tallinn and is now concentrated at the Institute of International and Social Studies under the leadership of Hansson (1995; Narusk and Hansson, 1996; 1999) and Kelam (Haavio-Mannila and Kelam, 1996). Blom, Narusk, and Hansson, co-PIs of "Social Changes in the Baltic and Nordic Countries" from 1994-1998, headed the most significant project. Life course analyses based on longitudinal studies are being developed at Tartu University (Titma, 1997; 1999, 2001). The data set of "Paths of a Generation" provides a unique opportunity to examine how the age cohort, studied before graduation from three major types of secondary schools in 1983 and surveyed again in 1987, 1993, and 1998, is taking advantage of new opportunities in Belarus, Estonia, Latvia, Moldavia, Russia, Ukraine, and Tajikistan.

Younger scholars have made many individual efforts in other areas. Some of them may enter the international arena in the near future. A lot of publications have appeared locally, but since they are inaccessible to the international audience, they are not included in this overview.

5. Public space and academic debates

Estonian sociologists are quite successful in developing public space for their research results. Two main dailies use a lot of sociological data, and one daily's special supplement, "Luup", concentrates on statistical and other data to address social problems. Sociologists initiated a public debate on social inequality and poverty in Estonia. The Prime Minister and members of parliament met with social scientists and discussed the problem. Sociologists pointed out that two aspects must be distinguished: the low standard of living and the strength of the social safety net for people who fall below the poverty line. It took some time to explain to society that some individuals fail because of personal deficiencies. Yet, if the number of unemployed people is over 10% and almost one-third of population is below the poverty line, there must be something wrong with the society, not with citizens.

Another big discussion concentrated on generations and their ability to be successful under the conditions of transition. It focused on the success story of the young adults' age cohort. As winners of the transition period, most of them succeeded, but around one-fifth were still losers. Problems of older age cohorts were discussed quite superficially, because data about them is limited. No one is really providing resources to study the elderly.

Problems of the elite are constantly discussed. At first, the focus was on the tension between the old nomenclature elite versus the dissidents and new younger politicians. But the Communist Party in Estonia was dissolved in 1990 and did not play any role in the re-established nation state, so the issue became irrelevant. Dissident ministers turned out to be unsuccessful managers or politicians and lost influence quickly. The emerging political elite was able to concentrate power and eliminate other elite groups from political decision-making. A situation unimaginable in Western European countries emerged when almost all academicians wrote an open letter to the government about the privatization of power plants; but the letter was ignored. The media have limited influence on the political process and the government often ignores Estonian entrepreneurs, as well. The population's alienation from the political process is a normal response to this kind of development. Social scientists are raising the problem of the government's capacity to govern effectively on very narrow ground (the political elite), but with limited success.

Public debate on ethnic relations was very intense in the early 1990s, but died down by 2000. The reason is that the political process has been normalized as Russian politicians are integrated in it. The Russian-speaking community is building up a functioning ethnic economy. It is still hurt by the citizenship issue, but for most Russian-speakers, this is not a very acute problem, since unemployment has not risen beyond the community's capacity to absorb it.

The only significant academic debate among sociologists touched the social stratification issue. Deep social inequality led to discussion of the possibility that class society would be re-established. At first, the issue discussed was whether there was one or many schemas of stratification. Lauristin argued against using the terminology of class society, pointing out that the use of certain terminology might itself lead to a certain approach to social stratification. Later it was empirically shown that different stratification schemas have to be used with different tasks.

A second issue was how plausible the emergence of a class society is. The Estonian economy and employment structure provides little space for the emergence of the working class as a social actor. Industry is represented with half a dozen plants with over 1000 employees. The private sector – the dominant employer – typically consists of small and some medium-sized companies with fewer than 100 employees. The organization of workers as a class seems rather unlikely with such small work units. Labor unions are organized on the basis of occupations, not industries, and no party in parliament is trying to be a working class party.

6. Views on further development

The further development of Estonian sociology is likely to be strongly influenced by EU membership. First, this will mean broader collection of social information. European Union institutions have yearly-upgraded databases and databanks. Estonian sociologists will be able to engage in corresponding activity in their own country. In addition to EU institutions, Western Europe has many unified private or university-based efforts to incorporate new members covering their home countries. This will provide Estonian sociologists with more data for analyses, but resources can become the bottleneck. A country as small and poor as Estonia has limits to this kind of activities.

International cooperation will probably deepen on the basis of individual researchers' activity. This is the way young people are now looking for opportunities to get good sociological training abroad. Of course, some of them are staying abroad, but as salaries and living standards rise, a number of well-trained sociologists will come back to Estonia. The sociological community is small, so competition between homegrown and Western-trained sociologists will end in favor of the latter. This will improve the professionalism of social research.

One major development might be in the direction of products. Better scientific skills will enable Estonian sociologists to compete at publishing articles in leading sociological journals in Europe. Improving the command of English and German will make this easier. Better qualifications will also improve the teaching of sociological approaches needed for analyses of sociological phenomena. Today, this is Estonian sociology's weakest point. The teaching of sociologists at the university level has clear limits in Estonia, but training other professionals who need to analyze social data is a much broader task. A broader function for sociologists in a small society is to improve the public services' and other influential social actors' understanding of the deeper complexity of Estonian society's social fabric.

---

[1] ESSDA's address: Room 217/218, 78 Tiigi Street, 50410 Tartu, Estonia. Phone: +372-7-375 931, fax: + 372-7-375 900, E-mail: socarch@psych.ut.ee WWW homepage: http://psych.ut.ee/esta/

Selected bibliography

Aarelaid-Tart, Aili, Johnston, Hank (2000): "Generations and Collective Action in Authoritarian Regimes: The Estonian National Opposition, 1940-1990", in: *Sociological Perspectives*, 43/4, 671-698;

Aarelaid-Tart, Aili and Tart, Indrek (1995a): "Culture and Development of Civil Society in Estonia", in: *Nationalities Papers*, 23, No.1, 153-165;

Aarelaid-Tart, Aili and Tart, Indrek (1995b): "Case of Estonia", in: *Communist Economies and Economic Transformation*, IEA, London, Vol. 6, No. 1, 55-73;

Aarelaid-Tart, Aili (2000): "Political Generations in Estonia: Historical Background to Form the Contemporary Political Scenery", in: *The Second Generation of Democratic Elites in Central and Eastern Europe*, Warsaw, 112-138;

Eamets, Raul (1994): Labour Market and Employment Issues of Transition Economies: The case of Estonia, in: *Command Economies and Economic Transition*, Vol. 6, No.1, London, IEA, 53-73;

Eamets, Raul, Philips, Kaia and Annus, Taavi (1999): *Employment and Labour Market in Estonia: Background Study European Training Foundation. Working Document*, Turin-Tartu;
Eamets, Raul and Ukrainski, K. (2000): "Hidden Unemployment in Estonia: Experience from the Early Years of Transition (1989-1996)", in: *Post-Communist Economies*, 12, No. 4, 463-484;
Haavio-Mannila, Elina and Kelam, Aili (1996): "Young Families and Gender Roles in Estonia and Finland in 1984 and 1993" – "Women and Transition: The case of Estonia", in: *The Finnish Review of East European Studies,* 3, No. 3-4, 79-100;
Hansson, Leeni (2000): "Combining Work and Family: The Case of Estonian Women", in: *Reconciliation of Family and Work in Eastern European Countries*, Domsch, M. E. and Ladwig, D. H. (eds.), Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 75-86;
Helemäe, Jelena and Saar, Ellu. (1995): "National Reconstruction and Social Re-Stratification", in: *Nationalities Papers*, 23, No.1, 127-140;
Helemäe, Jelena and Saar, Ellu (1997): "Intragenerational Mobility and Middle Class Formation in Estonia", in: *Kalmari Union. Middle Class in East and West*, Kivinen, M. (ed.), Dartmouth;
Hoyer, S., Lauk, Epp and Vihalemm, Peeter (eds.) (1993): *Towards a Civic Society. The Baltic Media's Long Road to Freedom. Perspectives on History, Ethnicity and Journalism*, Tartu, Baltic Association for Media Research/Nota Baltica Ltd.;
Keen, Michael and Mucha, Janusz (1994): *Eastern Europe in Transformation: The Impact on Sociology*, Westport, Connecticut, Greenwood Press;
Kenkmann, Paul and Saarniit, Jüri (1994): "Education and Shifts in Youths´ Value Orientations in Estonia", in: *Education and the Value Crisis in Central and Eastern Europe*, Rust, V. D., Knost, P. and Wichmann, J. (ẹds.), Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 161-183;
Kirch, Aksel, Kirch, Marika and Tuisk, Tarmo (1993): "Russians in the Baltic States: To Be or Not To Be?", in: *Journal of Baltic Studies*, XXIV/2, A Special Issue: Public Opinion in the Baltic States;
Kirch, Aksel and Geistlinger, M. (1995): *Estonia - A new framework for the Estonian majority and the Russian minority,* Vienna, Braumüller Verlag;
Kirch, Aksel and Kirch, Marika (1995): "Ethnic Relations: Estonians and non-Estonians", in: *Nationalities Papers*, 23, No.1, 33-59;
Kirch, Aksel, Kirch, Marika and Ott, A. A. (1996): "Ethnic Anxiety: A Case Study of Resident Aliens in Estonia (1990-1992)", in: *Journal of Baltic Studies*, XXVII, No. 1, 21-46;
Kruusvall, Jüri (1994): "Employment and organization", in: *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 32, No. 4, 6-37;
Kulu, Hill (1998): "Ethnic return migration: An Estonian case", in: *International Migration*, 36, 3, 313–336;
Kulu, Hill (2000): "An individual's growth environment and migration behaviour: The case of foreign-born Estonians", in: *International Journal of Population Geography*, 6, 5, 367-381;
Kulu, Hill and Tammaru, Tiit (2000): "Ethnic return migration from the East and the West: the case of Estonia in the 1990s", in: *Europe-Asia Studies*, 52, 2, 349–369;
Kutsar, Dagmar (1995): "Social change and stress in Estonia", in: *Scandinavian Journal of Social Welfare*, No. 4, 97-107;
Kutsar, Dagmar and Trumm, Avo (1993): "Poverty among households in Estonia", in: *Scandinavian Journal of Social Welfare*, 2, No. 3, 128-141;
Kutsar, Dagmar and Trumm, Avo (1995): "Changed situation, remaining needs: A challenge for welfare policy in Estonia", in: *Social Policy in Transition Societies. Experience from the Baltic countries and Russia*, Simpura, J. (ed.), Helsinki, 44-59;
Kuus, Merje, Short, J. R.; Kim, Y. and Wells, H (1996): "The Dirty Little Secret of World Cities Research: Data Problems in Comparative Analysis", in: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 20 (4), 697-717;
Lagerspetz Mikko (1993): "Social Problems in Estonian Mass Media, 1985-1991", in: *Acta Sociologica*, 36, No. 4, 357-69;
Lagerspetz, Mikko (1998): "A Constructionist Approach to Social Problems in an East-West Comparative Setting", in: *Trames*, 2 (52/47), No. 1, 5-18;
Lagerspetz, Mikko (1999): "Post-Socialism as a Return. Notes on a Discursive Strategy", in: *Eastern European Politics and Societies*, 13, No. 2, 377-90;
Lagerspetz, Mikko (1999): "The Cross of Virgin Mary's Land. A Study in the Construction of Estonia's 'Return to Europe", in: *The Finnish Review of East European Studies*, 6, 3-4, 17-28;

Lagerspetz, Mikko (2001): “From 'Parallel *Polis'* to 'The Time of the Tribes': Post-Socialism, Social Self-Organization and Post-Modernity”, in: *The Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, 17, No. 2, 1-18;
Lauristin, Marju and Vihalemm, Peeter with Rosengren, K. E. and Weibull, L. (eds.) (1997): *Return to the Western World: Cultural and Political Perspectives on Estonian Post-Communist Transition*, Tartu, Tartu University Press;
Lauristin, Marju (1998): “Estonia is Looking for its Own Welfare Model”, in: *Social Protection of the Next Generation in Europe*, Pieters, D. (ed.), London-Hague-Boston, Kluwer Law International, 277-289;
Limber, S., Kask, V., Heidmets, Mati, Kaufman, N. and Melton, G. (1999): “Estonian Children’s Perceptions of Rights: Implications for Societies in Transition”, in: *International Journal of Children’s Rights*, No. 7, 365-383;
Narusk, Anu (1995): “The Estonian Family in Transition. Estonian Path to Independence and Beyond, 1987 – 1993”, in: *Visions and Policies*, Huttenbach, H. (ed.), *Nationalities Papers*, 23, No. 1, 141-152;
Narusk, Anu (1996): “Gendered Outcomes of Transition in Estonia” and “Women and Transition: The case of Estonia”, in: *The Finnish Review of East European Studies,* 3, No. 3-4, 12-39;
Narusk, Anu and Hansson, Leeni (1996): *Transition to the Market Economy: Estonian Families and their Coping Strategies*, Trondheim, Norwegian University of Science and Technology;
Narusk, Anu and Kandolin, I. (1997): “Social Well-Being and Gender: Post-Soviet Estonia and the welfare state Finland”, in: *Scandinavian Journal of Social Welfare*, No. 6, 127-136;
Narusk, Anu and Hansson, Leeni (1999): *Estonian Families in the 1990s: Winners and Losers*, Tallinn, Estonian Academy Publishers;
Raagmaa, Garri (1995): “New Enterprises and Regional Development in Estonia”, in: *Local and Regional Development During the 1990s Transition in Eastern Europe*, Markku Tykkylainen (ed.), Avebury, Aldershot, 29-46;
Raagmaa, Garri (1996): “Shifts in Regional Development of Estonia During the Transition”, in: *European Planning Studies*, 4, No. 6, 679-699;
Raagmaa, Garri (1997): “Growth in the Hidden Economy: The case of Estonia”, in: *Transition in the Baltic States. Microlevel Studies*, Hood, Neil, Kilis, Robert and Vahlne, Jan-Erik (eds.), London, Macmillan, 148-179;
Saar, Ellu (1997): “Transitions to Tertiary Education in Belarus and the Baltic Countries”, in: *European Sociological Review*, 13, No. 2, 139-158;
Saar, Ellu and Titma, Mikk (1996): “Educational Careers in Estonia”, in: *International Journal of Sociology. Special Issue: Estonian's Transition from State Socialism: Nationalities and Society on the Eve of Independence*, Titma, M., Silver, B. D. and Anderson, B. A. (eds.), 4, 3-30;
Saarniit, Jüri (1995): “Changes in the Value Orientations of Youth and their Social Context”, in: *Values and Post-Soviet Youth: The Problem of Transition,* in Tomasi, L. (ed.), Milano, Franco Angeli, 141-153;
Sociological Research in the Baltic Soviet Republics (1982), Vilnius, Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences;
Sociological Research in the Baltic Soviet Republics (1986), Part I-II, Vilnius, Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences;
Strömpl, Judit (1996): “Delinquent Girls in Special Schools in Estonia”, in: *Journal of Clinical Psychology and Social Pathology*, 3, No. 1-2, 344-358;
Strömpl, Judit (2000): “The Transition in Estonian society and its’ impact on a girls’ reformatory school”, in: *European Journal of Social Work*, 3, No.1, 29-42;
Terk, Erik (1993) "Estonia", in: *The Privatization Process in Russia, Ukraine and the Baltic States*, Frydman, R., Rapaczynski, A. and Earle, J. S. (together with Tali, V., Kein, A., Kamratov, A. and Tõnisson, L.), London, CEU Press, 130-193
Terk, Erik (2000): *Privatisation in Estonia. Ideas, Process, Results*, Tallinn, Greif;
Titma, Mikk and Tuma, Nancy B. (1993): “Stratification Research in a Changing World”, in: *Eastern European Societies on the Threshold of Change*, Mach, Z., Mucha, J. and Szmatka, J. (eds.), Lewiston, Edwin Mellen, 225-254;
Titma, Mikk and Saar, Ellu (1995): “Regional Differences in the Secondary Education of the Former Soviet Union”, in: *European Sociological Review*, No. 1, 37-58;
Titma, Mikk, Silver, B. D. and Anderson, B. A. (eds.) (1996): “Estonia's Transition from State Socialism: Nationalities and Society on the Eve of Independence”, Part I-III. *Special Issue of International Journal of Sociology*, 26, 1-3, 93,99,95;

Titma, Mikk (ed.) (1997): *Sotsialnoe rassloenie vozrastnoi kogorty (vypustkniki 80-x v postsovetskom prostranstve. Proiekt "Puti pokoleniia")* (Social Stratification in an Age Cohort. Graduates of the 1980s in Post-Soviet Countries. Project "Paths of a Generation"), Moscow, published jointly by the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow) and the Center for Social Research in Eastern Europe (Tallinn, Estonia);

Titma, Mikk, Tuma, Nancy. B and Silver, B. (1998): "Winners and Losers in the Postcommunist Transition: New Evidence from Estonia", in: @ *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 2, No. 14, 114-136;

Titma, Mikk and Tuma, Nancy B. (2000): *Modern Russia*, New York, McGraw-Hill;

Tuma, Nancy. B., Titma, Mikk and Murakas, Rein (2001): "Transitional Economies and Income Inequality: The Case of Estonia", in: *Transitions from Communism: Impacts on Economy, Politics, and Culture*, Wejnert, Barbara (ed.), Greenwich, CN, Elsevier Science, JAI Press;

Varblane, Urmas (1999): "Estonia", in: *Marketing Challenges in Transition Economies of Europe. Baltic States and the C.I.C.*, Iyer, G. R. and Masters, L. A. (eds.) (together with Ziacik, T.), Haworth Press, 173-190);

Vihalemm, Peeter (1999): "Changing Baltic Space: Estonia and its Neighbours", in: *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 30, No. 3, 250-269;

Vihalemm, Peeter (2001): "Medien im Transformationsprozess in Estland", in: *Medien und Transformation in Osteuropa*, Thomass, B. and Tzankoff, M. (eds.), Wiesbaden, Westdeutscher Verlag, 95-120;

Vihalemm, Peeter (2001): "Development of Media Research in Estonia", in: *Nordicom Information,* 23, 1, 63-76;

Vihalemm, Triin (1999a): "Group Identity Formation Processes among Russian-Speaking Settlers of Estonia: A Linguistic Perspective", in: *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 30, No. 1, 18-39;

Vihalemm, Triin (1999b): "The Estonian Language Competence, Performance and Beliefs about its Acquisition among the Russian-speaking Habitants of Estonia 1989-1997", in: *International Journal of Sociology of Language,* Issue 139, 69-85;

Vöörmann, Rein and Anderson, B.A. (1996): "Women and Equality of the Sexes in Estonia", in: *International Journal of Sociology. Special Issue: Estonian's Transition from State Socialism. Nationalities and Society on the Eve of Independence*, Titma, M., Silver, D.B. and Anderson, B. A. (eds.), No. 4, 76-93.

Dénes Némedi and Péter Róbert

Sociology – Hungary

Discussant: Endre Nagy

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Hungarian sociology has a more or less long history – depending on the criteria one uses. Using the widely accepted institutional criteria, its history is roughly 40 years. However, ideas regarded as sociological appeared as early as the 19th century.

In Hungary, as in most Central Eastern European nations, the 19th century was a period of rapid adaptation to modern Western ideas and institutions. At the beginning of the century, Hungary was an economically backward country with a traditional estate-like society. In the second half of the century, the economy and society were transformed into a predominantly capitalistic one. Parallel to this process, there was an astonishingly rapid reception of modern ideas. De Tocqueville was translated and commented upon in the 1840s, Comte and Buckle in the 1860s, and Spencer was known to philosophers in the 1880s and translated toward the end of the century.

At the turn of the century, a new generation of intellectuals created an association of social science and founded a journal dedicated to social issues, the *Huszadik Század* (Twentieth Century). In a sense, 1900 is the birth date of Hungarian sociology. This group of sociologists was predominantly liberal or radical in politics, influenced by Spencer and the organicist sociology and by Marx and contemporary socialist thinkers. They believed that reactionary forces hindered the progress of Hungarian society, and they desired radical changes. The university remained closed to them. Their leading figure was Oszkár Jászi. He emigrated in 1919 to Austria, later going to the USA, where he taught at Oberlin College. Some intellectuals who later became internationally well known were loosely connected to these sociologists: György Lukács, Karl Mannheim, and Karl Polányi.

The end of the World War One was a disaster for Hungary: the country was reduced to one-third of its former territory, and after two revolutions failed, a conservative authoritarian regime was established. The best people of the first generation of sociologists died or were forced to emigrate. Not much interest in sociology remained at home. A new generation of intellectuals interested in social research emerged only in the 1930s. They did not care much for theory or institutionalized research. They did mostly qualitative, impressionistic surveys of the agrarian countryside. Only the works of Ferenc Erdei met scientific standards (e.g. Erdei, 1980). While they demanded radical agrarian reform, they were much influenced by right-wing ideas (even by anti-Semitism). The group disintegrated in the crises provoked by the beginning of World War Two.

After 1945, Sándor Szalai made a new, third attempt to create sociology in Hungary. Szalai was able to obtain a chair of sociology at Budapest University. But during the process leading to the establishment of a Stalinist regime, Szalai fell from grace, in spite of his Marxist orientation; his chair was abolished in 1948 and he was imprisoned.

Sociology appeared again in the 1960s. Several factors contributed to the creation of an institutionalized sociology: as the level of post-1956 repression subsided, the Kádár regime wished to obtain the support of intellectuals; the reformist wing of the ruling party believed that modern science would contribute to the renovation of socialism; and the regime's international reputation required the existence of modern scientific institutions. Anyway, a dozen men and women seized the opportunity and, in 1963, a Group (later Institute) of Sociology was created at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (HAS) and concentrated considerable intellectual capital. The specialized journal *Szociológia* (Sociology) (later *Szociológiai Szemle* – Sociological Review) was founded in

1972, and the first university program leading to the equivalent of an MA degree was started in the same year. The progress of sociology gained momentum and even political setbacks (the Party's ideological condemnation of some sociologists, the forced emigration of such sociologists as Ágnes Heller, Ferenc Fehér, György Márkus in the early 1970s and Iván Szelényi, István Kemény in the late 1970s, and the prohibition of research on poverty and the Roma problem) could not halt it. At the end of state socialism, Hungarian sociology had already produced results that were internationally known and esteemed, and about one hundred sociologists worked in the country, most of them having an acceptable level of theoretical and methodological knowledge.

The peculiar circumstances leading to the creation of contemporary Hungarian sociology left their mark on the physiognomy of the discipline. Hungarian science under state socialism, including sociology, had a dual structure, differentiating between research institutes and higher education (the Soviet and French model of science). In sociology, the research branch was stronger in intellectual capital until the end of the 1980s. The reason for this was simple: while the regime accepted the existence and practice of sociology as a science, it was quite realistically afraid of sociology's possible ideological impact at the universities. So only a limited number of students were allowed to study sociology. As a result, many sociologists came from neighboring disciplines, mainly economics and history. The fear of ideological reprisals reduced the interest in theory – though the probability of reprisals diminished in the 1980s. On the other hand, the reformist origins of contemporary Hungarian sociology excluded the necessity and possibility for the discipline to purify itself after the fall of state socialism.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

Hungarian sociology evolved in the 1990s. It was already quite well developed and up-to-date by the end of the 1980s. There were no significant changes in paradigms. Official Marxism disappeared, but its influence in the discipline was already insignificant by that time. The change in the political climate facilitated the adoption of Western paradigms and research patterns, but did not require the wholesale redefinition of the sociological endeavor. Of course, sociologists who were closer to the Communist Party elite lost some of their influence and prestige within the discipline, and those who were not favored in the earlier period came more to the fore. The leading sociologists were in tacit agreement that there should not be any politically motivated purge in the discipline. One crucial factor in this development was that those émigré sociologists who came back or renewed contact with their home country accepted this agreement.

Few changes can be seen in institutions. One of the most important continuities that survived the collapse of the former regime is institutional duality. It is based on two pillars: the research (in Hungarian terminology: academic) sector and the educational system. As in the earlier period, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (HAS, *Magyar Tudományos Akadémia*), directs the "academic" sphere, "governing" a network of research institutions in the various fields of science, including sociology. On the other hand, the university sector expanded rapidly. Now there are departments of sociology at many universities, and they are responsible for the educational sphere. The largest departments can be found in Budapest, e.g. the Institute of Sociology of the Eötvös Loránd University (*Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem*, ELTE) consists of seven departments dealing with theoretical and empirical sociology, methodology and statistics, social psychology, ethnicity, and social policy. There are other departments of sociology in Budapest at the University of Economics (*Budapesti Közgazdasági és Államigazgatási Egyetem,* BKÁE) and the Technical University (*Budapesti Műszaki Egyetem*, BME). Several departments can be found in provincial towns at the universities of Debrecen (*Debreceni Egyetem,* DE), Szeged (*Szegedi Egyetem,* SZE), Pécs (*Pécsi Egyetem*, PE), Miskolc (*Miskolci Egyetem*, ME), Gödöllő (*Szent István Egyetem*, SZIE), etc. A new Catholic university established in Budapest in the mid-1990s (*Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem*, PPKE) also trains sociologists. Another new development is that social policy is gaining institutional independence from sociology.

In addition to public academic and educational institutions, there was an emergence of private research organizations, mostly public opinion research institutes. Most of their activity focuses on market research, although some of them (TÁRKI, Szonda-Ipsos, Medián, Gallup) carry out academic research as well. Private institutions do the fieldwork for several empirical academic research projects, and, after completing the university, trained sociologists can find employment in the private sphere easier than in the public sphere.

The basic professional body is the Hungarian Sociological Association (*Magyar Szociológiai Társaság*), with several research committees representing different fields of sociology and about 700 members (about 200 doing research in some form). A recently established institution in social sciences is the Rudolf Andorka Social Science Society, which aims to support sociological and demographic research by providing fellowships to younger or senior scholars.

Studying sociology is a crucial part of the institutional system. As part of the huge educational expansion on the tertiary level in Hungary in the 1990s, sociology increased as well – and more than the average. In 2000, the number of sociology students was 1,856, about 0.6% of all students, studying at seven institutions. While in 1990 sociology was taught only in Budapest, in 2000, 54% of all students studied at four provincial universities. Tuition for tertiary education was introduced in the mid-1990s, but was abolished later. Now earning one's first diploma is free.

There is no sole standard curriculum of sociology at the universities. At all institutions, students have to take 10 semesters and write a thesis to obtain a diploma. This is practically an MA program; no BA program in sociology exists in Hungary. Courses on sociology probably have the most comprehensive character at the ELTE University; staff and faculty are the largest here in the Institute of Sociology; almost all fields in theory and empirical studies are well represented by professors and lecturers. The curriculum at the second biggest sociology department, at the Budapest University of Economics, has some focus on the sociology of economics. At the universities in the provincial towns, the teaching of research methods is less developed.

The graduate (PhD) training of sociologists takes place in the two separate doctorate schools, one program at the ELTE University, another at the Budapest University of Economics. Having a PhD is the basic requirement for an academic research position or for a lecturer position at the university. The program started in 1992. The curriculum consists of a period of course-taking and a period of writing one's thesis. Since the language of the PhD program (and of all undergraduate programs) is Hungarian, doctoral students are almost exclusively Hungarians (including some students coming from neighboring countries). The number of PhD students rose from 67 in 1995 to 134 in 2000, but only 12 theses have been defended so far. The number of grants available for PhD students is limited, and PhD students have to pay a rather high tuition.

The scientific qualifying system has a similar twofold character based on the academic/educational duality mentioned above. After completion of the PhD, there is an academic (in the Hungarian sense) and an educational route to completing a doctorate – i.e., the system of scientific promotion is adapted to the dual institutional system of higher learning in Hungary. Taking the academic route, one can become a Doctor of Science in Sociology by going through the evaluation of the Sociological Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Taking the educational route, one has to complete a habilitation (like in Germany), and this leads to the full professor position at the university. The doctorate committees at the universities supervise this process. These committees are multi-disciplinary, with members from various sciences, including sociology.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

One of the consequences of the discontinuity in the development of Hungarian sociology is that there was no theoretical tradition that survived the recurring crises. The positivistic-evolutionary approach was discarded after 1919, and the new beginnings after 1945 negated the legacy of earlier generations. After 1963, sociology legitimated itself by assimilating prestigious international theoretical and methodological achievements.

Max Weber was translated as early as 1967 and his works have continued to appear until the present. In the early years of Hungarian sociology, Weber was in a sense the model sociologist, the preferred subject of theoretical publications. We have the impression that interest in Weber has meanwhile declined. The reason is, perhaps, that Weber was most interesting as a critic of bureaucracy (and consequently of state socialism) and as a source of a non-Marxist theory of capitalism. The first reason has lost its significance, and so has the second, since only a minority position in Hungarian social thought identifies the new system as capitalism.

Émile Durkheim's fate was different. He never served as camouflage for political and social criticism. Rather, he was the ideal hero of serious scientific work. No wonder the first of his works to be translated was his study of suicide (in 1967), at that time at its peak of popularity. Several other volumes followed, and one of the authors of this paper published a historical-epistemological analysis of his sociological theory of knowledge (Némedi, 1996). However, despite the strong presence of Durkheim in the teaching of sociology, today there is nothing especially Durkheimian in Hungarian sociology.

The fates of Jürgen Habermas and Pierre Bourdieu (who are among the most important sociologists of our time) were mirror images of each other. Habermas' influence in Hungary was due to his analysis of the "public sphere" (his book was translated in 1971). He provided the tools to construct an ideal model of public communication that could be critically contrasted against the then-existing restricted, socialist public sphere. His influence was very visible in theories of mass communication (e.g. Angelusz, 1983). The Habermasian theory of communicative action, too, received some serious interpretative-theoretical attention (Némedi, 2000a; Felkai, 1993), and new volumes of translations appeared. However, the impact of Habermasian theory in empirical research declined. One of the reasons is certainly that, in its country of origin, too, the Habermasian school was rapidly disintegrating or retreating from sociology. On the other hand, the late Habermasian theory of the welfare state and his colonization thesis, while very relevant to transition societies, was contrary to the dominant liberal mood in the discipline.

Bourdieu's fate was different. He, too, was an important figure in the 1970s. His approach and theory inspired empirical research on education and stratification (he greatly influenced Zsuzsa Ferge). Even now, he is cited rather often; his notion of capital and capital conversion is the everyday conceptual tool of sociologists who deal with transition social processes. However, his theoretical work was never submitted to serious analysis, and the systematic assimilation of his work stopped in 1978.

The success story in the field of theory was that of rational choice theory. László Bertalan and László Csontos (Csontos, 1999) already effectively propagated it toward the end of the 1970s. In the 1990s, many translations appeared and the first empirical research reports influenced by the rational choice model were published. The relative importance of rational choice theory can be seen in the fact that 23 articles of the 66 coded as "theory" in the *Szociológiai Szemle* dealt with it, mostly sympathetically. Róbert Tardos (1998), for example, dealt with theoretical problems of the micro-macro link, analyzing the most important proposals to solve the issue. The paper was well received in the sociological community. It is easy to understand the relative success of the rational choice paradigm: it is an approach that is very popular in the Anglo-Saxon world; it has many points in common with the neo-liberal economic approach, which had overwhelming influence in the development of transition economic policies; and since a high percentage of active sociologists came from economics, its language is familiar to them.

Postmodernism was also discussed in Hungary. The works of Jameson and Lash were translated and, in the second half of the decade, there was growing interest in Foucault, ten volumes of whom were published in translation in a relatively short period. However, postmodernism was and is more an intellectual fashion than an establishing scientific paradigm. In sociology proper, its influence has been limited. Hungarian sociologists remained modern in the sense that they preferred working in ways conforming to mainstream scientific patterns.

New East-West asymmetries

System transformation put the relationship between Eastern and Western sociology in a new light. Post-socialist transition became an interesting topic for Western sociologists who could invest more funds in this investigation. Eastern European sociologists could contribute with their local knowledge, rooted in the sense of sociology's public relevance and a flexible language capable of mediating between conceptual frameworks and lived experience (Wessely, 1996). There were hopes that the possibility of merging the legacy of Eastern cultural and historical uniqueness and postmodern thought would enhance the potential to enlarge and deepen knowledge about postmodernity in general. However, these hopes placed in the cognitive chances of Eastern European sociology could not be realized; and the failure and malaise of Eastern European sociology can be attributed to a certain colonization by Western/Anglo-American colleagues. Eastern European social scientists often found themselves reduced to the auxiliary role of data suppliers, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the most talented (or the most fortunate?) young scientists received Western-style training that alienated them from Eastern realities. Both developments reduced the "cognitive chances" of Eastern sociology (Csepeli, Örkény et al., 1996).

Qualitative vs. quantitative approaches

The cleavage between qualitative and quantitative approaches exists in Hungary, too. Survey-type fieldwork is conducted more frequently. Quantitative researchers argue that sociological information and knowledge based on large nationwide probability samples are more valid and reliable than case studies or interviews. Qualitative researchers in turn question the validity and reliability of surveys that remain on the surface of social problems. Practically, there are very few researchers in Hungary who apply both approaches; some scholars believe in quantitative, others in qualitative methodology. In spite of the preference given to the quantitative approach, more sophisticated methods, like multivariate statistical analysis, are applied mostly by the younger generation. But the methodological textbook by Rudas (1998) published in English is worth mention.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

There is large variety of research themes but, due to lack of space, we will focus on certain topics only. We base our estimate of the relative importance of research themes on two sources: GESIS/IZ's mail survey on sociological projects and our own research approaching the problem from the viewpoint of outputs, i.e., a content analysis of publications appearing in the main sociological journal, *Szociológiai Szemle*.

Already in the socialist period, *social structure, social mobility*, and *way of life* were the most important fields of study; and in this respect there was no change after 1990 (23% of the articles in *Szociológiai Szemle* dealt with social structure in a broad sense). However, the approach to these topics has changed. Ferge, the author of a frequently-quoted English-language book on the social system in Hungary in the 1970s (Ferge, 1979), turned to the problems of social policy research. Andorka, the author of the monograph on social mobility in Hungary (Andorka, 1982), started to analyze poverty and social exclusion. In sum, there was a shift in interest toward research on the social consequences of system transition, toward the basic problems of winners and losers.

The empirical research focused on testing hypotheses like the "interrupted bourgeoisification" by Iván Szelényi and Robert Manchin (1989) and the "grand coalition" between the new economic elite and the former political elite by Elemér Hankiss (1990). In this line, Tamás Kolosi carried out a series of research projects in the 1990s and summarized his results in a monograph proving that various types of embeddedness – like managerial position or participation in the "second economy" before 1990 – were useful for later economic success and led to the development of a new "capitalist class". Szelényi (1995) expressed another opinion about Hungary's economic elite and labeled the system a "post-communist managerialism", in which managers took part in the privatization of the firms but did not become the owners of the new privatized companies. (On this, see also Eyal, Szelényi, and Townsley, 1998.) For the economic elite, Lengyel (1994) emphasized that, already under socialism, directors with educational and professional competence replaced the politically reliable directors of working-class origin. This is the reason why more reproduction and less circulation were expected for Hungary than for other post-socialist countries (Szelényi and Szelényi, 1995). Empirical research supported this assumption less for the political and more for the economic elite (Szelényi; Szelényi and Kovách, 1995). Kolosi (2000) found a similar trend of reproduction for the economic elite, too. The most important feature of the elite change was a faster generation replacement, an inflow of younger people into elite positions. This held for political leaders or managers more than for the cultural and scientific elite (in English, see also Kolosi and Sági, 1999).

In addition to the formation of the new elite, the emergence of self-employment (the petite bourgeoisie) was a significant research topic connected to privatization. Kolosi and Róna-Tas (1992) investigated entry into self-employment and found that cultural capital and human capital investments, but not former Communist Party membership, were the best predictors for starting private businesses in post-socialist Hungary (see also Róna-Tas, 1994). At the same time, the group pushed to self-employment by privatization turned out to be very heterogeneous, and the majority of them had no financial capital for any serious business (Laky, 1992). Consequently, by terminology, these people can hardly be labeled entrepreneurs. The Hungarian small business is of "too micro level" in international comparison. A most recent research on the topic revealed that a person's father's self-employment had an increasing impact on his becoming self-employed himself and that, rather than simple CP membership, the length of time spent in the party (interpreted as human capital investment) also influenced entry into private business (Róbert and Bukodi, 2000).

Andorka (1996) drew the first balance of the losers of the system transformation. He based his article on the increase of social inequalities on the Hungarian Household Panel Survey carried out in collaboration between the Department of Sociology, the Budapest University of Economics, and TÁRKI. This article underlined that more people lived in poverty after 1990 and especially that income differentiation has grown. Specific demographic and social groups appeared to be at risk of poverty: old people, but not all of the pensioners; families with several children (and especially the children in these families: child poverty); those with a low level of education; the unemployed; and those belonging to the Roma ethnic group (in English, see also Andorka and Spéder, 1996).

Ferge, in the framework of an international project (SOCO, 1994), carried out research on the evaluation of system transformation; her analysis (Ferge, 1996) shows that disappointment with the system transformation was a basic phenomenon in Hungary and stronger than in other post-socialist societies. Ferge offered a plausible explanation for this, namely that Hungary was more democratic and less depressed before 1990 than other countries, and consequently Hungarians have won less freedom. On the other hand, like people in other former socialist countries, they have lost lots of safety, so the relative balance was more negative for Hungarians. Róbert (1999) discussed other explanatory mechanisms, like materialistic vs. post-materialistic orientation, reference group theory, and the balance of investments and returns.

Obviously, from the point of view of transition, problems of social structure could not be separated from the *sociological study of economics* (industrial sociology, the sociology of work – which latter is present in 23% of the articles). In addition to economic topics already referred to, research on labor market issues should be mentioned. In this field, there was a strong focus on the decrease in the working population and the consequences of this decline, with special emphasis on unemployment. At the beginning of the 1990s, unemployment in Hungary was high by international comparison. On the macro level, the risk of becoming unemployed was highly correlated to privatization. On the micro level, a low level of education, older age, and/or Roma ethnicity increased the risk of unemployment. Regional differences were also substantial. The unemployed had few chances to find new employment (Köllő, 1992).

In addition to the analysis of social structure, its connection to political fields became another relevant new topic as Hungary turned into a multiparty system. (Issues of *political sociology* were present in 10% of the articles.) An important paper explicitly analyzed the social bases of party politics (Kolosi; Szelényi et. al., 1991). The authors identified three class positions: the intellectual elite (cadre elite and intellectuals); private entrepreneurs (the political bourgeoisie, entrepreneurs, and the new petite bourgeoisie); and the working class. They supposed the existence of three "political fields" occupying the space "between" the class positions, i.e., positions in the political space representing class coalitions. The liberal field is between the elite and the entrepreneurial class, the national-Christian field is between the entrepreneurial class and the working class, and the social-democratic field is between the elite and the working class (see also Szelényi and Szelényi, 1991). While this theoretical model has some plausibility, the empirical research conducted after the 1990 elections found only a very weak association between class position and voting behavior, while abstention was significantly related to class. Power, conflicting social groups, and strata were in the center of Szalai's publications (1994; 1996; 1999). She consequently tried to interpret every turn of politics in terms of elite group interests. According to her, an emerging new technocratic elite was the main protagonist of the transition period in Hungary; and her concept modifies Hankiss' "grand coalition" hypothesis.

After 1990, there was a double development in *public opinion research*: the majority of people in opinion research moved into the new commercial opinion research companies, producing information for the market and for political actors. A minority remained in social science proper. An outstanding example of scientific research in this field is the work of Angelusz (2000). He is concerned primarily with the visibility of social processes ("social optics") and analyzes structures of the public sphere from this point of view. The problem he starts out from is that accurate perception of the social environment is nearly impossible. According to Angelusz, the structure of communication is one of the factors that explain differences in visibility. Visibility, which is a precondition for a functioning democracy, depends on the transmissibility of channels connecting the informal and the public spheres of communication, "good" visibility resulting from a high level of thematic synchronicity.

Education was not a dominant theme in *Szociológiai Szemle* (3%), presumably because there are special journals and bulletins in this field. But studies on educational inequalities have strong traditions in Hungary and continued to be an important research topic in the 1990s as well. The analysis by Róbert (1991) demonstrated that the effect of social background hardly declined during the decades of socialism. The article by Szelényi and Aschaffenburg (1993) put greater emphasis on the role of institutions in creating and maintaining inequalities. They interpreted the persistence of educational inequalities as evidence of the "new class" theory. Turning to financial inequalities, in a recent article, Gazsó (1997) argued that only the offspring of high-status families with good material background had the chance to receive real marketable degrees in the post-socialist era. On the effect of cultural and material capital on educational decisions, see also Bukodi (1999) in English.

Only 4% of the articles in *Szociológiai Szemle* dealt with *rural and agrarian sociology*. However, these themes have greater salience in social science and in public debates than this indicator suggests. The reason is partly that the over-centralization of the country generates tensions that have to be investigated. Controversial agricultural policies also contributed to the interest in social science research on rural problems. The paper of Harcsa, Kovách, and Szelényi (1994) investigated this problem in a historical context. They argue that the agricultural crisis in the 1990s is a consequence of the economic recession as well as of the failure to institute reforms earlier in the 1980s. They also criticize the path taken by privatization and compensation as well as the general economic policy that does not adequately maintain and support agriculture. Privatization has led to significant differences in the distribution of wealth, and in the 1990s rural societies have become greatly segmented. A new agrarian proletariat with severely limited life chances has even emerged. (For an international comparison, see also Csite and Kovách, 1995 and Granberg and Kovách, 1998).

Two aspects of *nationality or ethnicity* are highly relevant in the Hungarian context: the problems of the Roma minority and those of the Hungarian minorities in the neighboring countries (5% of the articles dealt with these issues). Kemény and his collaborators (Gábor Kertesi, Gábor Havas) conducted empirical research on Roma issues. (For an overview, see Kemény 1999) The problem has many ramifications, extending to issues of unemployment, housing, education, and social policy. While the Roma problem is inseparably linked to issues of inequality and poverty, the minority question is more a cultural-political one. The most comprehensive research (Csepeli et al., 2000) centers on structures of national identification.

Private vs. public funding

The dual system (academic institutions and universities) is rather expensive. The main feature of the system is the institutions' large budgetary deficit. The financial situation of teaching activities is worse than that of research. While researchers can apply to various funds and institutions for funding, similar opportunities hardly exist for improving the material circumstances of lecturing. Teaching sociology is not a highly expensive field of education, but small computer labs, few computers relative to the large number of students, and old versions of software lower the quality of education at the universities.

The National Foundation for Scientific Research (*Országos Tudományos Kutatási Alap*, OTKA) is the main institution supporting research work. Applications can be submitted every year; they should include a research proposal and a detailed research budget. Applications are sent to anonymous reviewers; then, a board, which is elected for a 3-year period, makes the final decision. In principle, the system is competitive. However, the smallness of the field seriously limits anonymity and competition. The board always seeks a balance among the different fields of sociology and in institutional and geographical distribution. In general, the financial conditions of sociological research are worse than before 1990. The increase in the amount OTKA could distribute for research did not keep up with inflation; the real value of the research funds fell in the 1990s.

In addition to OTKA, researchers can apply for funds to the Ministry of Education. The amount available from this source is capped and more limited. The government and ministries also commission sociological studies and public opinion research on various topics. By law, tenders must be announced in this case; the tenders can be fully open, or specific research institutes can be invited to apply. Since this research is more the applied kind, this form of financing research provides more opportunity to private research institutes than to academic institutes. With the exception of the Soros foundations, actors in the private sphere provide little support for sociological research. There are some intergovernmental (like the French-Hungarian Balaton program) and European programs that occasionally support sociological research, as well.

While OTKA provided only part of the funding for sociological research, the only quantitative data we have covering the whole period relates to this organization. The data are taken from the official OTKA newsletters, which give some idea of the trends and magnitude of research funding in Hungary. By agreement, the social sciences get 20% of the total OTKA budget, and sociology gets roughly 4-5%. Funding of sociology was at a relatively high level in 1992, equaling roughly US $393,000 at that time; after a two-year period of decline, it reached a new peak in 1995 (191% of the 1992 amount), falling to its lowest level in 1996 (36% of the 1992 amount in real value). In 2000, it was at 65% of the 1992 value. The distribution between Budapest and the provinces reflected the general geographical pattern of Hungarian science: 89% of the funds went to Budapest (while 61% of all students study and 38% of all sociology professors teach in the provinces!). The funds were fairly evenly distributed between the two main types of locations of sociological research, with universities receiving 45% of the funds and research institutes 49%. Not surprisingly, social structure studies and economic sociology (in a broad sense) received the highest amounts among the main branches of sociological research (15% and 19% respectively), none of the other branches receiving more than 10%.

5. Public space and academic debates

Debated themes, problems, methods

Debates have little tradition in Hungarian sociology. The field was too small, sociologists knew each other, and criticism was underdeveloped. Special factors contributed to the avoidance of public controversy. The field of sociology was not homogeneous under state socialism. There were differences in worldview, ideology, and theoretical and methodological issues, but controversies were not fought out in the open. Public criticism could be exploited by the Party and the state to legitimate repressive measures, so fear of denunciation restrained controversies. Habits are changing slowly, but we can speak about some debates.

One of them is about lasting poverty. One party in this debate, Ferge and other social policy researchers, state that poverty is lifelong for those families who are in deprived situations and that there is no way out of this state. Researchers at the Hungarian Household Panel survey, like Andorka, Kolosi, Tóth, and Spéder, however, provided empirical evidence that families who were at the bottom of society one year could climb up from this position to be in a better economic position in the next year.

The other debate was about the role of the state in social policy and welfare. Again Ferge referred to the results of public opinion research, which proved that the majority of Hungarians counted on the state and expected it to take an active role in reducing social inequalities and in providing free (or strongly subsidized) education and health care for them. Another piece of research, however, investigated what people knew about the use of taxes, the real choices the government had to make when deciding about the use of funds, the real prices of educational or health care "goods", etc. The results revealed that people knew very little about these questions; in fact, they did not know what budget decisions they expected from the state. The research tried to explore the public view about different options on how people could take more care of themselves instead of always waiting for governmental solutions (Csontos, Kornai, and Tóth, 1996).

A much less explicit debate referred to emerging class relations and to the use of the concept of class. When analyzing social structure under socialism, sociologists wrote about "stratification" because the term "class" had a bad connotation in Hungarian sociological literature. Approaching the problem from the viewpoint of class identification, Róbert Angelusz and Róbert Tardos (1995) concluded that the use of the term "class" makes the empirical results questionable and misleading even in the post-socialist era. People have negative attitudes toward the "working class", while the term "middle class" has a new, "wishful-thinking character". Indeed, research by Fábián, Kolosi, and Róbert (1998) on the social structure revealed that the groups between the top and the bottom of society were quite stratified and inconsistent.

Róbert (1998a) suggested introducing the neo-Weberian class system developed by John Goldthorpe, which is widely used for analyzing social structure in industrial societies. Various classifications and an empirical test of their validity were investigated and compared as a further step toward a more careful class analysis of Hungarian society (Bukodi and Róbert, 1999).

Principal academic journals, publication

Due to bad financial circumstances and to the relative narrowness of the field, publication possibilities are limited in Hungarian sociology. The leading journal is *Szociológiai Szemle*

(Sociological Review); the Hungarian Sociological Association publishes it in Hungarian four times a year. A selection of the best articles is published every year in an English-language edition.

Another journal is named *Századvég* (End of Century); it is published in association with the Rudolf Andorka Social Science Society. It also appears four times a year in Hungarian. *Replika* (Riposte) is an interdisciplinary social science journal aiming at a broader public, with a postmodern tinge. There are some other journals, like *Társadalomkutatás* (Social Research) and *Esély* (Chance). Sociologists regularly publish in the journals of other social sciences, for example in *Statisztikai Szemle* (Statistical Review), *Közgazdasági Szemle* (Economic Review), and *Demográfia* (Demography). Both *Statistical Review* and *Economic Review* appear every month; *Demography* is published quarterly.

In addition to journals, some publishers specialize in works in the social sciences. The Ministry of Education finances book publishing on a grant basis. Publishers have to submit a synopsis of the book and apply for financial support. Books that can also be used as course material in education have better chances to get financed.

Sociological books published in Hungarian are mostly translations, but in recent years original works by Hungarian authors appeared in greater number, too. The most important publishers are *Osiris*; *Új Mandátum* (New Mandate), which collaborates with ELTE; *AULA*, which is associated with the Budapest University of Economics; and *Századvég* (End of Century), which publishes books as well.

New manuals, databases

As mentioned above, translations and course materials are easier to publish in Hungary. Several examples of the combination of these two can be mentioned; we provide only a selection. Two volumes include classical and modern texts on social stratification (Angelusz, 1997) and on social mobility (Róbert, 1998b). Andorka et al. (1995) also edited a collection of papers and book chapters on social stratification. A two-volume reader containing classical texts of sociological theory came out in 2000 (Felkai et al.). Lengyel and Szántó (1994; 1997; 1998) edited three volumes of translations of articles and book chapters on economic sociology. Another book edited by Wessely (1998) contains translations from the field of sociology of culture.

Rudolf Andorka (1997) has written an important real manual titled Introduction to Sociology. This is widely used to train first-year sociology students.

An important database is the nonprofit Data Archive at TÁRKI RT. It is a member of the International Federation of Data Organization (IFDO) and of the Council of European Social Sciences Data Archives (CESSDA). Data files from about 450 sociological and social statistical surveys are stored in SPSS system file form. This is the official data archive of OTKA; the publicly-funded surveys are available here for secondary analysis and there is on-line access to data of the New Democracies Barometer. The data archive is open to academic researchers as well as doctoral students.

Selection of publications in world languages

For sociologists who publish in Hungarian as their native language, publication in a world language is crucial. The *Sociological Review* mentioned above is the only regular forum for that. The occasional publication of any Hungarian text in a world language is a question of luck, money, and personal networks. Under appropriate conditions, either Hungarian or foreign publishers can publish the work of Hungarian scholars in a world language. We provide examples of both cases.

A collection of articles from the Hungarian journal *Századvég* was edited by Zsolt Spéder (1999) and published in Germany. TÁRKI publishes a volume titled *Társadalmi Riport* every second year, the first time in 1990, the last time in 2000. The 1990 and the 1998 volumes have been published by TÁRKI in English as well. The best articles of the 1994 and 1996 volumes were collected by Andorka et al (1999) and published by CEU Press. Andorka's manual, mentioned above, has been translated into German and published there (Andorka, 2001).

6. Views on further development

National sociologies – relics of history?

Above, we put in brackets the question of what "Hungarian" sociology is, apart from sociology in general. Now in our concluding remarks we would like to turn to this problem. (There is a debate currently going on about this issue: Némedi, 2000; Somlai, 2001; Saád, 2001; Lakatos, 2001.)

Sociology in Hungary is not Hungarian in the sense of being basically or essentially different from what is done elsewhere. It is not and should not be "original". Growing openness to international events and productions is one of the most important achievements of the past decade. The best people in Hungary study problems that are relevant for the network, and they are active participants in international organizations and networks.

To be concrete: the Hungarian Sociological Association provides a framework for Hungarian sociologists' participation in the international scene; it is a member of the International Sociological Association (ISA) and of the European Sociological Association (ESA). Several Hungarian sociologists are individual members in these institutions. One of our colleagues (György Lengyel) is a member of the board of the ESA. Several Hungarian colleagues participate in the activity of the research committees of the ISA or in the activity of the research networks of the ESA. Three Hungarian institutions (Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Economics, Inst. of Political Sciences of HAS, TÁRKI) are members of the European Consortium of Sociological Research (ECSR). International conferences provide Hungarian sociologists good opportunities to interact with the international scientific community. In 1995, the second ESA conference was held in Budapest. The Hungarian Sociological Association organizes conferences every year. In the last ten years, these conferences were mainly national ones, but the 1992, 1994, and 1999 conferences had an international character. The 1999 conference aimed to provide an overview of the 10 years of system transformation.

However, the problem of "national" sociologies is broader than just participation in international networks. Obviously, sociologists are linked to "their" societies: there they find the facts they study and there are the various publics they turn to in the hope of contributing to a better self-understanding of actors. It was in this sense that the sociology of the 1990s was "Hungarian": it was the sociology *of* Hungary. The system transformation provided the laboratory for research (even if the possibilities may not have been optimally utilized) and the topic of discourse.

New developments in theory and methods and the necessity of comparative research break up this primordial linkage of sociology to its "native" territory. Those who bother less with sociological enlightenment and more with really sophisticated and comparative research that requires access to data and sources outside the body of the nation therefore give preference to topics of interest to a different, international public.

There is another sense in which sociology was and is "Hungarian". It was and perhaps is sociology *for* Hungary. Many Hungarian sociologists tried to persuade "their" public, even if they were disappointed because this public did not listen to them with the interest they expected. Many sociologists believe that sociology (with other social sciences) should function as a kind of scientific conscience of "their" society. It is an open question whether sociology can in the future provide social self-knowledge and whether sociological enlightenment will be possible in a globalized world.

The most potent factors in the conservation of "national" sociologies are the institutions of education and research. In fact, "Hungarian" sociologists are those who are affiliated with an institution in Hungary. In this sense, "Hungarian" sociology is sociology done *by* Hungarians *in*

Hungary. The confinement of scientific disciplines in the frameworks of national states was an unquestioned postulate of the 19th-century academic system and remained so even in the first half of the 20th century. State socialism with its characteristic tendency to isolation reinforced the national separation of scientific disciplines, among them sociology. However, there are already a number of individuals (and not the unimportant ones) who have dual affiliations. As university education opens up to the "world" (i.e. to the institutions in the center) "national" scientific institutions are going to lose their strength as determining factors. It is not the "brain drain" that is the real problem. The brain drain has always existed and recent forms of scientific communications diminish its importance. The real problem is the growing irrelevance of national institutions.

Sociology in Hungary is "Hungarian" in the sense that it is done mostly (but less and less overwhelmingly) *in* Hungarian. It is hard to say whether it is an asset or a liability. It can result in parochial isolation from the international science market; on the other hand, sociological enlightenment requires the utilization of natural national languages. Obviously, that is not just sociology's problem.

Something is lost in the unavoidable internationalization (or "globalization"): sociology cannot fulfill the dream of the first Hungarian sociologists and cannot become the "self-knowledge" of society. The gains are considerable: greater openness to international developments, improved research tools, and multiplication of worldwide contacts. But network sociology has its own deficiencies. From a Hungarian perspective, the most important of these is that – at least in these years – it strengthens the center-periphery difference. The small sociologies on the Central Eastern European periphery – among them Hungarian sociology – are almost exclusively oriented toward the "big" Atlantic sociological communities, which leads certain relevant topics to be excluded from research.

Sociologists are often torn between two conflicting demands. Should they respond to the standards set by the international sociological community, or should they contribute to the rational discussion of public issues at home and to the enlightenment of "their" civil society? The role models created more than a hundred years ago, which stressed the local vocation of sociology, are breaking down. The tensions are particularly strong in the "small" national communities on the European periphery. We suppose that these problems will come to the fore in the beginning second century of academic sociology.

References

Andorka, Rudolf (1982): *A társadalmi mobilitás változásai Magyarországon* (Changes in social mobility in Hungary), Budapest, Gondolat;

Andorka, Rudolf (1996): "A társadalmi egyenlőtlenségek növekedése a rendszerváltás óta" (The growth of inequality after system change), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 6, No. 1, 3-26;

Andorka, Rudolf (1997): *Bevezetés a szociológiába* (Introduction to sociology), Budapest, Osiris;

Andorka, Rudolf, Hradil, Stefan and Peschar, Jules (eds.) (1995): *Társadalmi rétegződés* (Social stratification), Budapest, AULA;

Andorka, Rudolf and Spéder, Zsolt (1996): "Poverty in Hungary in 1992-1995", in: *Review of Sociology*,. Special Issue, 3-28;

Andorka, Rudolf, Kolosi, Tamás, Rose, Richard and Vukovich, György (eds.) (1999): *A Society Transformed. Hungary in Time-Space Perspective*, Budapest, Central European University Press;

Andorka, Rudolf (2001): *Einführung in die soziologische Gesellschaftsanalyse: Ein Studienbuch zur ungarischen Gesellschaft im europäischen Vergleich*, Opladen, Leske + Budrich;

Angelusz, Róbert (1983): *Kommunikáló társadalom* (Communicating society), Budapest, Gondolat;

Angelusz, Róbert (ed.) (1997): *A társadalmi rétegződés komponensei* (Components of social stratification), Budapest, Új Mandátum;

Angelusz, Róbert (2000): *A láthatóság görbe tükrei. Társadalomoptikai tanulmányok* (The distorting mirrors of visibility. Studies in social optics), Budapest, Új Mandátum;

Angelusz, Róbert and Tardos, Róbert (1995): "Social Restratification and Socio-political Identification", in: *Review of Sociology*, Special Issue, 65-80;
Bukodi, Erzsébet (1999): Educational choices in Hungary, in: *Hungarian Statistical Review*, 77, 71-94;
Bukodi, Erzsébet and Róbert, Péter (1999): "Historical Changes, Human Capital and Career Patterns as Class Determinants in Hungary", in: *Review of Sociology*, Special Issue, 42-65;
Csepeli, György, Örkény, Antal and Scheppele, Kim Lane (1996): "Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome in Social Science in Eastern Europe", in: *Replika*, Special issue, 111-123;
Csepeli, György, Örkény, Antal and Székelyi, Mária (2000): *Grappling with National Identity*, Budapest, Akadémiai;
Csite, András and Kovách, Imre (1995): "Posztszocialista átalakulás Közép- és Kelet-Európa rurális társadalmaiban" (Postsocialist changes in Central and Eastern European rural societies), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 5, No. 2, 49-72;
Csontos, László, Kornai, János and Tóth, István György (1996): "Az állampolgár, az adók és a jóléti rendszer fogalma" (The citizen, taxes and the concept of welfare system), in: *Századvég*, No. 2, 3-28;
Csontos, László (1999): *Ismeretelmélet, társadalomelmélet, társadalomkutatás* (Epistemology, social theory, social research), Budapest, Osiris;
Erdei, Ferenc (1980): "A magyar paraszttársadalom" (Hungarian peasant society) (first published 1942), in: *A magyar társadalomról* (On Hungarian society), Erdei, Ferenc (ed.), Budapest, Akadémiai, 83-252;
Eyal, Gil, Szelényi, Iván and Townsley, Eleanor (1998): *Making Capitalism without Capitalists*, New York, Verso;
Fábián, Zoltán, Kolosi, Tamás and Róbert, Péter (1998): "The Social Milieu of Material-Welfare Status Groups", in: *Social Report 1998*, Kolosi, Tamás, Tóth, István György and Vukovich, György (eds.), Budapest, Tarki;
Felkai, Gábor (1993): *Jürgen Habermas*, Budapest, Áron Kiadó;
Felkai, Gábor, Némedi, Dénes and Somlai, Péter (eds.) (2000): *Olvasókönyv a szociológia történetéhez I-II.* (Readings in the history of sociology), Budapest, Új Mandátum;
Ferge, Zsuzsa (1979): *A Society in the Making*, White Plains, N.Y., M. E. Sharpe;
Ferge, Zsuzsa (1996): "A rendszerváltás megítélése" (Opinions about the system change), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 6, No. 1, 57-74;
Gazsó, Ferenc (1997): "A társadalmi folyamatok és az oktatási rendszer" (Social processes and the system of education), in: *Századvég*, No. 7, 73-107;
Granberg, Leo and Kovách, Imre (eds.) (1998): *Actors on the Changing European Countryside*, Budapest, Institute of Political Sciences;
Hankiss, Elemér (1990): *East European Alternatives*, Oxford, Clarendon Press;
Harcsa, István, Kovách, Imre and Szelényi, Iván (1994): "A posztszocialista átalakulási válság a mezőgazdaságban és a falusi társadalomban" (Postsocialist transition crisis in agriculture and in rural society), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 4, No. 3, 15-43;
Kemény, István (ed.) (1999): *A cigányok Magyarországon* (Romas in Hungary), Budapest, MTA;
Kolosi, Tamás (2000): *A terhes babapiskóta* (The pregnant 'ladyfinger'), Budapest, Osiris;
Kolosi, Tamás, Szelényi, Iván, Szelényi, Szonja and Western, Bruce (1991): "Politikai mezők a posztkommunista átmenet korszakában. Pártok és osztályok a magyar politikában (1989-1990)" (Political fields in postcommunist transition period. Parties and classes in Hungarian politics 1989-1990), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 1, No. 1, 5-34;
Kolosi, Tamás and Róna-Tas, Ákos (1992): "Az utolsókból lesznek az elsők? A rendszerváltás társadalmi hatásai Magyarországon" (The First Shall Be The Last? Social impacts of system change in Hungary), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 2, No. 2, 3-26;
Kolosi, Tamás and Sági, Matild (1999): "Change of System – Change of Elite", in: *Hungary in Flux. Society, Politics and Transformation*, Spéder, Zsolt (ed.), Hamburg, Krämer Verlag;
Köllő, János (1992): "Munkában és munka nélkül – a fordulat után" (Employed and unemployed – after the transformation), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 2, No. 4, 15-20;
Lakatos, László (2201): "Mi a baj a szociológiával, és hogyan nem kéne rajta segíteni?" (What is wrong with sociology and how not to correct it), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 11, No. 3, 78-109;
Laky, Teréz (1992): "A privatizáció magyarországi sajátosságai és néhány érzékelhető társadalmi hatása" (Some special aspects of privatization in Hungary and its social impact), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 2, No. 1, 45-61;

Lengyel, György (1994): "A magyar gazdasági vezetés professzionalizációjának két hulláma" (Two waves of professionalization in Hungarian economical leadership), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 4, No. 3, 3-14;

Lengyel, György and Szántó, Zoltán (eds.) (1994): *A gazdasági élet szociológiája* (Sociology of economy), Budapest, AULA;

Lengyel, György and Szántó, Zoltán (eds.) 1997: *Gazdasági rendszerek és intézmények szociológiája* (Sociology of economical systems and institutions), Budapest, AULA;

Lengyel, György and Szántó, Zoltán (eds.) 1998: *Tőkefajták: A társadalmi és kulturális erőforrások szociológiája* (Forms of capital. Sociology of social and cultural resources), Budapest, AULA;

Némedi, Dénes (1996): *Durkheim. Tudás és társadalom* (Durkheim. Knowledge and society), Budapest, Áron Kiadó;

Némedi, Dénes (2000): "A kritikai elmélet normatív bázisának problémája Habermasnál" (The problem of the normative base of critical theory in Habermas), in: *Társadalomelmélet-elmélettörténet*, Némedi, Dénes (ed.), Budapest, Új Mandátum, 171-208;

Némedi, Dénes (2000): "A szociológia egy sikeres évszázad után" (Sociology after a successful century), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 10, No. 2, Budapest, 3-16;

Róbert, Péter (1991): "Educational transition in Hungary from the post-war period to the end of the 1998s", in: *European Sociological Review*, 7, 213-236;

Róbert, Péter (1998a): "Occupational Class Structure: Theoretical and Methodological Problems", in: *Review of Sociology,* Special Issue, 58-76;

Róbert, Péter (ed.) (1998b): *A társadalmi mobilitás. Hagyományos és új megközelítések* (Social mobility. Traditional and new approaches), Budapest, Új Mandátum;

Róbert, Péter (1999): "Gritting the Teeth – Embittered with the Change of System", in: *Hungary in Flux. Society, Politics and Transformation*, Spéder, Zsolt (ed.), Hamburg, Krämer Verlag;

Róbert, Péter and Bukodi, Erzsébet (2000): "Who are the Entrepreneurs and Where Do They Come From? Transition to Self-employment Before, Under and After the Communism in Hungary", in: *International Review of Sociology*, 10, No. 1, 147-171;

Róna-Tas, Ákos (1994): "The First Shall Be The Last? Entrepreneurship and Communist Cadres in the Transition from Socialism", in: *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 40-69;

Rudas, Tamás (1998): *Odds Ratios in the Analysis of Contingency Tables*, London, Sage;

Saád, József (2001): "Tíz széljegyzet Némedi Dénes tanulmányához és recenziójához" (Ten remarks to Némedi Dénes' paper and review paper), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 11, No. 1, Budapest, 63-75;

Somlai, Péter (1997): *Szocializáció: a kulturális átörökítés éa a társadalmi beilleszkedés folyamata*, (Socialization: The process of cultural inheritence and social adaptation), Budapest, Corvina;

Somlai, Péter (2001): "Egyetemesség és heterogenitás. Gondolatok a szociológiáról – Némedi Dénes és Saád József írásai kapcsán" (Universality and heterogeneity. Some remarks on sociology – in connection with the papers of Némedi Dénes and Saád József), in: *Szociológiai Szemle*, 11, No. 1, Budapest, 76-84;

Spéder, Zsolt (ed.) (1999): *Hungary in Flux. Society, Politics and Transformation*, Hamburg, Krämer Verlag;

Szalai, Erzsébet (1994): *Útelágazás. Hatalom és értelmiség az államszocializmus után* (Road-junction. Power and intellectuals after state socialism), Budapest, Szombathely and Pesti Szalon, Savaria University Press;

Szalai, Erzsébet (1996): *Az elitek átváltozása* (The transformation of elites), Budapest, Cserépfalvi Kiadó;

Szalai, Erzsébet (1999): *Oroszlánok és globalizáció* (Lions and globalization), Budapest, MTA Politikatudományi Intézet and Új Mandátum;

Szelényi, Ivan (1995): *The Rise of Managerialism: The New Class after the Fall of Communism*, Collegium Budapest, Discussion Paper No. 16;

Szelényi, Ivan and Manchin, Robert (1989): "Interrupted Embourgeoisement: Social Background and Life History of Family Agricultural Entrepreneurs in Socialist Hungary", in: *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 8, Kalleberg, Arne L. (ed.), Greenwich, JAI Press Inc, 253-278;

Szelényi, Iván and Szelényi, Szonja (1991): "Osztályok és pártok a posztkommunista átmenetben" (Classes and parties in post-communist transition), in: *Magyar Tudomány*, 12, 1415-1428;

Szelényi, Ivan and Szelényi, Szonja (1995): "Circulation or Reproduction of Elites During Post-Communist Transformation in Eastern Europe: Introduction", in: *Theory and Society*, 24, No. 5, 615-638;

Szelényi, Szonja and Aschaffenburg, Karen (1993): "Inequalities in Educational Opportunity in Hungary", in: *Persistent Inequality. Changing Educational Attainment in Thirteen Countries,* Shavit, Yossi and Blossfeld, Hans-Peter (eds.), Boulder, Westview Press;

Szelényi, Szonja, Szelényi, Ivan and Kovách, Imre (1995): "The Making of the Hungarian Post-Communist Elite: Circulation in Politics, Reproduction in the Economy", in: *Theory and Society*, 24, No. 5, 697-722;
Tardos, Róbert (1998): "Szociológiai válaszkísérletek a mikro-makro problémára" (Sociological approaches to the micro-macro problem), in: *Szociológiai* Szemle, 8, No. 1, Budapest, 3-22;
Wessely, Anna (1996): "The Cognitive Chance of Central European Sociology", in: *Replika,* Special issue, 11-19;
Wessely, Anna (1999): *A kultúra szociológiája* (Sociology of culture), Budapest, Osiris.

Aivars Tabuns

Sociology – Latvia

Discussant: Sylvija Senkane

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

The spectrum of Marxism-Leninism

The Stalinist era was a period of isolation from the scientific world, as well as from the Soviet Union's own scientific heritage. Since 1940, the blackout on statistical reporting worsened consistently. Demographic data publication ended; no statistical yearbook was published again until 1956 – after a pause of more than 20 years. There was no empirical research or fieldwork, because the Communist Party was loath to permit anything that might disclose errors in its doctrine.

Between 1956 and 1965, many attacks were launched against sociology as a conceptual science. Sociology was not set apart from political science, i.e., it was interpreted a bit more broadly than was the case later, when theoretical problems in the area of politics were always classified under "scientific communism", not sociology. Sociology was portrayed as an ideological weapon of American imperialism.

The situation changed somewhat after Stalin's death in 1953. As the Soviet Union's foreign policy began to change, contacts between Soviet and foreign scientists resumed, and Soviet specialists began to attend international conferences.

In August 1967, a plenary session of the Communist Party of Soviet Union (CPSU) was devoted to a discussion of "steps to be taken toward the further development of social sciences and in the interest of increasing the role of these sciences in the building of communism". Leaders of Soviet science believed that sociology could improve the existing regime. Around this time, the view began to dominate that sociology was a discipline dealing with "concrete social reality".

In 1966, a Department of Applied Sociology was opened at Latvian State University (Latvijas valsts universitate), and the training of professional sociologists finally began. On July 1, 1966, a laboratory of sociology was established at Latvian state radio (which had conducted irregular research since 1963). The first generation of Latvian sociologists had no formal education or training in the discipline and was recruited from various professions, mostly historians. The development of sociology in Latvia was hindered both by the interruption in professional succession (most of the notable representatives of the social sciences either emigrated from Latvia during the war or were repressed later) and by the lack of intellectual contacts.

As elsewhere in the Soviet Union, sociology in Latvia developed thanks to the fact that it was seen as an element of social engineering – a set of empirical processes to obtain information that in turn would allow the diagnosis and manipulation of society. In fact, this view was symptomatic of a crisis, because by granting this role to sociology, the authorities were admitting that society had freed itself from ideological paralysis, that society was alienated to a degree from the "mind and conscience of our time" (which is how the CPSU liked to describe itself), and that the party by no means automatically represented society. Theoretical sociology nevertheless developed very slowly.

Most Latvian sociologists researched the professional aspects of education, cultural issues, and the relationship of production to a specific branch of the economy or even a specific company. Thanks to the specifics of research methodology, sociology was largely influenced by the true problems of society, not by orthodox ideology. Financial resources also limited the selection of topics. Researchers usually chose as interview subjects students, schoolchildren, or groups of workers who filled out questionnaires at their place of employment. Research techniques like individual interviews and meetings in people's homes were used much less often. Regular surveys based on a national random sampling of the entire population did not begin until the early 1990s.

One of the first research projects to gain attention in society and that illustrated sociology's abilities was a book by Talivaldis Vilcins published by the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Latvian SSR in 1968. The book fully corresponded to the demands of the culture of the profession. A few years later, in 1970, Rita Kvelde defended the first sociological dissertation, "Radio broadcasts and the development of public opinion". The dissertation was based on a fairly large amount of empirical material (more than 6,000 respondents were questioned).

The 1970s were a golden age for empirical sociology. Throughout the 1970s, Latvian sociologists participated in their first major international research project, "The Influence of Higher Education and the Reproduction and Development of the Social Structure of Socialist Societies". This project involved researchers not only from the Baltic states and the central regions of European Russia, but also colleagues from Bulgaria, East Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. In the early 1980s, Latvian sociologists took part in a project that covered several Soviet cities and was titled "The Social Structure of the Urban Population in the USSR".

Between 1970 and 1981, a great deal of low-budget research was done in Latvia. The work of Latvian social scientists (projects that could be classified as more or less sociological in nature, as well as those using the results of sociological research) was published in many books, brochures, and magazine articles. Maija Asmane, Daina Fismeistare, and Talivaldis Vilcins published the first booklet in the Latvian language on the methods and organization of sociological surveys in 1977. In 1975, a Baltic branch of the Soviet Sociological Association was established to coordinate sociological research in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. At the beginning, fewer than 100 individuals and 30 institutions were engaged in sociological research. By the mid-1980s, this had increased to 300 individuals and 60 institutions. In 1978, there were 103 individual and 18 institutional members in the Latvian division of the sociological association, while in 1983 the numbers had increased to 112 and 23, respectively. The Baltic Sociological Association held conferences every other year.

The 1980s were a time of countless surveys, many of them on a high professional level. The largest research projects were carried out at three institutions: the Latvian Academy of Sciences (Latvijas Zinatnu akademija), Latvian State University, and the Riga Polytechnic Institute (Rigas Politehniskais instituts). There were also sociological centers in s

everal of the country's largest factories. The work of these various organizations was not coordinated. The leaders of institutions or sociological groups dictated the topics, and the research projects included a fairly high proportion of commercial projects (most often commissioned by administrative institutions or enterprises). It was in this period that the first academically educated sociologists entered the field, having undergone the same type of educational program at Latvian State University as did people who studied philosophy.

Pre-war traditions

The social sciences in Latvia in the 1920s and 1930s were characterized by many accents and the names of many new thinkers (Tabuns, 1997, 1998). Latvian social researchers began to attend sociology meetings in the West; for example, Karlis Kundzins attended the Frankfurt Sociology Congress in 1932. The works of prominent sociologists, among them Pitirim Sorokin's "The Sociology of Revolution" (1929), were translated, and the first empirical research projects were done (e.g. Olgerts Pinkis in 1938). The significance of translated works cannot be overemphasized. Sorokin's book, for example, gave the Latvian public a glimpse of the ideas of such thinkers as Herbert Spencer, Sigmund Freud, Vilfredo Pareto, Gabriel Tarde, Werner Sombart, Max Weber, William McDougall, and others.

The first Latvian-language sociology textbook – Peteris Birkerts' *Zociologija* – was published in 1921. The literature cited and mentioned in this work shows the three major schools of thought that influenced Birkerts' ideas. First and foremost, one finds the influence of psychologists and the Chicago school. The citations also suggest that authors with social-democratic orientations heavily influenced Birkerts. The third set of influences came from Russian thinkers. The work also cites many Latvian thinkers. The long list of authors indicates that Latvian society had an opportunity to learn about the views of the most famous social thinkers of that era. Second, one can clearly see the dominance of adherents of the psychological school, most of whom did not toe the Durkheim line in sociology.

The establishment of the University of Latvia and the subsequent publication of its scientific journal, *Latvijas Universitates raksti (Acta Universitatis Latviensis)* also promoted the development of social ideas. If prior to this age the development of social ideas was largely the provenance of journalists, authors, poets, and politicians, now the leaders of the university gradually undertook to develop and popularize the social sciences. Empirical research was still rare, but speculative sociology nevertheless took on a more systematic form.

During this period, several works devoted to the analysis of Latvia's economic development were published in Latvia. Several articles were devoted to the analyses of the social aspects of Latvia's demographic situation. In this context, the Institute for Research on the Living Force of the Nation not only analyzed Latvian demographic processes, but also researched the anthropological specifics of Latvians and the various issues of the Latvian heritage.

Latvian thinkers in this era also devoted a great deal of attention to national issues. Most nationalist publications, however, were written in the second half of the 1930s. The ideologues of Latvian nationalism opposed political liberalism and parliamentarianism, and they held collective rights to be higher than individual rights. The ideology of Latvian nationalists was not, however, typified by intolerance toward other nationalities. Rather, Latvian nationalism was characterized by a dislike of Marxism, whose propaganda championed other ideas about solidarity. Like other nationalists, the ideologues of Latvian nationalism worshipped at the altar of rural patriarchies and rural lifestyles, criticizing everything that had to do with industry.

Of separate interest are discussions about the respective defenders of democracy and authoritarianism. The crisis of democracy was primarily associated with the existence of numerous, small democratic parties in Latvia and the destructive activities of their leaders. Many more authors, however, adhered to the cult of leadership and denigrated parliamentarianism.

Also active at this time were the social democrats and persons near to them. On the 50th anniversary of the death of Karl Marx, the Marxist Club of Riga published a collection of articles called *Marx and Marxism*.

The Academic Social Sciences Association of the University of Latvia (also known as Aequitas), founded in 1927, was a forerunner of the Institute of Social Sciences, which was supposed to help develop the sciences of economics, sociology, and law. The sociology division of the association never was established, and the Soviet occupation interrupted any plans of establishing a Latvian Academy of Sciences.

Between 1921 and 1929, only one-quarter of the articles on philosophical and social issues that were published by the University of Latvia were in the Latvian language – two-thirds were in German. This brief review indicates that the development of social ideas in Latvia was characterized both by highly varied themes and by vivid personalities. There were sharp discussions, and the professional level of the participants in the process improved over time.

The impact of Western theories

Educational opportunities after the war were usually limited to reading pre-revolutionary texts available in libraries along with foreign works translated into Russian. In the first group were such sociologists as Durkheim, Simmel, Comte, Sorokin, Spencer, Dilthey, and Mills (mostly thinkers who had managed to avoid the attention of Marxist criticism and had therefore not ended up on censors' lists). In the other group were several books by Western authors, for example, Tomatsu Shibutani; *American Sociology: Perspectives, Problems, Methods* (edited by Parsons and published in 1959); and Carnap's book, *Meaning and Necessity: A Study in Semantics and Modal Logic* (1967). Most of these books were stamped "For Scientific Libraries", which meant that they were not accessible at public libraries and could not be sold. In short, they were the privilege of professional scientists.

Latvian sociologists were quick to learn traditional methodological approaches and Western concepts of sociology. The dominant research method was the standardized questionnaire, and there was a lack of other methods. But sociologists began to use internationally recognized programs for data analysis (BMDP, SAS, SPSS).

During the 1970s and 1980s, the number of translated works by Western sociologists increased considerably. Latvian sociologists gained an opportunity to attend global sociological congresses.

Oppositional activities

Strong thematic restrictions were placed on sociology, not only by external, institutional censorship, but also in the form of internalized self-censorship. During Soviet times, most sociologists managed to avoid becoming shills for the regime and its ideology, but only by "emigrating" to ideologically neutral issues (sociologists did not have to be members of the CPSU).

This may seem paradoxical, but during this period, sociology was not dominated by Marxism, but rather by ideas in concert with American positivism. Sociologists published very little in the mass media – the results of their work were published either in scientific journals or, more often, in reports meant for only limited, in-house circulation. The public was interested in sociology, but at the same time distrusted it. Respondents often doubted whether sociologists would really protect their anonymity, and the result was that many people gave incorrect responses. The results of research, therefore, were almost always distorted, the result of respondents' self-censorship, not of any falsification of data by the researchers. Of course, sociologists, being professionals, were well aware of the specifics of the Soviet system and its residents, so they never tried to provoke people into making unreliable statements.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

The change of paradigms

During the 1990s, as cooperation with the North and West broadened, the research partners of Latvian social scientists also changed. Latvian sociologists were able to study Western sociological theories and to increase the diversity of their theoretical approaches. But at the same time, many sociologists did not notice that they sometimes accepted theories that contradicted each other. While this situation "let a thousand flowers bloom", many of these flowers were poorly rooted. Sometimes it appeared that authors did not make any efforts to critically evaluate the theories they used in their work. That is, they seldom tried to verify these theories with empirical data. Furthermore, researchers rarely used methodological strategies that could confront the theories and challenge their assumptions or conclusions.

The change of elites

Several factors influenced the replacement of the scientific elite. This was facilitated by a nostrification (recertification) of academic degrees that had been conferred both before and after the restoration of statehood. Some scientists did not submit their work for nostrification, and some of those who did were not nostrified. Most scientists who were not nostrified nevertheless continued to pursue their academic activities as lecturers at universities or as researchers. The meaning of the nostrification procedure was more symbolic than practical. For most Latvian sociologists, Marxism had never been more than window dressing. Pro forma references to the last congress of the Communist Party had to be made, and some quotation from Marx had to be inserted in the introduction of a paper. In the introductions of papers in the 1990s, more references to other authors began to appear, although these quotations, too, often had weak relationships with the content of the papers.

To a large extent, the change of the academic elite was also influenced by a reorganization of funding and research priorities. Under the old system, scientific institutions received their financing directly. Now, the norm is to give grants for specific projects. The principal investigator (PI) of a proposed project submits a request to the Latvian Council of Science, and projects given high ratings in an independent expert review process receive grants from the Council.

A high scientific standard, competitiveness at the international level, and the present efficiency of international contacts serve as the main criteria defining research priorities. A special financing agreement was introduced to facilitate the participation of Latvian scientists in international activities, as well as to give additional support to the best doctoral students in universities and research institutions. Those scholars who were not nostrified are not eligible to be elected to grant review committees or to be eligible for the position of principal investigator (PI).

The integration of formerly independent institutions in universities also influenced the replacement of the elite. A number of researchers who were only partly involved in teaching students prior to the integration began to run departments of sociology at universities in the mid-1990s.

At that time, some scholars who had received their PhDs in Western Europe joined the academic elite as well. In the late 1990s, to facilitate a more rapid replacement of the academic elite, the existing system of two levels of doctoral degrees (Dr. and Dr. with habilitation degree) was replaced with that of a single doctoral degree that enables younger scientists to obtain administrative and academic positions at universities and institutes more quickly. Currently, great emphasis is placed on the preparation of PhD students.

New institutional structures

The main feature of the transformation of the institutional environment of Latvian science was the liquidation of the system of control that the Latvian Academy of Sciences exerted over the scientific institutes. The Institutes became independent from the Latvian Academy of Sciences. Since February 14, 1992, the Latvian Academy of Sciences has functioned as an association of scientists and acts as a non-governmental organization. The main aims and tasks of the LAS are: taking an active part in establishing Latvian science policy and advising the government on scientific issues; promoting the publishing of scientific literature, developing scientific terminology, and maintaining scientific standards; organizing congresses, conferences, discussions, and competitions and popularizing scientific achievements; maintaining international contacts of Latvian scientists; and protecting, maintaining and perfecting research ethics, discussion principles, and traditions. At the same time, the LAS is not authorized to distribute state science budget funds.

The structure of research centers also changed fundamentally, not least because of a lack of resources that led to the liquidation of many facilities at universities, companies, and government agencies. In addition, privately run research centers began to emerge, many of which conduct marketing research in addition to sociological work. Academic research centers, institutes run by universities, and private research centers owned by Western companies all regularly take part in competitions to carry out research projects for state and international organizations. Academic sociologists are oriented more frequently toward analytical research, while private companies tend to do public opinion surveys.

Most of the leading sociologists at Latvian universities have created their own private centers or collaborate with such research centers. Thus, possible conflicts between centers run by universities or private companies have been avoided. Both kinds of centers are also eligible to receive research grants from the Latvian Council of Science.

The Latvian Council of Science funds research projects at six sociological institutions. Among the largest scientific sociological centers in Latvia is the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, University of Latvia, which receives more than half of the Latvian Council of Science grants. Four of the nine doctors of sociology who are active in Latvia at this time are affiliated with the institute. The institute's sociologists can handle the most complex research projects, and they offer high-quality analysis of research results.

Four private companies are currently actively doing public opinion surveys: the Baltic Data House, Latvian Facts, Socially Correlative Data Systems, and the Baltic Studies Center. Specialists from these companies prepare research projects for clients in Latvia and other countries. By and large, these centers have valuable collections of data and good international contacts as well. The quality of the research done by both universities and private companies is pretty much the same. The level at which these resources are used, however, is not always satisfactory.

Baltic Data House is the largest center for market and social research in Baltic States and an affiliate organization of one of the leading research companies in Europe, Taylor Nelson Sofres. BDH serves more than 200 clients and provides information necessary for marketing and management decisions, as well as public administration. In 2001, BDH carried out more than 120 research projects. In 1993, in collaboration with Finnish Gallup Media, BDH founded a company named Baltic Media Facts. In 2000, building on one of BDH's academic and social research department, the Institute of Social Sciences was established. Its major research areas are public policy analysis, analysis and evaluation of public information campaigns, and comparative sociological studies.

The national policy for the development of social sciences is oriented toward integrating the national research potential in higher education by implementing general and sectoral integration plans and agreements. Practically, this means incorporating individual research institutions and their scientific staff in universities.

In September 1990, a new class of sociology students was accepted at the University of Latvia. Unlike the previous era, when sociology students majored in philosophy and specialized in their field only during the last two years of study, current training programs correspond to the curricular structures characteristic of Western European universities. Two other public institutions, the Academy of Culture and the University of Agriculture, also have undergraduate sociology students. All sociology programs must be accredited by a commission of experts that consists of two representatives from universities in Western Europe and one representative of a university from the Baltic States. Successful accreditation allows universities to issue diplomas that are recognized abroad.

Demand for sociologists in Latvia is not that high, and therefore, after graduation, most sociology students find jobs in the state administration or other organizations. But these people typically can use sociological research methods, which are in demand.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

Revival and adaptation of major pre-war traditions

Most works in the pre-war period were theoretical rather than empirical, but the predominant trend now is quite the opposite (there have been some exceptions – Ozhiganov 1986, Bankovskaja 1991). So there is no continuation of pre-war traditions. Some themes of academic discussions partly overlap (formation of identities, ethnic conflicts, relationships between civic society and the state), but sociologists seldom utilize the ideas that were dominant in the pre-war period. Nonetheless, a certain continuation in the development of sociology can be discerned in that most contemporary sociologist were students in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Latvia. And even now, considerably closer bonds are being developed among sociologists and philosophers due to their joint work in one institution, which is closer than in other countries.

New East-West asymmetries

The cooperation partners for Latvian social scientists changed in the 1990s. Before the 1990s, there was good cooperation with Baltic and Russian social scientists. Since then, these contacts have narrowed and become irregular. Nonetheless, with more frequent involvement in various research projects and conferences abroad and thanks to the new opportunities to obtain the results of studies done in other countries, Latvian sociologists now have more chances to obtain needed information and insights about social processes in other Central/Eastern European countries than they did under Soviet rule. Except for some isolated cases, however, most joint research projects carried out by sociologists from these countries do not receive Western financial support. The only exceptions have been some joint projects between Latvian and Polish sociologists, e.g. Vladimir Menshikov from the University of Daugavpils cooperated with researchers from Maria Skłodowska-Curie University (Lublin) and Nicholas Copernikus University (Toruń) on the sociology of finances.

Latvian sociologists regularly participate in significant international projects and most have spent time at Western research centers preparing collective monographs with foreign colleagues. The following projects should be mentioned specifically: the International Social Survey Program (ISSP, Latvia has participated in this program since 1995); Paths of a Generation (a longitudinal project involving people who graduated from high school in 1983, countries from the former Soviet Union participate in this project); the World Values Survey and European Values Survey; Democratic Consolidation in Central and Eastern Europe: Civil Society and Democratic Orientation; Making Agriculture Sustainable: The Role of Farmers Networking and Institutional Strategies (a European joint research project funded by European Commission DG XII/SEER, Socio-Economic and Environmental Research Program); and the UNESCO project, the Management of Social Transformation (MOST). Latvian researchers have also participated in the Central and Eastern European Barometer (CEEB) program, as well as other major research projects.

International research contacts have been established largely on the basis of Latvian sociologists' participation in international conferences and seminars. Each year, Latvian sociologists present papers at between 20 and 30 such events. Several Latvian sociologists have lectured at foreign universities. At the same time, many Western sociologists take part in projects directed by Latvian sociologists.

A number of full text databases, as well as sociological journals and monographs, are available to students, though limited due to financial constraints. In their studies, students mostly use works published in English, not in Latvian. Until very recently, none of the Western sociology textbooks had been translated into Latvian. Some local textbooks are available to students, but they serve only as an introduction to basic concepts and terms in sociology. With the financial support of the Soros Foundation – Latvia, some works have been translated into Latvian, i.e., Jean Baudrillard, Michel Foucault, Anthony Giddens, Erving Goffman, Anthony D. Smith, etc.

Quantitative vs. qualitative approaches

Generally speaking, there has been a good balance between the use of qualitative and quantitative analysis methods, but there has not been as good a balance between applied and theoretic research (Bankovskaja, 1991). This may have a negative effect on the quality of research in the near term.

A broad range of methods is used in qualitative research projects, including autobiography, the analysis of life stories, and public and private documents (Tisenkopfs, 1993; Zirnite, 2001). In-depth interviews and focus group discussions are carried out in the course of research. Latvian sociologists seldom use observation in gathering empirical data.

Basically, questionnaires approbated in other countries are used in quantitative research, so that the data obtained in Latvia can be compared with the data obtained by social scientists in other countries. This eases the interpretation of the data and the elaboration of the resulting conclusions. SPSS for Windows is the software program most used in data processing.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Choice of themes

The national policy for the development of social sciences is to orient the Latvian social scientists' potential toward national priorities and to stimulate researchers' more active involvement in solving current economic, cultural, and social problems.

In Latvia, socio-economic research projects are funded by a number of international organizations (the United Nations Development Program, the World Bank), various ministries and their affiliated organizations, and the Latvian Council of Science. Sociological research projects financed by the Latvian Council of Science tend to focus on issues related to the transformation of Latvian society in the post-Communist era. This includes research on social structure and the dynamics of social change (Tabuns, 1998c), the background of new economic, socio-political relations and social stratification (Dobelniece, 1997; Trapenciere et al., 2000), the emergence of new social groups, ethnic processes, and national relationships (Dribins, 1994; Karklins and Zepa, 1996; Tabuna, 1997; Vebers, 1996; 2000; Ezera, 1999; Tabuns, 2001), attitudes toward national, regional, and European integration (Broks, Tabuns, and Tabuna, 2001; Tabuns and Tisenkopfs, 2001), the mobility of young people and their integration with social structures (Tisenkopfs, 1995a; 1995b; Koroleva, 1995; 1997a; 1999; 2001), and the employment and life quality of women (Tabuns and Vanaga, 1999; Broks, 1999; Koroleva, 1997; Zarina, 1995).

Research on the society's institutional reforms is being done in connection with the establishment of a democratic system of politics (Broks et. al., 1997; Lakis, 1997; Tabuns, 1998) and citizens' involvement in the political process (Tabuns and Tabuna 1999; 2000; Zepa 1997; 1999a; 1999b; Karklins and Zepa, 2002; Vebers, 1998). Research is also being done on the international integration of Latvian science, as well as on qualitative and quantitative changes that have been occurring in science as a social institution (Tabuns, 1997; 1998b; Trapenciere, Ashmane, and Krutskih, 1994). Research on social policy seeks to analyze balanced agricultural policies (Tisenkopfs, 1998b; 1999a; 1999b) and public policy (Tisenkopfs, 2001b; Eglite, 1995; Menshikov, 2001).

Several grants have also been awarded to conduct research on the agents of social change. Research is being done on the establishment of new social identities (Tisenkopfs, 1995a; 2001; Zepa, 1997; 1998; Tabuns, 2000), the hereditary nature of traditions (Broks, Tabuns, and Tabuna 2001), the role of historical memory (Skultans, 1997; Tisenkopfs, 1993; Zirnite, 2001; Broks et al., 2001a), and present-day strategies of action (Tisenkopfs, 1995a; 1997).

Limited amounts of research are being done on ethno-sociology; the sociology of youth and education; social structure and social change; the sociology of rural and regional development; the sociology of politics; deviant behavior and criminology; gender and family sociology; the sociology of science; social anthropology; the sociology of mass communications, social policy and social work; and the sociology of the environment and of cities. Lack of money hinders work on sociological theory and history; the methodology of sociological research work; industrial and economic sociology; the sociology of lifestyles and culture; the sociology of organizations and social administration; and the sociology of religion.

From 1998 to 2001, one of Latvia's leading sociologists, Talis Tisenkopfs, was the chief editor of the *Latvia. Human Development Report* (2001b; 1999c; 1998a). Many Latvian sociologists were involved in this project. Thanks to this collaboration, it was possible to include a broad spectrum of themes in the series of reports: public policy processes, globalization, and the role of the individual, the state, and the private sector in human development.

On a regular basis since the beginning of 1991, private research centers have carried out public opinion surveys in which respondents are asked to evaluate social and economic aspects of the development of the Latvian state, privatization, and macroeconomic policies (Baltic Data House, www.bdh.lv). Through collaboration with the International Social Survey Programme and funded by the Latvian Council of Sciences, eight research projects have been carried out in Latvia on topics including national identity, the role of government, the family and changing gender roles, religion, inequality, the environment, and social relations and support. These studies have allowed researchers to do comparative analyses of the processes in Latvia (Zepa, 1999a; 1999b; Tabuns, 2001).

Scholars have been very interested in analyses of identity formation in the Latvian population for one important reason: Latvia is the most ethnically divided country in Eastern Europe. A number of surveys demonstrate that there are marked differences in the ways various sectors within the Latvian population develop identification with an ethnic group, the state, and the political regime. Work on these issues has been based on data from several different studies carried out between 1991 and 2001. Some of the studies overlapped with those carried out in political science, others with the sociology of culture.

These studies have focused on several facets of the problem. Some have focused on the formation of new national, state, and regime identity in Latvia, as well as the links between political and ethnic pluralism. This has included analysis of the role of ethnicity in political mobilization during transition to democracy and the various manifestations of ethnicity in self-consciousness, attitudes, behavior, ideology, and politics (Tabuns, 2001; Vebers, 1996; Zepa, 1997).

There has also been comparative research on national identity characteristics in Latvia and other European countries. This research has attempted to assess the most important similarities and differences in identities on the social and demographic group and national levels (Tabuns, 2001; Zepa, 1998). Researchers have also investigated the Latvian population's attitudes toward regional and European integration and analyzed the factors that influence links between Latvia and other European countries (Tabuns 2001; Tisenkopfs 2001a).

Studies of nationalism and ethnicity have been carried out on four different levels of investigation: first, the individual and biographical level of identity formation, change, transition, and reconstruction throughout the life course; second, the analysis of how identities find expression in concrete social situations and contexts; third, the study of identity as a set of codes, meanings, and stereotypes; fourth, the analysis of links between dominant institutional frames and widespread identity forms in Latvia and the exploration of what kinds of collective experience are likely to have impact on judgments of identity.

Latvian sociologists have also investigated the formation of children's ethnicity, respondents' opinions about typical traits of Latvians and non-Latvians and their ethnic stereotypes, the typical structure of inter-ethnic networks, the causes and consequences of various patterns of inter-ethnic networks, respondents' attitude to inter-ethnic relations in Latvia, non-citizens' attitude toward citizenship, links between the development of the market economy in Latvia and identity formation, individuals' participation in the social and political processes of society, the problem of alienation, how the pressure of local and global factors influences the formation of national identity and changes "system-self" relations, and problems that impede the integration of society (Tabuns, and Tisenkopfs, 2001; Tabuns and Tabuna, 1999).

Most researchers argue that identities are constantly challenged, negotiated, reconstructed, and maintained. They think that identities are not a relatively fixed set of traits of an individual, but that there is not merely a single, "real" national identity of the Latvian people.

The impact of thematic orientations on institutional structures

For the most part, Latvian sociologists are involved in carrying out short-term projects, so they are frequently compelled to shift their research themes and expertise. This “re-tooling” of sociologists is further fueled by the fact that the state or its affiliated institutions occasionally commissions research projects in fields in which Latvian sociologists have no prior experience. Sociologists affiliated with various institutions and universities frequently join projects with ever-changing research tasks. And many sociologists occasionally take simultaneous part in several projects whose research objectives are unrelated. As a result, the institutional structure of Latvian sociology has become amorphous. On the one hand, the low level of specialization may occasionally have a negative impact on the quality of research. On the other hand, in many instances the breadth of sociologists trained in such a manner offers a broader and deeper perspective on social reality than their colleagues who specialize in a narrow theme.

Private vs. public funding

The system of financing scientific research also changed in Latvia. In the old system, scientific institutions received financing; but these days, grants for specific projects are much more the norm. The principal investigator (PI) of a proposed project submits a request to the Latvian Council of Science, and grants from the Council go to projects that are given high ratings in an independent expert review process.

But for the most part, the grants financed by the LCS cover only researcher salaries and rent, because the LCS’ resources are not sufficient to cover the other expenses of a research project. Basically, this means that a researcher himself must seek necessary funding. In most instances, researchers get these resources from funds and scientific programs in other countries (Soros Foundation, the 5th Framework Programme of the EU, etc.) or by taking part in applied research projects financed by state government or institutions affiliated to it. At the moment, Latvian sociologists do not receive funds for social analyses from private sources.

5. Public space and academic debates

Debated themes, problems, methods

Latvian sociologists conduct academic debates very rarely, primarily because most of them are overburdened with their own projects. The largest public debate was devoted to the identity problem, but only a few sociologists participated in it. Public attention has also been drawn by regular conferences organized by the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology on democracy and ethno-politics (Vebers, 1998, 2000). Latvian sociologists have also organized a series of theoretical seminars. Unfortunately, the Latvian Sociological Association (Latvijas sociologu asociacija, LSA) did not become a center of cooperation among sociologists. At the moment, the LSA plans to pay more attention to improving the quality of sociological research and cooperation among sociologists, as well as between sociologists and society.

Unfortunately, cooperation between sociologists and national government agencies and organizations is far from ideal in Latvia. Nor have sociologists managed to develop good relationships with local government. Nonetheless, sociologists were involved in the preparation of several important documents, including the National Development Plan, the state program Social Integration in Latvia, and the Latvian Poverty Reduction Strategy. And the mass media have had a very friendly attitude toward sociologists, who have been afforded much opportunity to comment on the social and political situation. Sociologists frequently publish their articles in the leading newspapers and journals. As a result, public trust in sociology has increased during the last several years.

Principal academic journals

Approximately 30 scientific articles are printed each year in Latvian publications. Articles by Latvian sociologists also have received regular exposure in Latvian sociological and humanities magazines, such as *Latvijas ZA Vestis* (Proceedings of the Latvian Academy of Science, Part A) and *Humanities and Social Sciences: Latvia*. Research reports from the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology and from the Baltic Data House have also aroused the scientific public's interest. The limited number of potential authors and readers discourages the publication of an academic sociological journal.

The Latvian Council of Science also provides support for the publication of scientific books (sociologists wrote several books in the mid-1990s) and the development of on-line sociology courses.

Selection of publications in world languages

During the 1990s, Latvian sociologists published several articles in international journals, while countless articles were printed in social science books that were published in other countries in English, Russian, Polish, Finnish, German, and Swedish. English was the predominant language of international publication.

New manuals, databases

In October 1996, the Latvian Social Science Data Archive (LSZDA, www.lszda.lv) was funded. The Archive's objectives are cultural and historical (the acquisition and long-term preservation of standardized and highly-processed social science data describing Latvia or social investigators who study Latvia), social (the facilitation of the development of Latvian social science, the provision of open and equitable access to the results of researches, and the dissemination of data and documentation), scientific (making data easily accessible for secondary analyses, increasing the quality of researches and the credibility of research results), educational (providing an informational base for teaching activities in social sciences), and financial (promoting the better utilization of finance resources allotted to the investigation).

At the same time, the Archive provides Latvia's scientists and other interested persons access to data archives in foreign countries and helps foreign archives, investigators, and other interested persons obtain information about Latvia and our social sciences. The LSZDA's strategic planning took account of future increases in the volume of data and of changes in information technologies, which can influence work with data sets. The LSZDA's current task is to improve its services, to broaden its selection of services by offering users new types of data sets (compiled in Latvia and other regions), and to improve the information in the existing data sets.

6. Views on further development

Conclusion

In my opinion, the development of sociology in Latvia during the 1990s was influenced more by exogenous factors, including non-academic ones, than by factors endogenous to the discipline itself. The funding policy of the Latvian government limited scholars' opportunities to carry out their own research projects. In addition, inadequate stipends for postgraduate students and wages for lecturers made university graduates lose interest in pursuing postgraduate studies. The discontinuation of the Latvian Sociological Association's work is a serious drawback.

Sociology's development was also considerably influenced by Latvian sociologists' greater involvement in international projects. Social demand for empirical studies and the subject matter of these studies was largely determined, not by national institutions, but by international organizations. Scholars who were unable to join international projects had limited opportunities to find funding to pursue their own research. Not only their own colleagues, but also the mass media and scholars from different countries could evaluate the qualifications of Latvian sociologists. Only by winning their recognition and trust have Latvian sociologists been able to claim their place among the academic elite.

Further development

The main steps that need to be taken to improve the quality of research are:

- scientific and educational institutions need to be integrated, and high-quality teaching resources must be developed;
- standardized requirements must be developed for survey samples and their selection; a unified system of coding demographic parameters must be developed; and standards of describing research projects must be elaborated;
- unified terminology must be developed;
- a code of ethics must be adopted to govern sociological and market research, and a system must be developed to supervise observance of this code;
- public and academic debates must be facilitated that ensure the circulation of sociological (and social) knowledge both in academic milieu and in society as a whole; and
- a system of independent expert analysis must be established.

The development of students' scientific abilities must be facilitated, and students must be involved in actual research projects. Student participation in conferences and seminars in Latvia must be supported, and steps must be taken to make it easier for students to participate in events for young scientists. The bulk of the effort, however, must be devoted to creating conditions that allow students to prepare better bachelor's and master's theses.

At the same time, work must be done to develop better teaching materials – both textbooks and ancillary literature, as well as electronic teaching software that would let students do work with actual bodies of data. Specialists have developed a list of the foreign books whose translation is most urgent if students are to learn about the best examples of sociological thinking.

The development of the social sciences at this point is greatly hampered by terminology problems. To resolve this problem, a dictionary of sociology is being prepared. A smaller explanatory dictionary, meant for schoolchildren, has already been prepared (Zepa and Zobena, 1996).

Data standardization and harmonization is a very crucial issue in Europe right now, and Latvia must deal with these questions, or opportunities for data comparison will disappear very quickly.

Proposals have been developed for a code of ethics for Latvian sociologists. Efforts must be undertaken to ascertain that all organizations conducting sociological or market research in Latvia give official recognition to the code. This would not only improve relations between data users and donors, it would also help achieve better links among the organizations engaged in this kind of research. A generally recognized code of ethics would serve as a control for those persons whose research quality is not up to snuff. The acceptance of data in the social sciences archive will become an important indicator of the quality of an organization's data and of the organization's willingness to submit to external control.

There is an urgent need to establish a neutral institution of expertise to provide expert analysis of data quality for any and all data users.

References

Asmane, Maija, Fismeistare, Daina and Vilcins, Talivaldis: (1977): *Sociologiskie petijumi. Organizācijas un metodikas jautajumi* (The surveys. Organization and methods), Riga;

Bankovskaya, Svetlana (1991): Enviromentalnaya sociologija (*Environmental Sociology)*, Riga;

Birkerts, Peteris (1921): *Zociologija, 1.sej, Zociala statika* (Sociology, Vol. 1, Social Static), Riga;

Broks, Janis, Ozolins, Uldis, Ozolzile, Gunars, Tabuns, Aivars and Tisenkopfs, Talis (1997): "The Stability of Democracy in Latvia: Pre-Requisites and Prospects", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 4, No. 13 (96); Vol. 1, No. 14 (97), Riga, University of Latvia, 103-134;

Broks, Janis (1999): "Labour as a Value in a Transitional Society", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 1, No. 22, Riga, University of Latvia, 49-71;

Broks, Janis, Tabuns, Aivars and Tabuna, Ausma (2001a): "History and Images of the Past", in: *National, State and Regime Identity in Latvia*, Tabuns, Aivars (ed.), Riga, 42-91;

Broks, Janis, Tabuns, Aivars and Tabuna, Ausma (2001b): "National and Regional Integration", in: *National, State and Regime Identity in Latvia*, Tabuns, Aivars (ed.), Riga, 173-200;

Dobelniece, Signe (1997): "Poverty in Latvia During the period of Transformation", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 4, No. 13 (96), Vol. 1, No. 14 (97), Riga, University of Latvia, 199-212;

Dribins, Leo A. (1994): "Nation State and Its Ethnic Policies", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 2, No. 3 (94), Riga, University of Latvia, 70-93;

Eglite, Parsla (1995): "Family Policy During Transition Period", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 2, No. 7, Riga, University of Latvia, 28-47;

Ezera, Ligita (1999): "The Development of Ethnic Assimilation in Latvia in the 1990s", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 3, No. 24, Riga, University of Latvia, 83-96;

Karklins, Rasma and Zepa, Brigita (1996): "Multiple Identities and Ethnopolitics in Latvia", in: *American Behavioural Scientist*, Vol. 39, No. 8, 33-45;

Karklins, Rasma, and Zepa, Brigita (2002): "Political Participation in Latvia 1987-2001", in: *Journal of Baltic Studies*, Vol. XXXII, No. 4, 334-347;

Koroleva, Ilze (ed.) (1997): *Invitation to Dialogue: Beyond Gender (In)equality*, Riga, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Latvian Academy of Sciences;

Koroleva, Ilze and Rungule, Ritma (1997): "Old Education in New Circumstances", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 4, No. 13 (96), Vol. 1, No. 14 (97), Riga, University of Latvia, 213-236;

Koroleva, Ilze, Rungule, Ritma, Sebre, Sandra and Trapenciere, Ilze (1999): *Latvijas jaunatnes sociologiskais portrets* (Sociological portrait of Latvian youth), Riga;

Koroleva, Ilze and Rungule, Ritma (2000): *Narkotiku lietosanas uzsaksanas motivacija jaunatnes vidu Rigas pilsetas izklaides vietas* (Motivation to Start Drug Use among Youth (within Riga City Entertainment Places), Riga;

Koroleva, Ilze (ed.) (2001): *IT laikmets: Jaunatne un socialas izmainas* (IT Century: Young People and Social Changes. International Conference Proceedings), May 3-5, 2001, Riga, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology;

Lakis, Peteris (1997): "Mechanisms for Establishment of a Political Elite in Post-communist Societies", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 4, No. 13 (96), Vol. 1, No. 14 (97), Riga, University of Latvia, 199-212;

Menshikov, Vladimir (2001): "The Advent of Participation in Public Policy", in: *Latvia. Human development report 2000/2001. The Public Policy Process in Latvia*, Riga, UNDP, 75 – 104;

Ozhiganov, Edvard (1986): *Politicheskaya teoria M. Vebera. Kriticheski analis (M.Weber's Political Theory. Critical Analysis)*, Riga;

Rungule, Ritma, Pranka, Maruta and Trapenciere, Ilze (1998) "Bright Sides of the Transition Overshadowed by New Social Problems", in: *Public opinion on social problems*, Moskalewicz, J. and Tigerstedt, C. (eds.), Helsinki, Public Opinion on Social Problems; NAD publication, No. 36, 43-67;

Skultans, Vieda (1997): "Theorizing Latvian Lives: The Quest for Identity", in: *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, Vol. 3, No. 4, London, 761-780;

Tabuna, Ausma (1997): "Migration in Latvia and the Attitude of Residents toward Immigrants", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 4, No. 13 (96), Vol. 1, No. 14 (97), Riga, University of Latvia, 135-147;

Tabuns, Aivars (1997): "Sociology in Latvia: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 4, No. 13, Vol. 1, No. 14, 7- 63;

Tabuns, Aivars (1998a): "Transformation Risks - The Experience of Disintegrated Societies", in: *Central and Eastern Europe Continuing Transformation*, Genov, Nikolai (ed.), Paris - Sofia, UNESCO-MOST, 88-103;

Tabuns, Aivars (1998b): *Social Sciences and the Challenge of Transition – Latvia. Workshop on Social Sciences and the Challenge of Transition. Council of Europe. Compendium of National Reports* (Provisional Version), DECS/EDU/HE98/1Prov, Strasbourg, 25 May 1998, 83-207;

Tabuns, Aivars (ed.) (1998c): *Sabiedribas parmainas Latvija* (Social Changes in Latvia), Riga, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Baltic Studies Centre, Jumava;

Tabuns, Aivars and Vanaga, Sanita (1999): "Labour Market in Latvia: Employment and Unemployment", in: *Unemployment Risks and Reactions*, Genov, Nikolai (ed.), Bonn - Sofia, UNESCO-MOST, 230-252;

Tabuns, Aivars and Tabuna, Ausma (1999): "Estranged Europeans - Sociological Investigation of Latvian Society", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 1, No. 22, Riga, University of Latvia, 4-35;

Tabuns, Aivars and Tabuna, Ausma (2000): "Globalization and Development of Democracy in Latvia", in: *National Identity and Vision of Europe. Annales of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts*, Vol. 28, No. IX., Riga, 58-78;

Tabuns, Aivars (ed.) (2001): *National, State and Regime Identity in Latvia*, Riga, 271;

Tabuns, Aivars and Tisenkopfs, Talis (2001): "Attitudes towards European Integration", in: *National, State and Regime Identity in Latvia*, Tabuns, Aivars (ed.), Riga, 201-227;

Tisenkopfs, Talis (1993): "Perceptions of Ethnicity in Latvian Childhood Memories", in: *Childhood. A Global Journal of Child Research*, No. 1, 110-118;

Tisenkopfs, Talis (1995a): "Youth in Latvia: Identities and Mobility in a Transitional Society", in: *Values and Post-Soviet Youth. The Problem of Transition*, Tomasi, Luigi and Milano, Franco Angeli (eds.), 116-140;

Tisenkopfs, Talis (1995b): "Search for the Center in a Peripheral Society: A Case Study of Youth Identities in Latvia", in: *Nordic Journal of Youth Research,* No. 3, 2-19;

Tisenkopfs, Talis (1997) "Young People and New Capitalism", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 4, No. 13, Vol. 1, No. 14, Riga, University of Latvia, 167-198;

Tisenkopfs, Talis (ed.) (1998a): *Latvia Human Development Report 1998. The Role of the Individual, the State and the Private Sector in Human Development*, Riga, UNDP;

Tisenkopfs, Talis (1998b): "Post-Collectivist Farmers as Social, Economic and Political Group", in: *Actors on the Changing European Countryside*, Granberg, Leo and Kovach, Imre (eds.), Budapest, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 131-143;

Tisenkopfs, Talis (1999a): "Rurality as Creative Field: Towards an Integrated Rural Development", in: *Sociologia Ruralis*, No. 3 (39), 411- 430;

Tisenkopfs, Talis (1999b): "Constructed Countryside: Postsocialist and Late Modern Mixture in Rural Change", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 1, No. 22, Riga, University of Latvia, 72-111;

Tisenkopfs, Talis (ed.) (1999c): *Latvia Human Development Report 1999. Globalisation and Human Development in Latvia,* Riga, UNDP;

Tisenkopfs, Talis (2001a): "Globalisation and Peripheral Identity", in: *New Horizons in Sociological Theory and Research*, Tomasi, Luigi (ed.), New York - London - Sydney, Ashgate, 221-255;

Tisenkopfs, Talis (ed.) (2001b): *Latvia Human Development Report 2000/2001. Public policy process in Latvia*, Riga, UNDP;

Trapenciere, Ilze, Asmane, Maija and Krutskih, Janina (1994): "Three Decades of Sociology in Latvia", in: *Eastern Europe in Transition. The Impact on Sociology*, Keen, Mike and Mucha, Janusz (eds.), Greenwood Press, 145-148;

Trapenciere, Ilze (2000): Statistics on Alcohol, Drugs and Crime in Latvia, in: *Statistics on Alcohol, Drugs and Crime in the Baltic Sea Region,* Leifman, H. and Henrichson, N. E. (eds.), NAD publication, No. 37, Helsinki, 93-125;

Trapenciere, Ilze, Rungule, Ritma, Pranka, Maruta, Lace, Tana and Dudwick, Nora (2000) *Listening to the Poor – Social Assessment of Poverty in Latvia*, Riga, Ministry of Welfare of the Republic of Latvia;

Zarina, Inna (1995): "Actual and Desired Family Models in Latvia", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 2, No. 7, Riga, University of Latvia, 48-61;

Zepa, Brigita and Zobena, Aija (1996): *Cilveks un dzive sociologijas skatijuma* (Man and Life in Sociological View), Riga, LU, 208;

Zepa, Brigita (1997): "State, Regime Identity and Citizenship", in: *Social Changes in Latvia*. *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 4, No. 13, Vol. 1, No. 14, Riga, University of Latvia, 81-102;

Zepa, Brigita (1998): "Latvia and Europe: Competing or Congruous Identities. Which identity for which Europe?", in: *Belarussian, Estonian, Latvian and Russian post-cold-War identities in Europe*, Aalborg, University Press, 37-51;

Zepa, Brigita (ed.) (1999a): *Conditions of Enhancement of Civic Participation*, *Academic research report*, Riga, Baltic Data House;

Zepa, Brigita (1999b): "Conditions which Facilitate and Impede Political Participation" (Latvia in Comparison with Norway), in: *Humanities and Social Science,* No. 1, 36-49;

Zirnite, Mara (ed.) (2001): *Spogulis. Latvijas mutvardu vesture* (Mirror. The Latvian Oral History), Riga, Latvijas Universitates Filozofijas un sociologijas instituts, 2001;

Vebers, Elmars (1996): "Ethnic Minorities in Latvia in the 1990s", in: *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, Vol. 3, No. 12, Riga, University of Latvia, 4-28;

Vebers, Elmars (ed.) (1998): *Pilsoniska apzina* (Civic Consciousness*)*, Riga, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Ethnic Studies Center;

Vebers, Elmars, (ed.) (2000): *Integracija un etnopolitika* (Integration and Ethno policy), Riga, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology,;

Vilcins, Talivaldis (1968): *Profesiju prestizs un profesiju izvēle. Vesturiski sociologisks petijums* (Occupational prestige and choice. Historico-sociological investigation), Riga, LPSR ZA Vestures instituts.

Anelė Vosyliūtė

Sociology – Lithuania

Discussant: Vladas Gaidys

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Lithuanian sociologists, representatives of a small scientific community, have produced few analyses of the development of their discipline and of the strengths and weaknesses of results in its different branches. A small number of authors have contributed general overviews (Gaidys and Vosyliūtė, 1995; Gaidys, 1996) or have written on some aspects of sociological investigation (Rapoportas, 1997; Valantiejus, 1995; Kraniauskas, 2001). Lithuanian sociology's pre-war history and its several phases in Soviet times have been described (Vosyliūtė, 1996, 1998, 2000).

Sociology in the socialist period

During the postwar period in Lithuania, Soviet Communist doctrine rejected the scientific heritage and traditions of social sciences of the inter-war period, which were publicly labeled "bourgeois science". The problems of society were represented only through the perspective of "historical materialism". As noted by Vaclovas Bagdonavičius and Palmyra Katinaite (1997: 7), "Soviet Lithuania had to be protected not only from the overall effects of capitalism, dangerous to the whole Soviet empire, but also from some specific attributes conditioned by her own spiritual heritage and historical path. Catholic faith, which the occupational structures failed to subdue, and a strong emigration community, whose relations with the oppressed homeland were never severed completely despite harsh restrictions, constituted two major 'domestic' issues of concern for the Soviets." Philosophy and social sciences were therefore obliged to criticize "harmful bourgeois ideology", the religious worldview and the "reactionary nature of nationalism".

The exclusive approach in the social sciences was to analyze the historical and national aspects of Marxism-Leninism (as the heritage of the country's thought and social movement) as the theoretical background of social theory in the postwar period. Sociology was regarded as an empirical way to prove the theses of socialist thinking. On the one hand, because the Soviet authorities held power alone, this science had an apologetic function, and consequently its research was dependent and lacked neutrality; on the other hand, the development of the logic and creative power of sociology led to new separate projects and approaches.

In the post-war period, sociological research was carried out in the Sociological Research Laboratory (established in 1965 at Vilnius University), the Sociological Research Laboratory in the Kaunas Polytechnic Institute (since 1966), and the Department of Philosophy, Sociology and Law of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences (Institute since 1977). Sociological investigations addressed the social problems of socialist production (mostly in industrial enterprises) and the socialist way of life (Grigas, 1972; 1974) or the creation of social development plans for the collectives and towns (Morkūnas, 1985; Jonaitis, 1980). Later, the national comparative longitudinal research on youth orientations (Matulionis et al., 1983) and other (family, recreation) investigations were started.

Sociology was treated as one of the preconditions for the creation of the "Soviet people's community" – the new way of life in the Soviet Union. But society mostly perceived sociology as an empirical science divorced from ideological ideas. The foundations of sociological writings were the concepts of Marx and Lenin; for example, authors analyzing the popular problem of social activity (a subject permitted by the Soviet authority) used Marx's and Lenin's definition of this phenomenon as "the manifestation of free will". One of the first collective works by

Lithuanian sociologists was the book *Social activity of workers* (Morkūnas, 1977), in which they analyzed the following issues: the theoretical problems of prevailing social activity, historical change in social activity, the development of work and professional activity, the moral encouragement and motives of work, the influence of team spirit on social activity, the socio-psychological features of passivity, and workers' cultural activity and forms of leisure.

The practical work and experience sociologists accumulated enabled them to undertake theoretical research and find solutions. At that time, the first theoretical books on industrial sociology, time budgets, and youth problems were published; and the materials of the Baltic States' and republican conferences of sociologists were also collected and published.

As Gaidys and Vosyliūtė (1994) noted, sociologists' writings in the socialist era were required to stress the concepts of collectivism, a socialist type of personality, and the cult of work and to avoid numerous themes such as religion, politics, and national memory. In the complex of social stratification problems, various groups' statistical differences in living and working conditions (e.g. town versus village and physical versus mental work) were analyzed. But only the horizontal social structure was studied; elite groups were not investigated.

The impact of Western theories

In the Soviet Union, sociology was based on the division between Soviet and bourgeois society. Few Soviet sociologists (only those considered ideologically reliable, not those from national republics) had the chance to analyze Western sociological theories in the scientific centers (Moscow, Leningrad). Translated into Russian, the works of "bourgeois" sociologists, for example the books *Amerikanskaja sotsiologiceskaja mysl* (American Sociological Thinking) and *Sotsiologija segodnia* (Sociology Today) reached Lithuanian researchers only sporadically. It was impossible to use Western knowledge in pure form, because this raised ideological suspicion. Ordinary sociologists were obliged to do mostly empirical research. In every branch of sociology (leisure, work, family, youth), national sociologists took a leaf from the central (Russian) scientists' works (the positivistic paradigm dominated). The latter were regarded as authorities in the methodological and methodical formulation of investigation for national sociologists; sometimes leading sociologists in the centers were regarded as mediators between Western and Soviet sociology experience. Consequently, Soviet sociological thought was compounded of different parts: Marxist-Leninist ideas, some elements of Western theories, and autonomous sociological thinking. Sometimes no one knew the title or origin of some concept or theory; the ideas of social attitude (the authors Znaniecki and Thomas), social values (authors Durkheim and Parsons), the humanization of work (Friedman), and others concepts were used without reflecting on their genesis. Very popular concepts in the field of work sociology, like "job satisfaction", "job motivation", and "work content", were adapted in the usual way "from the West to Russian, later to Lithuanian sociology", as well. In Lithuanian sociology, the use of Western theoretical approaches (functionalism, phenomenology) and theories gradually increased when the political atmosphere became more open and the sociologists themselves became more qualified and their interests broader. The sociologists had some familiarity with the theories (of recreation, leisure, industrial society, consumption, social perception, personality, social conflict) of authors from socialist countries (Jan Szczepański, Eliška Rendlova, Stanisław Czajka, Radovan Richta, Stanisław Widerszpil, Ximena Gliszczynska), since they read journals like *Studia socjologiczne* (Sociological Studies) and *Sociologicky časopis* (Sociological Journal) and some books in foreign languages. After 1980, Lithuanian sociologists were familiar with such concepts as Max Weber's on the organization of bureaucracy, Marx's on alienation, concepts of human relations, adaptation, authority, social structure, and conflict. The theories of Freud, Skinner, and Piaget were used in family sociology, in youth research (Walter Friedrich's concept of disposition), and in education sociology (theories of personality). Tamotsu Shibutani's ideas ("social world", "attitude", "social climate", "delinquent behavior") were very popular (his book "Social Psychology" was translated into Russian in 1969). Russian sociologists' theory of disposition and ideas like the "socialistic way of life" and the " socialistic style of life" were adapted to socialist society from the Western pattern of investigation.

Oppositional activities

The sociology community was divided on lines corresponding to the level of identification with the communist regime. Some sociologists played the role of "controllers" (sometimes they were constrained to do so); social scientists of a different mentality and wider outlook were in opposition. The latter avoided joining the Communist Party; their dissident role consisted of skepticism about the regime and the search for a broader object of investigation (they didn't identify with such a narrow concept of social life as socialism). In the scientific collective, such "unbelievers" were marginal persons, ideologically dangerous ones, "others". Their careers were suspended. Their independent thinking and desire to work in another way were labeled "bourgeois" science and criticized. No social science workers left the country, because control was strong and the desire to live in their native land was great. Memory of the brutal Soviet repressions since 1940 was still alive – it had affected practically every family. Sociologists participated in the distribution of illegal and critical social literature, and they cultivated oppositional reflections on society, but had no hidden writings or manuscripts about socialist reality.

Sociology in the pre-war period

Sociological thought in pre-war Lithuania was often linked to the social and national movements. It appeared after the First World War as a branch of science at Kaunas University and at the Theological Seminary. Sociology reflected on the problems of the nation's economic, social, and political situation and sought and discussed ways to implement social (agrarian, cultural, and educational) reforms in the new state. Some groups of intellectuals discussed and interpreted the issues of society using the concepts of Comte, Marx, Spencer, Darwin, or Morgan. Teaching sociology in institutions of higher education was based on Western sociological ideas and knowledge. For example, the basis for the author of the first Lithuanian textbook *Sociologija*, Kazimieras Šaulys (Šaulys, 1920), was the ideas of the French author Charles Antoine as expounded in his book *Cours d'economie sociale*, which had a Catholic perspective. There was no pure sociological education or profession at that time. Sociology was partly an intellectual expression of and answer to social challenges. The problems of integrating people in the active social life of the independent Lithuanian Republic (1918-1940), the formation of civilized humans, and orienting society toward national meanings appeared to be key concepts. Some sociologists participated as leaders in political and social life, like Jonas Aleksa and Petras Leonas. *Sociology Lectures* (Leonas, 1939) analyzed such categories of sociology as social phenomena, social relations, social value, and some more important contradictions of social life like progress and regression, collective and private ownership, freedom and captivity, morals and immorality, and democracy and autocracy. Leonas based his investigation of theoretical problems on the concepts of Maxim Kovalevskij, Comte, Maunier, Peter Lavrov, Ludwig Gumplowicz, Sorokin, Spencer, Tönnies, Fouillée, and others. His analysis revealed urgent social questions. His concept of society is related to the methodological principles of evolutionism and neopositivism; the construction of his model of society is based on pluralism, social solidarity, and democracy. Kazimieras Paltarokas investigated the history of Lithuanian land ownership and land reform preconditions, and he advocated increasing agricultural productivity. The famous Lithuanian thinker Vydūnas developed a social conception connected with national problems and the spiritual perfection of man. Authors of a social democratic or communist bent analyzed social life, especially the living and working conditions of poor people and workers in villages and in industry.

The social issues related to the stratification of society, social justice, and the improvement of the quality of life were characteristic of the positivist and Catholic thinkers Antanas Maceina, Siman Schulte, and Petras Leonas. Most Lithuanian intellectuals' and sociologists' works critically evaluated capitalist and socialist ideas and doctrines; they were searching for a third, middle, “happy medium” way to develop society.

The search for a “good” society (in a material and spiritual sense) was characteristic of their social ideas. Reflectiveness and a focus on human values, participation in various networks of social life and in the moral development of society, and confronting forms of social injustice made the sociology of that time a kind of moral science.

The development of national sociology and the sociological investigations started by the first scientific generation after World War I were interrupted by the outbreak of World War II. The German and Russian invasions inaugurated a dramatic period of occupation; the life of the nation and scientific work were interrupted. Some sociologists emigrated; others were either forced into Siberian exile or killed. For example, Fabijonas Kemėšis, who investigated national solidarity and the factors of the realization of democracy, was arrested in 1946 and died in a Soviet prison.

In the Soviet era, strong ideological control in the social sciences rendered the use of the ideas of the national sociological heritage unthinkable; reference to theoretical problems of pre-war thinkers was possible only when tied to a critique of their ideas. Directly or indirectly, the tradition of the social democratic approach was transmitted to Soviet sociology. The main representatives of pre-war leftist social thought – Vincas Mickevičius Kapsukas and Zigmas Aleksa Angarietis – devoted many works to the problems of Lithuania’s economic and political situation and to criticism of bourgeois society from the viewpoint of radical leftist ideals.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

The change of paradigms

The decline of the hegemony of the socialist paradigm started in sociology with the period of searching for new transitional theories and diverse and contesting models of understanding. Theoretical eclecticism, pluralism, and competition arose; the maintenance of disciplinary coherence was related to the recognition and integration of diverse and contesting models of understanding and intellectual approaches.

Lithuania’s independence brought radical changes to the environment of social scientific thought and its paradigms. The new structures and features of society demanded a change in sociological research methodology and the rethinking of the subject matter of sociological investigations. The epistemological foundations of science and the theoretical and methodological problems of sociology are analyzed in the journal *Sociologija* (Valantiejus, 1999; see also Grigas, 2001).

Post-socialist Lithuania is involved in a process of democratization, national freedom, economic, social, and cultural reforms, and new reality. Social scientists became the “keepers” of these categories, which reflected people’s new practices, the importance of theoretical discussions on citizenship and democracy, and new social mobilization. Such concepts as “modernization”, “pluralism”, “democracy”, “the nation-state”, “civil society”, “new identity”, and “social change” appeared in sociologists’ analyses and in common use as well. Sociologists expanded their knowledge into entirely new fields; it was their collective attempt to refine and change the identity of this science.

At the beginning of the decade, sociologists’ writings were more descriptive; now their better qualifications are leading them to use in their analyses such concepts as social change (Taljūnaitė 1995), the post-communistic revolution (Šaulauskas, 1998), the gender approach (Juozeliūnienė, 1995, 1996), social mobility, the welfare state, Pierre Bourdieu’s field of power, Anthony Giddens’ theory of structuration, Zygmunt Bauman’s postmodern theory (Grigas, 2001), and others. The concept of the small nation was developed to characterize Lithuania.

Intellectual freedom is characteristic of the young generation of sociologists, which is more open to foreign influences. They pursue more individualistic scientific goals (unrelated to former national achievements, problems, and contradictions), considering only the modern situation. Noticeable is the augmentation of research presenting some theories that are new in the country, but lack factual data and reflection.

The change of elites

Because few people were qualified sociologists, at the beginning of the decade there was no change of elite in our country; only the orientations and problems of investigations changed. In the process of nostrifying the members of the scientific community (the revision of academic degrees and titles obtained in the Soviet period), practically all dissertations were accepted as relevant to an academic title. Few sociologists (mostly leaders) were active members of the communist party in the pre-1989 period, but even during the Soviet period they were not ideological bigots. The sociologists of the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law (since 1995, the Lithuanian Institute of Philosophy and Sociology) played a leading role; members of the younger generation (mostly from universities) were later incorporated in the elite and obtained professional or administrative status.

New institutional structures

The Lithuanian Institute of Philosophy and Sociology is the main and the oldest (opened in 1977) scientific institution addressing methodology and conducting empirical research. The Institute became the most important center of intellectual activity and the place where sociology adopted theoretical and methodological innovations. Later came the process of decentralization; the reconstruction of sociology in this period brought new institutions – departments of sociology at universities and research centers. Structural changes were related to the demand for sociologists in new topics that had been forbidden before (politics, religion, inter-ethnic relations); Western scientists and politicians and state institutions needed empirical data about the real situation. Empirical fieldwork has concentrated in three private public opinion and market research companies and at the Lithuanian Department of Statistics. In Lithuania, there are also some NGOs conducting projects based on empirical research (the Free Market Institute, the Women's Information Center, the Lithuanian Human Rights Center).

Repatriation, new departures

Of the famous social scientists who had emigrated to America after World War II, only Vytautas Kavolis and Antanas Paškus returned to work in Lithuania. A few young sociologists (mainly students and graduates) continue their studies in Europe and America.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

The influence of pre-war traditions

Knowledge of the ideas and development of national sociology did not become available to Lithuanian sociologists until this decade. Familiarity with the national roots of sociology has several effects. First, these roots have a clear symbolic value, if we recognize national sociology as an element of the nation's social and cultural capital (it can help us mobilize efforts for work in the field of sociology). The existence of "fathers" of the discipline affirms the legitimacy of national sociology and is the basis for sociologists' solidarity and commitment. Second, these roots interest some professionals with critical opinions about the level of pre-war sociology. Third, appealing to past authorities extends the real and imagined community of (different generations of) sociologists as participants in similar experience and a common destiny. The images of past sociologist-personalities create models for modern conduct.

The sociological ideas and research orientations of the 19th and 20th centuries were evaluated and analyzed in three volumes on the history of sociology in Lithuania (Vosyliūtė, 1996; 1999; 2000). The prevailing sociological perspectives included positivism, liberalism, and Marxism. Only the decline of the socialist paradigm's hegemony made it possible to restore the national roots of sociology.

Knowledge of the materials of the history of sociology allows sociologists to think about stable features of national society, to understand them, and to investigate socially accepted behavior that occurs repeatedly. These materials, as the memory of various periods of society's development, are the defining features of nationhood and national identity. Current concepts of the nation and nationality are impossible to construct without the ideas and definitions of pre-war authors like Petras Leonas, Stasys Šalkauskis, and Mykolas Riomeris. The fostering of particular worldviews and social ideas is the primary function of the history of sociology. Modern scientific researchers and mass media representatives use the works of pre-war sociologists as challenges in discussions on many social (especially national, political, agrarian) problems of the post-socialist country.

The leaders of modern movements like liberalism, Catholicism, and social democracy are appealing today to the works of the history of sociology: they are searching for their roots and the answer to the question: What ideological and political ideas are applicable and useful today in creating a "good society"?

The monographic approach has deep roots in the heritage of Lithuanian sociology. In Oskaras Kolbergas', Teodoras Narbutas', and Simonas Daukantas' ethnographic descriptions of localities, we can see the first features of the monographic approach. The social monograph of Vitoldas Stanevičius (Vilnius University, 1923), who continued the work of the Polish historian and rural sociologist Franciszek Bujak, was based on participant observation, data from questionnaires, and statistical material on the locality. The history of place, the set of relations, and the forms of life are the main elements of the social monograph. The social space is the construction and outcome of various processes, the result and product of social activities.

Now, using the case study method, the ethnographers, sociologists, and historians in the socio-ethnographical monographs of localities ("Žiobiškis" 2000; "Veliuona" 2001; "Lygumai. Stačiūnai" 2001; "Raguva" 2001; "Musninkai Kernavė" 2002) examine the features of small towns, people's attitudes toward culture, the physical environment, and social life. The renewed interest in localities coincides with the rebirth of national sovereignty, with the tendencies to the decentralization of life, and with the new distribution of social power in the postmodern period. In social praxis, written texts about villages and towns stimulate people's identification with these places, facilitate the rebirth of national memory, and stimulate the understanding of the village or town as a place of authenticity. Such investigation shows the old tradition of the relationship between social, human sciences and geography, which is now reappearing in Lithuania.

New East-West asymmetries

Since 1990, Lithuanian sociologists gradually received the "universal experience" of world sociology and understood that they are part of something greater. The sociologists began to feel stability because they were able to identify themselves with the whole world of the sociological community. They took the entire sociological heritage as a point of reference. Important was the emergent possibility to analyze Western sociological writings, which helped to create independent works. The relations and contacts of the scientific community with representatives of various branches of Western sociology and their active participation in sociological practice ensure the growth of the national discipline; these contacts became a positive factor for the appropriation of new methodological elements that enliven the discipline. However, this also creates a situation in which the national community is constantly borrowing theories and approaches from the West.

This phenomenon could also be perceived as interference in national science, as a kind of "colonization" of Lithuanian social sciences.

Scientific and cultural exchange is very important for the development of social and cultural capital of small countries. But indigenous authors have reason to be worried by foreign competition, because the materials of the imported texts can force them out of the social science and culture field; in the long run this can lead to an erosion of the mother tongue and of domestic culture.

A small country has specific problems in the process of representing its scientific results. For example, texts written in "less important" national languages have less chance of being published, their authors tend to be regarded as second string, and they are accustomed to paternalistic treatment by Western editors.

The changes in sociology and the transition from one situation to another are related to the change of language – from Lithuanian-Russian to Lithuanian-English – accompanying the change in the balance of power after 1989. The English language provided access to Western sociological knowledge and dominates over others. The national language does not have power in intercultural communication with West and East. More intensive participation in sociological events in Europe and the world depends on the possibility of presenting national works in English.

Quantitative vs. qualitative approaches

The tradition of positivistic, empirical, measurement-related sociological research is vital; it is used mostly in public opinion (i.e., election analysis), market research (by private companies), and social research at the Department of Statistics. The quantitative approach (which includes factorial, regression, and statistical analysis) is also used in research on the family, unemployment, youth, and the community. Though this kind of research represents the professional standard of sociology, the state institutions cannot afford to apply this expensive scientific strategy. Trust in the qualitative approach is increasing among young social researchers who want to do deep investigations (for example, in existential sociology), for example using the life history method as recognition of the subject's competence. Informal interview and biography, as qualitative methods, are popular in sociological studies of culture, women, rural communities, identity, etc.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Transition as an object of study

In sociologists' writings, transition is considered an important process related to economic reforms, privatization, the emergence of new institutions, restructuring practices, and the recognition of new social actors. The concept of transition is used alongside the categories of "social change" and "transformation". According to Marius P. Šaulauskas (Dobryninas, 2000, 36), various orientations (toward imitation, restitution, continuation, and innovation) of social change are taking place in Lithuania. Initially, transition toward a new social order meant separation from the hegemonic Soviet Union and moving to national independence and democracy. The problems of transition were deeply analyzed in a monographic book, *Social Changes: Lithuania 1990-1998* (Dobryninas, 2000). In this field, Taljunaite edited four volumes of *Social Studies* that include the most important Lithuanian authors writing on problems of transitional society. It is also important that Western scientists took an active part in preparing these editions: Richard Rose (Strathclyde University) organized five waves of the *New Baltic Barometer* (1993, 1995, 1996, 2000, 2001). The questionnaire of this sociological research, devoted to measuring changes in society, includes more than two hundred indicators.

Public opinion changes are analyzed by Vladas Gaidys (1994, 2000, 2000b) and Danutė Tureikytė.

Choice of themes. The main research areas

Researchers at state institutions have relative autonomy in choosing research themes. The main factors influencing this process are the scientists' orientations and qualification, the fashionability of topics in international sociology, the current demands of various state institutions, and sociologists' ability to participate in the competitions for grants.

After the re-establishment of independence, sociologists' new orientations have been related to problems of the nation and state. Romualdas Grigas (1995) analyzes the situation and role of the nation and of nationhood in the state and in the globalized world. He stresses (1993) the idea of the nation's self-defense, focusing especially on the citizens' inner activity, and of the vital interests and the consolidation of a small nation and state in the process of its integration in the world system. Juozas A. Krikštopaitis analyzes the causes of the decay of trust in the post-totalitarian condition when painful processes of value change take place (Krikštopaitis, 1997). The researcher Lina Astra comparatively analyzed national value types and their features (Astra, 1996). Sociologists characteristically focus on value problems (changes; value conflicts; the manifestation of political, material, and ethnic values) in transition periods (Mitrikas, 1999). The problem of openness is a new phenomenon in post-war Lithuanian philosophical and sociological thinking. The definition of the open society includes the problems of democracy and social identity (Juozeliūnienė, 1993). Very popular objects of Lithuanian sociologists' studies are knowledge of and experience with Western culture. Sociologists take part in research investigating national minorities in civil society and in ethnic processes (Kasatkina, 2000; Motuzas, 2000). What forms of relationship (of emotional depth, moral commitment, social order and authority, esteem for the other, respect for authenticity, social help, and cohesion) are characteristic of modern communities in Lithuania? Modern man is confused by his self-orientation, his desire to articulate his original identity, and his dependency on its confirmation within a community (Karalius, 2000; Grigas, 1996; Grigas, 2000).

In their analyses of the level of religiosity and of religious minorities (sects), sociologists present the changing strength of the role of religion (Juknevičius, 2000); the dynamics of religious values after the fall of socialism were analyzed in terms of such dimensions as church attendance, the importance of religious beliefs and rites, and attitudes towards religion (Žiliukaitė, 2000).

Characteristic norms of evaluation of the country's development are: the possibility of integration in the EU, people's positive or negative attitudes toward the EU and future activities in it, and the stability of the new democracy (as a basis for EU membership). The collection of articles *The Way to Europe* (Krukauskienė, 2000) analyzes some aspects of inhabitants' images and views of the EU. Public opinion centers ("Vilmorus" and "Baltic research") periodically analyze opinions on the EU.

As Irena Šutinienė noted, the attitudes of Lithuanian youth toward European integration are among the most positive and least critical in the Eastern and East-Central European region. The initiators of the international research were Bodo von Borries from Hamburg University and Magne Angvik from Bergen, Norway; the research was carried out in 1993-1996 in 26 European and 2 Asian countries (Krukauskienė, 2000).

The sociology of culture is an important research topic analyzed mostly at the Institute of Culture and Arts. The sociologist and culturologist Vytautas Kavolis (Kavolis 1992; 1994; Valantiejus, 2000) greatly influenced the methodology of investigations in the social and human sciences. The monograph *Sociology of Art* (Gaižutis, 1998) shows the theoretical ideas of the art sociologists and the importance of cultural factors in society. Arvydas Matulionis (2000) studies cultural identity, the evaluation of culture and its values, and the population's cultural needs.

Investigation also focuses on the reforms of the market economy and businessmen's problems in Lithuanian society (Kličius, 2001). Sociologists reflect on the creation of an effective private sector with liberal values as an essential goal of economic reforms in the country and on people's attitudes toward ownership (Taljūnaitė, 1995) and analyze the new social structure (the formation of the middle class and the expression of different social groups), social mobility, and occupational changes (Taljūnaitė, 1999).

The role of various elite groups (political, economic, bureaucratic, public and private enterprise, banking) in society is examined. Kęstutis Masiulis (1997) and Irmina Matonytė (2001) analyze the problems and worldview of the Lithuanian elite.

The orientation of family research changed in the last decade. The sources of the national science of family study and the main methodological and theoretical trends of social and sociological investigations are analyzed in a monograph by Juozas Uzdila (2001). Several sociologists (Stankūnienė, 1997) are investigating new features of the Lithuanian family, households and families (a socio-demographic view), the ethnic composition of families, the child as a value, fertility changes (regulation), support for families, the dilemma of a housewife's status, and value preferences. This research was part of the international project "Population activities unit of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe" in which 20 countries participated in 1989-1995.

Divorces are gaining more acceptance by young people; attitudes toward women who wish to raise children by themselves are growing more favorable. On the whole, material conditions are widely considered significant for successful marriage (Mitrikas, 2000). Family sociology is investigating new topics, for example, the concept of the foster family and the peculiarities of families with disabled children.

Social workers, politicians, and sociologists are devoting much attention to children and the phenomena of childhood. Children are often taken as objects for social, educational, and political projects and interests. Children often serve as emblems of poverty and social decline or as signs of society virtue or irresponsibility. Lithuanian researchers are analyzing childhood as a part of the socialization taking place in our society and in the family (Ona Jacikevičienė, Julija Litvinienė).

Sociologists, especially at the Institute of Labor and Social Research (Aktualūs 1999), are paying attention to rapidly growing unemployment (Gruževskis, 2000). The survey the Institute carried out in 2000 as part of the Lithuanian Labor Exchange project analyzed the characteristics of unemployed youth (Pocius et all., 2001).

Since 1990, new works on urban sociology have appeared: social monographs about Vilnius (Krukauskienė, 1995) and about Vilnius and Kaunas (Krukauskienė, 1997). Since 1990, the authors of urban sociology have increasingly examined the population's way of life, the reorganization of old social structures, social memory, the relationship between the various ethnic groups, social mobility, cultural attitudes, and values. Sociological research in the region of Ignalina Nuclear Power Station (analyzing the risk for inhabitants) has been carried out since 1989 (Čiužas, 1998).

The women's social movement and women's studies (gender research) in Europe and the USA influenced a new feminist perspective in choosing research problems and methods. Traditional epistemologies exclude the possibility that women can be agents of knowledge; gender research takes gender/sex into account as the most significant variable. In the Lithuanian society, we can see the formation of new roles for women (Juozeliūnienė, 1996; 1999; Purvaneckas and Purvaneckienė, 2001) and their changing socio-economic status (Danutė Tureikytė); some researchers (Kanopienė, 1998) stress women's segregation in the labor market and such negative phenomenon as violence against women (Šeduikienė, 1999). A significant orientation of studies of women deals with their existential problems, which are connected to the analysis of women's life stories (Vosyliūtė, 1999).

In Lithuanian society, new styles of life are forming and consumer needs and interests are changing. After long years of ascetic socialist consumption, the beginning of the new era can hardly be imagined without the explosion of consumer "hedonism" or without the development of mechanisms enabling people to satisfy long-restrained needs and desires (Vosyliūtė, 2001).

The impact of thematic orientations on institutional structures

The situation of the social sciences in Lithuania is unstable because reforms in this sphere are still incomplete. Thematic orientations define the character of the activity, profile, and structure of sociological institutions in a country now being re-organized. The structure of university research teams is always shifting, depending on the themes investigated. Leaders' discourse (the thematic orientations they consider) determines institutional structures. For example, the Lithuanian Institute of Philosophy and Sociology was oriented toward such problems as ethno-sociology, social changes, the problems of regions, cities, and identity. As a result of the science reform, a new Institute for Social Studies is now being created whose aim is to harmonize a theoretical and empirical approach and to gather the best productive sociological forces of Lithuania. The Institute's investigations will focus more on social policy – social programs related to diagnosing the quality of life, social transformation, social structure, the standard of living, and demographic problems. This change of thematic orientations was necessary for the survival of sociological institutions under the conditions of a market economy.

Private vs. public funding

The cutting of the state science budget since 1990 was characteristic of many post-socialistic countries. Budgetary resources were sufficient only for the survival of state institutions and their staff, but not for empirical research. A new phenomenon appeared in this decade – financial support for social science by some non-state funds. The Lithuanian Scientific Fund, the Soros Foundation (Open Society Fund – Lithuania), and various Western assistance programs were the main contributors to research projects and academic exchanges processes.

The State Science and Studies Fund of Lithuania has supported many sociological projects (in 1995 the research project *Social, cultural, and educational needs of the Lithuanians living in the neighboring countries*; in 2000, *The social memory of women, The problems of national minorities in Lithuania*, and others) and four conferences (including publication of collections of articles) of the Lithuanian Sociological Society in 1990-2001. Soros' Open Lithuania Fund provided financial support for sociologists to participate in world conferences.

National resources are quite modest and Western funds are playing an important role in sustaining sociology (especially its empirical branch) in Lithuania. This support has been an important factor in the individualization of sociologists, but hasn't helped consolidate their community. "Vertical" relations have intensified instead of "horizontal" ones, i.e., Lithuanian sociologists communicate intensively with Western colleagues, but it is very difficult to get information about projects carried out by Lithuanian colleagues.

5. Public space and academic debates

Sociologists as actors of social change. Debated problems

The broadening of social horizons and the diversification of patterns of economic, political, and cultural life in the country increased the dynamic of change in sociological science. Sociology's relationship with and ideological influence from the Soviet Union declined, and the necessity to be autonomous and to be oriented toward Western scientific standards increased. In the initial period of social transition, the socio-political context dominated in sociology. Together with politicians, sociologists were active participants in creating a new social order whose goal was to help the nation-state to become a respected member of international society.

Some researchers were active participants in the main social and political movement, Sąjūdis (three scientific workers from the Lithuanian Institute of Philosophy and Sociology are signatories of the Independence Act); most investigators welcomed the ideas of a democratic, free society (later on these ideas were their research orientation). Sociologists were active as researchers, too –

they analyzed the participation of leaders and other people in the political events, transformation actions, and changes of attitudes toward the new reality (Lietuva, 1990).

Discussions of national identity, citizenship, political culture, civil society, globalization, and the nation-state are very popular in the mass media and in social analyses. The radically new opportunities emerging in the evolution from a closed to an open society demand sociologists' responsibility; the problem of openness is a new phenomenon in Lithuanian theoretical and sociological thinking (coming from a totalitarian socialist, closed society). The definition of open society tackles the problem of social identity; the examination and experience of Western culture are very popular subjects in Lithuanian sociologists' studies.

After 1990, the restoration of civil society started with the foundation of mass organizations (the re-establishment of societies that functioned before 1940); de-Sovietization closed some large quasi-voluntary organizations and split others into smaller units. New cultural or social societies were established. Many of them stressed national, political, and cultural values. The country's voluntary organizations facilitated the processes of restitution and de-Sovietization and the construction of a democratic, pluralistic society.

Sociologists were involved in new administrative, communicative, and educational structures; they participated actively in the public sphere (the mass media), where new meanings of social change and cultural life were discussed. The writings and the data of sociologists in the virtual space have a chance to influence public opinion and civil society. Journalists; the leaders of social movements, associations, and political parties; and, as experts, sociologists are participating in the creation of an open public sphere. Sociologists debate with representatives of civil society, politicians, and economic actors. Public opinion surveys, questionnaires, and the results of research are discussed in the mass media (newspapers, radio, TV, public conferences).

Sociology (as society's self-knowledge and the possibility of deeper reflection on society's development) in Lithuania is now a hard agent in the struggle against civilizational and cultural backwardness. The significant function of sociology (and social science) in democratic society is to provide people with modern categories of thought, which means the extension of their understanding and activities (being in the network, in circulation, in a variety of changing forms and fashions of behavior, in a variety of perceptions of feelings). The sociological imagination is a very efficient form of self-consciousness that helps the individual to conceptualize himself, especially under the new conditions of the free-market economy and democracy. Seen from another side, sociology can offer individuals a unified view of the world and a factor deleting the peculiarities of dominant traditional thinking from memory.

Under postmodern conditions, it is important for sociologists to define and explore cultural identity (how traditional values, past narratives, the relation between sacred and profane, the modern spirit, and elements of ways of life coexist) and the new challenges of postmodern secularity (the fragmentation or division of the subject, alienation, inconsistency of goals). It is important for society under democratic conditions to understand the social sciences and the role of the scientific community and the media in public debate on social issues. The vocabulary and concepts of the social sciences are becoming one of the ways we perceive, describe, and analyze the world around us. But we can see the influence of some concepts in other spheres; for example, young artists use and embed in their conceptual artworks the postmodern issues of feminism, marginalism, alienation, and space. But we lack comprehensive information about the influence of sociology and other social, human sciences on the way people think and understand human life.

Principal academic journals

Two scientific journals publish sociological papers: *Filosofija. Sociologija* (Philosophy. Sociology), published four times a year by the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences since 1990 and dealing with philosophy, sociology, and demography; and *Sociology*, published four times a year by the University of Klaipeda and Vytautas Magnus University since 1997 and dealing with social theory, sociology, and social philosophy. Publications in world languages: Gaidys and Vosyliūtė

1995; Gaidys 1996; Gaidys 2000b; Juozeliūnienė 1993; Juozeliūnienė and Kanopienė 1995; Juozeliūnienė and Kanopienė 1996; Juozeliūnienė 1997; Juozeliūnienė 1999; Norkus 2001; Rinkevičius 1998; Rinkevičius 2000; Šeduikienė, 1999; Šutinienė 1998a; Šutinienė 1998b; Taljūnaitė, 1995; Taljūnaitė, 1996; Taljūnaitė, 1997; Taljūnaitė, 2000; Vosyliūtė 2001; Žvinklienė 1997, and others.

New manuals, databases

Few manuals have been published to fulfill the demands of teaching sociology in Lithuania (Luobikienė, 1997; Luobikienė, 2000; Matulionis, 2001).

Before 1990, data from investigations were concentrated only at the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law and at the Laboratory of Sociological Research of Vilnius University. The data from the first empirical surveys were held on magnetic tape: later, some of this data was rewritten onto floppy disks, hard disks, and CD-ROMs. Some of the methodological information on the parameters of surveys is irrecoverably lost, since the programs for data entry were changing; at present, much of the information is not accessible for ordinary users.

There is still a lack of well-organized databases for several reasons: 1) Empirical surveys are financed by various institutions, funds, etc., and the scientists participating in research are unwilling to share information with others. People do not want to transmit their data to a center accumulating information, because they don't want others to easily use it ("use one's work"). Other scientists cannot access the data and check conclusions or look for methodical and methodological errors; 2) The creation of a database is complicated and expensive work. Sociologists prefer to conduct new, current research than to employ financial and intellectual resources for depersonalized work.

At present, the creation of databases is not finished; the important centers for gathering data are: 1) the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology (data on values system, social change, regional development, the situation of the family, demographics), 2) the Institute of Labor and Social Research (data on unemployment), 3) the Lithuanian Department of Statistics (data on social indicators of the quality of life), and 4) the bigger private public opinion research centers (Wilmorus, Baltic research), which possess greater resources of information on the evaluation of social changes and social actors.

6. Views on further development

Globalization is influencing the economic and social subsystem; this affects the interpretation of organization, social actions, and the situation of others. Sociologists are responsible for their research analyzing the reaction of social and political institutions and human behavior to globalization. This is a rich field of interest that may increase knowledge and improve both the interpretation of and the methodologies used in the analyses of and research on social phenomena. Scientific relations were extended in two ways: 1) in traditional meetings with foreign sociologists and 2) in increasing anonymous acquaintance with their books and works and with internet information. Academic contacts and cooperation with international research communities made it possible to be conversant with Western countries' research projects and ideas of research and of teaching sociology. Scientific, academic, and educational institutions maintain close relations with the country's research and study institutions and governmental and non-governmental organizations and participate in international projects. There is active cooperation with Latvia (Daugavpils) and a common project with Scandinavia and other countries. Younger scientific researchers or lecturers who spoke English (or German or French) were the first to take advantage of such possibilities.

International cooperation was important not only because it provided Lithuanian sociologists with methodological support and helped them understand new sociological trends, but also because it provided economic support to academia during a hard transitional time (especially from 1990-1995). Lithuanian sociologists got financial support for various studies, grants, scholarships, and possibilities to participate in international conferences, to buy books, etc. Western sociologists sometimes played the role of experts, strict teachers, or "judges" evaluating the situation in Lithuanian sociology.

The training of sociologists at universities was successfully introduced with the help and influence of the Western educational system; the quality of education improved. One problem is the lack of Lithuanian textbooks in general sociology; and in most cases, universities use books by Leonard Broom, Charles M. Bonjean, Dorothy H. Broom's *Sociology*, Peter Berger's *Sociology* translated from English into Lithuanian, and some others. Selected works of Western sociological classics have been translated into Lithuanian: Anthony D. Smith, Benedict Anderson, Ernest Gellner, Peter Berger, Anthony Giddens, and others.

The independent Lithuanian Sociological Society was established in 1989 and now has approximately 120 members. Four LSS conferences were organized in this decade; sociologists analyze the important problems of Lithuanian society in the materials from conferences, which have been presented in Grigas, 1996b and Vosyliūtė, 1998; 2001. In 1992, the LSS was involved in the ISA; the Lithuanian Sociological Association is also a member of the European Sociological Association (ESA). In this decade, a few Lithuanian sociologists participated in every sociological congress and conference abroad – of the ISA, the ESA, and the International Institute of Sociology (34th congress 1999 in Israel, 33rd in Cologne).

Lithuanian sociology is now searching for new orientations (the proliferation of eclecticism is characteristic) and identities; it is always "under construction". Lithuanian social scholarship has tried to develop sociological research and to teach sociology, but new financial limitations have appeared.

Market relations and interest buttressed the reformation of scientific institutions and the new work identities of sociologists. The new historical context led to flux in people's national, cultural, religious, and political identities; new meanings and narratives of belongings that were in hiding because they were dangerous to their holders in Soviet time (expatriates, religious believers, dissidents) brought new issues to public discourse and enriched social investigations. Sociologists' scope to choose their own field of research became more extensive. At the same time, an internal "brain drain" was noticeable; people were able to move from academic work to politics or business careers. The opening of sociology departments at universities provided new opportunities, especially for senior sociologists with academic degrees, some of whom became professors or lecturers. Since the state has limited its subsidies of scientific investigations, teaching jobs now seem more stable and promising for the future to sociologists. Scientific researchers are paid poorly; state subsidies of empirical representative sociological research have been greatly reduced.

The sphere of sociologists' employment has changed: in the Soviet era, sociologists were hired only under the pressure of Communist Party decision, and now the possibilities of working in industrial and agricultural enterprises are reduced; sociologists are hardly ever needed in private business firms, very few of which operate research projects. All the same, the young sociologists are in demand in social practice, in administrative institutions, and in social organizations; in the future, they will be needed as experts even more. Society will need the expertise and scientific authority of sociologists when their qualifications improve and the prestige of the discipline rises.

The modernizing processes in post-socialist Lithuania have not led to a higher degree of social equality; instead, the determining power of social structure is operating as a reproductive mechanism of inequality. New social chances and social positions and the number of individualized orientations in society are increasing. New impressions and possibilities of participation are contributing to a new image of modern society as more open and pluralistic. Increasing flexibility and isolation from traditional sources of security and traditional certainties disorient the individual, who suffers from inconsistency. This situation increases people's self-reflectiveness and the disintegration of society. Sociologists' discussions and works on the processes of personal and collective identity formation are very important.

National science may become mature by integrating knowledge of national attitudes, the character of social relations of locality, and the heritage of international sociology. The intensification of relations among sociologists, the representation of their research projects, the mutual evaluation of their writings, and wholesome competition among theoretical orientations and in the quality of their work are the main criteria to confirm that their community has taken up and is the place for the national sociological discourse.

The future of sociology depends on the development of the educational system, and it ought to influence the quality of studies and scientific research at universities where the staff is young. The state cannot finance empirical surveys, because they are too expensive; empirical studies will concentrate in the private market and at public opinion research centers. Making Lithuania a member of the EU will improve scientific standards, the exchange of ideas, and participation in international projects. Empirical sociological studies will develop in the context of European integration.

The development of sociology is related to the change in its community, which plays an important role in making this discipline attractive for society. The process of creating an informational society and the development of people's intellectual culture will demand more knowledge and reflection about social processes and their roots. Sociologists will be useful in modern society as experts in various spheres and as social leaders, magi, and critics; the prestige of the sociologist will increase and his writings will be regarded as a form of symbolic capital for society.

References

Astra, Lina and Kuzmickas, Bronislovas (1996): *Lietuvių tautinė savimonė* (The Lithuanian National Cousciousness),Vilnius, Rosma;

Aktualūs socialinės politikos klausimai (Actual Problems of Social Politics) (1999), No. 1. Vilnius, Agora;

Bagdonavičius, Vaclovas and Katinaitė, Palmyra (1997): "History of development", in: *Science and art of Lithuania*, Vol. 5, Vilnius, Lietuvos mokslas;

Čiužas, Antanas (ed.) (1998): *Ignalinos AE: žmogus ir aplinka* (The Atomic Energy Plant of Ignalina: A Man and Environment), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutes;

Dobryninas , Aleksandras (ed.) (2000): *Socialiniai pokyčiai: Lietuva 1990/1998* (Social Changes in Lithuania 1990/1998), Vilnius, Garnelis;

Gaidys, Vladas (1996): "Social Sciences and their Empirical Basis in Lithuania in 1984-1994", in: *Social Sciences in Transition*, Bonn, Informationszentrum Sozialwissenschaften;

Gaidys, Vladas (2000a): "Viešosios nuomonės pokyčiai" (The Changes of Social Opinion), in: *Socialiniai pokyčiai: Lietuva, 1990 –1998*, Dobryninas, Aleksandras (ed.), Vilnius, Garnelis, 169-201;

Gaidys, Vladas (2000b): "Attitudes Towards the Economic System in the Baltic States: Past, Present, Future", in: *Streaming Towards Social Stability*, Taljūnaitė, Meilutė (ed.), Vilnius - Tampere, Lithuanian Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, University of Goteborg;

Gaidys, Vladas and Tureikytė, Danutė (1994): *Nuomonės 1989-1994* (The Opinions in 1989-1994), Vilnius, Filosofijos, sociologijos ir teisės institutas;

Gaidys, Vladas and Vosyliūtė, Anelė (1995): "Main Features in the Development of Lithuanian Sociology", in: *Eastern Europe in Transformation: The Impact on Sociology*, Keen, Mike F. and Mucha, Janusz (eds.), Westport Connecticut, London, Greenwood Press;

Gaižutis, Algirdas (1998): *Meno sociologija* (Sociology of art), Vilnius, Enciklopedija;

Grigas, Romualdas (ed.) (1972): *Darbininkas. Gamyba ir laisvalaikis* (Worker. Production and Free Time), Vilnius, Filosofijos, sociologijos ir teisės institutas;

Grigas, Romualdas (ed.) (1974): *Darbininkas ir įmonė* (Worker and Enterprise), Vilnius, Filosofijos, sociologijos ir teisės institutas;

Grigas, Romualdas (1993): *Tautos savigyna* (Self Defence of Nation), Vilnius, Academia;

Grigas, Romualdas (1995): *Tautos likimas* (Destiny of Nation), Vilnius, Rosma;

Grigas, Romualdas (1995): "Sociologiniai tyrimai Filosofijos, sociologijos ir teisės institute sovietiniu laikotarpiu" (Sociological Research in the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law in the Soviet Time), in: *Sociologija Lietuvoje*, Leonavičius, Juozas (ed.), Vol. 5, Kaunas, Technologija, 9-17;

Grigas, Romualdas (ed.) (1996a): *Paribio Lietuva* (The Boarder Regions of Lithuania), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas;

Grigas, Romualdas (ed.) (1996b): *Lietuva socialinių pokyčių erdvėje* (Lithuania in the Space of Social Change), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas, Lietuvos sociologų draugija;

Grigas, Romualdas (1998): *Socialinių įtampų Lietuvoje laukai* (The Fields of Social Tensions in Lithuania), Vilnius, Vilniaus Pedagoginis universitetas;

Grigas, Romualdas (2001): *Sociologinė savivoka. Specifika, metodai, lituanizacija* (Sociological Reflexivity. Specifics, Methods, 'Lituanization'), Vilnius,Vilniaus Pedagoginis universitetas, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas;

Gruževskis, Boleslovas (2000): "Darbas – užimtumo struktūros kaita" (The Work – Change of Employments' Structure), in: *Socialiniai pokyčiai: Lietuva, 1990-1998*, Vilnius, Garnelis;

Jonaitis Vytautas (ed.) (1980): *Šiaulių miesto socialinė raida* (Social Development of Šiauliai Town),Vilnius, Filosofijos, sociologijos ir teisės institutas;

Juknevičius, Stanislovas (2000): "Lietuvių moralinės vertybės: tarp Dievo ir Mamonos" (Moral Values of Lithuanians: Between God and Money), in: *Kultūrologija*, No. 6, Matulionis, Arvydas (ed.), Vilnius, Gervelė;

Juozeliūnienė, Irena (1993): "The Lithuania National Report", in: *Democracy and Local Governance (Ten Empirical Studies)*, Jacob, Betty M. et al. (ed.), Hawaii, Matsunaga Institute for Peace, 105-123;

Juozeliūnienė, Irena and Kanopienė, Vida (1995): "Women and Family in Lithuania", in: *Family, Women and Employment in Central-Eastern Europe*, Lobodzinska, Barbara (ed.), Westport Connecticut, London, Greenwood Publishing Group, 155-165;

Juozeliūnienė, Irena and Vida Kanopienė (1996): "Gender Roles and Identity", in: *Changes of Identity in Modern Lithuania*, Taljūnaitė, Meilutė (ed.), Vilnius, LFSI, 223-240;

Juozeliūnienė, Irena (1997): "Ethnic identities and interethnic identities relations in Lithuania", in: *Regional Contact,* No. 2, 194-206;

Juozeliūnienė, Irena (1999): "Political Systems and Responsibility for Family Issues: The case of Change in Lithuania", in: *Marriage and Family Review*, 28 (3/4);

Kanopienė, Vida (2000): "Užsiėmimų segregacija Lietuvos darbo rinkoje" (Sexual segregation of occupations in the Lithuania labour market), in: *Filosofija. Sociologija*, No. 4, 57-65;

Karalius, Alvydas (ed.) (2000): *Bendruomeniškumas ir savivalda* (Community and Self-Governance), Kaunas, KTU, LFSI;

Kasatkina, Natalija and Leončikas, Tadas (2000): *Lietuvos etninių grupių adaptacijos kontūrai ir eiga* (Context and Process of Adaptation among Ethnic Groups in Lithuania), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas;

Kavolis, Vytautas (1994): *Žmogus istorijoje* (Man in history), Vilnius, Vaga;

Kavolis, Vytautas (1992): *Moterys ir vyrai lietuvių kultūroje* (Men and Women in Lithuanian culture), Vilnius, Lietuvių kultūros institutas;

Kličius, Antanas (2001): "Verslo raida: vingiai ir problemos" (The Development of Business: Windings and Problems), in: *Filosofija. Sociologija*, No. 2, 26-34;

Kraniauskas, Liutauras (2001): "Lietuvos sociologijos istorijos bruožai" (The Features of Lithuanian History of Sociology), in: *Sociologija*, No. 3-4, 5-23

Krikštopaitis, Juozas A. (1997): *Prievartą patyrusių laikysena* (The Attitude of Those Who Experienced Violence), Vilnius, Pradai;

Krukauskienė, Eugenija (ed.) (1996): *Tėvynainiai* (Countrymen), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas;

Krukauskienė, Eugenija (ed.) (1997): *Miestiečiai* (Town-Dwellers), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas;

Krukauskienė, Eugenija. (ed.) (1998): *Kauniečio portretas* (The portrait of Kaunas Dweller), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas;

Krukauskienė, Eugenija (ed.) (2000): *Europos keliu* (On the Path to Europe), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas;

Leonas, Petras (1939): *Sociologijos paskaitos* (Sociology Lectures), Kaunas, Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas;

Leonavičius, Juozas (1996): *Studentai ir laikas* (Students and Time), Kaunas, Technologija;
Leonavičius, Juozas (ed.) (1999): *Sociologija aukštojoje mokykloje* (Sociology in the Higher School), Kaunas, Kauno Technologijos universitetas;
Leonavičius, Juozas (ed.) *Sociologija Lietuvoje: praeitis ir dabartis* (Sociology in Lithuania: Past and Present) Vol. 1 (1991), Vol. 2 (1992), Vol. 3 (1993), Vol. 4 (1994), Vol. 5 (2 books) (1995), Vol. 6 (2 books) (1996), Vol. 7 (2 books) (1997), Vol. 8 (2 books) (1998), Vol. 9 (1999), Vol. 10 (2000), Vol. 11 (2001), Kaunas, Kauno Technologijos universitetas;
Lietuva ir Sąjūdis (Lithuania and the Movement of Sąjūdis), 1990, Vilnius, Filosofijos, sociologijos ir teisės institutas;
Luobikienė, Irena, Guščinskienė, Jūratė, Palidauskaitė, Jolanta and Vaitkienė, Rimgailė (1997): *Sociologijos pagrindai* (Basis of Sociology), Kaunas, Technologija;
Luobikienė, Irena (1998): *Kultūra: sociologinės įžvalgos* (Culture: Sociological Insights), Kaunas, Technologija;
Luobikienė, Irena (2000) *Sociologija: bendrieji pagrindai ir tyrimų metodika* (Sociology: The General Elements and Methods of Research), Kaunas, Technologija;
Masiulis, Kęstutis (1997): *Lietuvos elitas* (Lithuanian Elite), Vilnius, Pradai;
Matonytė, Irmina (2001): *Posovietinio elito labirintai* (The Labyrinths of the Postsoviet Elite), Vilnius, Knygiai;
Matulionis, Arvydas and Taljūnaitė, Meilutė (1983): *Kelio pradžia* (The Beginning of the Road), Vilnius, Filosofijos, sociologijos ir teisės institutas;
Matulionis, Arvydas (2000): "Kultūros vertybių vartojimo savitumas ir dinamika: Menininkų socialinė padėtis" (Use of Cultural Values: Specifics and Dynamics), in: *Kultūrologija*, No. 6, Matulionis, Arvydas (ed.), Vilnius, Gervelė, 434-519;
Matulionis, Arvydas (2001): *Sociologija* (Sociology), Vilnius, Homo Liber;
Mitrikas, Alfonsas A. (ed.) (1999): *Vertybės permainų metais* (The Values in the Time of Changes), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas;
Morkūnas, Zigmantas (ed.) (1977): *Socialinis darbininkų aktyvumas* (Social Activity of Workers), Vilnius, Mintis;
Morkūnas, Zigmantas (ed.) (1985): *Druskininkai: socialinė ir ekologinė raida* (Druskininkai Town: Social and Ecological development), Vilnius, Filosofijos, sociologijos ir teisės institutas;
Motuzas, Remigijus (ed.) (2000): *Tautinės mažumos demokratinėje valstybėje* (The National Minorities in Democratic State), Vilnius, Tautinių mažumų ir išeivijos departamentas;
Norkus, Zenonas (2001): *Max Weber und Rational Choice*. Marburg, Metropolis Verlag;
Purvaneckas, Andrius and Purvaneckienė, Giedrė (2001): *Moteris Lietuvos visuomenėje*, Vilnius, Danielius;
Rapoportas, Sergiejus (1997): "Totalitarizmo laikų sociologija: struktūros ir tekstai" (The Sociology in the Totalitarian Times: Structures and Texts), in: *Science and art of Lithuania*, Vol. 5, Vilnius, Lietuvos mokslas, 121-138;
Rinkevičius, Leonardas (1998): "Lithuania: Environmental Awareness and National Independence", in: *Public Participation and Sustainable Development: Comparing European Experiences*, Jamison, A. and Ostby, P. (eds.), Aalborg, Aalborg University Press;
Rinkevičius, Leonardas (2000): "A case Study of Lithuanian Environmental Policy", in: *Environment and Global Modernity*, Spaargaren, G., Mol, A. P. and Buttel, F. (eds.), London, Sage;
Rinkevičius, Leonardas (2001): "Attitudes and values of the Lithuanian Green Movement in the Period of Transition", in: *Filosofija. Sociologija*, No. 1;
Socialinė adaptacija įmonėje (Social Adaptation in Factory) (1974), Vilnius, Mintis;
Stankūnienė, Vlada (ed.) (1997): *Šeima ir gimstamumas Lietuvoje* (Family and Fertility in Lithuania), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas;
Šaulauskas, Marius (1998): "Postkomunistinės revoliucijos želmenys, iš revoliucinio tarpsnio į postmodernią Lietuvą?" (The Sprouts of Postcommunistic Revolution: From Revolutionary Phase towards Postmodern Lithuania), in: *Sociologija*, No. 2, 77-94;
Šaulys, Kazimieras (1920): *Sociologija* (Sociology), Kaunas, Kazimiero Draugija;
Šeduikienė, Jūratė (ed.) (1999): *Violence against women in Lithuania*, Vilnius, Danielius;
Šutinienė, Irena (1998a): "Lithuania between Regions", in: *Cultural Encounters in East Central Europe*, Junefelt, Karin and Peterson, Martin (eds.), Forskning sradsnamnden;

Šutinienė, Irena (1998b): "Historical consciousness of the ethnic groups in Lithuania and their Integration", in: *Pilsoniska Apzina*, Riga, Filosofijas un sociologijas instituts;

Šlapkauskas, Vytautas (ed.) (1998): *Lietuvos socialinės panoramos kontūrai* (The Contours of Social Panorama of Lithuania), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas, Lietuvos sociologų draugija;

Taljūnaitė, Meilutė (ed.) (1995): *Lithuanian Society in Social Transition. Social Studies*, Vol. 1, Vilnius, Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law;

Taljūnaitė, Meilutė (ed.) (1996): *Changes of Identity in Modern Lithuania. Social Studies*, Vol. 2, Vilnius, Lithuanian Institute of Philosophy and Sociology; Goteborg University;

Taljūnaitė, Meilutė (ed.) (1997): *Everyday Life in the Baltic States*. Social Studies, Vol. 3, Vilnius, Lithuanian Institute of Philosophy and Sociology; Goteborg University;

Taljūnaitė, Meilutė (ed.) (2000): *Streaming towards Social Stability*. Social Studies, Vol. 4, Vilnius, Lithuanian Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, University of Tampere;

Taljūnaitė, Meilutė (ed.) (1999): *Socialinis struktūrinimasis ir jo pažinimas* (Measuring Stratification Structures), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas;

Uzdila, Juozas V. (2001): *Lietuvių šeimotyra* (The Family Research in Lithuania), Vilnius, Vilniaus Pedagoginis universitetas;

Valantiejus, Algimantas (1995): Sociologija kaip intelektualinis projektas (Sociology as Intellectual Project), in: *Metmenys*, No. 69, 80-109

Valantiejus, Algimantas (2000): "Vytauto Kavolio kultūros sociologijos metmenys" (The Features of Vytautas Kavolis Sociology of Culture), in: *Vytautas Kavolis: asmuo ir idėjos*, Kavolienė, Kuolys, Darius and Kuolys, Rita (eds.), Vilnius, Baltos lankos, 139-162;

Valantiejus, Algimantas (1999): "Teorinių prielaidų ir sąvokų sistema J. Alexanderio sociologijoje" (Theoretical and Presuppositional Issues: Defining a Conceptual Core for Neofunctionalism of Jeffrey Alexander), in: *Sociologija*, No. 1/3, 40-56;

Vosyliūtė, Anelė (ed.) (1998): *Socialinės grupės: raiška ir ypatumai* (Social Groups: Expression and Pecularities), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas, Lietuvos sociologų draugija;

Vosyliūtė, Anelė (ed.): *Iš Lietuvos sociologijos istorijos* (From the History of Lithuanian Sociology), Vol. 1 (1996), Vol. 2 (1999), Vol. 3 (2000), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas;

Vosyliūtė, Anelė (ed.) (1999): *Moterys: tapatumo paieškos* (Women: The Search for Identity), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas;

Vosyliūtė, Anelė (2001): "Consumer's society: Feminist dimension", in: *Filosofija. Sociologija*, No. 4, 44-53;

Vosyliūtė, Anelė (ed.) (2001): *Sociologija amžių sandūroje* (Sociology in the Crossing of Centuries), Vilnius, Lietuvos filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas, Lietuvos sociologų draugija;

Žiliukaitė, Rūta (2000): "Religinių vertybių kaita Lietuvoje 1990 – 1999" (Dynamics of Religious Values in Lithuania 1990 – 1999), in: *Kultūrologija*, No. 6, Matulionis, Arvydas (ed.), Vilnius, Gervelė;

Žvinklienė, Alina (1997): "Family discourse. The case of Lithuania and Finland", in: *Everyday life in the Baltic States*, Taljūnaitė, Meilutė (ed.), Vilnius, Lithuanian Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, University of Goteborg.

Janusz Mucha and Paweł Załęcki

Sociology - Poland[1]

Discussant: Zdzisław Krasnodębski

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Polish sociology was already a very well organized academic discipline at the end of the 1920s, thanks above all to Florian Znaniecki. Jan Stanisław Bystroń, Ludwik Krzywicki and Leon Petrażycki should also be mentioned in this context. Of these, only Krzywicki could be called a Marxist. Sociology has been functioning and developing its institutional structure established by Znaniecki until today, albeit with one interruption during World War II and another during the Stalinist period of 1948-1956. At the end of the 1980s, MA programs in sociology were offered by all but two (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin and the Gdańsk University) of the universities existing at that time (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, the Warsaw University, Jagiellonian University in Cracow, the Catholic University of Lublin, the University of Łódź, Silesian University in Katowice, Nicholas Copernicus University in Toruń, Szczecin University, Wrocław University) as well as by the Academy for Social Sciences (Akademia Nauk Społecznych - ANS), a private school run by the ruling Communist Party (Polska Zjednoczona Partia Robotnicza - Polish United Workers' Party).

During the socialist period, public opinion surveys were already being conducted. The Center for Public Opinion Research (Ośrodek Badania Opinii Publicznej - OBOP) was established in 1958 at the state-controlled Committee on Radio and Television in Warsaw. It was very active until the mid-1960s and later during the "First Solidarity" period of 1980-81. The Communist Party's Institute for Basic Problems of Marxism-Leninism (Instytut Podstawowych Problemów Marksizmu-Leninizmu - IPPM-L) had its own survey center in Warsaw between 1974 and 1982. Also in Warsaw, the Public Opinion Research Center (Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej - CBOS) was established in 1982 during the martial law period as a governmental agency. In Cracow, the Center for Media Research (Ośrodek Badań Prasoznawczych - OBP) was established in 1957 as a branch of the Party-owned media umbrella organization Workers Publishing Cooperative PRASA (Robotnicza Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza PRASA). The political authorities completely controlled the research topics, research procedures and dissemination of findings of all those centers. Many books were published based on empirical research of Polish society. However, no really important synthesis summarizing those findings was published in Poland before 1990.

Translations of classic sociological works were published during this whole period. The most important initiative was taken in 1968, when the Polish Scientific Publishers began the edition of the new series "Sociological Library" (Znaniecki founded the old series before the war). About 30 volumes have been published so far, from Durkheim to Merton. Important sociological books, including translations, came out in other presses like Czytelnik and Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy (PIW) as well.

Sociologists maintained international contacts as wide as possible. The Ford Foundation, the Fulbright Foundation, and the American Council of Learned Societies, among others, made these contacts possible. Thanks to them, dozens of scholars spent one year or more in the US after 1956. Cooperation with sociologists from other socialist countries was strictly regulated on the governmental level until the mid-1980s. Poles participated regularly, although in small numbers, in

1 We would like to express our gratitude to Krzysztof Pietrowicz for his help in collecting the data for the CD-ROM.

the ISA Congresses. A larger number of Polish sociologists took part in the Varna (Bulgaria) Congress in 1970. Some Poles were the International Sociological Association ISA's officers: Jan Szczepański was president (1966-1970), Stanisław Ossowski vice-president (1959-1962), and Magdalena Sokołowska vice-president (1978-1982).

The Polish Sociological Association (Polskie Towarzystwo Socjologiczne - PTS), established in 1957, was an island of independent and democratic organization of scholarly activity during the whole socialist period. But the Communist authorities always carefully controlled the programs of its congresses. The decision to held a congress or not was also in the hands of political authorities.

During the socialist period everything, including sociology, was subordinated to the political authorities. Many sociologists belonged to the Communist Party (but the proportion was smaller than in other social sciences). Real Party control over sociology decreased, however, after 1980.

The overrepresentation of Marxism was institutionally enforced. Many works on Marxism were published in an apologetic, rather than critical Marxist spirit. Theoretical research as well as large empirical research projects were politically and financially supported above all (though not solely) when they were carried out in the Marxist framework. Scholars who participated in international sociological debates were supported more willingly if they analyzed other theories in the Marxist spirit, and foreign books in the field of macro-sociology were published with Marxist introductions. Political and ideological control over sociology was particularly severe outside the main academic centers in Warsaw and Cracow, where it ceased to function at the beginning of the 1980s despite martial law. In practice, however, even before 1980, Polish sociology was multiparadigmatic when seen from the point of view of theory and methodology. Many scholars who did not want to be identified with Marxism had been developing the "humanistic sociology" (in the Florian Znaniecki and in the Stanisław Ossowski traditions) or general methodology of social sciences.

Censorship was very harmful for sociological research and publications. Its important consequence was the absence of some topics, like the political organization of society. Due to censorship, publication of translations of Western macro-sociological books was limited to those which did not "jeopardize" socialism in Poland nor question the positive international role of the Soviet Union. However, since 1976, Poland saw what was called "second circulation" of underground publications, which were easily available in academic circles. After the declaration of martial law in December 1981, sociological books and articles appeared in this circulation, one way to evade censorship.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

Many aspects of the transformations that began in 1989 have been widely discussed in the literature. Within a few years, a new, free society emerged. This new society became a precondition and a subject for research for a free sociology.

The historical and political criteria used by today's mainstream sociological community in accepting or not accepting sociologists who were active participants of the Polish public life of the pre-1989 period are not very clear. Many sociologists who were active in the Communist Party until its dissolution in 1990 and who were better or worse academic teachers of a more or less apologetic Marxism continue to be very active in the discipline's public life. Almost none of them continues his/her former Marxist interests. In their research programs and university lectures, many of them stress the virtues of economic liberalism and of the "social teaching" of the Roman Catholic Church. Only exceptionally do they belong to the post-Communist party - Alliance of Democratic Left (Sojusz Lewicy Demokratycznej). Nowadays some have strong political connections with post-Solidarity, right-wing political parties. Some senior professors of sociology, once strongly tied to the Communist Party apparatus, today carry out very interesting and fruitful analyzes of the processes of political democratization in Poland. They deal well with democracy and in democracy. They are democratically elected to central sociological institutions. They put forward successful initiatives, important for the sociological community. Basically, there is no strong resistance to this phenomenon among scholars who were connected with the democratic opposition before 1989. The only case of the active institutional de-Communization of sociology was the liquidation of the Institute for Basic Problems of Marxism-Leninism and of the Academy for Social Sciences – institutions belonging to the Communist Party which employed many sociologists (but many more economists and political scientists).

This lack of any deep "de-Communization" of sociology, however, worried some scholars who considered it an aspect of a more general failure to settle up with the socialist past. In 1989, the influential right-wing daily *Życie* (The Life) published a discussion of this problem lasting one week. It seems that the full "de-Communization" will come only with inevitable generational transition. However, some scholars still express opinions that the lack of de-Communization of sociology endangers democracy in Poland. There is no censorship in Poland – regarding either research projects or publications.

A new way of research financing was introduced. The main source of funds is the State Committee for Scientific Research (Komitet Badań Naukowych - KBN). Another thing is that state funds are extremely limited and there are no Polish private funds for research yet; salaries of scholars are very low; universities have a very small amount of money for foreign books, etc. The functioning of the KBN is based on anonymous competitions for research (candidates do not know the names of their reviewers), publication and conference grants. The competition procedures are overt in the sense that the applicants receive *post factum* all reviews and, if not funded, can improve their project before the next deadline. All of this is a new phenomenon in Poland, but has been accepted by the academic community. Foreign foundations, like the Research Support Scheme of the Central European University (funded by the Soros Foundation) or the Friedrich Ebert Foundation provide research and publication grants in the field of sociology as well. It seems to us that, so far, the interests of foreign foundations are similar to the intellectual interests of Polish sociologists.

Polish scholars participate much more often than before in international research programs. The internal life of academia has been democratized. Officers of the universities, including their institutes, as well as of the research institutes of the Polish Academy of Sciences (Polska Akademia Nauk - PAN) are democratically elected now. Since the mid-1990s, competitions have been organized for the positions of editors-in-chief of *Studia Socjologiczne* (Sociological Studies) (published by both the Committee on Sociology (Komitet Socjologii) and the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology (Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii – IFiS) of the PAN) and of *The Polish Sociological Review* (published by the Polish Sociological Association). Editors of other sociological periodicals are still being appointed without a competition.

After 1989, the number of sociological books on the market grew rapidly. Many new publishing houses specializing in social sciences emerged, for instance Nomos in Cracow, which concentrates on translations and original books in the field of religion; Zysk in Poznań, which concentrates on translations of foreign textbooks; the Oficyna Naukowa in Warsaw, which publishes the "Encyclopedia of Sociology", among other books, and the Scholar in Warsaw, which concentrates on the field of politics. The dominant position on the market is held by IFiS Publishers, which belongs to the largest sociological institution in Poland, the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the PAN. In general, there are so many publishing houses in Poland that it is difficult to keep track of new books. This makes the Bibliographical Information Bulletin of the Polish Sociological Association, which comes out four times a year, very helpful. Sociologists publish their articles in the front-line periodicals mentioned above, but also, for instance, in *Przegląd Polonijny* (Polonia Review) and *Przegląd Zachodni* (Western Review), which are interested in the field of ethnicity, in *Nomos*, which is interested in religion studies, in some monthlies of general interest like *Odra* (The Odra), and in highly respected Roman Catholic monthlies like *Znak* (Sign) and *Więź* (The Bond).

Important new publishing initiatives appeared after 1989. The most significant is the "Encyclopedia of Sociology". The first works, commissioned by the Committee on Sociology, were undertaken by a team led by Władysław Kwaśniewicz in 1991; the first of four volumes came out in 1998, the third in 2000. The Committee on Sociology also initiated other research and publishing enterprises that addressed European integration and the morality of Polish society. We will return to them in due course.

The Polish Scientific Publishers (Wydawnictwo Naukowe - PWN) continues to publish the "Sociological Library" series but many sociological books that are very significant at the turn of the century are still unavailable in Polish.

One can observe both continuity and change in the Polish sociological establishment. The Executive Council of the Polish Sociological Association did not become relatively younger until the mid-1990s. Its members are in their forties and fifties. More than half of the membership of the Committee on Sociology of the Academy are persons of more than 55 years of age. An "Interlocking directorates" phenomenon is visible if one takes into account the above mentioned Executive Council, the Committee, and the editorial boards of the leading periodicals. During the plenary sessions of the Congress of Polish Sociology in Rzeszów in September 2000, non of the organizers or speakers were below 50 years of age, and most of them were older that 55.

At the end of the 1990s, altogether, about 11 thousand people majored in sociology on the BA and MA levels in both public and private schools.[1] No single public or market opinion research center was in the state's hands. The old centers were privatized (in various ways) and many new, private centers emerged. Most of them were established by the scholars who had worked at the universities or at the academy of sciences.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

When analyzing Polish sociological production of the last decade, particularly in comparison with former decades, one can have the impression of a retreat from "theory as such" and from the general methodology of the social sciences. However, it is necessary to mention books on the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu (e.g., Jacyno, 1997); on interpretative sociology (e.g., Piotrowski, 1998); on the concept of the definition of situation (see Manterys, 2000); on microstructural sociology, which stresses new trends in exchange theory (e.g., Sozański, Szmatka and Kempny, 1993); on new trends in the sociology of knowledge (Zybertowicz, 1995); and on the role of theorizing in sociology (Misztal, 2000). Moreover, many empirical studies have been inspired by theory. We mean here particularly: a) the "grounded theory" and, more generally, interpretative sociology in its applications as a background for qualitative social research (e.g. Wyka, 1993; Konecki, 2000) and many studies based on the biographical method (e.g. Czyżewski, Piotrowski and Rokuszewska-Pawełek, 1996 and a special issue of *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* (Culture and Society) 4/1995 entitled "Biography and national identity"); b) neo-institutionalism and its applications to the analysis of the systemic transformation (which we will return to in due course); c) rational choice theory (see the special issues of *Studia Socjologiczne* 3/1998 and 1-2/2000); d) theories of social change as a background for the analysis of systemic transformation (e.g. Rychard, 1993, Wnuk-Lipiński, 1996); e) postmodernism in the analysis of culture change (e.g. Kempny, Kapciak and Łodziński, 1997 and numerous influential translations of books authored by Zygmunt Bauman). These theoretical currents often overlapped when applied to the analysis of empirical material.

Retreat from Marxism is very visible. Since the early 1980s, Marxism has ceased to be an important theoretical issue for sociologists educated in major academic centers. No single ideology which could become a framework for sociological interpretations of the world has replaced it, but it seems that many sociologists are adherents of theoretical liberalism. The Marxist themes, like economic aspects of political and cultural phenomena, class structure and new class-building processes, group interests and their contradictions, class conflicts, are present in sociological discourse.

Many Polish sociologists are interested in the methodology of empirical research, both qualitative (including the analysis of biography and narrative interviews) and quantitative (particularly of surveys). Scholars are increasingly interested in the ethical aspects of research methods. The Research Committee on Methodology at the Polish Sociological Association and the Section of Methodology of Sociological Research of the Institute of Sociology at Warsaw University have systematically organized national methodological conferences. Books on various methods were published and discussed (e.g. Sułek, 1990; Lutyńska, 1993; Domański, Lutyńska and Rostocki, 1999; Konecki, 2000). Special issues of *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* were published on "Methods of sociological research and contemporary times" (1/1990), "Methods of sociological research in the times of transformation" (3/1993) and "The emergence of public opinion research in Poland" (4/1999). A textbook for SPSS package has been published (Górniak and Wachnicki, 2000). Focus group interviews came to Poland quite late, but soon became very popular. The *ASK*, a periodical devoted to methodology of social sciences, has been published since 1995.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

In this article, we present only the research results on the *new*, post-1989 problems, presented in books or in special issues of major sociological periodicals.

Since 1989, sociologists have studied the socioeconomic transformation in Poland. Several components of this broad research area are important. The first is the analysis of changes in the economy in the domestic societal and international context, done with the application of neo-institutionalist theory (e.g. Rychard, 1993; Jakóbik, 1997; Morawski, 1998). The second is the analysis of privatization of state-owned enterprises as well as of the advantages and disadvantages of this process (Jarosz, 1993), and later the analysis of relations between new foreign owners and Polish workers (Jarosz, 1997). The attitudes and new social roles of individual workers, of trade union and employee self-government activists during this process were also studied (e.g. Gąciarz and Pańków, 1997). Privatization of the Polish economy means not only selling out already existing state-owned companies to private (Polish and foreign) investors, but also the emergence of new, mostly small, private firms (Reszke, 1998). The third sociological issue connected to economy was industrial relations in the new circumstances of a free market and democracy, both in still existing state-own enterprises as well as in companies sold to foreign investors, and in small private firms. The new role of trade unions in all kinds of enterprises was being studied (Kozek and Kupińska, 1998; Gieorgica, 1998). The fourth important research problem in this general area was the new style of consumption (Sikorska, 1998).

Systemic transformation has brought not only generally positive but also obviously negative social consequences, like "old" (originating in socialism but growing fast after 1989) and "new" poverty, joblessness, organized crime, and corruption. A cooperative network of three research centers dealing with poverty should be mentioned. The Institute of Sociology of Silesian University in Katowice studied, from the very beginning of the transformation, the psychological aspects of poverty as well as the poverty in "old industrial areas", particularly in the Silesia region, which is known for its old and inefficient mining and metallurgy industries. Scholars from Katowice also studied unemployed youth and its problems (e.g. Wódz, 1993). The Institute of Sociology of the University of Łódź concentrated on poverty in big cities. This approach was historical and comparative in several senses. The "old" poverty was distinguished from the "new" one; the Polish big city poverty was presented against the background of poverty in Western European big cities; and finally two Polish big cities, Katowice and Łódź, were compared. Relations between poverty and gender and between poverty and unemployment were also studied (e.g. Warzywoda-Kruszyńska and Grotowska-Leder, 1996). The third research center, the Section of Theory of the Culture of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the PAN, studied, above all, the historical aspects (transmission of poverty) and cultural aspects of poverty (the so-called "culture of poverty"), particularly in the rural settlements of the former state-owned farms, which were liquidated in the early 1990s. This research was conducted on the basis of biographical interviews and oral histories of families (findings were published in Tarkowska, 2000; see also the special issue of *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 2/1998 on "Poverty and Suffering", where articles written by scholars coming from all three centers were published).

Joblessness is a serious problem characteristic of market economies and came to Poland in the early 1990s. It has been fluctuating, but throughout the decade has always exceeded 10%. At the end of the decade it reached 16% of the labor force. Sociologists analyzed this phenomenon from the very beginning of the transformations. Already in 1993, a tentative summary of first findings was published. This was a many-sided study that addressed the particular traits of Polish unemployment (but without directly comparing it with this phenomenon abroad), the everyday life of the unemployed, the central and regional bureaucracy's attitudes toward jobless people, as well as a comparison of unemployment in rural areas, small towns, and big cities (Borowicz and Łapińska-Tyszka, 1993). In the early 1990s, another large project was carried out. It concentrated on seven towns and cities in eastern and southern Poland. In this study, joblessness was considered not only as an economic and structural, but also as a moral phenomenon. The author analyzed the everyday values of the unemployed, individual and collective effects of joblessness, attitudes of the unemployed toward work, and their expectations about a potential new job (Mariański 1994).

There are several interesting sociological works on new, post-1989 forms of delinquency, like organized crime, drug-related crime, and Internet-related crime. The problem of corruption should be stressed as well, since international agencies like Transparency International (Antoni Kamiński, a sociology professor, is very active in its Polish branch), say corruption is very widespread in Poland (e.g. Siemaszko, 2000; see also a special issue of *Więź* 9/1998).

Sociologists studied the dynamics of class structure in the 1990s. Most scholars abandoned the old stratification approach, which was dominant in the previous decades, but did not help to reveal the sources of social tensions and conflicts. Various research teams have been involved in this new kind of analysis of new social reality, but not all interesting findings have been published in book form.

With the privatization of the old economy and with the founding of more than one million small private firms, the social structure has changed significantly. The relative social position of the working class has deteriorated while a new category of the unemployed and a new business class has emerged. Some problems connected with these class-building processes were analyzed in the literature mentioned above. In this section, another issue will be put forward. From the beginning of the transformations, many scholars and politicians have agreed that a democratic market society needs a large and strong middle class. The question arose of whether Polish society has already met this "functional requirement" and what the character of this middle class is or should be. Two important books and one special issue of a periodical were published on this topic in the mid-1990s. The first book, by Henryk Domański (1994), put Poland in an international perspective. The author analyzed the role of the "old" and "new" middle class in stable Western democratic market societies. He also discussed the question which groups could be called middle classes in the Poland of the 1990s, why they could be called that, to what extent these groups had crystallized, and to what extent they were characterized by a specific ethos or class culture. The second book is a collection edited by Jacek Kurczewski and Iwona Jakubowska-Branicka (1994). It was devoted above all to the "old" (socialist period) and "new" (post-1989) private entrepreneurs. The problem the book addressed is whether a new ethos of this business class has emerged and what its everyday life patterns, career ideals, and attitudes toward law and morality are. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* published a special issue 1/1994 devoted to the same problems and titled "Classes in contemporary Poland". The third major participant in the class debate in the mid-1990s, besides Domański and Kurczewski, was Edmund Mokrzycki (Bryant and Mokrzycki, 1995). Discussion did not wane in 1995, but diminished during the next few years. At the end of the decade, though, a special issue of *The Polish Sociological Review* (2/2000) came out that contained an international discussion of Domański's article on the existence of classes in Poland. It seems to us that discussion on middle class was the only important public debate within sociology during the 1990s.

In the context of class analysis, a research project on social structure and personality under conditions of systemic change should be mentioned. The Polish part of this international program, inspired and led by Melvin L. Kohn of Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, dealt with the relationships between position in the social structure and personality characteristics, intergenerational transmission of values and life orientations, the impact of psychological resources on status attainment, and support for and aversion to systemic change (see Słomczyński, Janicka, Mach and Zaborowski 1996; 1999).

Since 1989, teams of scholars of various political biographies belonging to different generations carried out intensive studies of the world of Polish politics and its various aspects. In the early 1990s, a study was carried out linking the legitimization problems of the previous and the new political leaderships. It concentrated on the relationships between those who hold political power and those who were subordinated to them at the very beginning holders of political power and their subordinates at the very beginning of the decade. The scholars were interested in the subjective aspects of these political power relations. The study is an important contribution to the analysis of the de-legitimization of the old pre-1989 authorities and the legitimization of the new ones (Ziółkowski, Pawłowska and Drozdowski, 1994).

Political parties were an important subject for sociologists. Parties are a completely new phenomenon in Poland, since, understood in the Western democratic sense, they did not existed before 1989. When the so-called "post-Solidarity" political parties were being constructed at the beginning of the decade, Mirosława Grabowska and Tadeusz Szawiel followed the process. They analyzed the congresses of parties important at that time, but significantly transformed later: the Center Alliance, the Democratic Union, and the Liberal-Democratic Congress (1998). Other teams studied political parties in local milieus. An interesting example of such findings is a collection edited by Hieronim Kubiak (1997) that presented eight political parties active in Cracow in 1996 and 1997. The party system did not change again until the end of the 1990s. The whole decade of the functioning of political parties in Poland was summarized by a team of scholars led by Hieronim Kubiak and Jerzy J. Wiatr (2000). They compared activities of parties, on the one hand, and of NGOs and social movements, on the other; presented transformations of the right-wing and left-wing parties during the decade; analyzed women's participation in Polish party politics and the problem of party leadership's attitudes towards Polish "reason of the state".

Poland's first systematic sociological studies of the economic and political elites were conducted at the end of the previous decade. During the 1990s, they became very popular. Some research projects were international in character (Szelenyi, Treiman and Wnuk-Lipiński, 1995). This comparative research presented the economic, cultural and political elites' role in the systemic transformations. The project sought to answer the question how the two models - of the circulation of elites and of the reproduction of elites - explained the situation in Poland, Russia and Hungary in the early 1990s. Most Polish studies on elites concentrated, however, on members of parliament. These projects were also initiated at the end of the former political era, when the last parliament of socialist Poland was introducing systemic transformations (Wasilewski and Wesołowski, 1992). In the late 1990s, Janina Frentzel-Zagórska and Jacek Wasilewski published a collection (2000) that presents the findings of another international comparative study. Poland was analyzed along with other Central and Eastern European countries, but theoretical aspects were also important. The authors asked how contemporary sociological elite theory could be applied to the analysis of the region and how the empirical data from this region could improve general theory.

Election research is the third area of political sociology in which Polish scholars were very active from the first days of the transformations. A team led by Lena Kolarska-Bobińska, Piotr

Łukasiewicz and Zbigniew W. Rykowski (1990) analyzed the dramatic parliamentary elections of 1989, which ended the political era of socialism. The next important election, which occurred shortly after in 1990, made Lech Wałęsa the president of Poland. A team led by Mirosława Grabowska and Ireneusz Krzemiński (1991) studied this event. In this qualitative research, scholars analyzed the activities of the candidates' electoral committees, their campaign methods, the candidates' political preferences, and the "electoral geography". In the same year, Jacek Raciborski published a collection of comparative studies showing the emergence of representative democracy and political elections in Poland and other Central and Eastern European countries immediately after the break with socialism (1991). The next book by Raciborski is equally important. Published six years later (1997), it summarized the Polish political transformation, analyzed on the basis of view of consecutive election results. The author presented the Polish parliamentary elections of 1989,1991 and 1993; the presidential elections of 1990 and 1995; and the local elections of 1990 and 1994. We find in this book an analysis of the electoral campaigns, their results, their "political geography", the ideological orientations in Polish society, their consequences for the declared electoral behavior, the influence of the Roman Catholic Church on the political behavior of Poles, and electoral absenteeism and its determinants. Two years later, other scholars published an analysis of the important elections of 1997, obviously not yet known to Raciborski when he was writing the book mentioned above. Based on the Polish General Electoral Survey, they described Polish society's differentiation into a political right and left, the economic and axiological determinants of electoral behavior, the relationship between religiosity and electoral behavior, and the psychological characteristics of the electorates of the major political parties (Markowski, 1999).

Another area of study is the public sphere outside pure politics. A large project was devoted to the functioning of the legal system in Poland during the whole decade of the decomposition of the socialist system and of the building of civil society (Kojder, Łojko, Staśkiewicz and Turska, 1989-1993). A second program concerned the social images of law in the consciousness of such significant groups as businesspeople, journalists, and members of parliament, but also of a representative sample of Polish society (Turska, Łojko, Cywiński and Kojder, 1999). Since the spring of 1989, a civil society has been developing in Poland. At that time, the main actors in the public arena were the regional Citizens' Committees, a broad anti-Communist social grass-roots movement supporting the central Citizens' Committee around the Chairman of the Solidarity Trade Union, Lech Wałęsa. Sociologists studied these committees, their origins, transformations, institutionalization, relations with local political elites, and political culture (Borkowski and Bukowski, 1993). Barbara Lewenstein, for instance, studied local participation in public life in the form of rural and urban councils. She interviewed members of local Citizens' Committees in some villages and in Warsaw and later members of the formal councils that emerged after the local elections (see 1999). The ecological movement also became an important actor in the public sphere and was the subject of sociological investigations (see mainly Gliński, 1996). Many important articles on the emergence of civil society in Poland and its various aspects and problems came out in synthesizing collections, published since the mid-1990s (see Bryant and Mokrzyski, 1995; Domański and Rychard, 1997; Domański, Ostrowska and Rychard, 2000).

Gender research is a new phenomenon in Poland. There are two empirical research centers in Warsaw dealing with gender. The first, at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the PAN, studies social inequalities between men and women within the socio-economic realm, particularly in the job market (Domański, 1992). Other problems have also been addressed: differences between boys and girls in socialization patterns; double standards in the judicial system; sex and procreation seen from the vantage point of women; and the abortion issue as seen by women (Titkow and Domański, 1995). In the second center, at Warsaw University, Renata Siemieńska led the Interdisciplinary Team Studying Social Problems of Gender and Women. She was interested mostly in political aspects of gender research. In one of her important works, electoral behavior of Poles (elections of 1991, 1993, and 1995) was compared to this kind of behavior in stable democracies. The accent was put on gender as a factor differentiating the electorate (1997). In another study, a broader participation of women in Polish politics was presented (2000).

From the very beginning of the great transformations, Polish sociologists have studied the role of culture in social change. Two collections are particularly interesting. In the first, edited by Aldona Jawłowska, Marian Kempny and Elżbieta Tarkowska (1993), the authors expressed their lack of confidence in what they considered the generally accepted view that economics and politics had been the main instigators of systemic change. They wanted to put the Polish transformations into the perspective of cultural processes changing the whole Western world. Essays published in this volume were devoted to such issues as: unavoidable influence of cultural traditions of "real socialism" on the attitudes and behavior of Poles after the transformation; cultural chaos after the breakdown of the old system; and the erosion of the old Marxist ideology and attempts to construct new ideologies and a new sacrum. The authors suggested basing social research on recent sociological and anthropological theory of culture. The second collection came out ten years after the beginning of the systemic change (Sztompka, 1999). Interestingly, the diagnosis of the state of Polish sociology was similar to the diagnosis presented above: cultural aspects of changes that took place after 1989 were not stressed enough. Economic, political and legal changes, as well as changes in behavior and attitudes, were merely manifestations of deep civilizational undercurrents that are very difficult to measure: patterns, rules, norms, values, schemes, codes, forms of discourse, and intellectual habits. According to their editors, both books were only tentative diagnoses, since the emergence of the new, post-communist reality was still an ongoing process.

We have already mentioned public discourse in this text. Its analysis has been conducted since the end of the last decade. The new situation resulted in new ideological debates, new kinds of mental and political correctness, and new types of cultural exclusions. Three important collections were published in the 1990s in which those debates, as well as topics that were excluded from debate, were analyzed based on the theory of public discourse, interpretative sociology, and ritual theory (Czyżewski, Dunin and Piotrowski, 1991; Lewenstein and Pawlik, 1994; Czyżewski, Kowalski and Piotrowski, 1997).

Religiosity is an important subject in Poland. Since 1989, the institutional role of the Roman-Catholic Church is stronger, but on the other hand, many completely new religious phenomena have emerged. They have been connected with Polish society's openness toward the West and the Far East, but also with an increasing sense of insecurity and fear. Many articles on those topics came out in periodicals like *Nomos*, *Przegląd Religioznawczy* (Review of Religious Studies), *Znak*, *Więź*, but only a small number of books have appeared up to now. The authors refer to various theoretical traditions. A kind of summary of the simultaneous processes of institutionalization and privatization of religion can be found in a collection *From the Church of the People to the Church of the Choice*. The title draws upon traditional concepts in the sociology of religion. In this volume, the authors present analyses of the institutional Roman-Catholic Church in Poland in the process of transformations; of the religiosity of Poles compared with religiosity in stable democracies; of the religiosity of Polish youth; of the social role of the clergy in the new social situation; of the faithful who do not go to church; and finally a presentation of one of the religious minorities, the Jehovah Witnesses (Borowik and Zdaniewicz, 1996). The problem of the institutionalization of and individualization of religion was also discussed in a book authored by Irena Borowik published one year later. Sociologists have also studied religious phenomena new in Poland, including the New Age movement and the "sects". An important summary of their findings is presented in a "dictionary" of new religious and para-religious movements prepared by Tadeusz Doktór (1999). A collection edited by Marian Kempny and Grażyna Woroniecka (1999) also summarizes the debates on religion as an important aspect of culture in the globalizing world, including Poland.

Since the end of the 1980s, Polish scholars have systematically studied the country's ethnic composition. The democratization of the 1990s meant a great revival of the already stable and institutionalized ethnic minorities, which altogether constituted about 5% of the total population of Poland. Despite their demographic marginality, they became a very interesting topic for scholars. The largest minority is the Belarussian group, which traditionally lives in the northeastern corner of Poland, close to the border with the Republic of Belarus and with Lithuania. Empirical research was initially devoted to the social and cultural situation of Polish Belarussians, but was then expanded to the analysis of the whole cultural area on both sides of the Polish-Belarussian border (Sadowski, 1995). The second such group is the Ukrainians. Until the end of World War II, they lived in the southeastern corner of Poland (in its post-war shape) at the border with the Republic of the Ukraine, but since the forced resettlement of 1947, they have been dispersed throughout northern and western Poland. Empirical research on Polish Ukrainians was conducted by several academic centers. One trend will be mentioned here: Grzegorz Babiński, in his last works, described not only the Ukrainians as a Polish ethnic minority, but also Polish-Ukrainian social and cultural relations on both sides of the border (e.g. 1997).

There is one large but "new" ethnic minority in Poland, the Germans. It is new in the sense that, until 1989, the Communist authorities had denied the very fact of its existence, so there was no possibility to do any research. This minority lives above all in the southwestern part of Poland. Several academic centers are located in this area, and all of them systematically studied this group under the new political conditions (e.g. Kurcz, 1995). Polish border areas were analyzed in a systematic way at regular conferences held in Zielona Góra in western Poland (e.g. Gołdyka, 1999).

The Jewish minority constituted about 9% of the population of pre-war Poland. Due to the Holocaust and subsequent waves of partly voluntary and partly forced emigration after the war, only several thousand Jews live in Poland now. Poles' attitudes toward this group are also a new research topic (e.g. Krzemiński, 1996).

At the end of the 1990s, a number of books discussing all the ethnic minorities that live in Poland became available (see, e.g. Szczepański, 1997; Chałupczak and Browarek, 1998). Also, several special issues of *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* were devoted to this subject. Individual research projects, collections devoted to individual minorities, and collections overviewing the whole ethnic field have been theoretically conceptualized in various ways. We have already mentioned the border regions studies, which transcend problems of individual minorities. In the 1990s, however, most of the studies were conceptualized in terms of the strengthening of ethnic identity under new social and political conditions and in terms of relations between "us" and "strangers". These projects were a continuation of the programs initiated at the end of the last decade and were inspired both by Małgorzata Melchior and by Ewa Nowicka. During the 1990s, another approach emerged, a research program on cultural relations as seen from the vantage point of minority groups. Problems of cultural domination and of Polish culture as a foreign culture were addressed. Several volumes by the same research team were published (see, e.g. Mucha, 1999).

In the late 1980s, the first Polish research projects on foreigners were initiated. At that time, almost all foreigners were students from the so-called Third World. After 1989, Poland became, in a sense, an immigration country. In the early 1990s, some fears were expressed that hundreds of thousands of refugees from the former Soviet Union would stop in Poland on their way to the rich countries of Western Europe. This has not happened up to now, but asylum seekers and refugees actually do come to Poland, and immigration has become a subject of sociological and psychological analyses (e.g. Grzymała-Moszczyńska and Nowicka, 1998). Sociological and demographic aspects of immigration are also investigated by the Migration Research Center at the Institute of Social Studies of Warsaw University, led by Marek Okólski.

In the second half of the 1990s, some syntheses of the research findings were published. Scholars from the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the PAN summarized their own studies of the previous years in two volumes: *Elements of New Order* (Domański and Rychard, 1997) and *How do the Poles Live?* (Domański, Ostrowska and Rychard, 2000). The latter book concentrates on the following broad areas: social order and its dimensions; everyday life in Poland - work relations and the world of institutions; social hierarchy in social consciousness; collective actors - social classes and strata; and public life - national consciousness, local communities, and institutions of civil society. Still another synthesis deserves separate remarks. It is a part of the research project which has continued for about twenty years under the title "The Poles". Various teams led by Władysław Adamski studied living conditions and activities in Polish society during the times of the first "Solidarity" (1980-81); during the so-called "normalization" process after the military authorities lifted martial law in the years 1984 and 1985; during the negotiations between outgoing communist authorities and the "Solidarity" opposition at the beginning of the systemic transformations; and finally in 1995. The latter research was conducted together with Czech, Slovak and French scholars (Adamski, Buncak, Machinin and Martin, 1999). Another book edited by Adamski in 1998 is an analysis of the actors and clients of the Polish transformations. It took up the following problems: old and new social structure; sense of material deprivation compared with the life goals of Poles; egalitarian attitudes and social interests during the process of transformations; the perception of changes in social positions; social actors and institutions and their adaptive strategies; changes in political attitudes and behavior between 1988 and 1995; the dynamics of social interests and of the acceptance of various political systems in relation to ownership transformations; the situation of farmers; and finally the consciousness of national interest and ethnic resentments during the process of systemic change.

We are of the opinion that Polish sociology gives interested readers a lot of significant information on Polish society, both detailed date and generalizations. If the latter are not deep enough, perhaps the famous "owl of Minerva" has not yet had time to show its wisdom.

5. Public space and academic debates

It is very difficult to say what specific investigative topics or methodological perspectives dominate contemporary Polish sociology. Also, it would be difficult to identify significant academic debates in sociology. From time to time, single-thematic sociological periodicals are published, but one cannot speak about superiority of any particular perspective.

After World War II (we will ignore the pre-war period), many sociological periodicals came out. *Przegląd Socjologiczny* (Sociological Review), founded before the war by Znaniecki, has been regularly in print since 1957. *Ruch Prawniczy, Ekonomiczny i Socjologiczny* (The Juridical, Economic and Sociological Movement) was resumed after the war in 1961. New quarterlies were founded: *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* in 1957, *Studia Socjologiczne* in 1961, *Polish Sociological Review* (until 1993 known as *Polish Sociological Bulletin*) in 1961. *Sisyphus* was founded in 1981 appears irregularly, more or less once a year.

In our opinion, the most important Polish sociological journals are currently *Studia Socjologiczne*, *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* and *Przegląd Socjologiczny*. The first one is a quarterly published as a joint venture of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences and the Committee on Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences (originally published by the Committee for Social Sciences, of the Academy) and specializes in general sociology. Its first editor-in-chief was Zygmunt Bauman (between 1961-1967). *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* is published as a quarterly by the Committee of Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Political Studies of the Academy and was founded by Józef Chałasiński in 1957. The articles it publishes are related to all sciences of culture. *Przegląd Socjologiczny* was founded at the initiative of Florian Znaniecki. Before 1939, it was published by the Polish Sociological Institute at the University of Poznań. After the war, it became a journal of the Łódź Society of Science and Letters. It mostly specializes in sociology, but in the 1960s and 1970s it was dominated by the African studies, and methodological problems became its main focus in the 1980s

Sociological periodicals have attempted have to catch up with Western publication standards. However, no Polish journal succeeded in entering the "Philadelphia list" of the most respected journals, nor in being listed in "Current Contents", a weekly bulletin of the Philadelphia Institute for Scientific Information that already lists Croat, Czech, Russian and Slovak periodicals, though published in national languages.

In this text, the term "Polish sociologist" means a scholar who worked at least half-time in Poland during the last decade and/or was a "regular member" of a Polish academic institution and who in his/her publications presented himself/herself as a person institutionally connected with Poland. It should be remembered, though, that during the last several decades, Western (mostly American) university departments of sociology gave permanent employment to many Poles who were educated at Polish universities. These scholars are excluded from our analysis if they are not institutionally connected with Poland as well.

In the following paragraphs, we present a search of Western (international and national) sociological periodicals that do *not* concentrate on Central and Eastern Europe. International journals like *European Sociological Review*, *European Societies*, and *International Sociology*, as well as influential national journals like *British Journal of Sociology* and *Sociology in Great Britain*; *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* and *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* in Germany; *Revue francaise de sociologie* in France; *American Journal of Sociology* and *American Sociological Review* in the US will be taken into account.

Books will not be discussed here, due to the difficulty of collecting systematic information about them. It should be borne in mind, though, that scholars like Piotr Sztompka and Jadwiga Staniszkis publish in respected Western presses influential books that which refer to the Polish society.

Over the decade, one article by a Polish author (Kolarska-Bobińska, 1994) was published in the *British Journal of Sociology*, one article with four Polish co-authors (Kohn, 1997) in the *American Sociological Review*, one with one Polish co-author (Kohn, 1990) in the *American Journal of Sociology*, and one by a Polish author (Sztompka, 1993) in *Zeitschrift für Soziologie.* The situation was different in international periodicals. *European Societies* did not emerge until in 1999, and there was no Polish author in the first two volumes. *European Sociological Review* published two articles by Polish authors (Sawiński and Domański, 1991a; Mach, 1994), and *International Sociology* seven (Sztompka, 1990 and 1996; Sawiński and Domański, 1991; Kłoskowska 1991; Pommersbach and Woźniak, 1991; Zieliński, 1994; Buchner-Jeziorska and Evetts, 1997). Most Polish sociologists who publish articles (rather than chapters in edited collections) in English, do it in Poland in *The Polish Sociological Review* or in *Sisyphus*. Others publish in Western periodicals concentrating on Central and Eastern Europe, for instance *East European Quarterly* and *East European Society and Politics*.

There are no generally accepted Polish textbooks in general sociology. To date, these are the most important translations of undergraduate texts: American - Norman Goodman (1997) and Jonathan H. Turner (1998); British - Zygmunt Bauman (1996) and Anthony Giddens (1998); and French - Henri Mendras (1997). In addition, a translation of J. H. Turner's *The Structure of Sociological Theory* (1978) was made in 1985 and a translation of Peter Berger's *Invitation to Sociology* was made in 1988. As mentioned above, many classic works have been translated into Polish, but many contemporary classics are still missing on the Polish sociological market.

In the 1990s, few Poles were members of the administrative bodies of the European Sociological Association (ESA) and of the International Sociological Association (ISA) , and few were active in the organization of their congresses (above the level of thematic workshops). At the congress in Bielefeld, Germany, in 1994, Piotr Sztompka became the first Polish member of the Executive Committee in many years. Since the Montreal, Canada congress in 1998, he has been the association's vice-president for program. In Bielefeld, no Pole organized a plenary session or a symposium. In Montreal, Sztompka organized a symposium.

The First European Conference of Sociology was held in Vienna, Austria in 1993. During this conference, volunteers, including Władysław Kwaśniewicz from Poland (soon replaced by Janusz Mucha), organized a Steering Committee of the ESA. The first formal elections were held at the

Second Conference in Budapest, Hungary in 1995. Janusz Mucha was elected to the Executive Committee. During the elections at the Third Conference in Essex, England, no one from Poland was elected (Mucha did not run for re-election), whereas at the Fourth Conference in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, in 1999, Elżbieta Hałas became an Executive Committee member. At the Vienna conference, Włodzimierz Wesołowski gave a plenary lecture on the "Conflicting Principles of Political Action and Change", and at the Budapest conference Piotr Sztompka spoke about "The Year 1989 as a Civilizational and Cultural Break" and Jolanta Kulpińska gave a semi-plenary lecture. No Pole gave a plenary or semi-plenary lecture in Essex and in Amsterdam.

The most detailed "raw" information on Polish society is available thanks to the Polish General Social Survey (the PGSS, which is based on the American project, the General Social Survey). This project, supervised by Bogdan Cichomski has been, a permanent research program of the Institute of Social Studies (Instytut Studiów Społecznych) of Warsaw University since 1992 and is funded by the KBN. Data of 1992-97 are also available on the Internet (http://pgss.iss.uw.edu.pl).

The database provided by the Public Opinion Research Centre (Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej, CBOS) is also worth mentioning. Established in 1982, it is one of the largest public opinion research institutes in Poland. The CBOS conducts research projects to meet the needs of Polish public administration bodies as well as of various other interested institutions: scientific institutions, foundations, local government, media, industry, and advertising agencies. The CBOS has its own network of surveyors supervised by 20 area managers. Its regional managers coordinate a network of 400 interviewers (15-40 per region). It is possibility to subscribe CBOS publications and full research reports (containing questions, frequencies and cross-tabulations; CBOS publishes 15-20 reports per month) and to receive them via regular post or e-mail. Especially interesting is that, from September 1998 on, all results of noncommercial CBOS findings have been distributed free of charge, with a one-month delay, on the Internet (http://www.cbos.com.pl/index.htm). Another scientific database worthy of note is made available by the Information Processing Center (Ośrodek Przetwarzania Informacji, OPI, established in 1990), which is not a sociological institution, but a research and development unit supervised by the State Committee for Scientific Research. The OPI offers an access to many databases containing interesting materials connected with sociological studies and institutions. Some of them are: (1) "Scientific Research – SYNABA" (over 140.000 reports on research and development works, doctoral theses, reports made in research institutes and institutions of higher education, accumulated since 1984; since 1996 also in English); (2) "Doctoral and Qualifying Dissertations" (over 27.900 records carrying the personal data of scholars who received a PhD degree or habilitation degree and information on their dissertation topic, where the degree was conferred, and the professors sponsoring the degree and reviewing the thesis). (3) "Scientific Institutions" (over 6.200 descriptions of research establishments and research units, as well as complementary institutions, such as archives, museums, and libraries). The OPI databases can be reached via the Internet (http://www.opi.org.pl).

6. Views on further development

According to the official data given at the end of 1980s, about 740,000 of persons emigrated from Poland from 1980 on, including 22,000 engineers, 3,000 economists, 3,000 medical doctors, 1,500 architects, and 1,500 scientists. Approximately 75 percent were not older than 35. Sociologists do not constitute a noteworthy sub-group, so the problem of the "brain-drain" of Polish sociological community is not very painful.

In Poland the impact of sociological research on the public sphere does not match the quality of its findings. The results of sociological studies are covered by the media press almost only when related to parliamentary elections and referring to issues attracting public attention. Public debates almost completely ignore conclusions of sociological investigations, although sociologists are frequently present in electronic media.

There is no centralized official cooperation between sociologists from Central and Eastern Europe. However, the Polish Sociological Association invites colleagues from other countries of the region to its congresses, and sociologists from the region participate in joint research projects and in joint publications.

Poland and several other Central and Eastern European countries will probably join the European Union by the year 2005. This is a serious economic, political, structural and cultural challenge to Polish society. In the 1990s, Polish universities opened European studies programs. Some of them are purely educational, but some do empirical research. The topic most researched is Poles` attitudes of toward accession to the European Union. Many Poles want to "go to Europe", because they consider themselves members of Western civilization. On the other hand, "joining Europe" means a potential danger to "old industry", which will have to be modernized and restructured, with a resulting rise in unemployment. Another issue is Polish agriculture, which is very inefficient. European integration is also a problem for many people of traditional Roman Catholic cultural orientation, who are afraid of the increasing impact of "atheistic" Western culture on Poland. Elżbieta Skotnicka-Illasiewicz`s books described books such problems as the definition of Europe in Polish tradition, but also the image of European integration in the eyes of the parliamentary elites and their electorates in the first half of the 1990s (e.g. 1997).

The problem, however, is not only what the elites and the whole population think about Europe, but also whether Polish society is "objectively" prepared in various areas for the access to the European Union. A large research project sponsored by the Friedrich Ebert Foundation raised this question. A team led by Jerzy Hausner and Mirosława Marody published several volumes devoted to this issue. In the second volume, titled *Access or integration. Polish road to the European Union*, the scholars concentrated on such problems as the economic opportunities, dilemmas, and dangers of European integration; Polish agriculture and rural areas; the Polish political system as a stimulator and a barrier to integration; the social capital of Poles; the way public discourse is conducted in Poland as both a stimulus for and a barrier to integration; and the legal culture of Polish society (Hausner, Marody, Wilkin, Wojtyna and Zirk-Sadowski, 1998). The Committee on Sociology of the PAN also initiated a research project on European integration. The Committee members and some invited scholars presented syntheses of their own findings on various aspects of Polish society that are important for accession to the Union. Individual chapters of the report treat the following issues: the way the Polish economy is organized; socio-cultural aspects of Polish agriculture; social problems of the period of transformations; the adjustment of Polish law to the common European legal system; centralization and regionalism in Polish tradition, attitudes, and institutions; local democracy; national identity in the perspective of Poland's accession to various supranational institutions; contemporary customs of Poles compared to dominant customs in Western European countries; the Roman-Catholic Church's potential role in the accession; the role of the youth in the accession to the Union (Mucha, 1999a).

---

[1] The particular project of which this report is a part does not cover teaching so we will not comment on the quality of education in the field of sociology in public and in private schools.

Selected Bibiliography

Adamski, Władysław (ed.) (1998): *Polacy '95. Aktorzy i klienci transformacji* (Poles of 1995. Actors and Clients of Transformation), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;

Adamski, Władyslaw, Buncak, Jan, Machonin, Pavel and Martin, Dominique (eds.) (1999): *System Change and Modernization. East-West in Comparative Perspective*, Warszawa, IFiS PAN;

Babiński, Grzegorz (1997): *Pogranicze polsko-ukraińskie. Etniczność, zróżnicowanie religijne, tożsamość* (Polish-Ukrainian Borderland. Ethnicity, Religious Differentiation, Identity), Kraków, NOMOS;
Bauman, Zygmunt (1996): *Socjologia* (Thinking sociologically), Poznań, Zysk i Ska;
Berger, Peter L. (1988): *Zaproszenie do socjologii* (Invitation to sociology. A humanistic Perspective), Warszawa, PWN;
Borkowski, Tadeusz and Bukowski, Andrzej (eds.) (1993): *Komitety obywatelskie. Powstanie, rozwój, upadek?* (Civic Committees. Rise, Growth, Fall?), Kraków, Universitas;
Borowicz, Ryszard and Łapińska-Tyszka, Krystyna (eds.) (1993): *Syndrom bezrobocia* (Unemployment Syndrome), Warszawa, IRWiR PAN;
Borowik, Irena (1997): *Procesy instytucjonalizacji i prywatyzacji religii w powojennej Polsce* (Processes of Institutionalization and Privatization of Religion in Post-war Poland), Kraków, Uniwersytet Jagielloński;
Borowik, Irena and Zdaniewicz, Witold (eds.) (1996): *Od Kościoła ludu do Kościoła wyboru. Religia a przemiany społeczne w Polsce* (From the Church of the People to the Church of the Choice. Religion and Social Changes in Poland), Kraków, NOMOS;
Bryant, Christopher G. and Mokrzycki, Edmund (eds.) (1995): *Democracy, Civil Society and Pluralism in Comparative Perspective: Poland, Great Britain and the Netherlands*, Warszawa, IFiS Publishers;
Buchner-Jeziorska, Anna and Evetts, Julia (1997): "Regulating Professionals: The Polish Example", in: *International Sociology*, Vol. 12, No.1, 61-77;
Chałupczak, Henryk and Browarek, Tomasz (1998): *Mniejszości narodowe w Polsce 1918-1995* (National Minorities in Poland: 1918-1995), Lublin, Wydawnictwo UMCS;
Czyżewski, Marek, Dunin, Kinga and Piotrowski, Andrzej (eds.) (1991): *Cudze problemy. O ważności tego, co nieważne. Analiza dyskursu publicznego w Polsce* (Somebody Else's Problems. On the Importance of the Unimportant. Analysis of the Public Discourse in Poland), Warszawa, Ośrodek Badań Społecznych;
Czyżewski, Marek, Kowalski, Sergiusz and Piotrowski, Andrzej (eds.) (1997): *Rytualny chaos. Studium dyskursu publicznego* (The Ritual Chaos. A Study on the Public Discourse), Kraków, Aureus;
Czyżewski, Marek, Piotrowski, Andrzej and Rokuszewska-Pawełek, Alicja (eds.) (1996): *Biografia a tożsamość narodowa* (Biography and National Identity), Łódź, Katedra Socjologii Kultury UŁ;
Doktór, Kazimierz (1999): *Nowe ruchy religijne i parareligijne w Polsce* (New Religious and Quasi-religious Movements in Poland), Warszawa, Verbinum;
Domański, Henryk (1992): *Zadowolony niewolnik? Studium o nierównościach między mężczyznami a kobietami w Polsce* (The Satisfied Slave? A Study of Inequalities Between Men and Women in Poland), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;
Domański, Henryk (1994): *Społeczeństwa klasy średniej* (Middle Class Societies), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;
Domański, Henryk, Lutyńska, Krystyna and Rostocki, Andrzej W. (eds.) (1999): *Spojrzenie na metodę. Studia z metodologii badań socjologicznych* (A Look at the Method. Studies of the Methodology of Sociological Research), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;
Domański, Henryk and Rychard, Andrzej (eds.) (1997): *Elementy nowego ładu* (Components of the New Order), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;
Domański, Henryk, Ostrowska, Antonina and Rychard, Andrzej (eds.) (2000): *Jak żyją Polacy* (How Do the Poles Live), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;
Frentzel-Zagórska, Janina and Wasilewski, Jacek (eds.) (2000): *The Second Generation of Democratic Elites in Central and Eastern Europe*, Warsaw, ISP PAN;
Gąciarz, Barbara and Pańków, Włodzimierz (1997): *Przekształcenia przedsiębiorstw przemysłowych* (Transformations of Industrial Enterprises), Warszawa, WSPiZ;
Giddens, Anthony (1998): *Socjologia. Zwięzłe lecz krytyczne wprowadzenie* (Sociology. A brief but critical introduction), Poznań, Zysk i Ska;
Gieorgica, Paweł J. (ed.) (1998): *Związki zawodowe w okresie przeobrażeń politycznych i gospodarczych* (Trade Unions in the Period of Political and Economic Transformations), Warszawa, Centrum Partnerstwa Społecznego DIALOG;
Gliński, Piotr (1996): *Polscy Zieloni. Ruch społeczny w okresie przemian* (The Polish Greens. Social Movement in the Period of Transformations), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;
Gołdyka, Leszek (ed.) (1999): *Transgraniczność w perspektywie socjologicznej. Kontynuacje* (Borderlands in Sociological Perspective. Continuities), Zielona Góra, LTN and WSP;
Goodman, Norman (1997): *Wstęp do socjologii* (Introduction to sociology), Poznań, Zysk i Ska;
Górniak, Jarosław and Wachnicki, Janusz (2000): *SPSS for Windows. Pierwsze kroki w analizie danych* (SPSS for Windows. First Steps in the Data Analysis), Kraków, SPSS Polska;

Grabowska, Mirosława and Krzemiński, Ireneusz (eds.) (1991): *Bitwa o Belweder* (The Belvedere Battle), Kraków, Wydawnictwo Myśl and Wydawnictwo Literackie;

Grabowska, Mirosława and Szawiel, Tadeusz (1998): *Anatomia elit politycznych. Partie polityczne w postkomunistycznej Polsce 1991-93* (Anatomy of Political Elites. Political Parties in the Post-communist Poland: 1991-93), Warszawa, Instytut Socjologii UW;

Grzymała-Moszczyńska, Halina and Nowicka, Ewa (1998): *Goście i gospodarze. Problem adaptacji kulturowej w obozach dla uchodźców oraz otaczających je społecznościach lokalnych* (Guests and Hosts. The Problem of Cultural Adaptation in the Refugees' Camps and the Closest Local Communities), Kraków, NOMOS;

Hausner, Jerzy, Marody, Mirosława, Wilkin, Jerzy, Wojtyna, Andrzej and Zirk-Sadowski, Marek (1998): *Przystąpienie czy integracja. Polska droga do Unii Europejskiej* (Accession or Integration. The Polish Road to European Union), Warszawa, Fundacja im. Friedricha Eberta;

Jacyno, Małgorzata (1997): *Iluzje codzienności. O teorii socjologicznej Pierre'a Bourdieu* (Illusions of Everyday Life. On Sociological Theory of Pierre Bourdieu), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;

Jakóbik, Witold (1997): *Transformacja gospodarki. Spojrzenie retrospektywne* (Transformation of Economy. The Retrospective Outlook), Warszawa, ISP PAN;

Jarosz, Maria (ed.) (1993): *Prywatyzacja. Szanse i zagrożenia* (Privatization. Chances and Threats), Warszawa, ISP PAN;

Jarosz, Maria (ed.) (1997): *Foreign Owners and Polish Employees of Privatized Enterprises*, Warszawa, ISP PAN;

Jawłowska, Aldona, Kempny, Marian and Tarkowska, Elżbieta (eds.) (1993): *Kulturowy wymiar przemian społecznych* (Cultural Dimension of the Social Changes), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;

Kempny, Marian, Kapciak, Alina and Łodziński, Sławomir (eds.) (1997): *U progu wielokulturowości. Nowe oblicza społeczeństwa polskiego* (On the Verge of Multiculturalism. New Faces of the Polish Society), Warszawa, Oficyna Naukowa;

Kohn, Melvin W., Maoi, Atsushi, Schoenbach, Carrie, Schooler, Carmi and Słomczyński, Kazimierz M. (1990): "Position in the Class Structure and Psychological Functioning in the United States, Japan and Poland", in: *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 95, No. 4, 964-1008;

Kohn, Melvin W., Słomczyński, Kazimierz M., Janicka, Krystyna, Khmelko, Valeri, Mach, Bogdan W., Paniotto, Vladimir, Zaborowski, Wojciech, Gutierrez, Roberto and Heyman, Cory (1997): "Social Structure and Personality under Conditions of Radical Social Change", in: *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 62, No. 4, 614-638;

Kojder, Andrzej, Łojko, Elżbieta, Staśkiewicz, Wiesław and Turska, Anna (eds.) (1989-1993): *Elementy socjologii prawa* (The Basics of the Sociology of Law), 5 volumes, Warszawa, Uniwersytet Warszawski;

Kolarska-Bobińska, Lena (1994): "Social interests and their political representation: Poland in transition", in: *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 45, No. 1, 109-126;

Kolarska-Bobińska, Lena, Łukasiewicz, Piotr and Rykowski, Zbigniew W. (eds.) (1990): *Wyniki badań – wyniki wyborów 4 czerwca 1989* (Results of the Study – Results of Elections: June 4th 1989), Warszawa, PTS;

Konecki, Krzysztof (2000): *Studia z metodologii badań jakościowych. Teoria ugruntowana* (Methodological Studies of Qualitative Analysis. Grounded Theory), Warszawa, PWN;

Kozek, Wiesława and Kulpińska, Jolanta (eds.) (1998): *Zbiorowe stosunki pracy w Polsce. Obraz zmian* (Collective Industrial Relationships in Poland. The Image of Changes), Warszawa, Scholar;

Krzemiński, Ireneusz (ed.) (1996): *Czy Polacy są antysemitami? Wyniki badania sondażowego* (Are the Poles Anti-Semites? Public Opinion Survey Findings), Warszawa, Oficyna Naukowa;

Kubiak, Hieronim (ed.) (1997): *Partie polityczne w wielkim mieście. Szkice do portretu partii politycznych w Krakowie* (Political Parties in a Big City. Sketches to the Portrait of Political Parties in Cracow), Kraków, Instytut Socjologii UJ;

Kubiak, Hieronim and Wiatr, Jerzy (eds.) (2000): *Between Animosity and Utility. Political Parties and Their Matrix*, Warszawa, Scholar;

Kurcz, Zbigniew (1995): *Mniejszość niemiecka w Polsce* (German Minority in Poland), Wrocław, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego;

Kurczewski, Jacek and Jakubowska-Branicka, Iwona (eds.) (1994): *Biznes i klasy średnie. Studia nad etosem* (Business and Middle Classes. Studies on the Ethos), Warszawa, ISNS UW;

Lewenstein, Barbara (1999): *Wspólnota społeczna a uczestnictwo lokalne* (Social Community and the Local Participation), Warszawa, ISNS UW;

Lewenstein, Barbara and Pawlik, Wojciech (eds.) (1994): *A miało być tak pięknie... Polska scena publiczna lat dziewięćdziesiątych* (And It Was To Be So Nice … Polish Public Scene in the 1990s), Warszawa, Instytut Stosowanych Nauk Społecznych UW;

Lutyńska, Krytyna (1993): *Surveye w Polsce. Spojrzenie socjologiczno-antropologiczne* (Surveys in Poland. Sociological-anthropological Perspective), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;

Mach, Bogdan W., Mayer, Karl Ulrich and Pohoski, Michał (1994): "Job changes in the Federal Republic of Germany and Poland: A longitudinal assessment of the impact of welfare-capitalist and state-socialist labour-market segmentation", in: *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 1-28;

Manterys, Aleksander (2000): *Klasyczna idea definicji sytuacji* (The Classic Idea of Definition of Situation), Warszawa, INS UW;

Mariański, Janusz (1994): *Etos pracy bezrobotnych* (Work Ethos Among the Unemployed), Lublin, KUL;

"Market Research Companies. Ranked by 1999 Revenue from Market Research" (2000), in: *Warsaw Business Journal*, 8-14 May, 14-16;

Markowski, Radosław (ed.) (1999): *Wybory parlamentarne 1997. System partyjny, postawy polityczne, zachowania wyborcze* (Parliamentary Elections of 1997. Party System, Political Attitudes, Electoral Behavior), Warszawa, ISP PAN;

Mendras, Henri (1997): *Elementy socjologii* (Elements de sociologie), Wrocław, Siedmioróg;

Misztal, Bronisław (2000): *Teoria socjologiczna a praktyka społeczna* (Sociological Theory and the Social Practice), Kraków, Universitas;

Morawski, Witold (1998): *Zmiana instytucjonalna. Społeczeństwo, gospodarka, polityka* (Institutional Change. Society, Economy, Politics), Warszawa, PWN;

Mucha, Janusz (ed.) (1999a): *Kultura dominująca jako kultura obca* (Dominant Culture as a Foreign Culture), Warszawa, Oficyna Naukowa;

Mucha, Janusz (ed.) (1999b): *Społeczeństwo polskie w perspektywie członkostwa w Unii Europejskiej* (Polish Society in the Perspective of the Membership in European Union), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;

Piotrowski, Andrzej (1998): *Ład interakcji. Studia z socjologii interpretatywnej* (The Order of Interaction. Studies in the Interpretative Sociology), Łódź, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego;

Pommersbach, Joanna and Woźniak, Jacek (1991): "The TransEuropean Mobility Scheme for University Students (TEMPUS): Some Considerations", in: *International Sociology*, Vol. 6, No. 4, 473-480;

Raciborski, Jacek (ed.) (1991): *Wybory. Narodziny demokracji w krajach Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej* (Elections. The Birth of Democracy in Central and East European Countries), Warszawa, Uniwersytet Warszawski;

Raciborski, Jacek (1997): *Polskie wybory. Zachowania wyborcze społeczeństwa polskiego 1989-1995* (Polish Elections. Electoral Behavior of the Polish Society: 1989-1995), Warszawa, Scholar;

Reszke, Irena (1998): *Stereotypy prywatnych przedsiębiorców w Polsce* (Stereotypes of Private Businessmen in Poland), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;

Rychard, Andrzej (1993): *Reforms, Adaptation and Breakthrough*, Warsaw, IFiS Publishers;

Sadowski, Andrzej (1995): *Pogranicze polsko-białoruskie. Tożsamość mieszkańców* (Polish-Byelorussian Borderland. The Identity of Inhabitants), Białystok, TransHumana;

Sawiński, Zbigniew and Domański, Henryk (1991a): "Stability and Prestige Hierarchies in the Face of Social Changes: Poland 1958-1987", in: *International Sociology*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 227-242;

Sawiński, Zbigniew and Domański, Henryk (1991b): "Dissensus in assessment of occupational prestige: The case of Poland", in: *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 253-266;

Siemaszko, Andrzej (ed.) (2000): *Crime and Law Enforcement in Poland on the Threshold of the 21st Century*, Warszawa, Oficyna Naukowa;

Siemieńska, Renata (1997): *Płeć a wybory. Od wyborów parlamentarnych do wyborów prezydenckich* (Gender and Elections. From Parliamentary Elections to Presidential Elections), Warszawa, Instytut Studiów Społecznych UW;

Siemieńska, Renata (2000): *Nie mogą, nie chcą, czy nie potrafią? O postawach i uczestnictwie politycznym kobiet w Polsce* (Cannot They, Do They Not Want, Are They Unable? On the Women' Attitudes and Political Participation in Poland), Warszawa, Scholar;

Skotnicka-Illasiewicz, Elżbieta (1997): *Powrót czy droga w nieznane? Europejskie dylematy Polaków* (Return or the Road to the Unknown. Europen Dilemmas of the Poles), Warszawa, Centrum Europejskie Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego and Instytut Kultury;

Słomczyński, Kazimierz M., Janicka, Krystyna, Mach, Bogdan and Zaborowski, Wojciech (1996): *Struktura społeczna a osobowość. Psychologiczne funkcjonowanie jednostki w warunkach zmiany społecznej* (Social Structure and Personality. Psychological Functioning of Individuals in the Circumstances of the Social Change), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;

Słomczyński, Kazimierz M., Janicka, Krystyna, Mach, Bogdan and Zaborowski, Wojciech (1999): *Mental Adjustment to the Post-Communist System in Poland*, Warsaw, IFiS Publishers;

Sozański, Tadeusz, Szmatka, Jacek and Kempny, Marian (eds.) (1993): *Struktura, wymiana, władza. Szkice z socjologii teoretycznej* (Structure, Exchange, Power. Essays in Theoretical Sociology), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;

Sułek, Antoni (1990): *W terenie, w archiwum i w laboratorium. Studia nad warsztatem socjologa* (In the Field, in the Archives and in the Laboratory. Methodological Studies), Warszawa, Instytut Socjologii UW;

Szczepański, Marek (ed.) (1997): *Ethnic Minorities and Ethnic Majority*, Katowice, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego;

Szelenyi, Ivan, Treiman, Don and Wnuk-Lipiński, Edmund (eds.) (1995): *Elity w Polsce, w Rosji i na Węgrzech. Wymiana czy reprodukcja* (Elites in Poland, Russia and Hungary. Exchange or Reproduction), Warszawa, ISP PAN;

Sztompka, Piotr (1990): "Agency and Revolution", in: *International Sociology*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 129-144;

Sztompka, Piotr (1993): "Civilizational Incompetence: The Trap of Post-Communist Societies", in: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 85-95;

Sztompka Piotr (1996): "Trust and Emerging Democracy: Lessons from Poland", in: *International Sociology*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 37-62;

Sztompka, Piotr (ed.) (1999): *Imponderabilia wielkiej zmiany. Mentalność, wartości i więzi społeczne czasów transformacji* (Imponderables of the Great Changes. Mentality, Values and Bonds during the Time of Transformation), Warszawa-Kraków, PWN;

Tarkowska, Elżbieta (ed.) (2000): *Zrozumieć biednego. O dawnej i obecnej biedzie w Polsce* (To Understand the Poor. On the Former and the Present-day Poverty in Poland), Warszawa, IFiS PAN and Typografika;

Titkow, Anna and Domański, Henryk (eds.) (1995): *Co to znaczy być kobietą w Polsce* (What Does It Mean to Be a Woman in Poland?), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;

Turner, Jonathan H. (1985): *Struktura teorii socjologicznej* (The Structure of Sociological Theory), Warszawa, PWN;

Turner, Jonathan H. (1998): *Socjologia. Koncepcje i ich zastosowanie* (Sociology. Concepts and uses), Poznań, Zysk i Ska;

Turska, Anna, Łojko, Elżbieta, Cywiński, Zbigniew and Kojder, Andrzej (1999): *Społeczne wizerunki prawa* (Social Images of Law), Warszawa, Uniwersytet Warszawski;

Warzywoda-Kruszyńska, Wielisława and Grotowska-Leder, Jolanta (1996): *Wielkomiejska bieda w okresie transformacji (zasiłkobiorcy pomocy społecznej)* (The Big-city Poverty During the Period of Transformation), Łódź, Instytut Socjologii UŁ;

Wasilewski, Jacek and Wesołowski, Włodzimierz (eds.) (1992): *Początki parlamentarnej elity. Posłowie Sejmu kontraktowego* (Origins of the Parliamentary Elite. Members of the Contractual Seym), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;

Wnuk-Lipiński, Edmund (1996): *Demokratyczna rekonstrukcja. Z socjologii radykalnej zmiany społecznej* (Democratic Reconstruction. On the Sociology of Radical Change), Warszawa, PWN;

Wódz, Kazimiera (ed.) (1993): *W kręgu ubóstwa. Próba analizy psychospołecznych aspektów zjawiska* (In the Circle of Poverty. Tentative Analysis of Psycho-social Aspects of the Phenomenon), Katowice, Śląsk;

Wyka, Anna (1993): *Badacz społeczny wobec doświadczenia* (Social Researcher and the Experience), Warszawa, IFiS PAN;

Zieliński, Florian (1994): "The Rise and Fall of Governmental Patronage of Art: A Sociologist's Case Study of the Polish Poster between 1945 and 1990", in: *International Sociology*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 29-41;

Ziółkowski, Marek, Pawłowska, Barbara and Drozdowski, Rafał (1994): *Jednostka wobec władzy* (Individual Facing Power), Poznań, NAKOM;

Zybertowicz, Andrzej (1995): *Przemoc i poznanie. Studium z nie-klasycznej socjologii wiedzy* (Violence and Knowledge. A Study of the Non-classical Sociology of Knowledge), Toruń, UMK.

Maria Larionescu

Sociology – Romania

Discussant: Mihai Dinu Gheorghiu

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

The establishment of communism in Romania, as in other Eastern and Central European countries, coincided with a break in sociology's career as a didactic discipline and science with a critical vocation. The marginalization of this discipline came in waves of rejection of varying intensity, depending on factors of the domestic and foreign context.

The spectrum of Marxism-Leninism

In the 1950s and early 1960s, sociology experienced what is called its and other socio-human sciences' "ancillization" toward the Marxist-Leninist ideology, that is, their systematic control and manipulation by the communist party-state. Historical materialism, conceived as a Russian dogmatic and simplified variant of Marxism, took the place of sociological analysis. The general process of relaxation peaked in the mid-1960s with the re-institutionalization of sociology as both a teaching and a research discipline, of course under the tutelage of Marxism-Leninism. Political factors intruded on sociology's revival, making it generally "captive", but the post-war evolution of the discipline shows a few *paradoxical* aspects due to several factors: pre-war traditions, the existence of a group of sociologists despite the administrative ban and incarceration of reputed sociologists, the impact of Western theories, and, last but not least, the impact of empirical sociological research.

Pre-war traditions

The "career" of Romanian sociology began in the mid-19th century and was closely tied to the discourse of modernity in Romanian culture and society. The historical-comparative analysis of Romanian sociology through a century of its existence (1848-1948) reveals four ideal types of modernity: liberal rationalist representation, "organized or state modernity", the representation of modernity established on the specificity of cultural identity, and the historical materialist representation.

The second fundamental component of Romanian sociological traditions was classical theoretical sociology, or "desk sociology", developed by professionals starting in the last decade of the 19th century and continuing in the first half of the 20th century. Dimitrie Gusti founded the first modern sociological school in Romania, the Sociological School of Bucharest. The picture of Romanian sociology in that period reveals a simultaneous European synchronism with substantial contributions (Ilie Bădescu).

The existence of rich traditions in the discipline and of a large body of professional sociologists could not pass without leaving traces, even after the discipline was officially banned in 1948. A body of professional sociologists still went on practicing sociology, masked behind other disciplines (political economy, statistics, social hygiene, ethnology, and anthropology), and there were institutions such as the General Directorate for Statistics, the Institute of Hygiene, and the Institute for Economic Research. The "moral and institutional rehabilitation" of the discipline in the mid-60s was also a "nationalization of a cultural capital and re-establishment of an internal genealogy" (Gheorghiu, 1987:80). Henri H. Stahl, a reputed survivor of the Bucharest Monograph School, played a distinct role in the revitalization of sociology.

The impact of Western theories

The impact of Western theories increased substantially with the ideological thaw and with the re-institutionalization of sociology in 1965. In the long term, we may note the effect of "reformist sociology", which started to animate the sociologists interested in applying Western ideas and theories with the view of perfecting the socialist system. The fundamental Marxist orientation of the reformist sociologists gave them the required security to elaborate the research projects. Marxist "cover" was indispensable to any scientific manifestation within the system.

The combination of Western theories with historic materialism yielded unpredictable effects, including several theoretical incongruities, ambiguities, the empiricism of many investigations, puerile practices of opinion surveys, and the search for reasons legitimating theses in party documents.

Oppositional activities

There was no active sociological dissidence displayed within the communist system that signified an official and effective break from Marxist ideology. We may, nevertheless, identify a few defensive strategies that sociologists developed in their surveys: a) the stratagem of the *local* character of the surveys allowed the researchers to reveal social problems and various malfunctions, such as the "decrease in standards" in organizations, self-perpetuating bodies within the structures of socialist democracy, etc., without pretending to generalize them to the whole socialist system; b) the *adaptation and specification of concepts and theories* as "intended distortion" to avoid the defensive reaction of the system. Thus, the American sociological movement on the *social development* of organizations became the *human development* of socialist enterprises, in the project elaborated by Cătălin Zamfir, Ioan Mărginean, Septimiu Chelcea, Mielu Zlate, and Ştefan Ştefănescu, in which the authors used the methodology of diagnosis and assessment of social actors (SEDA) developed at Ann Arbor University, Michigan; c) the uses of special modes of communication reserved to writers to build "unorthodox" scientific constructions. For example, the comprehensive theory on Romanian culture focused on the stage of literature; the book as an object, symbol, and purpose; game theory and practice; and the socio-history of culture (Gheorghiu, 1987). Other ways of escaping the vigilance of censorship were to take refuge in history, methodological sophistication, or mimicry of ideological discourse; d) some authors (Gheorghiu, 2002) mention an alternative sociology outside the system, such as Pavel Câmpeanu's work (Campeanu, 1994), which was distributed as samizdat.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

The 1989 revolution awakened in sociologists a huge horizon of expectations and signified a mixture of hope for the rehabilitation of the science and of illusions about the decisive contribution sociology could make to the construction of a market-oriented democratic society.

Change of paradigms

The most significant and radical change in the discipline's physiognomy since 1989 was the "overnight" break with Marxism-Leninism. This break was so sudden and visible that we can say that the disappearance of the Ceauşescu regime coincided with the fall of the official paradigm, by general consensus, without displayed resistance or attempts to defend the former official doctrine. Rejection was so definite that not even after 10 years has there been any significant return to Marxism.

The formal absence of the Marxist perspective from the sociology of the past decade does not mean it has completely disappeared. Informally, the Marxist perspective is still present in the analysis of social phenomena, especially in combination with other theories, or leading to the development of other theories (see below such concepts as “survival society”, “parasitic capitalism”, etc.), or to a preference for certain areas of study (poverty, social policies, etc.).

Though not completely omitted, the Marxist paradigm is relativized; in particular, recently published textbooks treat it as one orientation among others. Most authors avoid mentioning Marxism altogether. Particularly during the early years of transition, the pressing need for a theoretical alternative to Marxism was met, in many cases, by a *theoretical syncretism,* which proved rather the variety of the sources available for documentation than a personal or assumed theoretical option.

Change of elites

The 1989 revolution caught the discipline in a marginalized position; its role in higher education was limited and under ideologically surveillance. One of the first measures the new regime took – at the initiative of the sociologists still working at institutes of higher education in Bucharest and in the country’s main university centers – was to reinstate sociology as a subject of higher education (in association with other socio-humanistic disciplines: psychology, pedagogy, social work, history, and philosophy). The decision-making structures of sociological education and sociological research consist mainly of teaching staff and researchers formed during the 1970s to 1980s, with documentation periods spent in Western countries and professional activity legitimized by the scientific community. The new elite also includes new sociologists accredited after 1989.

New institutional structures

The reconstruction of sociology meant not only the formation of a scientific elite, but also an unprecedented expansion of sociological institutions. Older institutions of academic research, such as the Institute of Sociology of the Romanian Academy, in Bucharest, the local branches of the Romanian Academy – Institutes of Social and Human Research from Cluj-Napoca, Iaşi, Timişoara, Sibiu, Tg. Mureş, and Craiova, and the Studies and Research Center in the Problems of the Young (C.S.C.P.T.) in Bucharest have consolidated their position. And new educational, research, and commercial structures in sociology have been added.

Rehabilitation, repatriation, new departures

Once the discipline was accepted and institutionalized, the rehabilitation of the “outlaws” who had left the country legally or illegally before 1989 was a mere formality. Romanian sociologists reputed abroad but censored in socialist Romania, such as Mihail Cernea (a senior adviser to the World Bank), Vladimir Tismăneanu, Vladimir Krasnaselski, Paul Stahl, and others, were rehabilitated. Some sociologists living in Western countries returned to live in Romania, like Paul Stahl; others paid frequent visits to the country after 1989, resuming their journalistic activity in Romania, like Vladimir Tismăneanu.

Parallel to rehabilitation and the permanent or temporary return of Romanian sociologists residing in Western countries before 1989, in an inverse process, many young Romanian sociologists, students, and graduates left for the West, mainly to study. Many of them continue their university training toward a master’s or doctorate in sociology at American and European universities.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

Revival and adaptation of major pre-war traditions

The discourse of capitalist modernization of Romanian society, with its abundant polemics during the pre-war period, was updated after the break from communism.

Theory of the soul latency
Ilie Bădescu defined latency as soul energy or power stored in human nature, which "spreads everywhere", forming a "bottomless store of virtualities, a kind of proto-virtues and foreboding". Shared by a small group of disciples, this spiritualist paradigm of latency offered a means of understanding and explaining modern history in terms of the "malady of modernity", of the national identity as a "substrate of the people through the theory of diffused soul latency" (Bădescu, 1997:129). The theory of latency is a qualitative and historical strategy, whose analysis emphasizes the coherence of the system, its manner of functioning, and the aims of the social agents (communist, national, oligarchic, and post-communist political elite).
"Transition as premises of postmodernity"
Lazăr Vlăsceanu observes a lag between formal and informal changes. The rhythm of change in formal institutions promoted by laws and normative regulations was faster than that of informal institutions, which are mainly "*moral* and social" and which have a profound cultural inertia (path-dependence, North).
Unlike the organicist theory, Lazăr Vlăsceanu does not see a solution in the appeal to the immutable Romanian soul, but rather in a postmodern development based on "constantly reinvented" cultural traditions (Vlăsceanu 2001: 133, 134).
The Bucharest Monograph School
After 1989, some integral village monographs were carried out in accordance with the Gustian interdisciplinary paradigm, many of whose sociological principles and methods were recovered: the theoretical foundation of empirical surveys, sociologic integralism, direct and active observation, interdisciplinary cooperation in the survey of local and zonal communities, and connection between sociology and politics. In 2001, the Romanian Social Institute was refounded on the lines Gusti established in 1921 as a public forum for research and debates on the fundamental problems of the country.
Recapturing the past
These are two large projects of analysis and recapture of Romanian sociological traditions: rehabilitation of the values repressed by the communist regime and the sociology of Romanian sociology. Frequent distortions in this approach include trends to stress the absolute originality of Romanian contributions and to underestimate the connections between national and Western sociology. There are extremely rare references to sociology from Central and other Eastern European countries.

New approaches

After 1989, Romania, like the other former socialist countries, opened up to a multitude of theoretical ideas about and practices of development under the new conditions of transition, social problems, the definition of ethnic identity, the genesis of civil society, institutional construction, etc. A substantial amount of research was dedicated to new general and specific theoretical approaches in sociology.
Enlarged causal analysis
The novelty of the solution proposed by Cătălin Zamfir is the insertion of a functional explanatory mechanism into the causal design, resulting in a "causal design detailed functionally" (Cosima Rughiniş). The intellectual challenges produced by this paradigm led to a more complex view of the social system that "must be regarded as being in a state of oscillation between system and oversystem" (Zamfir, 1999:130).
Theory of limited, individual, and collective human rationality
According to this theory, a behavior must be understood in terms of the interests it defends, the knowledge supporting it, and the constraints acting on it. This theory was tested in comprehensive studies of poverty and impoverishment, social polarization, marginalized categories, and social policies (Zamfir, 1990, 1999; Zamfir, 1995, 1999; Zamfir and Zamfir, 1993, 1995, 2000).

Theory of the "Social Space of Transition"
Elaborating an original synthesis between the phenomenological approach, the recent debates on the concept of social capital (Putnam, Bourdieu, Becker), and an older Romanian orientation of social mechanics (Spiru Haret), Dumitru Sandu formulated an enticing paradigm with the concept of "social space of transition" as central pivot. The "social space" is defined by the manner in which individual (education, health, income, wealth) and community (welfare of the community or area where the social actors reside) resources influence the actions, attitudes, and values of individuals. The paradigm "social space of transition" was tested in surveys on domestic migration, entrepreneurship, and agricultural households (Sandu, 1996, 1999).
The general perspective on social rationality
Sorin Rădulescu asserts that the most satisfactory model is that of "Homo Sociologicus", which synthesizes the two revealing images of the man (tied to the ideas of Ralf Dahrendorf): "rational" man, "included and subdued by predictable social roles", and "irrational" man, who acts unpredictably. This approach was used in research on deviance, social pathology, domestic violence, and some marginal groups (transsexuals). In a different direction, the study of Romanian and Western classical and contemporary theories led Ion Ungureanu to develop the constitutive problem of contemporary sociology as an expression of rationality and social action (Rădulescu, 1994; Ungureanu, 1990).
The specific theoretical answers of the sociologists to the challenges of post-communist transition show a wide range of concepts and *middle range theories***.** Here are examples of some thematic areas.
Theories on Romanian socialism
Very few Romanian sociologists devoted their efforts to the analysis of the communist regime in Romania. Foreign authors like Katherine Verdery or David Kideckel elaborated several papers on socialist Romanian society.
Public policies in communism
The analysis emphasizes the study of individual as rational actors; the monitoring of direct and deleterious effects of the ideology on policy and of policy on the situation of individuals; observation of contradictory evolutions in the social system (effects of the limited rationality of the state); identification of system failures, particularly those related to the official ideology; and observation of the incoherence of social policies, of the coexistence of positive and deleterious results (Zamfir, 1999; Zamfir and Zamfir, 1995).
Ethnic identity and the penury economy in communism
The roles of ethnicity and the border in the penury economy (János Kornai) are underlined (Chelcea and Lățea, 2000).
The line for food as a fundamental social institution
Pavel Câmpeanu conducts the qualitative, ethno-methodological analysis of the structure of interactions in the line (queue): the functional analysis of the line as an element of the socialist social system. The functions of the line are: to reduce demand to the level of supply, to dissolve the grown social hierarchy; and to make people overly concerned with securing their food, leaving no time for disputes over power. The study analyzes primarily the coherence of the system (the manner in which the line is an integrating and functional institution in socialism) and the cynicism of the system (how official ideology is clearly contradicted by reality) (Câmpeanu, 1994).

Theories on underdevelopment

"Survival society"
The paper by Vladimir Pasti, Mihaela Miroiu, and Cornel Codiță is an articulate assembly of explanatory ideas, concepts of conflict, and Marxist theories about the mechanisms generating postcommunist underdevelopment and about overcoming underdevelopment. "The post-totalitarian survival society is regarded as an unintended consequence of institution building after 1989." (Larionescu and Sandu, 2001: 142) These authors underline the dysfunction of the process

of institutional construction, paying less attention to the resources of the institutions that make them instruments of enabling (Pasti; Miroiu and Codiță, 1997).

Theories on poverty, social exclusion and social policy

Poverty is viewed as a fundamental challenge to both society and sociology. Three factors have been identified as responsible for the devastating erosion of the standard of living: the decrease in purchasing power of most incomes; the rapid increase of income differentiation; decreasing social transfers; and lower social protection (Zamfir, 1995; 1999; 2000; Zamfir and Zamfir, 1995; Zamfir and Preda, 2000; Teşliuc; Pop and Teşliuc, 2001).

Middle range theories on cultural heritage and development

M. Cernea – the former Senior Social Adviser for Social Policy of the World Bank and currently Consultant Social Adviser in the Middle East North Africa Region of the World Bank – generated a change in development thinking. He formulated a new theoretical approach in development projects focused on cultural heritage, "putting people first". The changes in development thinking the author proposes show that the "cultural sector contributes to effective economic growth rather than just consuming budgetary resources" (Cernea, 2001: 3-4; 1991; 2000, 2001).

Risks and reconstruction policies

Michael Cernea and McDowell formulate the Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) model for resettling displaced populations, based on studies on development, social change, population resettlement, grassroots organizations, and participation (2000). A brief presentation of this model is included in *The Challenge of Transition in Romanian Society and Sociology* (Larionescu and Sandu, 2001). Cernea's contributions to development thinking have expanded the range of entry points for social scientific knowledge in the World Bank's projects and have promoted "a more encompassing development paradigm" that "places the inducement of economic growth within the *social* context" (ibid. 173-174).

Theories of ethnicity and nationalism

The reconstruction of ethnic and national identity after decades of domination by the communist ideology, which generated prejudices and stereotypes with a strong ideological load, came to the attention of sociologists, anthropologists, historians, and psychologists. A defining characteristic of the major sociological projects focusing on ethnic identity is that they give up the substantialist position of mass psychology embraced by older sociological traditions, which considered identity to be primordial data.

Ethnicity as collective inhabiting

Dorel Abraham, Septimiu Chelcea, and Ilie Bădescu specify their constructivist approach in terms of ethnomorphology, treating cohabition as a phenomenon of ethnic interaction, in contrast to the old cliches of ethnic monads. Backed by such analytical instruments as Bogardus' scale of social distance and Tajfel's theory of social comparison, the authors have delineated four different patterns of cohabiting specific to the various cultural areas of Romania: cosmopolite, intercultural, cantonal, and ethnocentric (1995).

A "subjective" model of ethnicity centered on the exposure to difference

Alina Mungiu-Pippidi reached the conclusion that Tajfel's theory of the minimal group and the comparative-historical approach is essential to understand and explain ethnic identity. The theory of the minimal group reveals the trend of groups to maximize the differences between them (Mungiu-Pippidi, 1999). The author's "subjective" perspective on ethnic conflict is different from the approach to the same subject by Abraham, Chelcea, and Bădescu. The latter contested the legitimacy of the concept of ethnic conflict in provinces with ethnic heterogeneity (Transylvania, Banat, Dobrogea), asserting that the conflict has social (ownership, interpersonal relations) and not ethnic causes. But Alina Mungiu-Pippidi says sources of conflict may be found in its perception by significant ethnic groups in their rivalry to reach certain objectives.

Narrative identity
The survey of the process of the active reconstruction of identity borders within Romania's multiethnic community involved a combination of symbolic interactionism, hermeneutics, and thick description. What resulted was a construction of the "narrative identity" as a "weave of told stories". The "voices" listened and analyzed in the text certify the existence of disregarded social categories (spoiled identity) as well as the heterogeneity within the category of "Romanian", contradicting the theses based on the cultural homogeneity of the nation and of local histories (Chelcea and Lățea, 2000). Other approaches of ethnicity are *substantialist* in essence (Cobianu-Băcanu, 1998) and emphasize the differences between ethnic groups.

Theories on Management and Organizations

In the last decade, changes in management practices and constraints occurred simultaneously with growing criticism of developmentalist perspectives and transfer projects. Organizational culture became the keyword in the design of endogenous projects, aiming to achieve a reflective modernization and not merely to imitate an allegedly unique occidental model (Hoffman, 2000; Vlăsceanu, 1993, 1996, 1999; Mereuță; Pop; Vlaicu and Pop, 1998).

Theories of communication and electoral processes

Statistically processing the empirical data of the elections in Romania in the 1990s, sociologists formulated generalizations supporting one another, but also displaying differences that intrigue and stimulate new research. For instance, significant are conclusions on "minimal democracy" (Matei Dogan) as a historical variant of "showcase democracy" (Pasti; Miroiu and Codiță, 1997:129-164), on "vulnerable democracy" (Vlăsceanu and Miroiu, 2001:51), on the "permanent electoral campaign" (Mungiu), and on the "failure of democracy" in Romania (Bulai, 1999:258).
The symbolic construction of the electoral field
One of the first groups in Romania to specialize in a multidisciplinary sociology of communication took an innovating approach by "assessing the role of the mass media as actor in a multidimensional and interactive public space of social actors; measuring audition rates and media credibility by an assembly of interconnected indicators (beyond the formula of brief rating surveys); organizing specific sociological surveys to test classical paradigms and hypotheses on the influence, functions, and effects of the mass media." (Drăgan et al., 1998:15; Beciu, 2000)

Theories on corruption and deviance

Dan Banciu and Sorin Rădulescu highlight the issue using concepts of anomie, social disorganization, organizational deviance, legal fetishism, and the labeling process. They propose a multidimensional definition of corruption, which is understood as a "functional substitute for a reform that was not taken to its end, not just a mere excrescence" (1994: 26, 27, 29, compare also Rădulescu; Banciu and Teodorescu, 2001; Banciu and Rădulescu, 1994).

New East-West asymmetries

The above sketch of the major theoretical orientations revealed the *absence of Marxism* as a paradigm in contemporary Romanian sociology. Another difference between East and West lies in the asymmetry of sociological approaches to the *emancipation of some minorities* (women, children); Romanian sociology takes an academic approach and nothing is heard from radical sociological currents (feminism, protest movements against ethnic, racial, or sexual discrimination), with a few noteworthy exceptions. Some examples are conclusive.

The projects of the sociological investigation of *gender* and the *family* are generally middle range *academic* theories based on functionalist, interactionist-symbolic presuppositions of social action. (Mihăilescu, 1999; Stănciulescu, 1997, 1998; Voinea, 1996; Iluț, 1995; Zamfir and Zamfir, 2000). *Feminist sociology* (Grunberg, Miroiu, 1997a, 1997b, etc.), in its early days in Romania hovering around the revue "Analyses", displayed a more radical attitude on the status of women.

Feminist studies critically and militantly assess various forms of gender discrimination (economic, politic, cultural) and of physical and symbolic violence against women.

Another asymmetry with the West lies in *the deficit of internal critique* in Romania's sociological community. The domestic scientific practice of the invisible college is intermittent and unsystematic. Opinion on significant papers is seldom displayed. That sociologists publish refereed papers in Western journals also demonstrates an East-West asymmetry: the *insufficient institutionalization* of the discipline in Romania.

Quantitative vs. qualitative empirical research approaches

The quantitative approach used by most surveys includes a wide range of methods and techniques, more or less sophisticated: sociological survey, opinion survey, sampling, frequency distribution analysis, data processing, scaling, statistical significance analysis, cluster analysis, regression analysis, and factorial analyses. Quantitative empirical surveys are frequent mainly in the areas of life quality, policy, and elections.

The main aspects of the qualitative survey have been mentioned in the studies devoted to this field: thick description (Geertz), biography, case studies, interpretive approaches, grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss), participatory observation, individual interviews, focus-group interviews, and "theoretical sampling". Following pre-war sociological traditions, the studies of the 1990s showed a particular force of assertion of and trust in the qualitative approach, mainly in the symbolic areas of culture, ethnic identity, political community, community development, education, family, human resource management, etc. Most qualitative studies are descriptive, with a few noteworthy exceptions.

Considering the expansion of qualitative surveys after 1989, we have reason to believe they will be more accepted in the future. Whether they used preponderantly quantitative or qualitative strategies, most researchers displayed a propensity to contextualization, but sometimes ignoring the influences and contacts between ideas and cultures led to exaggeratedly "original" conclusions.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Sociology's thematic options in the 1990s reflected the challenges of transition, on the one hand, and the epistemological requirements of the internal reconstruction of the discipline, on the other. Most major sociological projects analyze Romanian society using empirical references.

Transition as a major object of study

Although most of the papers analyzing Romanian society and/or its segments refer to the process of transition, post-communist sociology cannot be simply equated with the sociology of transition, not even in the case of volumes whose titles refer to the sociology of transition. Many researchers define transition as a process of multidimensional change: the process of post-communist underdevelopment; the special case of remodernization through the reorganization of social, human, material, and symbolic capital; and transition as premises of postmodernity. Other authors approach transition as a complex of interconnected processes and phenomena: a) a process of massive and brutal impoverishment; an explosion of aspirations concomitant with the crash of possibilities; b) a social polarization arising from the low level of social services for disfavored categories; c) a moral crisis, meaning: the general perception that success is obtained through corruption and connections; disappointment; distrust in state institutions; and a crisis of social solidarity; and d) the lack of a coherent strategy on the political level; ad hoc political decisions.

Within the scope of this study, I could not consider all Romanian sociologists and their works. Some sociologists not included in the present study have taught sociology on various educational levels, disseminating sociological findings to a broader audience, etc.

Choice of themes

Transition permitted researchers to choose their own themes of study and abandoned the old practice of deriving themes from party documents. The state academic institutes have relative autonomy; they are controlled by the Romanian Academy through assessment and through funding from the budget. The institutes choose themes by internal negotiation between the collectives of researchers and the institution's Scientific Council. Formally, state institutions have full autonomy in choosing research themes; but actually they must consider the theme collectives' capacity to meet quality parameters and ensure that the assessment by the Academy's experts is as favorable as possible, thus winning proper financing. The commercial institutions select their themes according to the requirements of the beneficiaries.

The range of providers of research grants for different themes has recently expanded and now includes the Ministry of Education and Research, the Romanian Academy, the Ministry of Labor and Social Solidarity, the Ministry of Youth and Sport, the Ministry of Culture and Cults, the National Council for the University Scientific Research, the National Agency for the Protection of Children's Rights, the World Bank, the Open Society Foundation, the New Europe College, etc. Specialized research and development programs educating and supporting small and mid-size enterprises have a fundamental role in the expansion and selection of research themes by competition – Phare, Tempus, and Socrates, financed in common by international bodies (the EU, the World Bank, etc.) and the Romanian state.

The institutions and researchers are developing a market in sociological research. Some authors are drawing attention to the risk that sociology will become "auxiliary to the marketing and management modes" (Gheorghiu, 2002).

The impact of thematic orientations on institutional structures

Thematic orientation determines the profile and structure of any institute of sociological research. The thematic orientation's strongest and most visible impact on the research units was displayed in the research and education institutions established after 1989, which had deliberately elaborated flexible structures, readily adaptable to the thematic profile. A similar situation is observed in commercial sociological institutions, where the organizational diagram is subordinated to orders received from customers.

The sociological institutions established before 1989 underwent a process of adaptation to the new thematic requirements by reorienting existing teams and creating new teams. As the competition for research grants intensifies, the flexibility of organizational structures is expected to increase as a survival strategy and as a means of preserving the research units' status.

Private vs. public funding

A novel element of financing sociological research in the 1990s was the appearance and continuous increase of private funding. Funding from the budget ensured the survival of the state institutes, but the continuous trend is to cut the budget. There is a clear perception of the limits of budgetary resources and that, in periods of crisis, budget funding cannot cover the discipline's increasing needs. Hence the trend for research units and their research and teaching staff to diversify funding resources by identifying new opportunities.

The dynamics of research funds for socio-human sciences increased in the transition period (Table 1). The relative decrease of expenditure in 1999 may have been conjectural. The competition among research units and among individual researchers to win grants is becoming general; institutions and individuals are re-stratifying in accordance with scientific and interpersonal competence, the visibility of performance, prestige, and the importance of the themes addressed and of their beneficiaries.

5. Public space and academic debates

The position of sociology in the public space oscillates between axiological neutrality and sociologists' involvement as "reflection and action nuclei in the area of social norms and values" (Ioan Mihăilescu, 2001: 75).

Debated themes, problems, methods

Sociologists were involved in public debates on major themes and problems of transition. Disseminated by the mass media, symposia, and public conferences, the conclusions of sociological surveys approached the problem of transition in terms of: a) expected and failed intentions and effects of the reforms in the economy, politics, administration, health care, education, culture, the army, etc.; b) the population's opinions of and attitudes and behavior toward these reforms.

The methods debated publicly were public opinion surveys, sampling, questionnaires (used mainly in election surveys), political sociology surveys, communication, and mass media surveys. Sociologists do not perceive their dialogue with civil society, economic agents, political actors, and administrators as satisfactory. The community of sociologists has a persistent feeling of frustration about its involvement in debates on major problems of Romanian society in transition. A recent (2001) initiative of the Faculty of Sociology and Social Work at Bucharest University, the Association of Romanian Sociologists, and the Institute for Quality of Life seeks to establish a new review, "Social Romania", whose aim would be to maintain a constant dialogue with civil society, economic agents, political factors, and managers at the central and local level.

Principal academic journals

- *Romanian Sociology*, published by the Romanian Association of Sociology, 1990
- the Romanian Journal of Sociology, published by the Institute of Sociology at the Romanian Academy, 1990
- the *Social Research Review*, published jointly by the Faculty of Sociology and Social Work at Bucharest University, the Romanian Association of Sociology, and the Institute for Quality of Life, 1990
- the *Romanian Journal of Sociology*, published jointly by the Faculty of Sociology and Social Work at Bucharest University, the Romanian Association of Sociology, 1972
- the *Journal of Quality of Life Research*, published by the Institute for Quality of Life at the Romanian Academy, 1990
- *Studia Babeş-Bolyai University*, Series of Sociology, published by the Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, 1970
- the *Journal of Social Theory*, published by the Institute of Social Theory at the Romanian Academy, 1997
- *Revue Roumaine de Theorie Sociale*, published by the Institute of Social Theory at the Romanian Academy, 1998

These academic journals face severe material difficulties, so they are often irregularly published. Some publishers are supported by public bodies (the National Council for University Scientific Research, etc.) or private organizations (the Open Society Foundation) to publish the journals. But financial uncertainty disturbs the regular publishing of academic journals of sociology.

New manuals. Databases

The renewal and diversification of the sociology curriculum in state and private education was reflected in the elaboration of new manuals of general sociology and its branches. Besides the "classical" manuals of general sociology and of its branches, several new manuals appeared, with special themes associated with transition (Mărgineanu, 1994, 2000; Ştefănescu, 1999; Neculau, Ferreol, 1999).

During the decade of transition, field institutes and other bodies interested in sociological information developed databases. Databases are built around areas of interest, for example on: a) the socio-demography of Transylvanian localities (Babeş-Bolyai University, Department of Sociology, Cluj-Napoca); b) social change analysis and social reform in Romanian society; social problems diagnosis, social and demographic structures; community and regional development; social policy and probation; social indicators and quality of life; social communication; social problems of disabled people; organizational and institutional analysis; social marginalization and exclusion; cultural anthropology (University of Bucharest Department of Sociology and Social Work); c) population income and expenditure; social policies; the village during transition to the market economy (Institute for Quality of Life, Bucharest); d) social communities and identities during transition, the actors of social change during transition; encyclopedia of Romanian sociology (the Institute of Sociology at the Romanian Academy, Bucharest); e) demographic structure of the Romanian population (Center of Demographic Research of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest); f) and marketing, opinion surveys on economic, socio-political problems; election studies, mass media rating, etc. (commercial sociological institutes).

The barometer of public opinion (BOP) and the self-reflectiveness of public opinion. In 1994, the Open Society Foundation started the series of BOP surveys. There have meanwhile been 22 of these systematic reports, including a gender barometer in 2000. Access to BOP data is free (address: www.osf.ro). Although each survey has a given theme and while new themes concerning the European integration have been addressed since 1997, all surveys had a thematic structure designed to provide a dynamic perspective on Romanian society.

6. Views on further development

The future development of Romanian sociology is closely connected to East-West dialogue, regional cooperation in sociology, and European integration. A spectacular effect of the downfall of the communist regime was the enhancement of bilateral and multilateral, informal and project-based international cooperation. Here are just a few significant examples of international cooperation in sociology:

The French-Romanian colloquium on Media, Communication, and New Technologies (1991-2001). The eight meetings so far have been held in Bucharest. Part of the debates was published in France (Drăgan *et al*, 1998). A brief presentation may be found in Larionescu, Sandu (2001:148-149).

Vision of Europe in Romanian Young People's Perception, Dan Banciu, Ilut Petre, 2000-2001, Institute of Sociology at the Romanian Academy, Bucharest. Project partners: Foundation Minoritas, Research Institute on Ethnic Minorities, Budapest; Institute National de la Jeunesse et de l'Education Populaire, Paris. The main concerns of this project are civic values and attitudes in young people; attitudes and mentalities towards globalization, poverty, conflicts, chauvinism, and tolerance for difference; youth and politics; ethnic identity and alterity; normativity and social order; youth and Europe; assessment, self-assessment, projections, etc.

Performance and democracy in local administrations, 2001-2002, L. Pop, Department of Sociology and Social Work. Participants: Romania, Lithuania, Hungary, and Poland. Funding: Open Society Institute (LGI-Local Government Initiative).

The impact of accession

Romania's accession to the European Union stimulated sociological research and education by expanding reflection on new themes such as: challenges and responses to globalization; globalization and cultural identities; exposure to difference; transition and postmodernity; national and regional communities; social polarization and exclusion from the perspective of European integration, etc.

The impact of research in the public sphere

Sociologists have succeeded in bringing back to objective, nonpartisan scientific research several highly ideological themes: the quality of life, the erosion of the standard of living, polarization and the social exclusion of disfavored groups and categories, corruption, crime, etc., offering at the same time a consistent documentary basis for reform options.

Sociological studies have expanded public knowledge on social life by identifying certain "grounded reasons" (in agreement with the "bonnes raisons" – Boudon), which make sense of behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs otherwise perceived as aberrant or irrational.

The problem of the "brain drain"

The migration of human capital from Romania to the developed countries is particularly disturbing in the top areas of science and technology: computer science, computers, atomic physics, etc. Many students, graduates, researchers, and teaching staff in sociology study, train, take master degrees or doctorates, or go as visiting professors to Western countries; but the discipline does not face a "reverse transfer of competence", which could involve either sociologists who study in Western countries and then stay there to work after graduation or sociologists trained in Romania who migrate to Western countries. There are no significant trends of permanent migration to developed countries nor the "multiplying effect" of specialist migration, which decreases the capacity of the trained staff to form new competence. Most of the sociological community shares a favorable opinion about the circulation of sociologists, considering it an advantage for Romanian society and for individuals.

References

Abraham, Dorel; Chelcea, Septimiu and Bădescu, Ilie (1995): *Interethnic Relations in Romania*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Napoca, Carpatica;

Aldea, Andra, Chiribucă, Dan, Comşa, Mircea, Kivu, Mircea, Micu, Bogdan and Moldovan, Călin (2001): *Sondajele de opinie. Mod de utilizare. Alegerile 2000. Prezentare şi analiză.* (Opinion Polls. Using Guide. The 2000 Elections. Presentation and Analysis.), Bucureşti, Editura Paideia;

Bădescu, Ilie (1997): *Teoria latenţelor colective. Contribuţii la studiul popoarelor* (The Theory of Collective Latencies. Contributions to the Study of Peoples), Bucureşti, ISOGEP – EU;

Bădescu, Ilie and Ungheanu, Mihai (eds.) (2000): *Enciclopedia valorilor reprimate. Războiul împotriva culturii române* (The Encyclopedia of Repressed Values. The War against the Romanian Culture), Bucuresti, Pro-Humanitate;

Banciu, Dan and Rădulescu, Sorin M. (1994): *Corupţia şi crima organizată în România. Evaluări sociologice* (Corruption and Organized Crime in Romania. A Sociological Evaluation), Bucureşti, Continent XXI;

Beciu, Camelia (2000): *Politica discursivă. Practici politice într-o campanie electorală* (Discursive Policies. Political practices in an Electoral Campaign), Iaşi, Polirom;

Berevoescu, Ionica, Chiribucă, Dan, Comşa, Mircea I., Grigorescu, Narcisa, Aldea, Andra, Lăzăroiu, Sebastian, Pană, Marilena, Pop, Lucian and Stănculescu, Elena (1999): *Feţele schimbării. Românii şi provocările tranziţiei* (Different Sides of Change. Romanians and the Challenges of Transition), Bucureşti, Nemira;

Bulai, Alfred (1999): *Mecanismele electorale ale societăţii româneşti* (Electoral Mechanisms of the Romanian Society), Bucureşti, Paideia;

Câmpeanu, Pavel (1994): *România. Coada pentru hrană. Un mod de viaţă* (Romania. The Queue for Food. A Way of Living), Bucureşti, Litera;

Cernea, Michael M. and McDowell, Christopher (eds.) (2000): *Risks and Reconstruction. Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees*, Washington, The World Bank;

Cernea, Michael (ed.) (1991): *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Development Projects*, New York, Oxford University Press;

Cernea, Michael (ed.) (2001): *Cultural Heritage and Development. A Framework for Action in the Middle East and North Africa*, Washington, The World Bank;
Chelcea, Liviu and Puiu, Lățea (2000): *România profundă în comunism* (Profound Romania During Communism), București, Nemira;
Chelcea, Septimiu (1994): *Personalitate şi societate în tranziție. Studii de psihologie socială* (Personality and Society in Transition. Studies of Social Psychology), Bucureşti, Ştiință şi tehnică SA;
Chelcea, Septimiu (2001): *Metodologia cercetării sociologice. Metode cantitative şi calitative* (The Methodology of Social research. Quantitative and Qualitative Methods), Bucureşti, Editura Economică;
Cobianu-Băcanu, Maria (1998): *S.O.S.- Românii din Covasna şi* Harghita (S.O.S - Romanians from Covasna and Harghita Counties), Târgu-Mureş, Editura Petru Maior;
Costea, Ştefan (1994): "Continuity and Discontinuity in Romanian Sociology", in: *Eastern Europe in Transformation. The Impact on Sociology,* Keen, Mike Forrest and Mucha, Janusz (eds.)*,* London, Greenwood Press;
Costea, Ştefan (ed.) (2001): *Sociologi români. Mică* enciclopedie (Romanian Sociologists. A Small Enciclopaedia), Bucureşti, Editura Expert;
Cuciuc, Constantin (1997): *Atlasul religiilor şi al monumentelor istorice religioase din România* (The Atlas of Religions and Religious Monuments in Romania), Bucureşti, Gnosis;
Danciu, Dumitru, Cazacu, Honorina, Ciupercescu, Maria, Glodeanu, Ion, Nica, Maria and Petre, Ioana (1994): *L'Entreprise industrielle Roumaine en transition*, Paris, IRESCO;
Diaconu, Marin (2000): *Şcoala Sociologică a lui Dimitrie Gusti. Documentar sociologic* (The Sociological School of Dimitries Gusti. Sociological Documentary), Bucureşti, Editura Eminescu;
Dogan, Matei and Pelassy, Dominique (1990): *How to Compare Nations*, New Jersey, Chatham House Publishers;
Drăgan, Ioan (1996): *Paradigme ale comunicării de masă* (Paradigms of Mass Communication), Bucureşti, Şansa;
Drăgan, Ioan, Beciu, Camelia, Dragomirescu, Ioana, Marinescu, Valentina, Perpelea, Nicolae and Ştefanescu, Simona (1998): *Construcția simbolică a câmpului* electoral (The Symbolic Construction of the Electoral Field), Iaşi: Institutul European;
Drăgan, Ioan (ed.) (1999): *La communication du politique. Regards croises Est – Ouest*, Paris, L'Harmattan;
Dungaciu, Dan (2000): "East and West in the "Mirror of Nature". Nationalism in Western and Eastern Europe is Essentially Different?", in: *Focaal*, 35;
Geană, Gheorghiță (1999): "Ideas of Culture. Romanian Para-Anthropologist in the First Half of the 20th Century", in: *Journal of the History of Behavioural Sciences*, 35, 1;
Geană, Gheorghiță (2000): „Nichtorganische Entwicklung, Eigentumsform und die moralische Krisis in Rumänien nach 1989", in: *Strucktureller Wandel und Soziale Probleme in Südosteuropa nach 1985*, Gabanyi, A. U. and Sterbling, A. (eds.), München;
Gheorghiu, Mihai Dinu (1987): *Scena literaturii. Elemente pentru o sociologie a culturii româneşti* (The Stage of literature. Elements for a Sociology of Romanian Culture), Bucureşti, Editura Minerva;
Gheorghiu, Mihai Dinu (1988): *Cercetări contemporane de sociologia culturii* (Contemporary Researches of Sociology of Culture), Iaşi, Universitatea "Al. I. Cuza";
Gheorghiu, Mihai Dinu (2000): "Postfață"(Postface), in: *Simțul practic (Le sens pratique),* Pierre Bourdieu (ed.), Iaşi, Institutul European, 495-500;
Gheorghiu, Mihai Dinu (2002): *The Romanian Sociology and its Boundaries,* Paper presented to Collegium Budapest, January 23-25, 2002;
Glodeanu, Ion and Dragomirescu, Doina (2001): "Romanian Case Studies Report", in: *Telematics and Communication Technology. Industrial Comparative Study: Romania, Bulgaria, Macedonia*, Tchalakov, Ivan and Burton, Peter (eds.), Sofia, LIK Publishing House, 233-250, 239-375;
Grunberg, Laura and Miroiu, Mihaela (eds.) (1997a): G*en şi Societate. Ghid de inițiere* (Gender and Society. Introductory Guide), Bucureşti, Alternative;
Grunberg, Laura and Mihaela Miroiu, (eds.) (1997b): *Gen şi educație. Societatea de Analize Feministe AnA* (Gender and Society. The Society of Feminist Analyses "AnA"), Bucureşti, Alternative;

Hoffman, Oscar (2000): *Întreprinderea în tranziție* (The Enterprise in Transition), București, Lumina Lex;
Iluț, Petru (1995): *Familia. Cunoaştere şi asistenţă* (Family: Knowledge and Intervention), Cluj Napoca, Argonaut;
Krausz, Septimiu (ed.) (1999): *Sociologia Tranziției* (Sociology of Transition), Petroşani, Editura Universitas;
Larionescu, Maria, Rughiniş, Cosima and Rădulescu, Sorin M. (1999): *Cu ochii minerului. Reforma mineritului în România* (With a Miner's Eyes: Reforming the Mining Industry in Romania), Bucureşti, Gnosis;
Larionescu, Maria and Sandu, Dumitru (2001): *The Challenge of Transition in Romanian Society and Sociology*, in: *Social Sciences in Southeastern Europe*, Genov, Nikolai and Becker, Ulrike (eds.), Paris-Bonn, InformationsZentrum Sozialwissenschaften, 136-191;
Mărginean, Ioan (1994): *Politica socială şi economia de piaţă în România* (Social Policy and Market Economy in Romania), Bucureşti, Centrul de informare şi documentare economică;
Mărginean, Ioan (1997): *Brain Drain from Central and Eastern Europe*, European Comission, Daniela Bobeva;
Mărginean, Ioan (2000): *Economia politicilor sociale* (The Economy of Social Policy), Bucureşti, Editura Ars Docendi;
Mărginean, Ioan (2000): *Proiectarea cercetării sociologice* (Projects of Sociological Research), Bucureşti, Polirom;
Mereuță, Cezar, Pop, Luana, Vlaicu, Carmen, Pop, Lucian (1998): *Culturi organizaționale în spațiul românesc. Valori şi profiluri dominante* (Organizational Cultures in the Romanian Space. Dominant Valoric Profiles), Bucureşti, Editura Expert;
Mihăilescu, Ioan (1999): *Familia în societăţile europene* (The Family in European Societies), Bucureşti, Editura Universității din Bucureşti;
Mihăilescu, Ioan (2001): "Valori şi norme sociale în perioada de tranziție" (Values and Social Norms in the Transition Period), in: *Sociologie, Etică şi Politică Socială. Volum omagial Cătălin Zamfir* (Sociology, Ethics and Social Policy. Homage to Cătălin Zamfir), Constantinescu, Cornel (ed.), Piteşti, Editura Universității din Piteşti.
Mihăilescu, Ioan, Vlăsceanu, Lazăr, Zamfir, Cătălin (1994): *Higher Education Reform in Romania: A Study*, Bucharest, CEPES;
Mihăilescu, Vintilă (2000): *Socio Hai-Hui. O altă sociologie a tranziției* (Socio-wandering. Another Sociology of Transition), Bucureşti, Paideia;
Mungiu-Pippidi, Alina (1999): *Transilvania subiectivă* (Subjective Transylvania), Bucureşti, Humanitas;
Mureşan, Cornelia (1999): *Demographic Evolution in Romania. Old Trends. New Developments. Perspectives. 1870-2030*, Cluj-Napoca, Cluj University Press;
Neculau, Adrian and Ferreol, Gilles (1999): *Aspecte psihosociale ale sărăciei* (Psychosocial Aspects of Poverty), Iaşi, Polirom;
Pasti, Vladimir, Miroiu, Mihaela and Codiță, Cornel (1997): *România - Starea de fapt. Vol. I. Societatea* (Romania: The Facts. First Volume. Society), Bucureşti, Nemira;
Pop, Lucian (2000): *Poverty, Inequality and Social Protection*, Bucuresti, The Quality of Life Research Institute;
Popescu, Livia (1998): *Social Protection in the European Union*, Cluj-Napoca, Cluj University Press;
Popescu, Livia (1998): *Structură socială şi societate civilă în România interbelică* (Social Structure and Civil Society in Inter-war Romania), Cluj-Napoca, Presa Universitară Clujeană;
Puşcaş, Vasile (1999): *University and Society. A History of Higher Education in Cluj in the 20 th century*, Cluj-Napoca, Cluj University Press;
Rădulescu, Sorin M. (1994): *Homo sociologicus. Raționalitate şi iraționalitate în acțiunea umană* (Homo Sociologicus. Rationality and Irrationality in Human Action), Bucureşti, Editura Şansa;
Rădulescu, Sorin M., Banciu, Dan and Teodorescu, Vasile (2001): *Criminalitatea în România în perioada de tranziție* (Criminality in Romania in the Transition Period), Piteşti, Editura Lică;
Rain, Lily (2001): *Familia etnic mixtă* (The Ethnic Mixt Family), Sfîntu Gheorghe, Editura Arcuş;

Rostaş, Zoltan (2000): *Monografia ca utopie. Interviuri cu H. H. Stahl* (Monograph as Utopia. Interviews with H. H. Stahl), Bucureşti, Paideia;

Rostaş, Zoltan (2001): *O istorie orală a Şcolii Sociologice de la* Bucureşti (An Oral History of the Bucharest Sociological School), Bucureşti, Editura Printech;

Rotariu, Traian and Iluț, Petre (1999): *Ancheta sociologică şi sondajul de opinie. Teorie şi practică* (The Sociological Survey and the Opinion Poll. Theory and Practice), Iaşi, Polirom;

Roth, Maria (1999): *Child Protection. Methods, Concepts, Dilemmas*, Cluj-Napoca, Cluj University Press;

Sandu, Dumitru (1996): *Sociologia tranziției. Valori şi tipuri sociale în România* (Sociology of Transition. Values and Social Types in Romania), Bucureşti, Staff;

Sandu, Dumitru (1999): *Spațiul social al tranziției* (The Social Space of Transition), Iaşi, Polirom;

Schifirneț, Constantin (2001): *Geneza modernă a ideii naționale* (Modern Genesis of the National Idea), Bucureşti, Editura didactică şi pedagogică;

Stănciulescu, Elisabeta (1996): T*eorii sociologice ale educației. Producerea eului şi construcția sociologiei* (Sociological Theories of Education. Constructing the Self and Constructing Sociology), Iaşi, Polirom;

Stănciulescu, Elisabeta (1997, 1998): *Sociologia educației familiale* (The Sociology of Family Education), Vol. I-II, Iaşi, Polirom;

Ştefănescu, Poliana (1999): *Modele cauzale în sociologie* (Causal Models in Sociology), Bucureşti, Editura Universității Bucureşti;

Teodor, Corina et al. (1998): *Church and Society in Central and Eastern Europe*, Cluj-Napoca;

Teşliuc, Cornelia Mihaela, Pop, Lucian and Teşliuc, Emil Daniel (2001): *Sărăcia şi sistemul de protecție socială* (Poverty and the System of Social Protection), Iaşi, Polirom;

Tismăneanu, Vladimir (1992): *Reinventing Politics. Eastern Europe from Stalin to Havel*, New York, The Free Press;

Ungureanu, Ion (1990): *Rațiunea umană şi raționalitatea* socială (Human Rationality and Social Rationality), Bucureşti, Editura ştiințifică şi enciclopedică;

Vlăsceanu, Lazăr (2001): *Politică şi dezvoltare. România încotro?* (Politics and Development: Romania towards What?), Bucureşti, Editura Trei;

Vlăsceanu, Lazăr and Miroiu, Adrian (2001): *Democrația ca proces. Alegerile 2000* (Democracy as a Process. The Elections of 2000), Bucureşti, Editura Trei;

Vlăsceanu, Mihaela (1993): *Psihosociologia organizațiilor şi conducerii* (The Psychosociology of Organizations and Leadership), Bucureşti, Editura Paideia;

Vlăsceanu, Mihaela (1996): *Sectorul nonprofit. Contexte, organizare, conducere* (The Non-profit Sector: Contexts, Organization, Leadership), Bucureşti, Editura Paideia;

Vlasceanu, Mihaela (1999): *Organizațiile şi cultura organizării* (Organizations and the Culture of Organization), Bucureşti, Trei;

Voinea, Maria (1996): *Psihosociologia familiei* (The Psychosociology of the Family), Bucureşti, Editura Universității Bucureşti;

Zamfir, Cătălin (1990): *Incertitudinea. O perspectivă psihosociologică* (Uncertainty: A Psychosociological Perspective), Bucureşti, Editura ştiințifică;

Zamfir, Cătălin (ed.) (1995): *Dimensiuni ale sărăciei* (Dimensions of Poverty), Bucureşti, Expert;

Zamfir, Cătălin (1999a): *Spre o paradigmă a gândirii sociologice* (Towards a Paradigm of Sociological Thought), Iaşi, Cantes;

Zamfir, Cătălin (ed.) (1999b): P*olitici sociale în Romania: 1990 - 1998* (Social Policy in Romania: 1990 - 1998), Bucureşti, Expert;

Zamfir, Cătălin and Zamfir, Elena (2000): *Situația femeii în România* (The Situation of Women in Romania), Bucureşti, Expert;

Zamfir, Cătălin et al. (2000): *Poverty in transition,* New York, UNDP;

Zamfir, Cătălin and Pop, Lucian (2000): "Social Structure and Income Distribution in Transition. The Romanian Case", in: *Social Structure and Income Distribution in Transition*, Mihalcov, V. (ed.), Helsinki;

Zamfir, Elena and Zamfir, Cătălin (eds.) (1993): *Ţiganii între ignorare şi îngrijorare* (The Roma Between Ignorance and Concern), Bucureşti, Alternative;
Zamfir, Elena and Zamfir, Cătălin (eds.) (1995): *Politici sociale. România în context european* (Social Policy. Romania in European Context), Bucureşti, Alternative;
Zamfir, Elena (ed.) (2000): *Strategii antisărăcie şi dezvoltare comunitară* (Anti-Poverty Strategies and Community Development), Bucureşti, Editura Expert;
Zamfir, Elena and Preda, Marian (eds.) (2000): *Diagnoza problemelor sociale comunitare. Studii de caz* (The Diagnosis of Social Community Problems. Case Studies), Bucureşti, Editura Expert;
Zamfir, Elena, Bădescu, Ilie and Zamfir, Cătălin (eds.) (2000): *Starea societăţii româneşti după 10 ani de tranziţie* (The State of the Romanian Society after 10 Years of Transition), Bucureşti, Editura Expert.

Table 1 Overall expenditure for the survey of social structure and relations*, by type of funding (million ROL, current prices)**

Year	Overall expenditure	Of which public funds***	Other resources****
1991		712	
1992		1961	
1993		3365	
1994	1475	1196	279
1995	2241	1970	271
1996	15241	14254	987
1997	30987	25349	5638
1998	42786	39137	3649
1999	16685	10800	5885

* Sociology is included in the chapter Social Structure and Relations, along with other socio-human disciplines: psychology, philosophy, journalism, communication science, political science, and economic science.

** Source: Romanian Statistical Yearbook

*** From national research and development programs and from international programs (fromthe EU, the World Bank, etc.)

**** Economic agents, own income of the units, international sources

Zuzana Kusá, Bohumil Búzik, Ľudovít Turčan and Robert Klobucký

Sociology – Slovakia[1]

Discussant: Eva Laiferová

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

The beginnings of sociological thinking in Slovakia were tied to the institutionalization of sociology in the Czech lands. The Slovak graduates[1] of Prague and Vienna Universities had freely grouped around the journal *HLAS* (1898-1904). Inspired by the sociologist and politician Tomáš G. Masaryk, they critically analyzed the political and economic situation in the Habsburg monarchy. As a side effect, they advanced sociology as the modern science about society (Klobucký, 2001).

One special figure was Jan Lajčiak, a pastor and linguist with a degree from Sorbonne University. In a mountain village, he worked on his manuscript about the country's social problems. His study was published posthumously (Lajčiak, 1921). Its well-roundedness and methodological clarity are still esteemed (Turčan, 1996; Pašiak, 1996).

After the founding of Czechoslovakia in 1918, the Sociological Seminar was established in 1925 at Comenius University in Bratislava. Mainly Czechs – Josef Král, Otakar Machotka, Anton Obrdlik, and Josef Tvrdý – influenced its work (Laiferová, 1995) until the division of Czechoslovakia in 1939. Then Anton Štefánek took the chair of the Sociological Seminar. He fostered applied sociology and "sociography", his name for sociology based on statistical description (Pašiak, 1994). His principal work *Foundations of Sociography* (Anton Štefánek, 1945) is a widely cited social analysis of Slovakia (Pašiak, 1980; Turčan, 1992, 1994; Falťan, Gajdoš, Pašiak, 1995). In 1945, the Sociological Department of Matica Slovenská was founded in Martin, and in 1946, the first issue of the journal *Sociologický Sborník* (Sociological Volume) appeared. Alexander Hirner, the most productive sociologist of the 1940s, headed the department.[2]

In the inter-war period, sociological development was intertwined with Christian social thinking, though separately in Catholic and Lutheran circles (Kvasničková, 1998, Turčan, 1998, Laiferová, 1998).

The spectrum of Marxism-Leninism, 1948-1989

The Marxist perspective was marginal in Slovakia before 1948. It was associated with the working class movement, and most Slovak adherents of Marxist sociology were politically active in Prague and used their occasional field observations in political debates. Marxist intellectuals criticized poverty, capitalist production, and private ownership and published in their journal *DAV*.

Since 1948, the Communist Party centrals had to promote the expansion of Marxism (Kopčok, 1998). In the early 1950s, Soviet texts celebrating Marxist classics and mainly Stalin's work were translated on a vast scale, starting the dogmatization of the social sciences. Marxism-Leninism became the monopoly doctrine with a one-sided emphasis on the propagandistic and ideological function of theory. Sociology was labeled a bourgeois pseudo-science (Sirácky, 1950), and sociological workplaces and departments and the journal were cancelled. Sociologists either had to change their discipline (most chose philosophy) or were deprived of any possibility to do research work[3].

After 1956, first attempts were made to revive sociology; and in 1960, the Department of Social Research was established by the Institute for Philosophy of the Slovak Academy of

[1] This text benefited from the comments of Eva Laiferová, our kind discussant. Unfortunately, the lack of space did not permit us to implement all her suggestions.

Sciences (SAS). In 1964, the Department of Sociology at Comenius University was re-established and the Institute of Sociology of SAS was founded. In this period, the scholastic application of Marxism-Leninism was criticized and attempts were made to revive Marx's original ideas.[4] The first task of the renewed sociology was to define its research subject and its relation to historical materialism. Though similar discussions always recurred in periods when Marxist-Leninism was in a weakened position, in this period there were more reform advocates than actual reformers (Filová, Elena, 1998).

Beginning in the mid-1960s, Polish sociology exerted considerable influence on Slovak sociology by providing Slovak scholars with numerous fellowships to Polish sociological departments, through the translations of Polish sociologists like Jerzy Wiatr, Zygmunt Bauman, Jan Szczepański, Maria Hirszowicz, etc., through participation in joint research projects, and because it was possible to study sociology at Polish universities. This impact lasted till the beginning of "normalization" in 1970 (Pašiak, 1997).

Slovak sociology's most intensive international cooperation and presentation came in the late 1960s, when Slovaks participated in the ISA Congresses in Evian in 1967 and in Varna in 1970. In the 1970s and 1980s, cooperation narrowed down to the socialist block. International mobility at universities was negligible.

The Warsaw Pact occupation in 1968 and the Communist Party screenings in 1970 hindered the country's democratization. Few sociologists were forbidden to teach or to do research.[5] But favorably referring to non-Marxist sociology sufficed for one to receive the livelihood-threatening label of "revisionist". This threat led to caution and cowardice. Though sociology could develop institutionally, its cognitive and critical functions were ideologically hampered.[6] The Five-Year State Plan of Basic Research coordinated research. Its priorities in social sciences were attuned to the goals of the Party programs, for instance "diminishing differences between the working class and the intelligentsia", "the process of equalizing town and village", and "socialist personality development". Social class, defined by people's relations to the means of production, was still the canonized concept of the basic unit of social life. In empirical research, however, quiet debates[7] ensued about its analytical suitability for socialist society. Methodology (Hirner, 1976, Schenk, 1988) and later family research (Provazník et al., 1989) were less ideologically restricted sociological domains.

In the second half of the 1980s, partly in response to the Party's demand to combat "people's false consciousness and relicts of bourgeois prejudices", public opinion surveys became more frequent, under the auspices and the strict informational control of the Communist Party Central Committee. Individual experience and consciousness was rehabilitated as a source of knowledge. Information about participatory research (Frič et al, 1988), critical studies in the sociology of science (Gál, Frič, and Bútorová, 1987), and the topic of self-help groups and social movements (Martin Bútora) contributed to socially-engaged sociology. Bútora's research on addiction (Bútora, 1989) offered a comprehensive overview of theoretical approaches to the study of marginal behavior and self-help groups. It also served as a source of practicable examples of sociological work with and in communities.

The impact of Western sociological theories on Slovak sociology before 1989

During the liberalized 1960s, numerous Western authors like Charles Wright Mills, Herbert Marcuse, Talcott Parsons, Erich Fromm, etc. appeared in (mostly) Czech translation. In the 1970s, they were supplemented by translations of Russian overviews of Western sociology (Galina Michailovna Andrejeva, Gennadij Vasilievič Osipov, Michail Nikolajevič Rutkevič, etc.). The study of sociological classics and contemporary sociological theories (Alijevová, 1986) was an essential part of sociological education,[8] but until 1989, the impact of Western sociological theories on Slovak sociology was quite negligible. The principle that Marxist authors' theory had to surpass any non-Marxist authors cited was very difficult to fulfill.[9] It was easier simply to avoid referring to them at all. The outcome was a rapid decline of references to Western authors: in the

Slovak journal *Sociológia,* the proportion of references to non-Marxist sociologists was more than 40% in 1969 and 1970, but the long-term average (1971-1988) did not exceed 10% (Dianiška, 1989).

Oppositional activities

The 1970 Party screenings excluded a few Slovak sociologists from academic life as "unreliable". But the majority of sociologists were left in place, their livelihoods dependent on Party-controlled opportunities to work. This limited the formation of alternative structures in Slovakia. Oppositional activities emerged mainly in connection with the Soviet *perestroika* in the second half of the 1980s.

In 1987, the group around Fedor Gál and Pavol Frič began promoting the idea of participatory sociology, identifying problems from *the bottom up*, and dialogue between the state administration and a broader public (Frič et al, 1988; Szomolányi, 1988; Gál et al, 1990). Participation also characterized Roško's research on enterprises in Bratislava at the end of the 1980s. The focus here was on workers' participation in enterprise management and the study of relations of control and collaboration among workers, trade union leaders, and managers. The researchers also involved the people under study in the process of validating the research findings (Roško et al., 1989).

One encouraging event was Szomolanyi's October 11, 1988 lecture on the history of the Institute for Sociology. She was the first person to publicly criticize "normalization" policy in sociology and the ideological restriction of its development. She stated that Slovak sociology had become a sterile and conformist socio-technique without deeper theoretical reflection (Szomolányi, 1990, 1995). In September 1989, at the second congress of Slovak Sociological Association (SSA), sociologists supported democratization and anti-totalitarian ideas (Roško, 1990) and for the first time elected non-Party men to the SSA Committee (Macháček, 1990).

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

The change of paradigms

The Marxist paradigm in Slovak sociology, or more precisely, the constant explicit reference to Marxists and the use of terms like structure and superstructure, class relations, property, capital, and exploitation, ended in 1990 rapidly and spontaneously. From 1990 to 1995, the journal *Sociológia* did not receive any text framed in a Marxist perspective or defending the principles of Marxist ideology (Feglová et al., 1995). Emblematic Marxist words vanished from sociologists' vocabularies. Only one article searched for the failures of the Marxist conceptualization of social life.[10] In the 1990s, authors did not as a rule refer to articles they or their colleagues had published before 1989.[11] How are we to interpret this discontinuity and the ease with which Slovak sociologists abandoned the Marxist perspective and their own work? There are several possible explanations: (a) Ignoring one's own work[12] might signal that its Marxist framing had been merely tactical – to mask critical analysis that could otherwise be interpreted as anti-regime. (b) A researcher might have a lukewarm relation to theory of any kind (Bohumil Búzik in: Laiferová and Turčan, 1997). (c) Political change coincided with a change of generations – key guards of Slovak sociology's ideological purity in the 1970s and 1980s were just retiring at the end of the 1980s.

Since 1989, the turn to empirical research has been striking. Surveys, polls, public opinion studies, and life history collections started immediately. They indicated sociologists' belief in and hunger for authentic, uncensored data. They stressed the need to "use the unique historical opportunity to observe the current changes"; and "to record the vanishing witnesses" of historical events whose interpretation until then had been ideologically skewed (e.g. Kusá, 1992). The introductions to many articles and volumes justified their descriptive character by the duty to preserve the fullest possible description of facts for future research. The realist stance – belief in the possibility of mirroring social reality – dominated the articles in Sociológia in the first half of the 1990s; they had a minimum of explicit theoretical framing. This descriptive tendency was probably strengthened by (a) the traditional division of labor between Slovak and Czech sociologists in joint research projects, where Slovaks tended to transfer the theoretical work to their Czech counterparts (Búzik, 1997: 27-28) and (b) the new model of research cooperation with Western sociologists. This cooperation was often reduced to the translation of already elaborated questionnaires and the organization of data collection and processing. The scarcity of articles published in co-authorship by Slovak sociologists and their foreign partners supports this assumption: as late as 1995, *Sociológia* had published only one article of this type (Bačová, Homišinová, and Cooper, 1994). Later the situation improved.

Ján Sopóci first raised the question of the paradigm. He suggested that, aside from the eclectics, the most numerous group worked "without any explicit theoretical perspective and is willing to state openly that they could do well without any theory" (Sopóci, 1993). Later, Búzik advocated the legitimacy of eclectic approaches (Búzik, 1995) and argued that the present Slovak sociology was characterized by numerous theoretical perspectives that were not clearly articulated, not consistently used, and rather pragmatically combined. We can even speak about intuitive programmatic eclectics. Such a characterization fits the traditional quantitative surveys as well as the proliferating qualitative studies.[13]

Changes of elites

If we define the sociological elite by their ability to control access to informational[14] and financial sources, then it includes sociologists who are at the head of research and educational institutions, as well as the members of various scientific approval and examination commissions, funding awarding commissions, editorial boards, etc. We can include among the sociological "power elite" also those whom journalists consider the core source of information or the reference point and whose references influence their colleagues' access to the media.

In 1989-1990, the scientific "power elite" underwent substantial changes. Staff immediately used the opportunity to choose persons for management positions (who were previously chosen by Party bodies). Positions were changed or subjected to votes of confidence by secret ballot with the entire staff participating. In secret balloting, Róbert Roško was "100% confirmed" as the head of the Sociological Department of the Institute for Philosophy and Sociology. The staff of the Department of Sociology (Comenius University) voted for Juraj Schenk (instead of Marcel Sloboda). Juraj Schenk was confirmed as Department Head in two elections. Schenk is concerned with sociological methodology and complex quantitative data analysis and modeling. He is the author of several methodological monographs. In 1992, he qualified as a university professor and is still the only university professor in sociology[15] in Slovakia. After the re-establishment of the Institute of Sociology,[16] the staff of the Institute elected Ľubomír Falťan its director. Falťan is now in his third term of office, confirmed each time by secret ballot.[17]

In November 1989, Soňa Szomolányi gained a high civil reputation for her involvement in and support of the university students' strike and demonstrations. Sociologists, most strikingly Fedor Gál, who headed the movement "Public against Violence" (VPN), but also Martin Bútora, Zora Bútorová, and others who were active in the protests of Winter 1989 and the subsequent political negotiations gained a similar reputation.

In 1990-1991, the composition of the editorial board of the journal *Sociológia* reflected the changes of the elite and the overlapping of criteria for scientific, civil, and political prestige. The members were also ministers of the Slovak government and the Czechoslovakian president' advisor. In the second half of 1990, the editorial board was composed nearly solely of people from the academic milieu.

Ján Pašiak was put in charge as editor-in-chief of the journal Sociológia in 1990. Ladislav Macháček, a continual member and editor of Sociológia from the journal's foundation on, was put in charge as editor-in-chief in the mid-1990s. Since 1990, the journal has had foreign advisors from Italy, the United Kingdom, the USA, Austria, and Japan.

Scientometric criteria are the second way of defining the scientific elite. The first half of the 1990s was characterized by the underestimation of degrees and other standards of an academic career. Besides the economically determined declining interest in studying for a PhD, the academic middle generation was too involved in flourishing survey research to aspire to scientific degrees. After the provisional years of exemption, the Supreme Accreditation Commission stipulated that any institution offering a PhD had to have a supervising guarantor who had earned a Dr.Sc.[18] or Professor degree. The Institute of Sociology (SAS) did not fulfill this precondition and ceased to be a place of PhD studies in 1999.

In the first half of the 1990s, even academic sociologists considered it more meaningful to mobilize the public with their newspaper articles or research reports for the expert audience (DG XII European Commission) than to write for the small audience of the scientific journals. Despite this practice, there were a considerable number of foreign references. There are many references to the analyses of political situation during and after the division of Czechoslovakia and to electoral behavior (Soňa Szomolányi, Zora and Martin Bútora, Vladimír Krivý). Because of this practice, even the cited authors had a strikingly small number of articles published in the scientific journals covered in the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), even in the Slovak and Czech ones. Slovakia's domestic Sociológia' is covered in the SSCI, so the proportion of Slovak SSCI articles has grown, but there are still few articles by Slovak authors published in foreign (except for Czech!) sociological journals. Even those who often publish in foreign journals had only one or two articles published in foreign SSCI journals, and none of these were in the truly sociological journals (e.g. Bútora Martin and Zora, 1993, 1999; Wightman and Szomolányi, 1995; Falťan and Dodder, 1995; Piscová and Dodder, 1995; Radičová, 1994).

New institutional structures

In the 1990s, savings measures and the state's weakening economic functions led to a decline in outlays for science and education from 0.48% in 1993 to 0.38% in 1998 (Slovensko, 2000: 640). The result was a loss of jobs in science and research organizations. Several branch research institutions were gradually cancelled or significantly reduced, including the Research Institute of Culture at the Ministry of Culture, the Research Institute for Economics and Organization of the Building Industry, the Journalist Research Institute, and the Institute for Education and Information in the Ministry of Education. The savings measures led to the cancellation of the majority of full-time jobs of sociologists working in industrial enterprises (often together with the shutting of the enterprises themselves). The sub-disciplines of the sociology of labor, work, and organizations nearly ceased to exist in Slovakia. The SSA Section of the sociology of work was cancelled. Academic research institutions still existed in the 1990s, but in a leaner shape. For instance, the number of staff members at the Institute for Sociology has fallen from 39 in 1990 to 25 in 2000 (Laiferová and Búzik, 2001).

In spite of financial problems, the number of universities, students, and teaching positions increased. In 1991, the Social Work Department was established at the Pedagogical Faculty of Comenius University with sociologists in the staff; and in 1992, the Department of Sociology was established at a new Trnava University. Jozef Matulník heads the department. Since 1997, the annual number of graduates in sociology has doubled; there are now more than 30-35 graduates.[19] Former sociologists also work and head the Department of Political Science at Comenius University (Soňa Szomolányi, Iveta Radičová). New universities (there are now 13 universities) offered new positions at their departments of social science, which provide sociological education for non-sociologists. But research there is negligible. In spite of increasing economic hardships, universities and academic institutions have preserved their autonomy in the thematic orientation of research and the organization of work and personnel; but they cannot grow.

The Ministry of Defense created job opportunities at the newly established (and twice cancelled and re-established) Office for Sociological Research in Military Service, with Karol Čukan at its head. The Ministry of Labor, Social Affairs, and Family continues to operate the established Research Institute of Labor and Social Affairs. The Institute provides research and social policy analysis commissioned by the Ministry. In 1994, the Ministry established the Bratislava International Center for Family Studies, which employs eight full-time and part-time researchers with academic backgrounds.

Non-academic working opportunities for sociologists are in marketing research, consultation services, social services, volunteer work, and large firms' personnel departments. Many non-governmental organizations employ sociology graduates and conduct surveys and social analyses. The latter's skill in and sources for disseminating their research findings often help them overshadow academic research. The leaders are the Institute for Public Affairs (IVO) , founded by Zora Bútorová and Martin Bútora, and the Center for the Analysis of Social Policy S.P.A.C.E, founded by Iveta Radičová and Helena Woleková. The most important output of the IVO is its annual "Global Reports" – comprehensive volumes of analysis of the country's economic, cultural, and social issues (1996–2001). They are co-authored by sociologists (Vladimír Krivý, Soňa Szomolányi, Roman Džambazovič, Iveta Radičová.) and published concurrently in Slovak and English.

Public opinion research developed rapidly in the 1990s. Besides the state-funded Institute for Public Opinion Research of the Slovak Statistical Office (subordinated to the Central Committee of the Communist Party until 1989), numerous commercial and non-governmental agencies started marketing and public opinion research. Historians of sociology will definitely focus on the intriguing case of the Institute for Social Analysis (CSA) established by Comenius University in 1991; it was staffed by leading scholars who formed the public opinion research group during their work for the Coordination Center of VPN. The Center later transformed itself into a privately operated research agency, FOCUS.

Commercial agencies are organized in the Slovak Association of Research Agencies. Stiff competition triggered debate on how to evaluate sampling quality in public opinion research. Proposals to establish a Sociological Chamber, supported by the General Assembly of the SSA in 2000, have not yet found general agreement on the issues of licensing and supervising public opinion research competence and of methods of preventing the misuse of institutionalized tools.

In addition to the education and research institutions and the journal *Sociológia* (see part 5), Slovak sociology also has a stable institutional pillar in the Slovak Sociological Association. The SSA became the legal body of Slovak sociologists in 1969. From 1969-1992, the SSA's international contacts were administered through the Czechoslovak Sociological Association.[20] In 1993, the SSA became a regular collective member of the International Sociological Association. The SSA elects its Committee for terms of two years. Since 1990, the SSA presidents have been Juraj Schenk (1990-1992; 1993-1994), Gejza Blaas, Ján Bunčák, Eva Laiferová, Ladislav Macháček, Dilbar Alijevová, and Ján Sopóci (2002-2004).

Rehabilitation, repatriation, new departures

Though sociologists like Ján Pašiak, Ľubomír Falťan, Dušan Urda, Martin Bútora, and Zdeněk Šťastný did not receive official certificates of rehabilitation, the end of the communist regime removed long-term obstacles to their academic work. Their rehabilitation was done by the staff's spontaneous election or support for their appointment to the top positions in institutional management. For instance, Falťan was elected Director of the Institute for Sociology. Pašiak was made Editor-in-Chief of *Sociológia*. Bútora became Czechoslovak President Havel's advisor for national minorities issues in 1990-92.

Bútora and Bútorová[21] successfully founded three research agencies (the Center for Social Analysis, FOCUS, and the Institute for Public Affairs). They are the most prolific authors. Besides their great number of titles, they also published several texts in both Slovak and English

(Bútorová et al., 1995, 1996a, 1996b). Zora Bútorová is the most cited Slovak author in SSCI journals (55 references in the fields of political science and gender studies). The increasing number of their articles comes close to the field of political science or practical political engagement (see the selected bibliography of English-language publications).

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

Revival and adaptation of major pre-war traditions

In the 1990s, several authors studied the history of pre-war sociology in Slovakia (Turčan, 1992, 1994; Laiferová, 1998; Kvasničková, 1998). However, the history of Slovak sociology has become more a specialization than a general source for present research. Some authors speak about the discontinuity with the pre-war tradition (Turčan, 1997). Some argue that our sociology has continued its inter-war tradition in at least three ways: First, academic sociologists show a high degree of practical engagement. Second, they deliberately identify sociology with collecting data usable for the "organization of public life". And finally, they mistrust theoretical sociology and doubt the necessity to develop it (Kusá, 1997).

New East-West asymmetries

Sopóci was the first to suggest that the declining interest in theoretical issues could be the result of involvement in international survey projects, which pay scholars well for doing auxiliary technical tasks (Sopóci, 1993). Especially in the first years of Slovakia' independence, journalists and politicians were especially sensitive to the asymmetrical relations between domestic and foreign researchers. They thought the translation of questionnaires and the use of pre-existing scales were connected to information campaigns misrepresenting the situation in the country. Some critics assumed that the finding that the Slovak population has less democratic and more authoritarian attitudes than their neighbors had been "ordered" by the foreign research contractors. Some encouraged the Ministry of Education and Science to "think seriously about whom it allows to work at the University and in the Academy". Offended sociologists took such opinions and remarks as additional evidence of authoritarian attitudes that could threaten academic autonomy. Even though administrative interventions did not follow, their widely published opinions had impact.

Quantitative vs. qualitative approaches

As elsewhere, quantitative approaches are pervasive and used in most research. It would take too much space to refer to even a small part of them, so we deal only with (the less extensive) qualitative research.

Qualitative sociology had little problem entering Slovakia. The Slovak Grant Agency for Science VEGA and the journal *Sociológia* accepted and supported its first projects (Kusá, 1992). Qualitative research mainly takes the form of collecting life history narratives and family histories, conducting non-standardized interviews, and analyzing media discourse. In academic sociology, it is linked to Zuzana Kusá (e. g. Kusá, 1992, 1997b), (Harmadyová and Bunčák, 1998) and Findor Andrej (2000). It is attracted to the subjects of the elite and poverty. Outside academia, a diverse research prospers under the label of oral history. Oral history projects collect and preserve the memories of selected social groups and periods. The Milan Šimečka Foundation fulfilled an important fundraising and organizing role in this field. The first large project "History and the Present of Czech and Slovak relations" responded to the division of Czechoslovakia. It resulted in the five-volume collection of life-history narratives of inhabitants of both the countries (Radičová and Fialová, 1994).

The next oral history projects of the Šimečka Foundation collected the memories of the Jewish and Romany survivors of the Holocaust and of the victims of communist persecutions. The next oral history projects organized by BICFS and SPACE focused on female politicians' experiences and resulted in the big collection of the narratives of women active in local and national level politics (Jarmila Filadelfiová, Iveta Radičová, Puliš Peter). Iveta Radičová analyzed the media discourse of the construction of Slovakia's image in foreign dailies (Radičová et al., 1997). Kusá uses discourse analysis and narrative analysis in the study of family and collective memory and the construction of social identities; she also deals with methodological problems of qualitative research (for instance Kusá, 1999).

New approaches (if any)

At the turn of 1980 and 1990, there was intensive interest in participatory research. But this interest waned. Focus groups are one of the newly used data-collecting techniques, not only in marketing research, but also in noncommercial research, for instance in research on the institutional changes in the education system (Zora Bútorová, Oľga Gyárfášová) and in social psychology in the analysis of argumentation and the study of social representations (mainly Plichtová, 2001).

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Transition as a major or exclusive object of study

Modernization, civil society and citizenship, transformation and transition, and political (voting) behavior dominated Slovak sociology in the 1990s. The topics of modernization and civil society emerged in critical debates on reforming socialist society at the end of the 1980s. At the beginning of the 1990s, they became nearly synonymous with the three goals of the transformation process: "a democratic society, the rule of law, and a market economy". These three transformation goals were often were used in article introductions as space-time coordinates. The need for the transformation was taken as self-evident, and only a few articles in *Sociológia* touched on the issue of its social costs (Feglová et al., 1995).[22] Key barriers to transformation were seen mainly in the "traditional value orientation and culture of the people" (Krivý, 1993, 1996, 1997; Szomolányi, 1993; Stena, 1993; and others) and in historically delayed and then – under socialism – forced industrialization and urbanization (Gajdoš, 1992, 1993; Falťan Ľubomír, Gajdoš, and Pašiak, 1995). The idea of an insufficiently developed democratic culture as the most serious barrier to transformation was the framework for numerous articles. Some said, "spiritual culture represents the direct basis of the creation of the new social order" (Stena, 1993: 178). Others considered "historically formed socio-cultural characteristics, including the weaker political and civic culture of the Slovak population" to represent "the deeper level of explanation of the critical attitudes of the Slovak population to the current transformation" (Krivý, 1993: 311). Róbert Roško formulated the concept of the three levels (economic, political, and personal) of the transformation. He argued for the necessity of personal self-transformation, whose most important aspect is shedding egalitarianism and evaluating the coercive methods of government and which is the limiting factor for the next two levels of transformation (Roško, 1995).

Lack of discussion and the fact that articles deal mainly with hindrances to transformation and not with its stakeholders (domestic and international interest groups) promoted the naturalization of the transformation into "historical necessity" or a process of "natural history" (in effect, a continuation of Marxist historicism).

The choice of themes

Aside from transformation, transition, and modernization,[23] the most frequent key phrases in 1990s sociological articles were "sociology of politics", "sociology of minorities and ethnic relations", "sociology of urban, rural, and regional life", and last but not least, "the history of Slovak sociology". The topic of nationalism was first introduced in defending the common state of Czechs and Slovaks. It served to expertly unmask independence efforts as a token of an outlived and perilous nationalism (e.g. Szomolányi, 1992). The topic of ethnicity and minorities found an echo, raising minority issues in domestic and international public forums and stimulating foreign funding agencies' interest to support this kind of research.[24] The results of the foreign-funded projects are published in volumes and journals that are not covered in ISI and are often not known and discussed by the domestic sociological public. Guest editing of thematically-tied issues of *Sociológia* has been welcome but rare (noteworthy exceptions are the issues edited by Iveta Radičová (Radičová, 1995, 2001).

Several domestic and comparative projects studied the issues of local democracy, municipal life, and self-government (Ľubomír Falťan, Silvia Miháliková, Ishikawa Akihiro, and others). Academic priority is also given to social stratification and mobility (Ján Bunčák), criminality (Ján Buček, Lubelcová Gabriela), and family and gender issues (Peter Guráň, Ivan Chorvát, Jarmila Filadelfiová, Magdaléna Piscová, Zora Bútorová).[25]

Though economic transformation and the rule of law became almost ritual parts of article introductions, economic and legal issues were almost neglected. The exception has been social partnership and tripartite negotiations (Čambáliková, 1995, 1996, 1999). Some research topics drew new scholars and re-emerged due to the offer to participate in international projects. A typical case is the study of religion. After the dissolution of the Institute for Scientific Atheism in 1990, sociologists did not study religious life until the ISSP offer to become a member and to implement the ISSP module "Religion" in 1998.

Private vs. public funding

Since 1991, the Slovak Grant Agency for Science VEGA has been the most important part of the scientific infrastructure and an example of scientific self-governance. The scientific community autonomously operates VEGA; projects proposals are evaluated solely by eminent scholars who, like the discipline-specific evaluation committees, are elected from below – by scholars from research institutes. VEGA does not define research priorities, but keeps open the possibility of internal autonomous development of scientific disciplines. However, the amount of funding that VEGA can distribute depends completely on the state budget. The state contribution to VEGA gradually decreased during the 1990s. Since 2001, the government has run a new research and technology development agency. It is better funded than VEGA, has established research (developmental) priorities, and its project evaluation committees are composed of representatives from both the state administration and science. Its concern with the country's developmental agenda in setting research priorities follows the pattern of the Fifth Framework program of the European Commission. Because the government of Slovakia contributes more to the EC research programs than Slovak scientists gained through their participation in the Fifth Framework Programme, they are resolutely advised to join the projects of the programs of the European Commission. A project's coordination with foreign funding– like the publication list and citation lists – is ascertained in the VEGA application form and regarded as the criterion of researcher competence.

5. Public space and academic debates

Debated topics and issues

The irony of the 1990s was that the topic sociologists debated most was the absence of critical debate. This "absence of debate" debate was initiated by Ján Sopóci (Sopóci Ján, 1993, 1995) and later continued and specified as discussing the problem of prevailing empiricism (Sopóci, 1995; Búzik, 1995; Köverová, 1995; Turčan, 1997). In the beginning, "alienation" resulting from "political disharmony" was identified as the main reason for the lack of discussion (Roško, 1993). "Disharmony" in the form of "overlooking and not referring to the work of others" was the outcome of the controversy about the political engagement of the public opinion analysis done by well-known sociologists and then about the scientific name of their research institution. The problem of overlapping political and sociological interpretation was discussed (on a general level) several times, most recently on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the sociological congress in Martin (Roško, 2000; Schenk, 2000; Búzik, 2000).

The editors of *Sociológia* organized several round tables debates on selected topics (democracy, nationalism, history of the Institute for Sociology, the nonprofit sector, etc.). There were also unanswered efforts by various authors to provoke discussion, for example, the methodological article of the Czech author Konopásek (1996). The first spontaneous discussion revolved around the concept of a culturally defined residual group (Stena, 1994). The next discussion was about how to interpret the decreasing birth rate in Slovakia and Europe (Matulník and Pastor, 1997; Guráň and Filadelfiová, 1997). Their "exchange" might be characterized as the clash of functionalistic and pragmatist concepts of social life. The clash between the conservative and the liberal concept of social well-being and of the welfare state took place in the polemics on the state conception of family politics in Slovakia (Lentzová, 2001; Kvapilová, 2001). In *Sociológia*, the sharpest debate was about sociobiology's relations with and contribution to other social sciences. It was opened by the biologist and philosopher Sýkora (1999) and continued by two discussants, the philosopher Tatiana Sedová (2000) and the anthropologist Martin Kánovský.

Principal academic journals

Sociológia, often cited in this paper, is the first and leading Slovak sociological journal. It was founded in 1968. Its publisher is the Institute of Sociology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. It appears six times per year and publishes anonymously peer-reviewed articles, book reviews, round table debates, and interviews with scholars and information from scientific life. In 1994, the journal succeeded in getting coverage in ISI (SSCI databases). The ISI coverage enormously helps Slovak sociologists (as well as other social scientists who are invited to publish in *Sociológia*) in fulfilling the standard scientometric criteria. In 1995, the first issue of *Slovak Sociological Review* appeared in the English language. It was intended to be an independent journal with the same editorial staff as *Sociológia*. For practical reasons (the problem of getting coverage in SSCI, and failures to acquire foreign subscribers), after two years of sending the issues free of charge, the publisher merged the journals. The *Slovak Sociological Review* now appears as the third and the sixth issue of *Sociológia* each year. The majority of the English issues of the *Slovak Sociological Review – Sociológia* do not leave the territory of Slovakia.

From 1991 to 2001, the Institute of Sociology and the SSA published the bulletin *Sociologický zápisník* (Sociological Diary).[26] It appeared four times per year in newspaper format and contained information about sociological events, book reviews, profiles of Slovak sociologists, research projects (including those of students), and occasionally debates.

The Research Institute of Labor and Social Affairs of the Ministry of Labor has published the journal *Social Work and Social Politics* since 1992. It appears ten times per year and publishes basic conceptual materials related to the work of the Ministry, statistical overviews, theoretical articles dealing with social politics, welfare, social insurance, pension reform, and tripartite and labor relations. Contributors are mainly scholars from the Research Institute, but also other authors, both economists and sociologists. Sociologists also publish in cultural and social-critical weeklies and monthlies like *Literárny týždenník* (Literary Weekly), *OS*, *Domino-fórum*, *Kultúrny život* (Cultural life), and others. Some have apparent political engagement.

Selection of publications in world languages

In the 1990s, Martin Bútora and Zora Bútorová and their coworkers were the most productive Slovak sociologists. Their research was internationally funded, so they often published the results (on the sociology of political life, public opinion research, but also gender issues and the brain drain) concurrently in English. Ladislav Macháček, thanks to his participation in various foreign research projects, and Iveta Radičová, who conducted extensive research on social policy transformation and ethnic groups, followed a similar publication policy. The opposite strategy is that of Ján Sopóci, who deals solely with general sociological themes. He is a co-author of the first secondary school textbook (*Sociológia*, 1995, 1997), the Dictionary of Social Sciences (1997), and monographs on collective behavior (1996), the relation between politics and social life (1998), and social stratification and social mobility (1999).

New manuals, databases

Slovak sociologists have collaborated in numerous international comparative projects. They still have no central archive,[27] but the majority of the projects' databases are accessible in well-known European data archives and universities. For instance, the International Social Survey Program (ISSP), in whose context the module surveys National Identity (Magdaléna Piscová, 1997), Religion (Ján Bunčák, 2001), and Social Inequalities (Katarína Strapcová, 2001) were realized, is archived at Cologne University; the European Values Study Surveys (1991, 1999) are archived at Tilburg University, etc.

6. Views on further development

International cooperation

Because the forms of research funding are diverse and there is no institution of "central" registration of foreign publication outputs that are not covered in SSCI, the number of completed international projects or projects implemented with foreign funding is hard to estimate. Along with registered international projects and conferences, co-authored publications are the most tangible evidence of international cooperation. In the first half of the 1990s such texts were very rare, but their number has been growing since 1995. Several co-authored monographs have appeared (for instance, Szomolányi and Gould, 1997; Delmartino, Versmessen, Miháliková, and Falťan, 1997). Going by the actual length of cooperation in the projects at universities and the Academy, the most important foreign research partners will continue to be the Czech Republic, Poland, Austria, France, and Japan. The Japan Institute of Social Sciences at Chuo University Tokyo cooperates mainly with the Institute for Sociology in research on local communities and, more recently, on industrial relations. The Department of Sociology at Comenius University cooperates with the Rene Descartes University in Paris, the Nicolas Copernicus University in Toruń, and Austrian university research centers. The Department of Sociology at Trnava University collaborates with the University of Cardinal Wyszyński in Warsaw. The Polish partner provided several teaching courses when Trnava University was in its early stages and now serves as a center for PhD studies for Slovak graduates. Sociology departments are involved in international cooperation through the UNESCO, TEMPUS, and PHARE programs. Participation in the multi-national research projects supported by the Fifth Framework Program of the EC has been very rare (Ladislav Macháček), but are considered to be of crucial importance.

The National Committee MOST UNESCO, part of the Institute for Sociology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, has supported various projects, including the 2nd European Social Science Conference: "Europe: Expectations and Reality – The Challenge for the Social Sciences." This conference was organized by the Institute for Sociology and held in Bratislava in 1998 (Falťan, 1999).

The impact of EU accession

Slovakia's effort to accede to the EU has also marked the thematic orientation of sociological research (the study of pro-EU attitudes, citizens' democratic potential, the development of European identity) and its comparative character (extensive comparisons of the differences in the EU readiness of Slovaks, Czechs, and citizens of the other accession countries).[28] Some argue that the accession effort has not only contributed to new themes and to an increase in comparative studies, but – in various ways – to paralyzing sociological discussion (see Kusá, 1999, 2001).

The impact of research in the public sphere

Besides the influential public activity of several sociologists in the revolutionary events of 1989, sociologists were most visible for their political engagement[29] at the beginning of the 1990s and because of some politicians' negative reactions to these sociologists' analyses of political life. Political critique of the interpretation of public opinion research data was more frequent in the first half of the 1990s. As in other countries, the media mostly equate sociology with public opinion research and give the greatest space to electoral preferences and scales of political trust. Various sorts of expert analysis for the government or for foreign institutions like the World Bank (Radičová and Woleková, 1999, Radičová, 2001a, 2001b) exert important, though less apparent influence.

The problem of the "brain drain"

There are two forms of brain drain in Slovakia: the internal brain drain from the academic to the commercial sphere and the brain drain from Slovak to foreign research institutions. In both forms, "pull factors"[30] (mainly, much better pay) prevail. The first form of the brain drain is very frequent. Academia can offer considerable autonomy and freedom of research, but only very low stipends for PhD students and salaries for graduates, whose actual value is further decreased by the high apartment rents in the capital, Bratislava (the only place for PhD study in sociology). So talented graduates look for jobs outside the science, mainly in marketing research, personnel departments, or the nonprofit sector. Those who leave the capital face the risk of unemployment.

---

1 The most sociologically informed members of HLAS' group were Anton Štefánek, later the first Slovak professor of sociology, and Vavro Šrobár and Milan Hodža, who later became prominent politicians.

2 Although the communists persecuted and imprisoned him in the 1950s, he continued his research (Hirner, 1973, 1976) and teaching at the renewed Department of Sociology in Bratislava. During the twenty years of his pedagogical work, he educated many sociologists who are proud to have been his students (Turčan, 2000).

3 In spite of their overt deprecation of empirical research, Party administrations ordered several surveys (Katriak, 1988, Szomolányi, 1990).

4 The young Marx's texts, unknown until then, were studied.

5 Martin Bútora, Zdeněk Šťastný, and Ján Pašiak.

6 The personnel structure of research workers was controlled by the District Communist Party Committee and, at the beginning of the 1970s, also by the Central Communist Party Committee; every new scholar and even every PhD student had to be approved by the Party.

7 The sole discussant was Robert Roško, who introduced the concept of the anti-bourgeois class collective to suggest the concept's limited suitability for grasping the actual problems of socialist daily life (more about Roško's theoretical efforts in Búzik, 1999; Roško, 2000).

8 University teachers continued to refer to Western sociological theories. Dilbar Alijevová dealt with contemporary American sociological theories (Alijevová, 1979, 1986, 1989), Ján Pichňa developed an institutionalist perspective in his sociology of labor, occupation, and organization (Pichňa, 1982), and Alexander Hirner and Juraj Schenk elaborated methodological issues and system analysis (Hirner, 1973, 1976; Schenk, 1989).

9 In this period, articles devoted to non-Marxist sociology were categorized as "the critique of bourgeois theories". Some of them were undoubtedly real ideological critique, but others tried to present Western sociological theories without bias. The representation practices applied in such "criticism" deserve special analysis.

10 Jiří Suchý discussed the shortcomings of the construction of social development in socialist prognosis and planning (1991).

11 Only a few authors referred to their own texts published under socialism, for instance, Róbert Roško, Dilbar Alijevová (modern sociological theories), Ján Pašiak (local communities), and Ladislav Macháček (the sociology of youth).

12 However, this "quotation gap" suggests that the older articles were not worth building on and that the Marxist paradigm and Slovak sociology of the "normalization" period did not deserve attention (Kusá, 1996a). Few authors continued their research. Dilbar Alijevová has continued her research in phenomenological sociology. She deals mainly with the topic of personal and group identity (Alijevová, 2000), framed mainly by a phenomenological and existentialist perspective. The only author who returned to his older work, reviewed it critically, and tried to reconnect it with his present interest in civil society was Robert Roško (2000a, 2000b).

13 Here we do not deal with qualitative studies separately, because – in agreement with various authors (Becker, Howard, 1998, Seale, Clive, 1999, etc.) – we do not think they can be considered a single paradigm, nor to be a clear alternative to (similarly wrongly lumped) quantitative research.

14 In the first half of the 1990s, the situation was quite different. The Internet was not accessible at universities or the Academy and many strategically important addresses, terms, etc., especially those connected to fund-raising, were accessible only to a few people included in the directories of donor institutions and were not disseminated freely throughout the sociology community.

15 Soňa Szomolányi has recently qualified as a university professor in political science. She heads the Political Science Department at Comenius University. Martin Bútora and Fedor Gál also qualified as university professors in political science at Prague Charles University. Fedor Gál left for the Czech Republic in 1993.

16 After Róbert Roško's refusal to run for the position of its Director.

17 Ľubomír Falťan acquired his PhD in sociology in Poland. His critical attitude toward the "normalizing" practices of Andrej Sirácky kept him from being approved to work in the Academy of Science until 1988.

18 The Dr.Sc. – the so-called Big Doctorate – is the highest academic degree for scientific activity. The applicant has to fulfill scientometric criteria like a certain number of published books, articles in ISI periodicals, references in the quotations index, and tutored PhD students.

19 Both sociology departments are younger than the institutions of the Academy.

20 Czech sociologists did not have a sociological association; they organized directly in the Czechoslovak Sociological Association, whose headquarters were in Prague. From the perspective of information dissemination, the Slovak/Czech partnership had an asymmetric character.

21 Martin Bútora and Zora Bútorová are the Slovak Ambassadors to the U.S. (1999-) and honorary presidents of IVO.

22 The situation changed in the middle of the 1990s. The increased interest in social problems might be ascribed to the operation of the SPACE agency and especially the SOCO (Social Costs of Economic Transformation) program of the Institute of Human Science in Vienna, which supported most of the research and publication (Radičová, 1995; Falťan Ľubomír, Gajdoš, and Pašiak, 1996).

23 Because the pool of authors was small, a single author could represent a whole sociological sub-discipline (as Ladislav Macháček did for the sociology of youth and Juraj Schenk did for system theory and modelling). A few efficient authors could make a topic dominate Slovak sociology. For instance, in 1990-1995, eleven scholars wrote half of the articles published in Sociológia (Feglová et al., 1995).

24 In the 1990s, VEGA evaluated and supported only one project on nationalism and none concerning the Romany minority (Robert Klobucký and Katarína Strapcová in 2002) Research on Romany issues was usually initiated by foreign research foundations, including the World Bank (Radičová, 2000, 2001).

25 More in (Búzik and Laiferová, 2001).

26 The editor of Sociological Diary was Zuzana Kusá.

27 In 2002, Katarína Strapcová started her project of building a Slovak Archive for Survey Data at the Institute for Sociology (SAS). Her goal is to create a primary data catalogue and then to attempt a systematic documentation of the existing stock of social science data sets (Strapcová, 2001).

28 For example, Rošk et al., 1997; Machonin , 1994; Bunčák et al., 1999.

29 Some distinguished sociologists (Soňa Szomolányi, Olga Gyárfásová, Zora Bútorová) used their political experiences and gradually re-qualified as political scientists.

30 However, the stagnated number of workplaces in academic institutions and the fact that competitions are announced only when someone retires can be interpreted as "push factors".

References

Alijevová, Dilbar (1979): "Nededuktívne teórie v súčasnej americkej sociológii" (Non-deductive theories in the contemporary American sociology), in: *Sociológia*, 11, No. 4;

Alijevová, Dilbar (1986): *Súčasná americká sociológia* (Contemporary American Sociology), Bratislava, Pravda;

Alijevová, Dilbar (1989): "Štruktúry každodennosti v sociologickej reflexii" (Structures of everyday life in sociological reflection), in: *Sociológia*, 21, No. 2;

Alijevová, Dilbar (2000): "Osobnostná identita: kontinuita verzus diskontinuita" (Personal identity: Continuity and discontituity), in: *Sociológia*, 32, No. 4 , 319-342;

Bačová, Viera, Hominišová, Mária, Cooper, Marc-Philippe (1994): "Problém reformy verejnej správy na Slovensku vzhľadom na národnostne zmiešané oblasti" (The problem of the public administration reform at nationally mixed regions), in: *Sociológia*, 26, No. 5-6, 438 – 446;

Bratislava Nahlas (1987), Bratislava Aloud. Attachment of the Minutes of the Meeting of 13th ZO SZOPK (Basic Organization of Slovak Association of Nature and Environment Protectors), Bratislava;

Becker, Howard (1996): The Epistemology of Qualitative Research, in: *Essays on Ethnography and Human Development*, Jessor, Richard, Colby, Anne and Schweder, Richard (eds.), Chicago, University of Chicago Press;

Bunčák, Ján, Harmadyová, Valentína and Kusá, Zuzana (1996): *Politická zmena vo verejnej rozprave* (Political Change in Public Discourse), Bratislava, Veda;

Bútora, Martin (1989): *Mne sa to nemôže stať. Sociologické kapitoly z alkoholizmu Martin* (It Cannot happen To Me. Sociological Chapters on Alcohol Adiction), Osveta;

Búzik, Bohumil (1995): "Teoretický pluralizmus alebo eklekticizmus?" (Theoretical Pluralism or eclecticism?), in: *Sociológia*, 27, No. 4, 297-300;

Búzik, Bohumil (2000): "Zjavenie sa modernizácie v slovenskej sociológii" (Revelation of modernization in Slovak sociology), in: *Sociológia*, 32, No. 4, 385-390;

Búzik, Bohumil (1997): "Od kritiky teórie k empirizmu" (From the critique of theory to empiricism), in: *O kontinuitu a modernu*, Turčan, L'ubomír and Laiferová, Eva (eds.), Bratislava, Sociologický ústav SAV;

Delmartino, Frank, Versmessen, Elke, Miháliková, Silvia and Falťan, Ľubomír (eds.) (1997): *Nové podoby verejnej správy. Slovenská a flámska skúsenosť* (New forms of public administration), Bratislava Sociologický ústav SAV;

Dianiška, Ivan (1989): "Konsolidovaná sociológia" - malá, ale naša! Nad výsledkami jednej citačnej analýzy. (Consolidated Sociology – small but ours! On the results of a quotation analysis), Paper presented on the Second congress of Slovak Sociological Association, Martin, manuscript;

Falťan, Ľubomír, Gajdoš, Peter and Pašiak, Ján (1995): *Sociálna marginalita území Slovenska* (Social marginalisation of the territories of Slovakia), Bratislava, S.P.A.C.E.;

Feglová, Viera et al. (1995): "Conceptualization of Poverty in Slovakia: Discussions on Methodological Issues and Measurement", in: *The Social History of Poverty in Central Europe*, Budapest, Max Weber Foundation, 291-302;

Findor, Andrej (2000): "National Identity as Narrative Construction", in: *Sociológia*, 32, No. 1, 57 – 79;

Frič, Pavol, Gál, Fedor, Dianiška, Ivan (1988): "Profesiová orientácia sociológa vo svetle spoločenských očakávaní", in: *Sociológia*, 20, No. 1;

Gál, Fedor et al. (1990): *Prognózovanie vývoja vedy* (Prognosing science development), Bratislava, Veda;

Gál, Fedor, Frič, Pavol, Bútorová, Zora et al. (1987): "Problems of the Science Development in the Slovak Socialist Republic", in: *Ekonomický časopis*, 35, No. 9, 820-832;

Guráň, Peter and Filadelfiová, Jarmila (1997): *Hlavné demografické trendy: Slovensko 1996* (Main Demographic Trends: Slovakia 1996), Bratislava, BICFS;

Harmadyová, Valentína and Bunčák, Ján (1998): "Transformation in the evaluations of the elite", in: *Sociológia*, 30, No. 1, 9 – 46;

Hirner, Alexander (1973): *Sociálna kontrola a problémy jej empirického výskumu* (Social Control and the problems of its empirical research), Bratislava, ČSVÚP;

Hirner, Alexander (1976): *Ako sociologicky analyzovať?* (How to analyse sociologically?), Bratislava, ÚŠI;

Kánovský, Martin (2000): "Sociobiológ na ľadovci", in: *Sociológia*, 32, No. 5, 483-494;

Katriak, Martin (1988): K začiatkom rozvoja marxisticko-leninskej sociológie u nás v 50. rokoch a na začiatku 60. rokov (On the Beginnings of the Development of Marxist-Leninist Sociology in our Country in the 1950s and 1960s), manuscript;

Klobucký, Robert (2001): "Vplyv T. G. Masaryka na konštituovanie slovenskej sociológie", in: *Sociológia*, 33, No. 2, 207-220;

Klobucký, Robert and Strapcová, Katarína (2002): "Knowledge Utilization in Slovak Public Policy", in: *Sociológia*, 34, No. 3, 223-250;

Konopásek, Zdeněk (1996): "Sociology as Power-Play", in: *Sociológia*, 28, No. 2, 99-126;

Kopčok, Andrej (1998): "Kriesenie sociológie na stránkach Filozofického časopisu", in: *Filozofia*, 5, 53;

Köverová, Štefánia (1995): "Dve poznámky k legitimizácii profesionálneho konania slovenských sociológov" (Two Comments on the Legitimization of the Professional Acting of Slovak Sociologists), in: Sociologický zápisník, 4, No. 2, Bratislava, SÚ SAV;

Krivý, Vladimír (1993): "Sociokultúrne pozadie transformačných problémov na Slovensku" (Socio-Cultural background of transformation problems in Slovakia), in: *Sociológia*, 25, No. 4-5, 311-326;

Krivý, Vladimír, Feglová, Viera and Balko, Daniel (1996): *Slovensko a jeho regióny: sociokultúrne súvislosti volebného správania*, Bratislava, Nadácia Médiá;

Kusá, Zuzana (1992): "Autobiographical Narratives in the Research 'the 20th Century in the Slovak intelligentsia families'", in: *Sociológia*, 24, No. 6, 571-578;

Kusá, Zuzana (1996): "Komunikácia na stránkach časopisu Sociológia" (Communication in the journal Sociológia), in: *Problémové polia slovenskej sociológie*, Kusá, Zuzana (ed.) SÚ SAV - SSS SAV Bratislava, 34-43;

Kusá, Zuzana (1997a): "Nechcená kontinuita?" (Not wanted Continuity?), in: *O kontinuitu a modernu*, Turčan, L. and Laiferová, Eva (eds.), Bratislava, SU SAV, 68 – 75;

Kusá, Zuzana (1997b): "I followed her (Free) Voice but Europe didn´t like me. The Case of Expelled refugee´s Autobiography", in: Sociológia, 29*,* 6, 685 – 706;

Kusá, Zuzana (1999): "Poor People – Poor Life Stories? Ordinary and Extraordinary in Life History Narratives", in: *Sociológia*, 31, 3, 263-290;

Kvapilová, Erika (2001): "K charakteru koncepcie rodinnej politiky na Slovensku" (On the Conception of Family Policy in Slovakia), in: *Sociológia*, 33, No. 4, 375-377;

Kvasničková, Adela (1996): "Recepcia diela J. Lajčiaka", in: *Sociológia*, 28, No. 4;

Kvasničková, Adela (1998): "Proti stereotypom obrazu sociológie náboženstva a kresťanskej sociológie na Slovensku do r. 1948" (Against the stereotypes of the picture of sociology of religion and of religious sociology in Slovakia till 1948), in: *Sociológia*, 30, No. 2;

Laiferová, Eva (1998): "Problematika národa v náboženskej sociológii na Slovensku v prvej polovici 20. storočia", in: *Sociológia*, 30, No. 2;

Laiferová, Eva and Búzik, Bohumil (2001): "Hľadanie vlastnej tváre: dekáda slovenskej sociológie" (Looking for the own face: A decade of Slovak Sociology), in: *Sociology in Central and Eastern Europe: Transformation at the Dawn of a New Millennium*, Keen, Mike and Mucha, Janusz (eds.), Greenwood Publishers;

Lajčiak, Ján (1921): *Slovensko a kultúra* (Slovakia and Culture), Myjava, Nakladateľstvo Pažického;

Lenczová, Terézia (2001): "K charakteru koncepcie rodinnej politiky na Slovensku" (On the conception of Family Policy in Slovakia), in: *Sociológia*, 33, No. 4, 353- 374;

Lubelcová, Gabriela (1999): "Primal trends and risks in the development of criminality in Slovakia between 1989 and 1999", in: *Sociológia*, 31, No. 5, 497 – 501;

Macháček, Ladislav (1990): "Valné zhromaždenie Slovenskej sociologickej spoločnosti pri SAV", in: *Sociológia*, 22, No. 3;

Machonin, Pavel (1969): *Československá společnost*, Bratislava, Epocha;

Machonin, Pavel (1994): "On sociological comparison of Czech and Slovak society", in: *Sociológia*, 26, No. 4, 307-22;
"Materiály celoslovenskej sociologickej konferencie – 1989, 1990", in: *Sociológia*, 22, No. 3;
Matulník, Jozef and Pastor, Karol (1997): "Pokles pôrodnosti na Slovensku ako deviácia a ako výskumný problém", in: *Sociológia*, 29, No. 5, 549-562;
Ondrejkovič, Peter (1997): *Socializácia mládeže ako východisková kategória sociológie výchovy a sociológie mládeže*, Bratislava, Veda;
Ondrejkovič, Peter (1999): *Sociálna patológia*, Bratislava, AMOS, PdF UK;
Ondrejkovič, Peter (2000): "Modernizácia a anómia. Je teória anómie aktuálna i v súčasnej slovenskej spoločnosti?", in: *Sociológia*, 32, No. 4, 343-360;
Pašiak, Ján (1980): *Človek a jeho sídla,* Bratislava, Obzor;
Pašiak, Ján (1994): "Anton Štefánek – zakladateľ slovenskej sociografie", in: *Sociológia*, 26, No. 1- 2;
Pašiak, Ján (1996): "Problematika modernizácie slovenskej spoločnosti v diele J. Lajčiaka Slovensko a kultúra", in: *Sociológia*, 28, No. 1;
Pašiak, Ján (1997): "K problematike interdisciplinárnosti v slovenskej sociológii", in: *O kontinuitu a modernu*, Turčan, Ľudovít and Laiferová, Eva (eds.), Bratislava, SÚ SAV, 94-108;
Pašiak, Ján and Macháček, Ladislav (1994): "Sociology in Slovakia. Fiction and Reality", in: *Eastern Europe in Transformation. The Impact on Sociology,* Keen, Mike F. and Mucha, J., Westport, Connecticut, London, Greenwood Press, 89-991;
Pichňa, Ján (1982): *Sociológia podniku*, Bratislava, Práca;
Plichtová, Jana and Eros, F. (1997): "Meaning of some political and economic terms in relation to experience of two Slovak and Hungarian generations", in: *Sociológia*, 29, 6, 723-737;
Plichtová, Jana (2001): "Responsibility and rights of patients and doctors in treating transmittable disease", in: *Sociológia*, 33, No. 3, 297 – 316;
Provazník, Dušan et al. (1989): *The Current Problems of the Sociology of Family*, Bratislava, Veda;
Radičová, Iveta and Fialová, Zuzana (1994): *Malé dejiny československých vzťahov* (Small History of Czech and Slovak Relations), Volumes 1-5, Bratislava, Foundation of M. Šimečka,;
Radičová, Iveta (1995): "Social Cost of Economical Transformation in Central Europe", in: *Sociológia*, 27, 59-72;
Radičová, Iveta, Gyárfášová, Oľga and Wlachovský, Miroslav (1997): *Content Analysis of Selected Foreign Press on the events in Slovakia in 1995*, Bratislava, SFPA;
Radičová, Iveta (2001a): "Roma = Problem", in: *Sociológia*, 33, No. 5, 419-438;
Radičová, Iveta (2001b): *Hint sunt Romales*, Bratislava, S.P.A.C.E;
Roško, Róbert (1989): "Štruktúra a dynamika individuálneho, skupinového, spoločenského vedomia a konania v súčasne etape" (Structure and Dynamics of Individual, Group and Social Consciousness and Action in the Present Period), in: *Final Report of ČÚ ŠPZV IX-3-9/01*, Roško, Róbert (et al.), Bratislava, UFS SAV;
Roško, Róbert (1990): "II.zjazd slovenských sociológov a naša revolúcia", in: *Sociológia*, 22, No. 3;
Roško, Róbert (1993): "Quo Vadis slovenská sociológia", in: *Sociologický zápisník*, 2, No. 2;
Roško, Róbert (1995): "K hypotéze o reziduálnej skupine", in: *Sociológia*, 27, No. 3, 215-227;
Roško, Róbert, Macháček, Ladislav, Čambáliková, Monika (1997): *Občan a transformácia*, Bratislava, Sociologický ústav SAV;
Roško, Róbert (2000): *Slovakia in the End of Millennium*, Bratislava, Veda;
Sedová, Tatiana (2000): "O jednom pohľade na sociálne", in *Sociológia*, 32, No. 1, 123-130;
Seale, Clive (1999): *The Quality of Qualitative research*, London, SAGE;
Schenk, Juraj (1990) (1989): *Samoorganizácia sociálnych systémov*, Pravda, Bratislava;
Schenk, Juraj (2000): "Alexander Hirner on Social System Problems", in: *Sociológia*, 32, No. 6, 521-538;
Schenk, Juraj (1988): "K trom aspektom sebareflexie slovenskej sociológie", *Sociológia*, 32, No. 2, 190-196;
Schenk, Juraj (1981): *Metodologické problémy modelovania v sociologickom bádaní*, Bratislava, Pravda;
Sirácky, Andrej (1950): "Buržoázno – triedne korene a idealistické pozície sociológie a sociografie na Slovensku", in: *Filozofický sborník*, No. 5, Bratislava;
Slovakia 1997. Global Report about the situation in society, Bratislava, IVO;
Slovakia 2000. Global Report about the situation in society, Bratislava, IVO;
Sopóci, Ján (1993): "Quo Vadis.....", in: *Sociologický zápisník*, 2, No. 2;
Sopóci, Ján (1995): "Hľadanie teórie v slovenskej sociológii" (Quest for Theory in Slovak Sociology), in: *Sociológia v meniacej sa spoločnosti*, Sopóci, Ján (ed.), Bratislava, IMPULZ;

Sopóci, Ján and Búzik, Bohumil (1995): "Basics of Sociology", in: *Základy sociológie*, Bratislava, SPN;
Sopóci, Ján (1995): "Theoretical diversification of Slovak sociology", in: *Sociologický zápisník*, 4, No. 2;
Sopóci, Ján (1996): *Kolektívne správanie*, Bratislava, IMPULZ, Univerzita Komenského;
Sopóci, Ján et al. (1997): *Slovník spoločenských vied* (Vocabulary of Social Sciences), Bratislava, SPN;
Sopóci, Ján (1998): *Politika a spoločnosť* (Politics and Society), Bratislava, IMPULZ, Univerzita Komenského;
Sopóci, Ján and Búzik, Bohumil (1999): *Teórie sociálnej stratifikácie a mobility* (Theories of social stratification and mobility), Bratislava, IMPULZ, Univerzita Komenského;
Stena, Ján (1993): "Občan v postkomunizme: vecné a výskumné problémy", in: *Sociológia*, 25, No. 3;
Stena, Ján (1994): "Fenomén 'reziduálnej skupiny' v slovenskej politike", in: *Sociológia*, 26, No. 4, 371-380;
Strapcová, Katarína (2001): *Slovak Archive of Survey Data*, VEGA research project No. 2/2096/22;
Suchý, Juraj (1991): "Prognózovanie a plánovanie sociálneho rozvoja", in: *Sociológia*, 23, No. 3, 173- 187;
Sýkora, Peter (1999): "Bojí sa sociológia biológie?" *(Is Sociology Afraid of Sociobiology?)*, in: *Sociológia*, 31, No. 4, 375-396;
Szomolányi, Soňa (1988): "Pokus o sebareflexiu slovenskej sociológie ako jej problémové a participatívne skúmanie" (An Attempt for self-reflection of Slovak Sociology as its problem-oriented and participative study), in: *Sociológia*, 20, No. 3;
Szomolányi, Soňa (1990): "História zrodu a formovania sociologického pracoviska SAV" (History of the Origin and Formation of the Sociological Workplace), in: *Sociológia*, Vol. 22, No. 3;
Szomolányi, Soňa (1992): "Čo zmôže sociológia?" (What Can Sociology Do?), in: *Sociológia*, 24, 1-2,
Štefánek, Anton (1945): *Základy sociografie Slovenska* (Basics of Sociography of Slovakia), Bratislava, 4 Volumes;
Turčan, Ľudovít (1992): "Dejiny slovenskej sociológie a osobnosť Antona Śtefánka", in: *Sociológia*, 24, No. 4;
Turčan, Ľudovít (1994): "Anton Štefánek a jeho nepublikované texty", in: *Sociológia*, 26, No.1-2;
Turčan, Ľudovít (1996): "Sociologické inšpirácie Jána Lajčiaka", *Sociológia*, 28, No. 3;
Turčan, Ľudovít and Laiferová, Eva (1997): "Kontinuita a modernizácia v sociológii na Slovensku v 20.storočí", in: *O kontinuitu a modernu*, Turčan, Ľ. and Laiferová E. (eds.), Bratislava , SÚ SAV, 7- 18;
Turčan, Ľudovít (1998): "Sociálna otázka v kresťanskej sociológii na Slovensku v prvej polovici 20. storočia", in: *Sociológia*, 30, No. 2.

Selected Bibliography

(Books and the articles in the foreign social science journals covered in SSCI)

Alijevová, Dilbar (1995): "Paradigmatičeskije sdvigi v sovremennoj sociologii povsednevnosti: koncepcija Mišela Maffesoli", in: *Sociologičeskij žurnal ,* No. 1, Moskva, 110-122;
Adamski, W.Wlodyslaw, Bunčák, Ján, Machonin, Pavol and Martin, Dominique (eds.) (1999): *System Change and Modernization. East-West in Comparative Perspective*, Warsaw, IFiS Publishers;
Bunčák, Ján and Piscová, Magdaléna (2001): "Modern national Identity of Slovaks and Their Attitude Towards Europe", in: *Newsletter Social Science in Eastern Europe*, Special Edition, IZ;
Bútora, Martin and Bútorová, Zora (1993): "Slovakia: The Identity Challenges of the Newly Born State", in: *Social Research*, 60, 4, 705-736;
Bútora, Martin and Bútorová, Zora (1999): "Slovakia' democratic awakening", in: *Journal of Democracy*, 10, No. 1, 80-95;
Bútorová, Zora et al. (1996): *She and He in Slovakia*, Bratislava, Focus;
Čambáliková, Monika (1995): "Tripartite Decision-Making in Slovakia", in: *Transfer von Sozialpartnerschaft in die Neuen Demokratien*, Innsbruck, 1995;
Čambáliková, Monika (1999): "Tripartism in Slovakia: Actors and Strategies", in: *Historical Reflections on Central Europe*, Houndmills (England), Macmillan, 191-208;
Čambáliková, Monika, Páleníková, Eva and Petrík, Borislav (1996): *Tolerance in Slovakia – Situation and Possibilities*, Bratislava, EMPO,105;
Falťan, Ľubomír and Dodder, Richard (1995): "Privatizing the housing sector – The case of Slovakia", in: *Public Admin. Develop* 15, No. 4, 391 – 396 (SSCI);

Falťan, Ľubomír (1998): "Cross-border Interregional Cooperation and Slovakia. Chapter 8", in: *European New Order and National Problems-International Joint Studies II.*, Takayanagi, S. (ed.), Tokyo, Chuo University Press;

Falťan, Ľubomír (ed.) (1999): *Europe: Expectation and Reality*, Bratislava, MOST-UNESCO;

Gajdoš, Peter and Pašiak, Ján (1997): "The Socio-Spatial Connections in Regional Development of the Slovak Republic", in: *Räumliche Auswirkungen des Transformationsprozesses in Deutschland und bei den östlichen Nachbarn*, Musil, J. and Strubelt, W. (eds.), Opladen, Leske + Budrich;

Gorzelak, Grzegorz, Ehrlich, Éva, Falťan, L'ubomír and Illner, Michal (eds.) (2001): *Central Europe in Transition: Towards EU Membership*, Warsaw, Scholar - Wydawnictwo naukove;

Laiferová, Eva (1998): „Up and Down of Slovak Sociology during the 20th Century", in: *Čarnijev zbornik (1931-1996)*, *Zbornik mednarodnih družboslovnih in humanističnih razprav*, Ljubljana, Filozofska fakulteta, 354-365;

Macháček, Ladislav (1999): "Citizenship Potential of Unemployed and Self-Employed Young in East-Central Europe", in: *Idäntutkisimus*, 6, 1, 35-49;

Macháček, Ladislav, Fagan, Collette, Foti, Klara, Jung, Bogdan and Kovatcheva, Sijka (1999): "Tackling Young Uneployment in East-Central Europe", in: *Journal for East European Management Studies* 4, 3, 238-251;

Ondrejkovič, Peter (1995): "Prevention of Juvenile Criminality and labeling Approach", in: *International Bulletin for Youth Research*, 20-27;

Ondrejkovič, Peter (2000): "Social Pathology or Deviation?", in: *Journal of Health management and Public Health*, No. 3, Scranton (PA), 16-25;

Piscová, Magdaléna and Dooder, Richard (1995): "Demographic Trends Impacting the Family During the Economic and Political Transitions in Slovakia. 1988 – 1993", in: *The Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. XXXVI, No.1, 45-56, SSCI;

Piscová, Magdaléna et al. (1995): *Family in Slovakia in Figures and Commentaries*, Bratislava, Institute of Sociology;

Radičová, Iveta (1994): "Attitudes to the present Economic Situation in Slovakia", in: *Acta Oeconomica*, Vol. 46, No. 1-2, 199–211, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, SSCI;

Radičová, Iveta and Woleková, Helena (1999): *Impact Analysis of the Non-Profit Sector in Slovakia*, Vienna, SOCO;

Szomolányi, Soňa and Gould, John A. (1997): *Slovakia: Problems of Democratic Consolidation and the Struggle for the Rules of the Game*, Bratislava, SPSA;

Turčan, Ľudovít (2000): "The Circumstances of the Development of Sociology in Central European Countries - Slovak Sociology in the 20th Century", in: *Slovak Sociological Review*, Vol. 32, No. 6, 507-520;

Wightman, George and Szomolányi, Soňa (1995): "Parties and Society in Slovakia", in: *Party Politics* 1 (4), 609 – 618, SSCI.

Frane Adam and Matej Makarovič

Sociology – Slovenia

Discussant: Franc Mali

Introduction

The primary purpose of this chapter is to provide a brief overview of sociology in Slovenia, including both the history of its development and its present condition. A number of authors have made contributions, both general and more narrowly focused, that can be helpful in this regard. Jogan (1994; 1995a), Vičič (1989), and Kerševan (1995), as well as, more recently, Adam and Makarovič (2001) have provided general overviews. Others have focused on specific aspects of sociological practice in Slovenia, such as the collection of bibliometric and other data on the social sciences (Mali, 1999), the history of qualitative research (Adam et al., 1999), and the reception of particular theoretical paradigms, such as modern systems theory (Bernik and Rončevič, 2001) or classics like Schutz (Jogan, 1995b). Several authors, including Bojan Čas (1996), have also described the prewar history of Slovene sociology.

This overview is not an end in itself. It also strives to make a contribution to critical intradisciplinary self-reflection on the strengths, weaknesses, potential, and future perspectives of Slovene sociology.

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

The first Slovene sociological publications appeared at the beginning of the twentieth century (Janez Evangelist Krek, Aleš Ušeničnik, Andrej Gosar, Josip Jeraj, France Veber), and sociology first became a university course for students of philosophy in 1927–28 and for students of pedagogy in 1935–36. It is no surprise that, at this time (and in this part of Europe), sociology was not considered an autonomous discipline, but rather a source of additional knowledge and new insight that could supplement the curricula of other, more established disciplines. Sociology was taught merely on an informative level, with only the rudiments of empirical research. It is interesting to note that the first presentations of sociological concepts were written by Roman Catholic theologians; only later were some sociological terms included in the discussions and publications of Marxist circles. To put it differently, the sociology that appeared and was recognized in the prewar period (before 1941) was primarily sociology in its pre-empirical stage of development.

Sociology virtually disappeared from Slovene society during the first decade of Yugoslavia's communist regime, which dismissed it as "a bourgeois science" (Jogan, 1995: 51-53). In the mid-1950s, however, sociological discussion reappeared, though of course from a "historical materialist" perspective (Kerševan, 1995: 42). Sociological research was institutionalized in Slovenia with the establishment in 1959 of the Institute of Sociology and Philosophy at the University of Ljubljana, which became the Institute of Sociology in 1981. In 1991, it merged with the Research Institute of the Faculty of Sociology, Political Science, and Journalism to become the Institute of Social Sciences at the Faculty of Social Sciences (Dekleva, 1995). At the University of Ljubljana, the graduate study of sociology was initiated in 1960 at the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Arts, and later, in 1966, it began as well at the Faculty of Sociology, Political Sciences, and Journalism, now called the Faculty of Social Sciences (Jogan, 1995: 54-55). In 1993, the graduate study of sociology was also introduced at the Faculty of Pedagogy at the University of Maribor. A national sociological association was established in 1965.

In a relatively short time, at least a few Slovene sociologists began to collaborate on some international research projects: on industrial democracy in the 1960s (Veljko Rus, Vladimir Arzensek, Janez Jerovsek); in the field of spatial and urban sociology in the 1960s and 1970s (Zdravko Mlinar); and, in the 1980s, on the family in Europe (led by Katja Boh), on the meaning of work (Vojko Antončič), and on the quality of life and welfare (Ivan Svetlik and Veljko Rus), to mention the most notable examples (Jogan, 1995: 54).

Despite the prevailing "historical materialist" orientation of the institutions, the development of sociological practice inevitably led to inconsistencies with the official Marxist ideology, at times resulting in confrontations with the communist regime. In the 1970s, for instance, four professors in what is now the Faculty of Social Sciences (one phenomenologically-oriented philosopher and three professors from the sociology department) were suspended because of their views and especially because of their "ideologically inappropriate" influence on students. But as it is well known, this ideological confrontation (and the subsequent discreditation) involved not only communist party functionaries. Academics – sociologists – also played important, morally problematic roles here. The suspended social scientists were accused of using methods borrowed from the bourgeois social sciences and of presenting (socialist) social reality in a "biased" way.

As the regime's ideological control grew weaker during the 1980s, however, new sociological discussions became possible that, using concepts such as civil society, modernization, and functional differentiation, provided a strong theoretical basis for criticism not only of deformations *within* the system, but also of the communist system as a whole (Bernik and Rončević, 2001). The collapse of the communist system and the ability to analyze it freely were thus interdependent.

Any discussion and summary of the development of the sociological discipline during the communist period must take into account differing points of views, various kinds of achievements, and positives as well as negatives. It is a very ambiguous legacy. On the one hand, it is true that sociological research was either subjected to strict ideological control (accompanied by temporary repressive measures) or subtly exploited by the regime, not only in the 1950s, but also later, in the period 1973–1984. On the other hand, new institutions in research and teaching emerged, and, what is especially important, an infrastructure for empirical research was established. By the end of the 1980s, some fields of research, such as industrial sociology and urban studies (the sociology of space), were well developed, and not only in Slovenian or Yugoslav terms; these fields could be favorably compared with their international counterparts. To a lesser extent, this is true also for mobility and stratification research; public opinion research, meanwhile, already had some practical experience and results.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

As already noted, the strength of various theoretical traditions and the influence of recent theoretical developments on Slovene sociology were connected to the loosening of the former regime's ideological control during the 1980s and its ultimate collapse in 1990. The end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s were thus marked by what may be called "a theoretical turning point" (Bernik and Rončević, 2001) from the domination of a single theoretical paradigm that observed everything through (dogmatic or simplified) Marxist eyes to a multi-paradigmatic situation, which, however, has naturally shown a greater enthusiasm for some of the recently discussed paradigms than for others. It should also be noted that theories were often discussed from the perspective of their practical relevance for a better understanding of current societal problems.

The collapse of the communist system did not in itself lead to major changes in research and teaching personnel. But some people who had been marginalized in the old regime were now given opportunities for faster professional promotion or a teaching career. Those who had acted as communist party ideologues, inhibiting free and open discussion and accusing colleagues of being proponents of bourgeois science, soon underwent a conversion to feminist, ecologically-oriented, or social democratic views or portrayed themselves simply as "neutral" observers of society. Here it is worth mentioning that only a minority of academic sociologists had represented dogmatic Marxist views or had been directly politically active from high positions in the *nomenklatura*. There is only one known case in which an important person was (informally) forced to leave the faculty after the turn to democracy in 1990. For the most part, teaching and research institutions (namely, in Ljubljana, the Faculty of Social Sciences and the Sociology Department of the Faculty of Arts and their respective research institutes) kept their general structures, and there were no major changes to speak of. Over the past decade, however, several new public and private institutions in academic research and higher education have been established (for example, the Sociology Department of the Faculty of Education at the University of Maribor), while others are in the developmental stage (notably, the Faculty of Humanities in Koper).

In the late 1980s and the 1990s, greater cooperation became possible between Slovenia's sociological institutions and sociologists of Slovene origin living abroad. The most prominent example is that of Thomas Luckmann, co-author of the well-known book *The Social Construction of Reality*, who received an honorary doctoral degree from the University of Ljubljana and was a guest professor at the Faculty of Social Sciences.

The trend toward autonomy, professionalization, specialization, and internationalization, the rudiments of which had existed earlier (especially in the 1980s), continued to develop after 1990. Sociology in Slovenia was thus transformed into a modern social science discipline (with all the deficiencies and contradictions this entails). New topics arose in the area of transition studies. Also, the curricula went through some changes, and new subjects and even whole new programs were introduced (cultural studies, for instance).

As far as sociology's appeal to students is concerned, figures show that, over the last decade, the number of graduate and post-graduate students has been steadily increasing. On the negative side, however, some studies of the performance of first-year students indicate that, in comparison to previous years, the students who choose to study sociology are not as strong as they once were (the better students tend to opt for such political science disciplines as international relations). The latest statistics from the Faculty of Social Sciences (October 2001) gives the following picture: At the Department of Sociology there are 576 students (199 of them are new students who first enrolled in the current academic year). Approximately the same number of students are at the Faculty of Arts, but they combine sociology or the sociology of culture with other humanistic subjects taught at the faculty, while at Maribor there are about 100 students, who also combine sociology with other subjects.

Also, the number of post-graduate students has been growing in recent years. At present, there are 141 students, mainly part-time, registered at the Faculty of Social Sciences.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

One can hardly speak of any major revival of Slovene mainstream pre-war sociology after the collapse of the communist regime. Instead, there have been only a few relatively minor references – to the work of Andrej Gosar, for example – that seemed relevant for the recent discussions of social market capitalism and (neo-)corporatism. Much more attention has been devoted to the classics of sociology and recent developments in Western sociology.

The 1980s and 1990s witnessed a degree of increased interest in the study and translation of sociological classics. Where there were once primarily Marxist discussions, now there were a variety of perspectives, with discussions about, for instance, Schütz's phenomenology, Weber's concepts of rationality and legitimacy (which Ivan Bernik applied to the communist regime), Parsons' theories of socialization (Vesna Godina) and modernization (Frane Adam), and Durkheim's contributions to the study of deviance and law (Sergej Flere). Recent interpretations of classical theories were usually considered in these discussions, which, for example, echoed the neo-functionalist reinterpretations of Parsons in the 1980s and (to a lesser extent) showed a renewed appreciation for Georg Simmel.

More recent sociological theories, however, have received greater attention. One may first mention the systems theory of Niklas Luhmann. Discussions of this theory have examined its philosophical and theoretical foundations (Frane Adam, Tine Hribar), its significance for the understanding of the role of science (Mali, 1994), and its emphasis on the differentiation of society into autonomous functional sub-systems, which has been understood as a useful tool for analyzing both the failure of communism and the problems of post-communist modernization (Ivan Bernik and Matej Makarovič). For a discussion of this classification, see Bernik and Rončević, 2001.

Another German sociologist receiving significant attention in Slovenia is Jürgen Habermas, who has been discussed both on the level of general concepts and in the context of the meaning of the public sphere (Škerlep, 1997).

One may also mention, among other concerns, an interest in postmodernism as articulated in the intersection between sociology and cultural studies (Debeljak, 1998). New approaches include micro-perspectives of everyday life, the role of emotions, the examination of subcultures, and feminist views.

Quantitative and qualitative methods

Nevertheless, there is still a substantial gap, hardly unique to Slovene sociology, between theory and empirical research. It seems we are still concerned, on the one hand, with descriptive empiricism (or, as Luckmann once said, "social bookkeeping") and, on the other, with abstract theorizing and "moralizing" without any significant empirical evidence.

Most empirical research is characterized by the clear domination of quantitative approaches[1] using the survey method. This can best be illustrated by the series of public opinion surveys that the Center for the Research of Public Opinion (now the Public Opinion and Mass Communications Research Center) conducted as the Slovene Public Opinion (SPO) project.[2] The surveys, led by Niko Toš, have been carried out continuously since 1968 and, taken together, use more than 4,200 different variables, not counting the repetition of several variables in more than one survey (Toš and Malnar, 1995: 63). Although many of the indicators measured by these surveys were later replaced by newer ones, very interesting comparisons between various periods have still been possible. These surveys have thus been able to provide extremely rich data on Slovene society. But it would seem that these data have not been systematically interpreted in the light of more general (theoretically articulated) approaches. On the other hand, they are used much too extensively and often as the sole source of empirical evidence.

Over the past twenty-five years, there have been a number of successful applications of qualitative methods worth mentioning (Adam et. al., 1999). Even so, these methods have always remained marginal and have not been accorded their deserved place in the education process. It is interesting and at the same time problematic that the majority of research (roughly three-quarters) in which qualitative research techniques were employed focused on adolescents and youth subcultures. This is certainly the case for research conducted in the 1990s. One might expect that the thematic range would be greater, with research of this sort also focusing on phenomena like local elites, civil initiatives, processes of decision-making in local communities, new companies, NGOs, political parties, etc. Yet this has not occurred, although a democratic system might be expected to generate more incentives for research in these directions.

Sociologists also make little use of case studies, to say nothing of more in-depth phenomenological studies. Regarding the methods applied, we can observe a predominant use of unstructured and semi-structured interviews, while employment of the biographical method is only just beginning. The application of long-term fieldwork and participant observation is still rare; the use of computer-based programs to analyze qualitative data, too, is only in its early stages.

4. Thematic orientation and funding

Societal problems related to the post-communist transition and modernization are clearly reflected in sociological research to quite a great extent, especially if transition is understood broadly as having at least some impact on almost all major aspects of society. Looking at such problems in the 1990s from the perspective of Slovene sociology, one may distinguish several issues that have, to a greater or lesser degree, become the major areas of sociological research:

1. The issue of political *democratization* – sociological studies in this field have mostly dealt with such elements as civil society (the public sphere), its values and attitudes (political culture), and the characteristics and role of the elite.
2. Research on potentials and indicators related to *developmental issues* and transformation (transition) processes, including the structure and effects of management, industrial relations, education, privatization, human resources, and so on.
3. Research related to various aspects of cultural *identity*, particularly on the national, ethnic, regional, and local levels, with regard to the European or global context.
4. Other studies dealing with some particular aspects of *social structure*, welfare, and social policy, such as the impact of the market economy on social cohesion or the quality of life; the effects of unemployment, poverty, social exclusion, and the societal position of various categories, such as young people, women, the elderly, and so on.

On point 1: Sociologists, political scientists and legal experts have conducted studies on democratization in virtual isolation from each other. Unlike other specialists, sociologists have been much less interested in the institutional aspects of democratization. Although there was in the late 1980s some interest in the theoretical concepts relating to the notion of civil society, more empirical issues dominated sociology in the 1990s. These have included, in particular, quantitative research on the public sphere using opinion polls, as we have noted, as well as studies of elites.

Many research questions involving opinion polls, which have provided a valuable empirical basis for a number of relevant discussions, have concerned values and attitudes toward democracy (such as the problem of its instrumentalist acceptance, discussed by Bernik et al. 1996, and public confidence in institutions), as well as other issues such as religion, the environment, work, family, inequality, etc. The public perception of democratization has also been studied in a comparative perspective, using, for example, data from the survey *The Consolidation of Democracy in Central and Eastern Europe*. Nevertheless, the number of published discussions of democratization hardly reflects the enormous amount of data that has been collected.

Splichal (1999) has also discussed public opinion in a more theoretical way. Public attitudes and perceptions are profoundly related to the topic of mass communication, which has also been a subject of study, including research on the mass media's role in post-communist democratization from a comparative, international perspective. Recently, greater attention has been devoted to the question of the freedom of the mass media in the context of state regulations and a market economy.[3]

Research on public attitudes has been complemented by two surveys on leadership, both international in scope. One of these surveys was oriented toward the characteristics and especially the values of leaders on the local level, while the other studied elites on the national level: their characteristics, attitudes, origins, interdependencies, etc. The latter study, which provided evidence for quite a high level of elite reproduction, provoked some heated polemics (for some contributions on this topic, see Kramberger, 2000).

On point 2: Sociological studies have approached developmental issues from several angles. Sociologists have used a number of indicators to measure various aspects of development, including socio-cultural factors and other theoretically-based models (Adam et al., 2001).

Emphasis has been placed on studying the regulation and organization of new forms, from extensive studies of privatization in social services and of industrial relations (Stanojević, 2001) to discussions of neo-corporatist arrangements, the potential of societal self-regulation, and the developmental role of the state, with an emphasis on small-state specifics (Adam and Tomc, 1994). Some attention has also been given to the regulation of relations between scientific institutions (universities and institutes), the economy, and the state (Mali, 2000).[4]

On point 3: Various aspects of identity have also been examined. Mlinar and his colleagues, for example, emphasized the relations between spatially-based identities, in particular, and current globalization processes (Mlinar, 1992; Mlinar, 1995). Ethnic identity and minorities have also been extensively addressed (Miran Komac, Boris Jesih, Mitja Žagar). Particular stress has been placed on studies of Slovene minorities outside of Slovenia, especially those living in Austria and Italy, and the Slovene diaspora abroad. For the most part, research in these areas has been carried out at the Institute of Ethnic Studies in Ljubljana and the European Center for Ethnic, Regional, and Sociological Studies at the University of Maribor. There have also been some theoretically-based studies of nationalism issues and of the emergence of a new nation-state in the era of globalization (Rizman, 1993).

Given its crucial importance for Slovene society, the question of European integration, which involves complex identity issues related to autonomy and globalization, has received surprisingly little sociological attention, especially compared to discussions of the topic by economists and, to a lesser extent, political scientists. There are, however some significant exceptions, and sociological interest in the topic appears to be increasing.

On point 4: Finally, one should mention studies concerned with certain other aspects of the social structure. There are practically no recent extensive and systematic studies of stratification in general, though the problem has been discussed in relation to several other topics. The only partial exception is a collection of studies edited by Kramberger (2000). Such neglect seems quite strange, given the significant changes in the stratificational structure caused by the market economy, as well as the tradition of stratification and social mobility studies in post-war Slovene sociology.

Somewhat greater attention has been paid to studies of various specific categories within the social structure, such as youth (Mirjana Ule, Tanja Rener), the elderly (Ivan Svetlik), and women (Vlasta Jalušič, Silva Mežnarič and Ule 1993; Rener 1993). Issues of social cohesion versus the problems of exclusion (Martina Trbanc) and poverty (Mojca Novak) have also been addressed, especially in the context of marketization.

Attention has also been paid to the standard of living, which Ivan Svetlik and his colleagues studied extensively in the international *Social Structure and the Level of Living Survey*. Recent research on the standard of living has made use of several new methods, such as event history analysis (Mandič, 2000).

It may be argued that most sociological research in Slovenia, especially at the macro level, has been at least partially and indirectly related to various issues of transition. However, this does not mean, that these issues – or other major societal problems – have been fully covered. Over the past decade, in fact, there has been a serious lack of studies dealing with stratification and social mobility. Despite some researchers' significant interest in particular social categories, virtually no attention has been devoted to certain new social categories, such as entrepreneurs or, on the other hand, the "losers" in the transition. In the area of democratization, interest in the structure and (political) functions of the public sphere or civil society has hardly gone beyond the study of public opinion.

The thematic orientation of Slovene sociologists is at least partially reflected in institutional structures. This may be clearly seen, for instance, in the high level of internal differentiation into research centers and groups at the Institute for Social Sciences at the University of Ljubljana. Perhaps the strongest of these, in terms of personnel and financial resources, are the Public Opinion and Mass Communication Research Center; the Center for Organizations and Human Resources, which deals particularly with the sociology of organizations, labor markets, and industrial relations; and the Center for Spatial Sociology, which studies primarily spatial divisions, relations, and identities in the context of globalization. To some extent, these centers may also reflect certain thematic priorities in Slovene sociology.

Theoretical interests and orientations in academic institutions are not directly related to issues of funding, though obviously the relationship between funding and choice of topic is much more direct in applied research. The funding of sociology depends almost exclusively on public sources, mostly from governmental bodies on the national and, to a lesser extent, local and municipal levels. The importance of international funds (especially from European Union institutions) is also increasing. Private funding of sociology remains insignificant. A notable exception is the Soros Foundation, though in the recent years this foundation has severely cut back its funding of Slovene social scientists.

The lack of private funding is also due to the relatively weak cooperation of Slovene academic institutions, in general, with the business sector, as well as with public bodies, state agencies, and NGOs. This may be particularly true for sociology, which decision-makers may quite often perceive as too exclusively "academic" and insufficiently "practical" or applicable.

5. Public space and academic debates

There is a relative lack of open sociological discussion in Slovenia, despite the long existence of institutions that should be the proper place for academic debates, such as academic journals and the Slovene Sociological Association, established in 1965. In 1983, a specifically sociological journal, *Družboslovne razprave* (Journal of Social Sciences) was added to the collection of more general Slovene social science journals, such as *Teorija in praksa* (Theory and Practice) and *Anthropos.* Sociological articles have also been published in other academic journals, such as *Javnost* (The Public), *Časopis za kritiko znanosti* (Journal for the Critique of Science), and such magazines as *Nova revija*, *Ampak*, etc. *The Public/Javnost* is listed by the Social Science Citation Index, while *Družboslovne razprave* and *Teorija in praksa* are indexed by the Sociological Abstracts database.

Researchers can also make use of various databases in Slovenia. The Slovene Social Science Archive at the Faculty of Social Sciences in Ljubljana holds the most exhaustive collection of databases, compiled from a great variety of social surveys in Slovenia as well as international surveys that enable valuable comparisons, particularly from the last decade but also from earlier years. General information about the collection of databases is accessible on the Internet.

Despite what might seem like numerous institutional opportunities for discussion, the only significant debate within sociological circles in recent years (which also attracted the attention of the mass media and the general public) was about the empirical studies of Slovene elites mentioned above. The lack of elite circulation in Slovenia was interpreted either as a sign of societal stability and the proper adaptation of "old" elites or as a deficiency in the democratic processes of elite circulation (see also Kramberger, 2000). However, for the most part, this debate did not take place in academic journals, but in publications intended for a broader intellectual public – which may also be an indication of the state of public debate *within* Slovene sociology.

Along with a lack of public discussion among sociologists, there are other problems with the public role of sociologists. Sociologists are too often exploited and (ab)used in ideological confrontations ("cultural struggle") between political factions. The vast majority of sociologists who take part in such public disputes hold worldviews that reflect a single political faction (which considers itself "leftist-liberal" and mostly overlaps with the ruling political parties), so actions by politicians of this faction may be legitimized by being implicitly perceived as based on scientific arguments.

A typical example concerns the "proper" public role of the Roman Catholic Church. Sociologists writing on this topic[5] share very similar worldviews, and it is sometimes hard, especially in public debates, to distinguish between their scientific contribution and their value judgments. There are also other examples, in which some sociologists present political stances, for example skepticism toward or opposition to Euro-Atlantic integration, in a way that gives the impression that personal opinions are sociological facts. Such cases may produce an unjustified public image of Slovene sociology and sociologists as being incapable of the necessary degree of value-neutral, detached judgments.

These problems could be at least partially addressed by the development of a more open and tolerant climate for discussion within the sociological community. Unfortunately, this community is characterized by a certain reluctance to enter into such discussions (which to some extent may be related to the general atmosphere in Slovene media, as well as in Slovene public and political life). The same holds true for the Slovene Sociological Association. Unfortunately, its activities have recently decreased in number and are mostly limited to annual meetings.[6]

Needless to say, such a lack of discussion also contributes to fragmentation when dealing with various issues, a relative dispersion of the scientific community, and a lack of productive teamwork.

6. Views on further development

As mentioned above, Slovene sociologists have established many international contacts and began a certain amount of cooperation with Western social scientists in international research projects as early as the 1960s. They have been able to use these contacts in the international scientific community to develop extensive cooperation in international research projects and publications, as well as to avail themselves of study and teaching opportunities at foreign universities. However, given the relatively small size of Slovenia's societal and scientific network, even greater openness to the international scientific community is needed (especially in regard to publication in journals indexed in SSCI and to collaboration in common European projects like the Framework Programme 5 and 6).

Slovene sociology is not confronted with any serious "brain-drain" problems, since even those who study abroad are very likely to return.

To summarize what has been said about the achievements and current problems of Slovenian sociology, it might be helpful to apply an elementary version of SWOT analysis. Looking at four dimensions – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats – we can establish a basis for anticipating future trends.

Strengths

Sociology in Slovenia is a well-organized, institutionalized, and, to some extent, diversified discipline with a strong research orientation. It is also relatively well-funded, has a sophisticated information infrastructure, and is in many ways better off than all other social science disciplines. Compared, for example, with the situation of sociology in Greece (which has approximately the same GDP as Slovenia), where there are 77 academic researchers and teachers[7], the situation in Slovenia, which has nearly the same number of academic staff but only one-fifth the population of Greece, is, at least quantitatively, far more advanced.

Weaknesses

Research activity is often fragmented; very little attention is given to open discussion and the exchange of ideas. There is some reluctance to deal with more "delicate" topics and to re-examine the validity of the data sources used in one's own or another's research projects. Teamwork, a focus on strategic issues, and more complex methodological approaches (triangulation) are rather rare. These deficiencies may seriously jeopardize the quality of the sociological endeavor.

Opportunities

A new impetus for renewing the discipline and improving the quality of research is offered by internationalization and close cooperation (but also competition) among individual sociologists and research groups from different countries. Comparative, cross-cultural projects with a more complex methodology have become more viable.

Threats

Without teamwork and interdisciplinary links, it will be quite difficult to avoid a marginal position in the process of internationalization. The further erosion of theoretical (self-)reflection can lead to the establishment of a pragmatic "social engineering" approach and the neglect of the greater public interest.

Within a small social system and a small scientific community, certain phenomena of "inbreeding" – such as clientism, nepotism, and old-boys' networks – are likely to occur. The best mechanisms for avoiding such deleterious practices are an openness toward international influences and an acceptance of more demanding and unbiased criteria of scientific evaluation and promotion.

Concluding remarks

Proceeding from this weighing of the various parameters that determine the endogenous dynamics and the social context of sociology, various scenarios appear possible. The process of unreflected differentiation and specialization, which leads to fragmentation on the institutional as well as on the epistemic level, is becoming more and more counterproductive. In an increasingly interconnected (networked) world and in a paradoxical and risky society, it is probably more important to give an approximate (but empirically- and theoretically-grounded) answer to a complex question, rather than a precise answer to a partial question.

What is the meaning and mission of sociological theorizing and research in the broader social context? In our view, there are two main contributions: first, to a more rational (self-)reflection of society and, second, to the concrete resolution of specific social problems. In this sense, the separation of so-called critical theory from so-called scientific approach is unproductive. What can sociology do and what can it not do? It might be said that sociology is not able to generate solutions in the form of "pure" prescriptions and "categorical imperatives". Its role and expertise potential are more modest. It can produce hypothetical solutions in the form of scenarios, multiple options, and cost-benefit or SWOT analyzes. It can be very helpful in indicating and evaluating the side-effects and potential risks of certain decisions and policies. To perform its function, sociology must become a more integrative discipline, open also to new interdisciplinary (and even transdisciplinary) cooperation. Based on our assessment of the situation in Slovenia, the state of the discipline is still far from "optimal". Nevertheless, this report could serve as a good opportunity to reconsider the state of the art of the discipline within the national and international contexts.

---

1 Besides possessing good facilities for conducting social surveys, the Faculty of Social Sciences has a very competent staff with strong backgrounds in mathematics who deal with statistics, methodology, and informatics. Recently they have been working with sophisticated methods of network analysis. It seems, however, that they are somewhat isolated from core sociological research activities.

2 There are also several private research institutions that conduct public opinion polls and market research.

3 This may be closely related to the dangers of concentrated ownership of the mass media, which jeopardizes media pluralism.

4 Sociological research on developmental potentials has also included studies of human resources. Both the accessibility and the quality (Kump, 1994) of higher education have been evaluated, and its relationship to the labor market has been discussed (Ivančič, 2000).

5 The most relevant authors in the field are Zdenko Roter, Kerševan (1993), Flere (2001), Smrke (1999) and Sreco Dragoš.

6 Last year's meeting of the Slovene Sociological Association provides an interesting illustration of the lack of open discussion. In one group, it was argued that sociology should be purely "scientific" in the strictest sense of the word, while a session in a different room concluded that that sort of thinking was illusory. Both groups considered their views virtually self-evident, but there was no opportunity for them to confront each another on the issue.

7 Lambiri-Dimaki (2001): "The Status of Sociology in Greece", in: Genov, Nikolai and Becker, Ulrike, (eds.) (2001): *Social Sciences in South-Eastern Europe*, Paris; Bonn, International Social Science Council; Informations Zentrum Sozialwissenschaften, 91-111.

References

Adam, Frane and Makarovič, Matej (2001): "Society in transition as reflected by social sciences: The Case of Slovenia", in: *Social Sciences in South-Eastern Europe*, Genov, Nikolai and Becker, Ulrike (eds.), Paris, Bonn, International Social Science Council, Informations Zentrum Sozialwissenschaften, 192-222;

Adam, Frane and Rončević, Borut (2001): "Dialogue of social scientists and public administration in Slovenia", in: *Science in South-Eastern Europe*, Genov, Nikolai (ed.), Sofia, Union of Scientists in Bulgaria, 124-133;

Adam, Frane, Podmenik, Darka and Krajina, Dijana (1999): "Qualitative methods in sociological research", in: *Anthropological Notebooks*, 5, No. 1, Ljubljana, 78-88;

Bernik, Ivan and Rončević, Borut (2001) "Slowenien: Eine differenzierte Rezeption der differenzierten Theorie", in: *Družboslovne razprave*, 17, No. 37-38, Ljubljana, 15-27;

Čas, Bojan (1996): "Prispevek k zgodovini sociologije na Slovenskem" (A contribution to the history of sociology in Slovenia), in: *Kriza socialnih idej*, Lešnik, Avgust et al. (eds.), Ljubljana, Filozofska fakulteta, 459-474;

Jogan, Maca (1994): "Modern Slovenian sociology", in: *Eastern Europe in Transformation*, Keen, Mike F. and Mucha, Janusz, Westport, London, Greenwood, 125-130;

Jogan, Maca (1995a): "Sociologija na Slovenskem: Od konca 19. do konca 20. stoletja" (Sociology in Slovenia: From the end of the 19th till the end of the 20th century), in: *Zbornik ob 30 letnici slovenskega sociološkega društva*, Kramberger, Anton and Kolarič, Zinka (eds.), Ljubljana, Slovensko sociološko društvo, 51-58;

Jogan, Maca (1995b): "Die Schütz-Rezeption in Slowenien", in: *Krise und Exodus*, Luebe, Kurt R. and Pribersky, Andreas, Vienna, WUV-Universitätsverlag, 191-197;

Kerševan, Marko (1995): "Slovenska sociologija med socialnim okoljem in znanstveno skupnostjo" (Slovene sociology between the social environment and the scientific community), in: *Zbornik ob 30 letnici slovenskega sociološkega društva*, Kramberger, Anton and Kolarič, Zinka (eds.), Ljubljana, Slovensko sociološko društvo, 41-50;

Mali, Franc (1999): "Slovenia: Social sciences and the challenge of transition", in: *Compendium of national reports*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe;

Toš, Niko and Malnar, Brina (1995): "Projekt Slovensko javno mnenje: Primer infrastrukturne podatkovne baze slovenske sociologije" (The Slovene Public Opinion project: An example of the infrastructural database of Slovene sociology), in: *Zbornik ob 30 letnici slovenskega sociološkega društva*, Kramberger, Anton and Kolarič, Zinka (eds.), Ljubljana, Slovensko sociološko društvo, 59-70;

Vičič Vlasta (ed.) (1989): *Stanje, vloga in razvojne perspektive družbenih znanosti na Slovenskem* (The condition, role, and developmental perspectives of social sciences in Slovenia), Ljubljana, Marksistični center.

Selected Bibliography

Adam, Frane and Tomc, Gregor (eds.) (1994): *Small societies in transition: The case of Slovenia: Transformation processes in a small post-socialist society*, Ljubljana, Slovene Sociological Association, Institute for Social Sciences;

Adam, Frane, Makarovič, Matej, Borut, Rončević and Tomšič, Matevž (2001): *Socio-kulturni dejavniki razvojne uspešnosti* (Socio-Cultural Indicators of Developmenatal Performance), Ljubljana, ZPS;

Bernik, Ivan, Malnar, Brina and Toš, Niko (1996) "Die Paradoxa der instrumentellen Akzeptanz von Demokratie", in: *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, 25, No. 3, Vienna, 339-356;

Debeljak, Aleš (1998): *Reluctant modernity: The institution of art and its historical forms*, Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers;

Debeljak, Aleš (2001): "Reflections on elusive 'common dreams': Perils and hopes of European identity", in: *Alternatives*, 26, No. 2, Boulder, 211-231;

Ferligoj, Anuška and Mrvar, Andrej (eds.) (2000): *New approaches in applied statistics*, Ljubljana, FDV;
Ferligoj, Anuška and Batagelj, Vladimir (1992): "Direct multicriteria clustering algorithms", in: *Journal of classification*, 9, No. 1, New York, 43-61;
Flere, Sergej (2001): "The impact of religiosity upon political stands: Survey findings from seven central European countries", in: *East European Quarterly*, 35, No. 2, Boulder, 183-199.
Ishikawa, Akihiro, Roderich, Martin and Rus, Veljko (eds.) (2000): *Workers, firms, and unions*, Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang;
Ivančič, Angelca (2000): "Education and shifts between labour-market states in the transition from the socialist to the market economy: The Slovenian case" in: *European Sociological Review*, 16, No. 4, Oxford, 403-425;
Kerševan, Marko (1993): "Ambivalence of religious revitalization in post-socialist societies", in: *Social compass*, 40, No. 1, London, 123-133;
Kramberger, Anton (ed.) (2000): *Mechanisms of Social Differentiation in Slovenia*, Ljubljana, Journal of Social Sciences;
Kump, Sonja (1994): *Akademska kultura* (Academic Culture), Ljubljana, Znanstveno in publicistično središče;
Makarovič, Jan (1998): *Od Črne boginje do Sina božjega: Slovensko ozemlje kot sotočje verskih tokov* (From the Black Goddess to the Son of God: Slovenian territory as the confluence of religious currents), Ljubljana, Pisa, Fakulteta za družbene vede, Dipartimento di linguistica, Università degli studi di Pisa;
Mali, Franc (1994): *Znanost kot sistemski del družbe* (Science as the Systemic Part of Society), Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede;
Mali, Franc (2000): "Obstacles in developing university, government and industry links: The case of Slovenia", in: *Science Studies*, 13, No. 1, Tampere, 31-49;
Mandič, Srna and Clapham, D. (1996): "The meaning of home ownership in the transition from socialism: The example of Slovenia", in: *Urban Studies*, 33, No.1, Harlow, 83-97;
Mandič, Srna (ed.) (2000): *Kakovost življenja: Stanja in spremembe* (The Quality of Life: Conditions and Changes), Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede;
Mežnarić, Silva and Ule, Mirjana (1993): "Women in politics in Eastern Europe: Croatia and Slovenia (The case of delayed modernization)", in: *The Journal of Ethno-development*, 2, No. 1, Detroit, 92-105;
Mlinar, Zdravko (1995): "Local responses to global change", in: *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, No. 540, Thousand Oaks, 145-156;
Mlinar, Zdravko (ed.) (1992): *Globalization and territorial identities*, Aldershot, Avebury;
Morinaga, Yasuko, Hanson, Irene Frieze and Ferligoj, Anuška (1993): "Career plans and gender-role attitudes of college-students in the United States, Japan and Slovenia", in: *Sex Roles*, 29, No. 5-6, New York, 317-334;
Rener, Tanja (1993): "Biografická metóda v skúmaní sexuálnej štruktúry každodenného života" (Biographic method and sexual structure of everyday life), *Sociológia*, 25, No. 6, Bratislava, 565-572;
Rizman, Rudi (1993): "The Sociological Dimension of Conflicts between Ethnonationalisms", in: *Kleine Nationen und ethnische Minderheiten im Umbruch Europas*, Devetak, Silvo, Flere, Sergej and Seewann, Gerhard (eds.), Munich, Slavica Verlag;
Rizman, Rudi (2000): "The relevance of nationalism for democratic citizenship", in: *Javnost-The Public*, 7, No. 1, Ljubljana, 5-13;
Rubin, Donald B., Stern, Hal S. and Vehovar, Vasja (1995): "Handling don't know survey responses – The case of the Slovenian plebiscite", in: *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90, No. 431, Alexandria, 822-828;
Rus, Andrej (1999): *Social capital, corporate governance and managerial discretion*, Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences;
Rus, Veljko (1990): *Socialna država in družba blaginje* (The social state and the welfare society), Ljubljana, Domus;
Smrke, Marjan (1999): "Proselytism in post-socialist Slovenia (Religious pluralism and national identity in post-communist Eastern Europe)", in: *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 36, No. 1-2, Philadelphia, 202-220;
Splichal, Slavko (1999): *Public opinion: Developments and controversies in the Twentieth Century*, Boston, Rowman & Littlefield;
Stanojević, Miroslav (ed.) (2001): *Uspešna nedozorelost* (Successful Immaturity), Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede;

Svetlik, Ivan (ed.) (1992): *Social policy in Slovenia: Between tradition and innovation (Studies in the social policy of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union)*, Aldershot, Avebury;

Svetlik, Ivan et al. (eds.) (2000): *Managing Cultural Diversity: Implications for the EU integration*, Ljubljana, Inštitut za družbene vede;

Škerlep, Andrej (1997): *Komunikacija v družbi, družba v komunikaciji* (Communication in Society, Society in Communication), Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede;

Tomc, Gregor (2000): *Šesti čut: Družbeni svet v kognitivni znanosti* (The Sixth Sense: The Social World in Cognitive Science), Ljubljana, Znanstveno in publicistično središče;

Toš, Niko, Mohler, Peter and Malnar, Brina (1999): *Modern society and values: A comparative analysis based on ISSP project*, Ljubljana, Mannheim, Zuma, Faculty of Social Sciences, Center of Survey Research and Methodology;

Velikonja, Mitja (1999): "Historical roots of Slovenian Christoslavic mythology", in: *Religion in Eastern Europe*, 19, No. 6, Princeton, 15-31.

Piotr Sztompka

The Condition of Sociology in East-Central Europe

Summary and some personal responses to problems raised in the discussion

The extensive country reports and the rich discussion during the conference have touched on a stunning variety of problems and challenges facing sociology in post-communist societies of Eastern and Central Europe. The goal of this essay is to underscore some main lines of the debate, systematize the issues, and attempt a tentative summary.

Let's start with a methodological point. The comparative focus taken by the project allows two directions of research. The first, akin to the classical logic of the comparative approach as put forward by John Stuart Mill, is to seek uniformities and similarities in the sea of diversities and differences and then to account for the reasons why such uniformities emerge. The second, opposite in intention, unravels specificity and uniqueness in the sea of seeming homogeneity and then explains why such diversity emerges and persists (Sztompka, 1990).

The main theme of the reports and discussion is the latter: diversity. Only in the myopic perspective of distant outsiders was the so-called "socialist bloc" an undifferentiated entity, a kind of uniformly gray (and sad) area in Europe. We insiders knew better. Bulgaria was different from Czechoslovakia, Romania from Poland, Hungary from the GDR, Albania from Yugoslavia, and all were different from the imperial center, the Soviet Union. These differences have become even more salient and deeper after the collapse of communism and the dismantling of the Soviet empire. Eastern and Central Europe today presents a colorful mosaic of countries different in economic standards, political arrangements, cultural values, lifestyles, mentalities, etc. Why this is so is a fascinating question for sociology. Keeping in mind that, for decades and in some cases for half a century, these countries were subjected to the powerful unifying mold of Soviet-type institutions, organizational arrangements, and indoctrinating pressure imposed by the imperial power, what are the causes of such diversity? And after the collapse of the empire, they have fallen under the new unifying forces: one broader, operating on a world scale and known as globalization, which entered forcefully through the open gates of "open societies"; and another narrower, operating on the regional scale and labeled European integration, which became the common aspiration and political intention of most post-communist countries. In spite of all these influences, they remain different and preserve unique identities. Why?

The focus of our project was the condition of sociologies in post-communist societies and not the condition of societies as such, so this question necessarily remained in the background. The main questions underlying all discussions was: Are the sociologies of Eastern and Central European countries similar or different? How are they faring in the context of the broader phenomenon of European sociology? And finally, how are they being influenced by the progressing internationalization of sociology on a global scale? Summarizing the debate, I will start from the end, with the list of universal problems that we share with sociologists of most other countries of the world; then I will move to regional problems that we share with sociologists of other Eastern and Central European countries; and finally I will close with the list of country-specific problems reported by the participants in our discussion.

1. Universal problems of the discipline

(a) Several discussants raised the problem of interdisciplinary borders as a hindrance to innovative research and a multidimensional explanation of social phenomena. This is of course a concern of sociologists all over the world. The Committee of the Gulbenkian Foundation chaired by Immanuel Wallerstein prepared a famous report "Open the Social Sciences" (Wallerstein, 1996), which argued that the rigid separation between social-scientific disciplines – economics, political science, sociology – is the unfortunate legacy of academic institutionalization of these fields in the 19th century and has nothing to do with the immanent qualities of social reality.

It is instructive to recall how the problem of interdisciplinary research was resolved in the history of our field. In the classical period of the 19th century, European sociology had a close alliance with history and economics. Just think of Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Vilfredo Pareto. Then with the birth of American sociology at the beginning of the 20th century, the links with psychology and particularly social psychology became crucial. Later, particularly in the British tradition, sociology became closely related to social and cultural anthropology. In the meantime, the links with economics and history have become very attenuated. And it is only in the last decade of the 20th century that the birth of two extremely important and lively subdisciplines, historical sociology and economic sociology, signaled the return – in new ways – to the classical tradition.

It would seem natural that under socialism as it existed, which claimed inspiration from the work of Karl Marx, sociology should come close to history and economics. Strangely enough, this was not the case. In those countries where it was officially recognized, sociology was placed somewhere between the brand of philosophy known as Marxism-Leninism or scientific communism, some forms of politological reflection, and fact-oriented demographic statistics. History and economics followed their own courses, far removed from sociology.

Then came the revolution of 1989. Sociology had its glorious days, not only in the sense that sociologists, as ideologists and articulators of grievances, were often on the frontlines of struggle against the old regime. But also because a fascinating range of problems opened to sociological research: the mobilization of mass social movements, new forms of collective behavior, the role of charismatic leaders, and the demise of utopian thinking. The whole perspective on social change was revised: the belief in necessary, irreversible forces of history was replaced by the image of contingent "social becoming" or by collective human agency making history (Sztompka, 1991, 1993a).

The revolution began an arduous task of constructing a completely new social order – democratic, capitalist, culturally open, and pluralistic. Understandably, the process of post-communist transformation (transition, modernization) became a central concern for sociologists. By its very nature, the transformation is a multidimensional process. Ralf Dahrendorf identified its three major levels and the different speeds of changes occurring on each of them in his famous metaphor of "three clocks": the clock of politics, which runs the fastest, allowing major legal or institutional changes almost overnight; the clock of economics, which requires years to shift from the command economy to the market; and the clock of civil society, which runs slowest, since changes in values, mentalities, and "habits of the heart" require decades (Dahrendorf 1990). This multidimensional quality of transformation demanded a multidisciplinary approach. It could not be adequately understood with the tools of just one discipline. Political science, economics, and ethnology (or cultural analysis) joined hands with sociology and a number of studies crossed the traditional disciplinary borders. But in line with Dahrendorf's intuition in the first years of the transformation, the leading role in the alliance was played by political and legal sciences (and their immediate cousins within sociology: political sociology, the sociology of law, etc.), focusing on the process of democratization. Then came the days of economics (and the revival of interest in the sociology of organization, the sociology of labor, economic sociology, etc.), as the focus of research shifted to the processes of marketization and privatization. But after some years it has become obvious that building new institutions is not enough. The barriers, obstacles, and "frictions" (Etzioni, 1991) in the process of transformation have been related to the "human factor" – legacies of "homo sovieticus", trained "civilizational incompetence" (Sztompka, 1993b), deficiencies in motivations and capacities, and the syndrome of pervasive distrust (Sztompka, 1999) – on the level of civil society. To use an apt metaphor: building a new house turned out to be insufficient to create a new home (Brzezinski, 1989). A solid architecture was found inadequate to produce true attachments, loyalties, identities – "feeling at home" in the new structure.

Researchers' attention turned to the social and cultural tissue, where the post-revolutionary trauma (Sztompka, 2000) has left its most acute and lingering mark. And accompanying this, the social costs and unintended consequences of the transformation itself – a radical, deep, and comprehensive change in the whole "life world" of the people – appeared more visibly, with unemployment, considerable enclaves of poverty, a wave of crime, corruption, and moral anomie, the overturning of accustomed hierarchies of prestige, the growing distance between those who succeeded and those who became marginalized, the weaknesses of political leadership, the demoralization of political elites, etc. Here, sociology gained the leading role in the study of transformation, since it is best endowed with the methods and theoretical models to deal with this societal and cultural level of phenomena.

(b) The second universal problem faced in new forms by the sociologists of Eastern and Central Europe is the opposition between empirical research and sociological theory. It seemed that this problem had already been resolved in world sociology by means of the concept of "middle range theory" (Merton, 1968), or explanatory theory, linking research and theory in undivided unity. But, unexpectedly, this problem is now returning in the post-communist societies. Most of the effort in studies of transformation has so far been concentrated on gathering data, particularly by means of survey research, opinion polls, etc. In effect, the diagnosis of the process is very rich. But theoretical reflection has been much more limited. Paradoxically, if it exists at all, it came mostly from outsiders – Western sociologists: Dahrendorf (1990), Offe (1996), Saxonberg (2001), and Kumar (2001), to name just a few. They have proposed generalized models of transformation with some explanatory and predictive power. It is only now, after a decade, that some insiders are venturing similar theoretical images on a high level of generalization, e.g. Pavel Machonin (1997), Jadwiga Staniszkis (1999), Mirosława Marody (2000), and Piotr Sztompka (2000b).

The trouble with narrow empirical focus is not only its relatively limited contribution to sociological knowledge, but also its meager impact on politics and common thinking about society. What politicians as well as common people expect from sociology is not more and more facts and data, but rather a vision, a map of the terrain allowing us to orient ourselves in the chaos of events and phenomena, to tell where we come from, where we are, and where we are going. Politicians and citizens need imagination rather than information, insights rather than facts. This demand can be fulfilled only by valid theory. Instead, when the public image of sociology becomes synonymous with statistics and opinion polls incessantly discussed by the same self-appointed pundits (a new vocation of the "TV sociologists") quoting percentages, drawing cross-tabulations, and offering comments on the level of trivialities well known to every taxi driver in town, then sociology's chances to fulfill its applied and enlightening mission are seriously undermined.

(c) The third universal issue we face in Eastern Central Europe, together with sociologists in other countries, is the impact of globalization. Globalizing tendencies appeared quite early in the domain of science, which is by nature cosmopolitan and ignores borders. In sociology, ideas, concepts, models, and theories characteristically flowed mainly between Europe and America. Sociology, a 19th-century European invention, has developed to a great extent in the US and for much of the 20th century was dominated by American trends and leading scholars (Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, Paul Lazarsfeld, George Homans). The flow seems to have reversed only at the close of the century, when major European authors – Jürgen Habermas, Niklas Luhmann, Pierre Bourdieu, Michael Foucault, and Anthony Giddens – again started to exert great influence on American sociology and became trendsetters worldwide.

In Eastern and Central Europe in the communist period, ideological and political constraints slowed down or even prevented entirely the full internationalization of sociology. When the barriers were brought down, it often meant wholesale and sometimes uncritical borrowing of Western methods, ideas, and theories. The pressing issue now, after a decade of freedom, is whether we are doomed to remain the poor cousins of Western colleagues – mere recipients, trend followers, and imitators. Or perhaps we can offer something original and innovative, an authentic contribution to world sociology. The chances for this appear in three directions. First, the post-communist societies present a unique and stimulating "strategic research site" for the study of major, fundamental systemic change, an unprecedented process that Elster, Offe, and Preus wittily label "rebuilding the ship at sea" (Elster et al., 1998). Three aspects of the process seem particularly interesting. Nowhere else – except perhaps in the civil rights movement in the US – has the role of popular contestation, collective behavior, and grass roots mobilization been as salient as in the "revolution of 1989". It provides a perfect laboratory for students of social movements. Then, the purposeful construction and spontaneous emergence of new institutions – the second birth of capitalism and democracy – can be observed *in situ*. And third, the adverse cultural consequences of rapid, wide-ranging and unexpected social change, even if the change, in itself, is beneficial and progressive, – what I call "cultural trauma" – stand out in particularly bold relief.

The second possible contribution appears in the domain of fruitful sociological concepts. Perhaps it is not widely recognized that one of the most fashionable ideas in sociology now, the concept of civil society, was dug up from oblivion when Polish and Czech dissidents started to read the works of Scottish philosophers and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel and used some of their forgotten ideas for a critical diagnosis of communist societies, as well as for the main imperatives of their revolutionary program. There are other concepts originating in post-communist experiences that have a chance of entering a canon of sociological wisdom: "self-limiting revolution", "nonpolitical politics", "political capitalism", "conversion of social capital", "civilizational incompetence", "post-communist trauma", etc.

But the ultimate challenge, and the task for which sociologists from former communist societies seem best equipped, is to formulate the historically and empirically grounded theory of social change that would finally depart from utopianism and developmentalism, whether of evolutionist or Hegelian-Marxian provenience, toward an image of contingent history-making by human agents, or what I like to call incessant "social becoming" (Sztompka, 1991), or in other words, permanent production and reproduction of social reality (Giddens, 1985).

2. Regional problems shared among sociologists of post-communist countries

The second group of problems widely discussed among the contributors to the present project relates directly to the experiences of the region. At the forefront is the continuing burden of the past. Societies of East-Central Europe are particularly deeply immersed in history. Thinking of historical influence on the present, we may take various perspectives and adopt various time horizons. For the societies of the region, the obvious period of common fate was the post-World War II domination by the Soviet Union and the imposed communist regime. The importance of this relatively short-range horizon should not preempt the relevance of deeper temporal perspective going back several centuries.

(a) Here it becomes clear that the region has always been underdeveloped compared with leading countries of the West. It has been dominated by agriculture and rural ways of life; industrialization and urbanization were considerably delayed; and the level of education was relatively low. If we accept the idea that sociology was born and developed as a reflective awareness of modernity, then it should come as no surprise that the development of sociology in Eastern Europe has been late and slow. This is a branch of science that simply cannot flourish in pre-modern societies.

Existing socialism was – among other things – a modernizing project. It cannot be denied that its obsession with forced industrialization led to major restructuring of the economy, rapid urbanization, educational advancement of the population, and social benefits for the masses. But the modernization was significantly incomplete, crippled. It missed two crucial dimensions: democratic politics and free culture. And for sociology, these were crucial. The discipline has always remained constrained in its development, even though the extent of limitations has varied considerably from country to country and from period to period.

(b) But apart from the impact of distant history, more intense debate surrounded the impact of the more recent past: the decades of socialism as it existed. To paraphrase the opening phrase of the "Communist Manifesto", the specter of socialism is still haunting East-Central Europe. How is it manifested?

Let me start with the paradoxical impact of the mental legacies of historical socialism on the conceptual and theoretical content of sociology in post-communist societies. As a reaction to official Marxism-Leninism, sociology has now rejected Marx's ideas and insights completely and entirely. It is seen almost as bad manners to refer to Marx. Nowadays the phrase "Marx is dead" describes the intellectual climate in Eastern Europe better than in the West, where the slogan was first formulated. And the paradox is that many problems that post-communist societies face could be explained precisely by reference to Marx's ideas: e.g. alienation, impoverishment, class divisions, etc. The pendulum has swung too far. And the main reason is insufficient awareness of the fundamental difference between the political and ideological misrepresentation of Marx in so-called "Marxism-Leninism", on the one hand, and the authentic sociological core of Marx's legacy that remains a valid explanatory tool, on the other. It is good to remember that communist authorities were often more vigorous in fighting authentic, theoretical Marxism, which they labeled "revisionism", than in criticizing the "bourgeois theories". This was precisely because no theory unraveled Lenin's or Stalin's ideological abuse of Marxism better than Marx's Marxism. In our present blindness to Marx, we are haunted by the associations with the repressive political system of socialism, which put Marx on its banners quite against the spirit of his liberating, humanistic message.

Another legacy of existing socialism remains on the level of academic institutions. Contrary to the old Western idea of the university, the Soviet model imposed a division between research and teaching Research was located in the institutes and academies of science, the teaching in institutions of higher education. This was particularly true of such a sensitive area as sociology. Even when it was no longer banned, in many countries (the USSR, Bulgaria, Romania, and Czechoslovakia) it emerged first and remained for a long time exclusively within the confines of the research institutes of the national academies of science. Even in countries like Poland, where the strong tradition of research universities, dating back to the 1920s, allowed the restoration of sociology departments as early as the "thaw" of 1956, the double track of sociological research – universities vs. institutes – remains to this day. This is partly responsible for the predominance of the undergraduate teaching at the universities and the slow development of doctoral and post-graduate education. Here we still lag behind leading Western research universities, where the emphasis is clearly on the highest degrees of education, innovative research, and training for research careers.

Governmental policies of socialist regimes exerted a strong influence on the current condition of sociology. Science is a continuous and cumulative enterprise, both in the sense of being a growing pool of ideas and in the sense of having cadres that are continuously reproduced. In some of the countries, rigid policies broke continuation and cumulation. The politicization and ideologization of sociology (if at all recognized under this name) was particularly strong in Russia and the other countries of the USSR, as well as in the frontline country at the border with the West, the GDR. For considerable periods of time, a similar fate befell the countries that were at some point directly occupied and then dominated by the imperial center: Hungary after the revolution of 1956 and Czechoslovakia after the "Prague Spring" of 1968. On the other hand, countries that were able to preserve at least partial sovereignty – like Poland and Yugoslavia – were much more permissive toward academic sociology, and it was able to flourish at their universities and institutes as early as the late 1950s, with strong centers of sociological thought emerging in places like Warsaw, Kraków, Poznań, Zagreb, Ljubljana, Skopje, and others. As one discussant put it: "There was a revolution in societies, but evolution in sociology." The gap in ideas and personnel was prevented here, unlike in other countries where this gap is only now slowly healing and gradually being overcome.

Another crucial factor was the size and composition of the sociological community, which differed significantly among the countries of the region. The strength and bargaining power of sociologists vis-à-vis political authorities depended on the number of active sociologists. The sociology of a small country, even now, differs fundamentally from the sociology of a big country. The estimated number of sociologists doing research and teaching in Latvia is 20, in Lithuania 100, in neighboring Poland 1,500 (with 17,500 students yearly taking some form of sociological instruction). Another important factor is the typical educational background of currently working sociologists. For example, reports from Estonia and Lithuania indicate that they are recruited from graduates of technical and natural sciences; in Poland, law and history are typical educational experience linked with sociological studies; and in other countries, currently working sociologists often came from the fields of Marxism-Leninism, scientific communism, or political science. These factors influence the level on which the professional standards of sociology have developed; the meaning of the label "sociologist" is quite loose and vague in some countries, whereas in others it indicates very specialized expertise.

Finally, the "hottest" and most contested issue is accounting for and coming to terms with the complicity of sociologists who lived and worked under the old regime, including cases of outright political collaboration. The controversial and sometimes highly emotional public debate that has ensued (see: "Transitions", No. 2/1997 and No. 9/1998) allowed the introduction of certain distinctions. First, most participants agree that outright criminal acts committed by the communist authorities or party apparatchiks should be brought before courts of law. But even here, except for cases of particular personal viciousness or abuses of office, it can be argued that the authorities acted according to the laws of the day. A counter-argument must invoke some parallel to the Nuremberg trials and the notion of the fundamental lawlessness of inhuman laws. Anyway, a number of court trials have been started and continue to the present day. Mercifully, there are practically no sociologists in this first category of collaborators.

The second category contains high-ranking communist politicians, who – with the benefit of hindsight – may be seen as collaborators of the foreign, Soviet regime. There are many cases in which sociologists reached – at least temporarily – high party and political offices (to refer just to the Polish case, these include some famous names: Zygmunt Bauman, Jerzy Wiatr, Włodzimierz Wesołowski, Władysław Markiewicz, Jan Szczepański, and Hieronim Kubiak). Some vicious accusers would forbid any political roles (or even academic roles) for these people in the present democratic system. But again, controversy arises when their past moral responsibility is matched with their present potential usefulness for the country and for science. They happen to be very well trained and skilled professionals of political science as well as of sociology – qualifications that are not in abundance among oppositional activists, who have no earlier experience of ruling and who often come from weakly educated groups. One line of policy leans to pragmatic arguments about using the qualified "cadres" (Brown, 1997: 33). It may even be argued that the role of sociologists/politicians in the past was not entirely negative. For example, at least part of the exceptional story of Polish sociology, which was much more open to the world and free quite early, may perhaps be attributed to the presence of many eminent sociologists at the top echelons of power. They were a sort of "buffer" protecting the sociological community from the direct control and pressure of party apparatchiks who were ignorant of sociology. But of course there are always self-appointed prosecutors (also at our conference) who do not recognize this possibility and who, defining the role of sociologists in power as servility and treason, demand purges.

The proponents of "decommunization" have their weakest case when they apply the idea to the third category of villains: the rank-and-file members of the communist party whose political role or influence on political events was absolutely minimal. Most sociologists fit in this category.

Some of them, a small minority, came to the party because of their leftist ideological convictions. But for most, it was an opportunistic choice at a time when the communist system seemed to be strongly entrenched and destined to persist for centuries. It was a kind of symbolic compromise opening a possibility of fuller participation in occupational and public life, of proceeding with normal careers, and often of contributing considerably to the science of society. Should they now be punished for leftist beliefs or for innocuous opportunism? How can one measure their guilt compared with their professional contributions? This is another contested problem.

It will be obvious by now that the issue is inherently ambivalent and is perceived quite differently by moral fundamentalists than by permissive pragmatists. No wonder it led to completely opposite policies in various post-communist countries. One extreme is the GDR, where the great majority of sociologists were sacked or forcibly retired, and almost all academic positions were filled with Western-trained sociologists, mostly from the German Federal Republic. Another extreme is Poland, where the policy of a "thick, black line" dividing the past from the present was put forward by the first democratic government of Tadeusz Mazowiecki and consistently observed by later governments. This policy of reconciliation and forgiveness was applied to the sociological community. The result is that the former members of the Party Central Committee and even the Politburo, the directors of the Institute of Marxism-Leninisms, ministers in communist governments, and members of the Council of the State (the erstwhile collective presidency), not to mention rank-and-file party members, have retained their academic positions, and are now fully accepted and recognized members of the sociological profession, highly popular with students, democratically elected to academic offices, doing important, innovative research, etc. Isn't this sufficient proof that this policy was right?

3. Specific problems of national sociologies

Let us move now to the third and final category of issues raised by the discussants at the conference. They reflect the specific, idiosyncratic historical or cultural experiences and specific current situations of various countries, which are reflected in the present-day condition of sociology. These factors are mainly responsible for the diversity of sociologies in the region.

(a) Several discussants noticed the national peculiarities of the research agenda. These are rooted, first of all, in different intellectual traditions, with iconic figures whose work is cherished and followed. But of course the research agenda is also responsive to pressing current challenges in social and political life. To give some examples: in Poland, the tradition of humanistic sociology focusing on culture has been particularly strong, due to the work of Bronisław Malinowski, Florian Znaniecki, Stanisław Ossowski, Kazimierz Dobrowolski, and Józef Chałasiński, whose pupils and followers are still around and shape the current trends and research preferences. In the Czech Republic, the intellectual tradition of political sociology shaped initially by Tomáš Masaryk, which was suppressed for a time, has now re-emerged with force. It is also easy to illustrate how most pressing current issues shape sociological agendas. In Balkan countries, but also in Hungary, the sociologies of ethnicity and of religion have become more relevant than in ethnically homogenous societies. On the other hand, in ethnically homogenous Poland, with its huge diaspora in the US, Australia, and other continents, sociologists are devoting considerable attention to the problems of migrations.

(b) A number of discussants emphasized that there are "national styles" of doing sociology. Two polar types were mentioned: one that someone called "the aggregate social psychology", i.e., narrowly empirical, fact-oriented, statistically sophisticated studies of opinions, beliefs, and attitudes, mostly carried out by survey research, and another macro-structural, historical, and cultural orientation in which interpretation and theoretical explanation are much more salient.

(c) Another differentiating factor has to do with international academic connections and currents of influence. These are rooted in the histories of respective countries and are reflected in the life of the sociological community: the directions of personal exchanges, the books translated, the ideas discussed. It is well known that the language influences one's style of thinking, so countries influenced by Germany may be expected to cultivate different modes of sociology than countries influenced by the Anglo-Americans or those under the spell of French culture. Several discussants mentioned typical international alliances in sociology: Slovenia with Italy and Germany, Estonia with Scandinavian countries, Poland with the US, and Romania with France.

(d) With Max Weber's ghost in the background, some discussants posited that religious differences among the societies in the region were partly responsible for differences in the development of sociology. The examples included: Protestantism in Estonia, Roman Catholicism in Poland and Lithuania, Orthodox Christianity in Bulgaria, mixed Protestant and Catholic influences in Slovakia, and considerable secularization in the Czech Republic.

(e) Finally, an important differentiating factor was found in the strength of traditional pro-Western orientation. It cannot be denied that sociology was a Western invention and has become an important component of Western culture. Hence it can be speculated that in those countries that fell within the orbit of Western influence or aspired to do so, sociology would be stronger than in those influenced by Byzantium or the Ottoman Empire and which looked toward Asia. If the claims of some historians are right (e.g. Davies, 1997) and there is indeed a hidden civilizational and cultural fault line across the European continent that can still be perceived today, then obviously it has to be reflected in the styles, concepts, visions, and theories of sociology.

4. Coda

This closes the long list of universal, regional, and particular traits characterizing the discipline of sociology in post-communist societies of East-Central Europe that I jotted down during three days of discussions at our conference. I believe that a systematic and clear self-awareness of the state of the field, its richness and tremendous diversity, is not an empty scholastic exercise, but may have direct and significant consequences. As the eminent Polish sociologist Stanisław Ossowski once said, sociology is a domain whose fate depends very much on what its practitioners think of themselves.

By providing the opportunity to think about ourselves, for intensive self-reflection and self-appraisal, the organizers and hosts of this conference have done an important service to the East-Central European sociological community.

References

Brzezinski, Zbigniew (1989): "Toward a common European home", in: *Problems of Communism*, November-December, 1-10;

Dahrendorf, Ralf (1990): *Reflections on the Revolutions in Europe*, New York, Times Books;

Davies, Norman (1997): *Europe: A History*, London, Pimlico;

Elster, Jon, Offe, Claus and Preuss, Ulrich K. (1998): *Institutional Design in Post-communist Societies*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press;

Etzioni, A. (1991): *A Socio-Economic Perspective on Friction*, Washington, IAREP/SASE Conference, mimeo;

Giddens, Anthony (1995): *The Constitution of Society*, Cambridge, Polity Press;

Kumar, Krishan (2001): *1989: Revolutionary Ideas and Ideals*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press;

Machonin, Pavel (1997): *Social Transformation and Modernization*, Praha, Slon;

Marody, Mirosława (2000): *Między rynkiem a etatem* (Between the Market and the State Employment), Warszawa, Scholar;

Merton, Robert (1968): *Social Theory and Social Structure (revised edition)*, New York, Free Press;

Offe, Claus (1996): *Varieties of Transition*, Cambridge, Polity Press;

Saxonberg, Steven (2001): *The Fall*, Amsterdam, Harwood Publishers;

Staniszkis, Jadwiga (1999): *Post-Communism. The Emerging Enigma*, Warsaw, Institute of Political Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences;

Sztompka, Piotr (1990): “Conceptual Frameworks in Comparative Inquiry”, in: *Globalization, Knowledge and Society*, Albrow, M. and King, E. (eds.), London, Sage, 47-60;
Sztompka, Piotr (1991): *Society in Action: The Theory of Social Becoming*, Cambridge, Polity Press;
Sztompka, Piotr (1993a): *The Sociology of Social Change*, Oxford, Blackwell;
Sztompka, Piotr (1993b): “Civilizational Incompetence: The Trap of Post-Communist Societies”, in: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, No. 2, April, 85-95;
Sztompka, Piotr (1999): *Trust: A Sociological Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press;
Sztompka, Piotr (2000a): “The Ambivalence of Social Change: Triumph or Trauma?”, in: *Polish Sociological Review*, No. 3, 275-290;
Sztompka, Piotr (2000b): *Trauma wielkiej zmiany* (The Trauma of a Great Change), Warszawa, Institute of Political Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences;
Transitions (a monthly), No. 2/1997, No. 9/1998;
Wallerstein, Immanuel (ed.) (1996): *Open the Social Sciences*, The Report of Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisboa.

Other disciplines

Mihály Sárkány

Cultural and Social Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe

For several reasons, it is difficult to discuss the position of cultural and social anthropology in the formerly socialist countries of Europe. First, it is not easy to identify the practitioners of these disciplines. Their institutionalization is a recent phenomenon in the region; most university departments and research institutions that bear the name social or cultural anthropological were established after 1990.

A notable exception is Romania, where a Department of Cultural Anthropology was formed side by side with a Socio-Demographic Department within the Research Center (Laboratoire) of Anthropology at the Victor Babes University of Bucharest. This research center was founded in 1964, and its first leader, Vasile V. Caramelea, was a student of the famous sociologist, Dimitrie Gusti. It was a small institution with a few researchers and a focus on value-orientation research in the 1970s (Caramelea, 1979).

The terms social and cultural anthropology, however, were widely used in the region. It is sufficient to recall the two conferences of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES), the largest world meetings of anthropologists that were held in Eastern Europe (Moscow, 1964 and Zagreb, 1988) with many participants from the then-socialist countries. Social and cultural anthropology was lectured within ethnography and ethnology curricula in many countries for a long time or in special courses in the 1970s and ’80s (Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania), and anthropological texts were also translated.

Against this background, many scientists, irrespective of their narrower scientific affiliation, considered themselves social or cultural anthropologists in the 1990s, when the institutionalization of the subject had become widespread. Chris Hann is right when he remarks that local anthropologists “may or may not trade under this name” (Hann, 2002: xii).

Good evidence for his statement is the most recently published Register of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA), which appeared for the 4th EASA Congress held in Barcelona, 1996 and in which the Czech Republic, Poland, Russia, and Slovakia were listed as countries of the region having cultural and social anthropological institutions. In the EASA selection, only Polish institutions included the terms cultural or social anthropology in their names. The other countries were represented by institutions of ethnography, ethnology, and folklore.

Surprisingly, no institution was mentioned from Romania, where the abovementioned research center continued to exist as a member of the institutional network of the Romanian Academy of Sciences, anthropological departments were being formed at the universities of Bucharest, Cluj, and Timisoara, and a small research unit for studying the anthropology of communication was very active in Miercurea Ciuc. Moreover, the Romanian society of cultural anthropology used to publish yearbooks from time to time with studies in English or French (1998, 1999). Hungary was also omitted, where cultural anthropological departments were established at the universities of Budapest (1990) and Miskolc (1993) and where cultural anthropological specialization was possible at the University of Pécs. Names of scientists from these countries with their institutional basis were also published in the Register, so readers have had more chance to get information through these data.

If we keep in mind that the circle of historical anthropologists has also been broadening since the 1980s (Klaniczay, 1984), it is obvious that the boundaries between related disciplines have been shifting in the formative last decade and that scholars’ self-classification can differ from their classification by others. I shall address this fact by discussing the recruitment for the subject.

Second, it is well known that social scientists of Central and Eastern European countries publish mainly in their own languages. A very small and probably not the most original part of their production appears in the leading English or French journals of anthropology. It is difficult to follow and evaluate scientific achievements in so many languages. No publication tries to cover this heterogeneity.

Some stock-taking papers were written on anthropological research in Eastern Europe, but these deal mainly with English and American efforts; very little is said about research carried out by representatives of the region. It is clear from these works that economists and sociologists like János Kornai and Iván Szelényi and students of the philosopher György Lukács had a greater influence on the ideas of visiting anthropologists than did local anthropologists, if the latter's activity is referred to at all (e.g. Hann, 1994: 238, Wolfe, 2000: 203, 207). In a short article, László Kürti (1996: 14-15) presented some serious problems encountered in confronting European-style ethnography and its practitioners with expanding social and cultural anthropology and its representatives in Eastern Europe, but he discussed this situation in rather general terms without a deeper analysis – though he could not have done otherwise in the limited space available to him.

Under this handicap, I will try to outline the context in which social and cultural anthropology started to emerge as an institutionalized science in the formerly socialist countries of Central and Eastern Europe and to describe some of their characteristic features here. In this effort, I can rely on a fairly good knowledge of the Hungarian scene, on my readings, on consultations with colleagues, and on some international workshops held on the possibility of implanting social and cultural anthropology in the region. These workshops were held in the framework of larger anthropological conferences in Prague in 1999 (4th Aleš Hrdlička Conference), in Cracow in 2000 (6th Congress of the EASA)[1] and in Cluj ("Representing Anthropology and Anthropological Representations in Eastern Europe" regional workshop) in the same year. This basis of information is certainly not exhaustive and does not cover all the concerned countries equally. Therefore some subjectivity and exaggeration is unavoidable in the presentation.

Changing labels

Vesna Godina from Ljubljana carried out research on the institutionalization of cultural anthropology in the formerly socialist countries. She did not publish her results in written form, so I have to rely on her presentation at the EASA Conference in Cracow in 2000[2]. She reported that various changes of names can be observed in addition to the foundation of new social and cultural anthropological departments. One form of transformation was when an older ethnographical department was turned into a department of social or cultural anthropology or of cultural studies, as happened in Poland. Another form was when it was turned into an ethnological department, as occurred in some other countries (Russia, or translation of native names as ethnology instead of ethnography, as in Czech Republic, Hungary or Slovakia), or when cultural anthropology was added to the accepted and well-known term ethnology (e.g. Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia and at University of Poznan, Poland). The American 'sociocultural' variety appeared in the titles of publications, too (Skalník, 2000, 2001).

Kürti (1996: 15) raises the possibility that in this rediscovery of anthropology in Eastern Europe "there is a competition for funding and jobs; a solidification of a new patron-client relationship; and a race for political and ethnic correctness." Without denying the relevance of these factors, it is worthwhile to take into account other considerations for this change of names, like modernization or a desire for a more comparative look or for participation in international cooperation.

The old term "ethnography", a heritage of an emerging interest in ethnic and cultural differences in Germany in the middle of the 18th century (Stagl, 1998), has become out of date in two ways. On the one hand, in the English-speaking countries, it has taken the meaning of descriptive undertaking, and, on the other hand, in the Marxist classification of science in the Soviet Union and in the German Democratic Republic, it covered the whole research procedure of description, analysis, and comparison of ethnic, cultural, and social differences. The term ethnology, coined by the French philosopher Alexandre Chavannes in 1786 (Bitterli, 1982: 399), seemed to be a good solution, well in accordance with European and American research traditions alike, being the equivalent of cultural anthropology in the United States. It served those properly who wanted to express their detachment from a Marxist commitment, but maintain a continuity of research (Szynkiewicz, 1992)[3]. In contrast to the cautious reformers, the more radical preferred the use of social or cultural anthropology, by which they signaled a break with the past. The Slovenian and Polish solutions should be seen in this context.

Recruitment

The advocates for introducing social and cultural anthropology to university education came from various scientific circles.

There were former non-European ethnologists. Their number was small in every country in Central and Eastern Europe except Russia. They had thought of themselves as social or cultural anthropologists earlier, too, and were recognized as such abroad. Publications and participation in congresses gave them presence in international anthropological life. They played the biggest role in the institutionalization of cultural anthropology in Hungary. They could have played a similar role in Czechoslovakia, where well-known social anthropologists worked in the 1960s, but the leading Czech social anthropologists left Bohemia after 1968 (Ladislav Holy and Milan Stuchlik in 1968, Peter Skalník in 1976). Clear evidence of their recognition is that they all got jobs in social anthropological departments in the United Kingdom or the Netherlands. Peter Skalník wandered farther to South Africa, and he alone returned to Czechoslovakia in 1990, where he has experienced difficulties in finding a position for himself in the home scientific community.

Another important group consisted of European ethnographers and folklorists, who were not content with the research targets and the weak theorization in their science. Members of this group did not have to shift greatly, either. International organizations like the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) accepted them as members of the same club – together with all those who practiced native ethnographies without paying much attention to Anglo-American anthropology. They were, however, more selective in adopting objects of research and more inclined to theorization than were non-European specialists.

There were philosophers in all formerly socialist countries who were interested in theoretical problems of culture. This was also a chance to step away from the orthodoxy of dialectical and historical materialism. Some of them made outstanding contributions to anthropological problems (Márkus, 1966, 1992). The Armenian Eduard Markarjan even organized a group in Jerevan in the 1970s to investigate anthropological theories of culture, in addition to his own elaboration of a science of culture (Markarjan, 1971, 1986). These philosophers usually remained outside the new subject, but contributed to the clarification of the field. It was different with the next generation. Some younger philosophers entered cultural anthropological departments and became mainly interested in theoretical issues.

Sociologists, politologists, social psychologists, and even economists also started to work on social and cultural anthropological questions. They were also young scholars who focused on human and symbolic aspects of social, political, and economic behavior instead of the central problematic of their respective sciences.

The social context of social and cultural anthropology: a comparison of West and East

The outcome of this great variety of impulses is a very broad circle of research targets and methods, which became especially apparent at the EASA meeting in Cracow in 2000. Cultural and social anthropology seems to be a very attractive science with this abundance of possibilities for students, but less for institutions. Social and cultural anthropological departments were formed with little personnel, with 2-5 lecturers as full-time employees. The reservation of the host universities can not be explained by the lack of unity in cultural anthropology or by vested interests alone. Moreover, the situation is very similar in Western Europe, where the implantation of social and cultural anthropology started a few decades earlier, but has not resulted in a unified science except in those countries where these disciplines or some of their important intellectual traditions were created (the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, France).

It seems to me that there are different approaches to the social and cultural phenomena at stake and that the split is a consequence of the development of social sciences in different historical, social, and intellectual settings.

Social and cultural anthropology are products of the English-speaking world. Their roots are in common with those of ethnography and ethnology in the Enlightenment period, but their crystallization as theory-oriented but empirically-based sciences is the result of a long development from the second part of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century. By studying human behavior in its social and cultural diversity, their aim is to discover the unity of mankind or at least the principles that explain social and cultural diversity. This orientation deviates from the particularizing historical approach that has been dominant in the European and especially in the German tradition of ethnology and ethnography, which tended to distinguish the study of societies according to the researcher's relation to his or her subject, by distinguishing "our" problems (Volkskunde) from "their" problems (Völkerkunde).

Though important monographs were written about the development of anthropology, both in its American (Harris, 1968)[4] and British (Kuper, 1975) variants, it is not easy to clarify the factors responsible for the particular Anglo-American development. As I see it, the following circumstances were decisive in the formative period:

1. By the 19th century, the philosophical tradition of the English-speaking world had a different turn from that of continental Europe. There was no determining ontological tradition in it, moral philosophy was also losing ground, and "...the social sciences became arenas for the debate of fundamental issues about the nature and destiny of humanity..." (Adams, 1998: 2). In contrast, a strong epistemological interest was developing, which promoted the fight against speculation in social analysis.
2. The historical context of the development of sciences dealing with social and cultural diversities along the Atlantic coast was determined by the emerging capitalistic world economy. The leading trading and later industrial nations became the main actors in the colonization of the other parts of the world, and their social science was involved in interpreting world processes.
3. The colonial context of research demanded reliable knowledge and this led to a gradual improvement of research techniques (Urry, 1972). Fieldwork became a central element of the research process, in which theoretical considerations and local knowledge confronted each other.
4. Much research was carried out in societies in which historical data was not available or was available only covering a very short period and more attention had to be paid to the relationship between phenomena as they condition each other. This led to an acceptance of a structural-functionalistic approach in its various varieties, which encouraged raising questions instead of taking anything for granted, including questions about the relation of particular phenomena to a supposed totality of a society or culture.
5. Most studied societies were at a distance and were subject to the anthropologist's part of the world. It suggested itself to consider them laboratories (Benedict, 1960: 29) in which phenomena could be "objectively" studied with a hope to formulate laws or principles of social and cultural existence.
6. There were strong incentives behind the research, such as to help rule colonies (Asad, 1973), or to give a definite answer to the question whether the Southern and Eastern European immigrants would become culturally similar to other Americans (Frank, 1995).
7. Perhaps the key factor was freedom in democracy. Scholars before World War I were allowed to announce their discovery of anything, irrespective of particular interests, and this ideal was more consistently maintained in the English-speaking world than in other parts of the world, even after the Soviet Revolution in 1917.

This resulted in a classical phase of anthropology, which John Bennett puts between 1916 and 1953. It started with Alfred R. Kroeber's formulation of the superorganic concept of culture, according to which culture can be explained in itself and not by noncultural factors, and with Malinowski's elaboration of fieldwork methods. It ended with the revolt against colonialism (1999: 951).

In contrast, ethnographical or ethnological research in Central and Eastern Europe had other characteristics in its formative period:

1. It tended to separate the descriptive and comparative levels of research; theorization was reserved for the peers of the science; and the "great" problems of mankind were left for the philosophers who dominated intellectual life with their aura.
2. Ethnographers and ethnologists working in their own societies in Central and Eastern Europe had to face two problems. One was the relation of their knowledge to the task of creating independent nation-states. The other was a split in the society reflected in a differentiation between "great" (national) and "little" (local community) traditions (Redfield, 1956: 42-43). Academic disciplines developed in accordance with this division without hope for a holistic understanding. This division of labor limited the scope of the emerging ethno-sciences.
3. Consequently, the driving forces behind research activity were an awareness of ethnicity, nationalism, and historical and cultural ties and a recognition of social tensions with their concomitant illusions. The native ethnographers worked in a web of interests charged with strong emotions.
4. Research techniques were refined in connection with a historical approach, which accounted for divisions in society, culture, and language.
5. A search for laws or basic principles was rare, except in the period when Marxism, with its demand to discover laws of historical changes, became the dominant philosophy.
6. There was usually a scarcity or lack of democracy in Central and Eastern European societies. Short periods of relative democracy were preserved in memory as "golden ages", as Hungarians have seen the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy or as Czechs see Czechoslovakia between the two world wars. Freedom was always greater in science than in society, but national and social sensitivity limited impartial study and led to prejudiced debates.

It is not my aim to discuss the development of ethno-sciences in other parts of Europe, but it should be mentioned that developments on the continent varied in accordance with power status or geographical positions. Greater powers and countries on the shores of oceans (France, Norway, the Netherlands, even Russia) developed a science of different societies and cultures that was more or less similar to British or American anthropology or developed two separate sciences for the home culture and other cultures, similar to the German example of distinguishing Volkskunde and Völkerkunde – as in Sweden, where ethnology and ethnography have been similarly separated. In France, even the theoretical demand has been comparable to the American since Durkheim's work. But ethnology, or later social and cultural anthropology, developed in Continental Europe within a scientific orbit in which a vigorous philosophy, theoretical sociology, and influential historical science has been present, which limited the range of influence of ethnological (or later anthropological) thinking.

A surprising feature of ethnography (ethnology) in non-German speaking Central and Eastern European countries is that there has never been an absolute dichotomy between home investigations and research on distant territories. This may be due to the formation of this science in empires, with their many nations and ethnic groups (Russia and the Austro-Hungarian monarchy), which helped preserve a wider sense of unity even in Austria, for which the *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft zu Wien* is still the best evidence.

There was an additional element in the Hungarian case. The study of Hungarian ethnic and cultural history required a thorough investigation of the Ob Ugrians in Western Siberia and of the Turkic peoples in Central Asia. There was even a period at the end of the 19th century when the evolution of an American-style anthropology could have been envisaged (Sozan, 1977: 202-217).

But the Siberian studies were connected to the dominant historical-national trend and did not develop toward a theory-oriented social and cultural anthropology. The number of those who carried out research on other continents was small, and the famous anthropologists of the region worked abroad with the exception of the Russian. The Polish Bronisław Malinowski lectured in Great Britain and in the United States, Emil Torday worked in Brussels and in London, and Aleš Hrdlička did his seminal work on the American continent, to name a few.

The existence of ties between home ethnography and non-European studies, however, helped incorporate some anthropological ideas in Central and Eastern European ethno-sciences. Paradoxically, the compulsory introduction of Marxism did not transform the theoretical outlook, but strengthened the maintenance of already-present evolutionism and paved the way for the acceptance of structural functionalism as a method with an implicit historicism in its application. Notwithstanding important changes in the selection of research targets and increasing attention to the changing popular culture, theory remained weak in European ethnology. The "abandonment" of Marxism, which had never been extensively applied, was not followed by the acceptance of another comprehensive intellectual tradition. With this lack of theoretical awareness, it was not always realized that, even if anthropologists and ethnographers study the same phenomena, they conduct different research from different perspectives.

Tamás Hofer, who compared American cultural anthropology and European ethnography with perspicuous circumspection, called attention to the difference not only in stance, but also in the style of research. The cultural anthropologists conduct a "slash-and-burn" type of mobile cultivation of the cultural field, while national ethnographies "...may be compared to granaries where generations of ethnographers, one after the other, hoard and preserve their knowledge" (Hofer, 1969: 313).

This statement is true even in the Russian case, where the research themes of ethnography (ethnology) have most closely resembled American anthropology. There, Marxism had a more profound effect on ideas than in other parts of Eastern Europe, but it ceased to be a demarcating feature. However, research traditions are maintained and differences in interests play a role in approaching such an important issue as ethnicity, as Tishkov made explicit (1998).

Options

By the end of the 20th century, the British and American varieties of anthropology became much more diversified than before, leading to many trends and rather unclear objectives in a new world of inequalities and increasing globalization. There was a wide selection of problems and theoretical directions to choose from at an unfortunate moment – unfortunate because this selection took place at a time when postmodern criticism permeated American anthropology. This criticism may have been beneficial in the United States by demanding greater methodological scrutiny, but it had a very different effect on the emerging cultural anthropology of Central and Eastern Europe. It hindered the choice of a firm paradigm.

Budding cultural anthropological education and research has directed more attention to theoretical inspiration and methodology than can be observed in its twin discipline, ethnography (ethnology). There are also some new targets of research, but this seems to be less important than a more analytical-critical look at phenomena described or studied by ethnographers, historians or other social scientists from a different perspective, such as the nation as a socio-cultural system, nationalism, identities, and ethnic, religious, and other minorities, or the transition from socialism to a new social order or as cultural process (e.g. Bitušíková, 2000; Buchowski, 1994, 2001; Hubinger, 1992; Mach, 1993; Manolescu 1998; Mihailescu, 1993; Prónai, 1995). This competitive overlapping of research raises the possibility of a confrontation with other sciences, particularly with those that are supposed to be significant in strengthening national consciousness or dictating the direction and pace of current social change. In order to avoid these confrontations or for other reasons a maintenance of disciplinary borders is favored despite the challenges of the new social reality. An exception from this rule seems to be a greater willingness for co-operation in the study of rural social transformation on the last decade, though these researches started only a few years ago (Kovács, 1998, Borsos, Csite and Letenyei, 1999).

Difficulties

Taking into account all these elements, it should be emphasized that the definition of the field of social and/or cultural anthropology has not been completed. There have been debates and curricula follow deviating vistas even in the same country or within the same department.

There are uncertainties about methodologies, as well. The key point is fieldwork. Here, opinions differ between those with an ethnographical background and those who lack it. The first group favors fieldwork, and non-European specialists consider long-term field experience indispensable in training. The second group places a different emphasis on it, and those who entered cultural anthropological departments with a sociological or philosophical background are sometimes content to conduct a survey and analysis of opinions.

Social and cultural anthropology took on two different classifications in the institutionalized scientific network in the region. In some countries, they have been treated as a branch of ethnology; in others, they have been associated with sociology. A general feature, however, is their weak ability to defend their self-interest or promote their own expansion; even existing networks can be in danger, as Vintila Mihailescu reported from Bucharest at the conference in Cluj in 2000.

There are possibilities for publication, but specialized cultural anthropological journals do not exist. Funding of research within the home country is usually possible, though it is not built into the university norms. It is a major problem if a need for research abroad emerges; support can be expected from scientific foundations in countries where anthropology has had a longer career.

There are also difficulties in writing up the research materials. Very few libraries have a tradition of collecting anthropological literature, and even they are unable to follow the recent production in the world. The great data bases, like the Human Relations Area Files, are not available in any countries in this region.

International connections

The European Union exchange programs (Tempus, Socrates/Erasmus) enormously helped training. More than 20 students from the Department of Cultural Anthropology of the Eötvös Loránd University of Budapest studied social anthropology (ethnology, Völkerkunde) within EU exchange program frameworks at Austrian, British, Danish, and French universities, and I suppose that students from other formerly socialist countries had similar opportunities. Personal connections played a decisive role in making the necessary agreements. No “brain drain” seems to have resulted. Many conferences are organized from year to year, usually with international backing, but real research cooperation is rare and a highly personal matter.

Cultural anthropology and the broader public

The impact of original social and cultural anthropological research in the public sphere is small, compared with more influential sciences like history. It is limited to scientists and students with similar interests. The same group also makes use of comprehensive works dealing with a history of the discipline or with its problematic (Paluch, 1990, Sárkány, 2000).

Experience is different with translations of the works of great anthropologists. Publication of anthropological classics started in most East-Central European countries some decades ago, but has increased in the last twelve years primarily for training purposes. The success of these works is an important factor in increasing the status of anthropological knowledge in the region.

1 Many papers presented at these two conferences with additional studies were published by Peter Skalník in August 2002, after this manuscript was closed.
2 It happened in the meantime, see Godina, 2002 in Skalník 2002.
3 This choice is not fitting into the British tradition, where ethnology refers to ethnohistorical studies.
4 The scope of the book of Harris is wider than the American scene, but the non-American theoretical traditions are not discussed in the same extent and according to their own logic.

References

Adams, William Y. (1998): *The Philosophical Roots of Anthropology*, Stanford (Cal.), CSLI Publications;
Asad, Talal (1973): *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter*, New York, Humanities Press;
Benedict, Ruth (1960): *Patterns of Culture*, New York, Mentor Book;
Bennett, John W. (1999): "Classic anthropology", in: *American Anthropologist* 101, 951-956;
Bitterli, Urs (1982): *'Vadak' és 'civilizáltak'* (Die 'Wilden' und die 'Zivilisierten'), Budapest, Gondolat;
Bitušíková, Alexandra (2000): *The global vs. the local – European vs. national: paradoxes of new identities, in: Sociocultural Anthropology at the Turn of the Century. Voices from the Periphery*, Skalník, Peter (ed.), Praha, Set Out, 51-60;
Borsos, Endre, Csite, András and Letenyei, László (1999): *Rendszerváltás után. Falusi sorsforduló a Kárpát-medencében* (After altering system. Rural change of fortunes in the Carpathian Basin), Budapest, Számalk;
Buchowski, Mihal (1994): "The national issue in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in 1988-89", in: *Social Anthropology* 2/2, 133-148;
Buchowski, Mihal (2001): *Rethinking Transformation. An Anthropological Perspective on Postsocialism*, Poznań, Wydawnictwo Fundacji Humaniora;
Caramelea, Vasile V. (1979): "Philosophy and the Romanian social and cultural anthropology. The first axiological atlas of the national culture", in: *Revue Roumaine des Sciences Sociales. Série de Philosophie et Langue* 23, 273-288;
E.A.S.A (1996): *Register and Conference Program*, Barcelona (disc edition on 2 discs);
Frank, Tibor (1995): "Franz Boas és a közép- és dél-európai kivándorlás antropológiája" (Franz Boas and anthropology of emigration from Central and Southern Europe), in: *Ethnographia* 106, 155-193;
Godina, Vesna V. (2002): "From ethnology to anthropology and back again", in: *A Post-Communist Millennium: The Struggles for Sociocultural Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*, Skalník, Peter (ed.), Praha, Set Out, 1-22;
Hann, Chris M. (1994): "After Communism: Reflections on East European Anthropology and Transition", in: *Social Anthropology* 2/3, 228-249;
Hann, Chris M. (ed.) (2002): *Post-socialism*, London, Routledge;
Harris, Marvin (1968): *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Company;
Hofer, Tamás (1968): "Comparative notes on the professional personality of two disciplines", in: *Current Anthropology* 9, 311-315;
Hubinger, Vaclav (1992): "Experiencing nationalism: a Central European case", in: *Folk* 34, 145-159;
Klaniczay, Gábor (1984): "A történeti antropológia tárgya, módszerei és első eredményei" (Object, methods and first results of historical anthropology), in: *Történeti Antropológia*, Hofer, Tamás (ed.), Budapest, MTA Néprajzi Kutatóintézet, 23-60;
Kovács, Katalin (ed.) (1998): Restructuring post-socialist agriculture, in: *Central European Hysteria. Replika Special Issue*, 137-221;
Kuper, Adam (1975): Anthropology and Anthropologists. *The British School* 1922-72, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books;
Kürti, László (1996): "Homecoming. Affairs of anthropologists in and of Eastern Europe", in: *Anthropology Today* 12/3: 11-15;
Mach, Zygmunt (1993): *Symbols, Conflict and Identity*, Albany, N.Y. State University of New York Press;
Manolescu, Anca (1998): "The native stranger and the itinerant stranger: two solutions of orthodoxy when confronted with modernism", in: *Yearbook of the Romanian Society of Cultural Anthropology 1998*, 80-92;
Markarjan, Eduard (1971): *A marxista kultúraelmélet alapvonalai* (Outlines of a Marxist theory of culture), Budapest, Kossuth;

Markarjan, Eduard (1986): *Theorie der Kultur*, Moskau, Redaktion „Gesellschaftswissenschaften und Gegenwart";

Márkus, György (1966): *Marxizmus és ‚antropológia'*(Marxism and ‚anthropology'), Budapest, Akadémiai;

Márkus, György (1992): *Kultúra és modernitás* (Culture and modernity), Budapest, T-Twins;

Mihailescu, Vintila (ed.) (1994): „Enquête d'identité", in: *Civilisations* 42/2;

Paluch, Andrzej K. (1990): *Mistrzowie antropologii społecznej* (Masters of social anthropology), Warszawa, Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe;

Prónai, Csaba (1995): *Cigánykutatás és kulturális antropológia* (Research on Gypsies and cultural anthropology), Budapest – Kaposvár, ELTE BTK, Kulturális Antropológia Tanszéki Szakcsoport – Csokonai Vitéz Mihály Tanítóképző Főiskola;

Redfield, Robert (1956): *Peasant Society and Culture*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press;

Sárkány, Mihály (2000): *Kalandozások a 20. századi kulturális antropológiában* (Adventures in anthropology of the 20th century), Budapest, L'Harmattan;

Skalník, Peter (ed.) (2000): *Sociocultural Anthropology at the Turn of the Century. Voices from the Periphery*, Praha, (Prague Studies in Sociocultural Anthropology 2),Set Out, 51-60;

Skalník, Peter (ed.) (2002): *A Post-Communist Millennium: The Struggles for Sociocultural Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*, Praha, (Prague Studies in Sociocultural Anthropology 2), Set Out;

Sozan, Michael (1977): *The History of Hungarian Ethnography*, Washington, D.C., University Press of America;

Stagl, Justin (1998): "Rationalism and irrationalism in Early German Ethnology. The controversy between Schlözer and Herder, 1772/73", in: *Anthropos* 93, 521-536;

Szynkiewicz, Slawoj (1992): "Po co nam antropologia?" (What do we need anthropology for?), in: *Etnografia Polska* (Polish Ethnography) 36, 21-24;

Tishkov, Valery A. (1998): U.S. and Russian anthropology. Unequal dialogue in a time of transition, in: *Current Anthropology* 39, 1-17;

Urry, James (1972): "Notes and Queries on Anthropology and the development of field methods in British Anthropology, 1870-1920", in: *Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for 1972*, 45-57;

Wolfe, Thomas C. (2000): "Cultures and Communities in the Anthropology of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union", in: *Annual Review of Anthropology 29*, 195-216;

Yearbook of the Romanian Society of Cultural Anthropology 1998;

Yearbook of the Romanian Society of Cultural Anthropology 1999.

Tomáš Kučera and Olga Kučerová

Population science in Central and Eastern Europe: Implications for Research and Practice

Introduction

Any brief characterization of such a complex discipline as demography must be arbitrary and selective in many respects. First, it should be borne in mind that demography can be used in either a broad or a narrow sense. As David Coleman (2000: 27) puts it, demography is "the statistical study of the processes of reproduction, migration and death in their human species, their interrelations with the distribution and dynamics of population, and their biological, environmental and socio-economic causes and consequences". This definition would include ethology, population genetics, biosocial anthropology, sociology, and economics. In the narrow sense, following Nathan Keyfitz (1996), demography refers primarily to the analysis of population variables. Both positions have been explored in lively theoretical debates about whether demography is a discipline or a field of study (see e.g. Pavlík, 2000). But whatever it is, it has become obvious over the last decades that more and more demographers have gone beyond the standard demographic accounting because they also wanted to know why a fertility level is dropping or why a mortality level is worsening for specific groups. And to the degree that they have been using more and more ideas borrowed from other disciplines, we could probably now speak of *population science*, i.e., the scientific discipline that covers current knowledge of the size and structure of populations, changes therein, and their causes and consequences.

This article contains an overview of the situation in the field of population studies in the CEE region identifying the most important lines of research and providing insight into promising developments and lacunae, partly with a view of the possible effects of population research on social policy and on political issues. As a result of the extremely short duration of our investigation as well as the lack of systematic surveys of research results in the countries under consideration, the presented overview is correspondingly brief (and general). It is based on information that was quickly available and that consequently varies in volume from section to section. This means that the availability of information relating to various aspects of population science development also can vary greatly. The following descriptions call for more extensive study of the field.

We begin by placing population science in its historical context and then describe the socio-political and cultural contexts of the field's development, followed by a section discussing some theoretical and applied approaches.

1. Analysis of the pre-1989 situation

Historical outline

Demography had to move through several stages of development until the new science, with its more rigorous methodology and systematic theory-building, took over. Although a wide variety of scholars, including anthropologists, biologists, psychologists, historians, sociologists, and economists, were involved in population research, the early years of demography were most clearly interwoven with the development of statistics. Actuaries developed much of the theory, and statisticians and biostatisticians added the techniques of numerical and casual analyses (Keyfitz, 1996).

As a result, demographic analysis has often some claim to be considered the beginning of population science itself, in that the relative growth and decline of populations has been a fundamental concern of political and economic theorists since Machiavelli and Boisguilbert. A more sophisticated algebra of human numbers began as early as the 17th century, when John Graunt used statistical methods to estimate the male-female ratio at birth and to conclude that people have unequal risks of death. The first technical problem that demographers solved was how to go from statistics of deaths and of exposed populations to the probabilities of dying (the first actuary tables were developed in the Netherlands and in Britain during the course of the 18th century). Later, Malthus and his 19th-century contemporaries observed that human numbers are checked not only by mortality, but also by institutions and customs, like delayed marriage, that keep fertility well below the biological maximum for the species (but the development of a general method of analyzing how these and other factors influence populations' structures dates only to the 1950s, when the French demographer, Louis Henry, initiated a new approach). The pioneer in demographic methods and models was Alfred J. Lotka, who in a series of papers extending from 1907 to 1948 showed how to answer the questions that are still being asked. A central one was "How fast is a given population really growing, as determined by its age-specific birth and death rates, in abstraction from its age distribution?"

The search for general principles of population dynamics has also been going on for a long time. Up to now, no one has discovered a definitive, all-encompassing, spatially and temporally invariant set of principles of population change, but many have contributed interesting ideas. Malthus' *An Essay on the Principle of Population* (1798) identified the checks to population and for most of the 19th century they remained the basics of political economy, though his population principles seemed to impose narrow limits to the possibilities of economic growth and social improvement. Another important contribution to population theories was made during the 19th and early 20th centuries. An essential part of Dumont's *Principle of Social Capillarity* (1890) was that people with ambition to rise restrict their fertility to enable them to take advantage of opportunities to move up the social ladder.

During the progressive era (approximately between 1880 and 1920) with its stronger concern for social issues, demography appeared to have been more influenced by a broad cultural matrix, and there was growing interest in the problems created by industrialization and urbanization, but also in the personal domain of life. Scholars began focusing on face-to-face family relationships, the implications of family life for individual well being, and, particularly during the 1920s (and later in the 1930s), on ways to predict success in marriage and family life. There were, of course, other threads in population research that were not entirely family- or individual-oriented.

Pre-war demographers, too, were usually affiliated with statistics. The major element unifying demography and statistics at that time was a population census that still remains the most comprehensive and valuable source of statistical data on population. The censuses were not only a fertile soil for the further growth of demography, but also the first real field of its application and of its connection to the public domain. National statistical offices or bureaus provided a home to many demographers of that time, especially in Central and Eastern Europe, and became a hub for demographic research. Academia recruited many university teachers and professors from the "state" demographers. Later, mostly after the World War II, some of them joined the universities and built the chairs or institutes of demography. But pre-war demography in the region remains a discipline of rather "private" demographers, i.e., a discipline without its own institutional settings.

Generally, in the 20th century, descriptive analyses of fertility, mortality, and migration differentials began to receive considerable attention. The so-called *demographic transition theory* was formulated (see e.g. Thompson, 1929; Notestein, 1945; Blacker, 1947) and repeatedly reformulated (Coale, 1973; Caldwell, 1976; Léridon, 1981; van de Kaa, 1987), and the use of typologies in developing conceptual schemes was proposed. The other prominent theoretical framework that developed in the post-war period was Landry's (1934) concept of *demographic revolution* (see e.g. Pavlík, 1979, 1981; Vishnevsky, 1982).

On the other hand, with some notable exceptions, theoretical enterprises seemingly went into decline from the 1950s to the mid-1980s. In most national demographies, quantitative methodology remained the "gold standard" of population research. Especially beginning in the

1960s, scholars increasingly used computer-facilitated multivariate statistical techniques. These techniques allowed for a closer fit between complex theories and statistical procedures, since several variables could be examined simultaneously and interactively and several measures could be used as indicators of an underlying theoretical construct (Bogue, 1969; Coale, 1972; Land and Rogers, 1982). In many ways, however, advances in the sophistication of statistical methods had outpaced advances in population theory and measurement. There often were elegant analyses of relatively crude measures not supported by a corresponding theory; research questions were selected more on the basis of the availability of a statistical technique than on the substantive value of what was under study.

That is why many reviewers of the field pointed out that the late 1980s were not only the end of an era of ideologically unified science in the former communist countries (see the following section), but also the beginning of a new stage in the development of population science itself. First of all, there appeared to be a revival of interest in developing theory alongside more methodological diversity. At the same time, demographers increasingly recognized the contextual limits of population theory and research knowledge. Academically, population science grew more open to developments and fashions in other disciplines involving greater numbers of sociologists, anthropologists, social biologists, and economists, but also of physicians, lawyers, policy analysts, and social workers.

The spectrum of Marxism-Leninism

The field's development in the post-war period in the CEE region was undoubtedly influenced by the state socialism system, particularly the rule of command economies, doctrinal orthodoxy, and the leadership claims of communist parties. The question of the extent to which scholars used Marxist social theory as a point of departure for their research cannot however be answered in general terms. At first glance, the Marxist-Leninist conception of history, particularly the Marxist theory of conflict, seemed reflected in the development of population theory, and was often called the socialist theory of population. It considered the modern history of population mainly a reflection of the contradictions of capitalism and proclaimed that only the socialist system could allow working people to realize their choices and preferences, for example, in family matters and marriage. In turn, the economic (material) determinism of this approach led to preoccupation with macro-analysis in demographic research and, as a result, the dominant use of quantitative techniques. Although not faring well in dealing with the many aspects of demographic behavior or, for example, in explaining the hidden unemployment also existing under socialism, Marxist-Leninist ideas were also extensively used when population-related policies and programs were being designed and put into effect.

In the course of time, the limitations of conceptualizing population issues in Marxist (socialist) terms become apparent to most demographers. Marxism, for example, offered fewer (if any) impulses for scholarly enterprises dealing with the measurement of demographic processes and their prospective effects. The failed attempts to explain demographic phenomena in social theory terms, however, had an important by-product in that the specificity of population development became much clearer than that of other social processes. In the late 1970s, this already led to a search for a synthesis between the Marxist-Leninist approach and theories emphasizing familial and individual behaviors. By the mid-1980s, a number of studies had provided evidence that class (social) differences were not the only source of the origins and continued existence of variations in demographic behavior among population (sub)groups, and that the Marxist model conceiving the separation between the individual and society had limited the kind of research questions that could be asked. It was recognized that demographic phenomena had too often been seen as outputs of social practices instead of as an essential part of them. In other words, researchers were more and more confronted with the question of the application of Marxism in population theory and analysis.

The influence of the ruling ideology on the development of demography varied among the former socialist countries and was probably greatest in the countries where the main focus was placed on designing universal population theory (e.g. the USSR, Bulgaria, and Romania).

Opposition to Marxist ideology was either "legal"/"soft" (in the form of further development and specification of Marx's and Lenin's ideas) or, less often, illegal (public criticism and resistance). In the former socialist countries, Marx's work not only paradoxically inspired many demographers to varying degrees; even those who rejected Marxism-Leninism frequently found themselves "obliged" to define their own thought in relation to it.

The impact of Western theories

By almost universal consent, the principal theoretical orientation of pre-World War II demography was *structural-functionalism* (or simply functionalism), and some functionalist assumptions remained central to demographic studies, particularly to family studies, during the period of state socialism, as well. In this framework, a pivotal notion was that, to perform its functions in an optimal fashion, the family must have a particular kind of structure or arrangement of the roles composing a social system. According to functionalists, role-specialization increased a system's (in this case, the family's) functionality. Consequently, family policies often stemmed from the so-called "social work" values, in terms of help or self-help to overcome "inadequacies" in fulfilling family functions.

The emergence of *modern systems theories* also had some impact on the development of population theory, especially since the mid-1960s. Demographers began to consider applications of systems theories to the process of population reproduction (growth) or, to a lesser extent, to family dynamics. Concomitant with an interest in systems theory was the family field's recognition that policies affect families and that family professionals have a role in policy-making. As early as the mid-1970s, there was already significant pressure on governments to focus their policy more directly on the well being of "socialist families". Demographers in particular emphasized that recognition of the family system must involve some clear consideration of how various alternative policies could either foster family development or discourage the institution.

Theorists working in the area undoubtedly "borrowed" from other Western theories, too. More specifically, *family development theory* provided them with the idea of "family life-cycle stages" and of "family transitions", whereas *human ecology theory* brought their attention to the concept of the "sustainability of environments". Among the newer versions of demographic transition theory, the *European Fertility Project* seems to have been the most influential. This project, undertaken by scholars associated with Princeton University, came up with a number of important findings, e.g. that economic development was not a necessary condition for fertility to start declining in Europe. Last but not least, scholarship undertaken in Western countries demonstrated to demographers from the former socialist camp the advantages of prospective longitudinal methods and of the uses of *simulation* and *experimentation*.

2. Redefinition of the discipline since 1990

The beginning of the 1990s marked a turning point in the development of social science in the CEE region. First of all, Marxist-Leninist doctrine came under attack for its political prejudices, hegemonic nature, and lack of empirical verification. This criticism, along with the fostering penetration of theories and methods used in the Western countries, underlined important shifts in the understanding and application of demographic research. In this section, we attempt to sketch some major changes that occurred in the field in the 1990s, while recognizing that this description is inevitably incomplete and oversimplified.

Change of paradigms

The most important change has been the replacement of one, dominant, Marxist (materialistic) paradigm by a plurality of relatively autonomous conceptual frameworks and analyses.[1] A second important change is the trend toward more theoretical and methodological diversity. Although the concept of demographic transition is still the backbone of theoretical discourse in demography, the classic works have been frequently revisited, reread, and reinterpreted in the light of new knowledge as well as of changing experience, interests, and cultural meanings. On the whole, there has been an increased blending of theories and methods typically associated with different disciplines and a growing consensus among population researchers that the opposition between quantitative and qualitative methods is artificial and limiting. But one of the consequences of the acceptance of diverse kinds of theories and methodologies is a lack of consensus about how to evaluate the quality of these theories and of population research in general.

The other major development, in our view, has been the movement toward more concern with the contextual and cultural dimensions of demographic phenomena. Criticism of the existing conceptual and methodological frameworks have displayed skepticism about the earlier goal of codified, abstract population (meta)theory. It has been more often emphasized that the knower and the object of knowledge cannot be separated and that knowledge of the world also requires the study of language and meanings constructed by the observer. In other words, a post-positivist view became more articulated that demography cannot find an overarching theoretical construction because of the inherent complexity of population development and the cultural/contextual specificities involved in interpreting that development. This in turn has led to an increased focus on the transmission of ethics, values, and religion through demographic studies, particularly those dealing with fertility and migration issues.

In the 1990s, demographers in Central and Eastern Europe also attempted to reconsider the dichotomy between population science and social interventions, particularly the public policy implications of their work. The absence of an objective, value-free approach to population issues under the communist regimes raised a number of important questions about the relationship between science (theory) and practice. Knowledge for itself versus knowledge for social change – or to what degree should population science be viewed as basic (fundamental) science, to what degree as applied science? Starting in the second half of the 1990s, this question has attracted more and more attention among demographers in the CEE countries, as a result of the ongoing changes in population dynamics and behaviors and their consequences for large-scale social development.

Before describing the core theoretical and methodological orientations in more detail, two comments are necessary. The first concerns the change of professional elites in time. The second relates to the current conditions, that is, to the extent and form of institutionalization.

Change of elites and the new institutional structures

In the early 1990s, most researchers in the CEE countries had to legitimize their previous (social) position as well as their academic work in the field, but demography was generally less influenced by replacement of its elites than some other scientific disciplines were. We have even discovered that few personal changes among demographic researchers since 1989 can be attributed solely to political screening. Influenced by restructuring processes within academia (including funding shortages), on the one hand, and by emerging opportunities in society, particularly in business and management, on the other, a number of recognized professionals have "voluntarily" left the field. But it is unclear whether the quantity of personal replacements was due to the ideological neutrality of scholars involved in population studies compared with those working in other areas like history, sociology, or economics or if was because of the lower competitiveness of their professional backgrounds and skills.

In our view, the most important change in personnel policy was that, beginning in the 1990s, good education and expert knowledge of the issues of the field of population studies became more significant qualification criteria for professional appointment than they were before. Generally, academic institutions had not previously regarded professional skills as a crucial requirement. Instead, ideological faithfulness, often party membership, and length of service were seen as the most important factors determining one's professional career in the field. At present, the academization process is a fairly self-evident phenomenon, and young university graduates have more chances "to come to power", at least in principle. The increasing involvement of younger scholars has led to a broadening and deepening of the research agenda and, to some degree, to a shift from the heteronomous values that determined research practice before 1990 to more autonomous academic values, i.e., values that are inherent to the cognitive process itself (including the striving for "better" knowledge, independent of the interests of third parties). Demographically, the field now has a greater number of women in visible positions and, to a lesser extent, individuals from ethnic minority groups.

To date, there has been little systematic insight into the effects of *institutionalization processes* on the scope and quality of scholarly practice in the field of demography in the CEE region since 1989. First, though some new structures have been established, especially in countries with worrying population developments, on the whole, developments have been the opposite. Starting in the early 1990s, the number of scholars and the level of research funding were reduced in many existing units. Population studies also seem to have lost their previous prestige among university graduates in competition with such areas as marketing, management, and business administration, which offer a wider choice of careers and better salaries.

Second, our brief investigation provides evidence that impulses for institutional (professional) renewal often took place outside existing academic structures. In particular, the demand from policy makers and public administrators for demographic expertise became more urgent, due the increasing pressure on governments to develop social programs for pensioners, to manage migration problems, to reform health care systems, etc. As a consequence, in a majority of cases, the new structures have not been created as exclusively scientific units. The new academic institutions are more oriented toward processes of social change than are traditional ones, and therefore focus more on developing specific instruments that can contribute to these processes.

3. Core theoretical and methodological orientations

As noted earlier, no clear dominant framework can be discerned at present in the theoretical and methodological pluriformity of population studies. In the search for useful theoretical concepts, the notions of "classic" and "modern" theorists are examined and, if possible, reinterpreted on the basis of newer population research as well as of recent developments in other scientific disciplines. Sometimes, after trying and testing, a specific approach becomes a preferred method on a local level. But in practice, the boundaries between the different theoretical constructions are inevitably blurred.

Revival and adaptation of major pre-war traditions

Current demographic research often starts with the revival of concepts that have their roots in pre-war years. In this respect, *structural-functionalism* should be mentioned first, not only because it occupied a central place in population studies in the pre-war period, but also because many recent studies have continued applying functionalist assumptions, in spite of arguments against doing so. The central theoretical issue that already preoccupied Parsons, that is, the condition of equilibrium (e.g. sustainable population reproduction), is still being addressed, though few demographers today explicitly use functionalist terminology, much less call themselves functionalists. Literature on the family and lifestyles, in particular, represents the realm of population research in which nonconformity ("deviance behavior"), the other important functionalist notion, is most articulated. Undoubtedly, there are important differences between classic pre-war theory and neofunctionalism, which has shifted its focus much closer to general theory in both psychology and sociology (see e.g. Alexander, 1985).

Another important theoretical orientation of the 1920s and 1930s, *symbolic interactionism*, has also, though to lesser extent, shaped the area throughout the 1990s. Conceptualizing families as social groups and as sets of interacting selves and identities leads family demographers to examine questions like: How do time, age, gender, class, or race/ethnicity relate to family groups? What strategies and tactics do family members use to construct familial realities and negotiate familial roles? That is, how are family identities constructed, learned, and eventually played out; why are some family roles deemed more important than others; and how do individuals add their uniqueness to family roles? In recent years, scholars have been paying more attention to the formulation of concepts and theories that specify the nature of connection between the individual and society. At the same time, symbolic interactionism has been extensively employed in historical and comparative research.

As demographers moved increasingly from cross-sectional to longitudinal analysis (or a combination of the two), the *concept of family cycle* surfaced again the early 1990s. This framework, which can be traced already at the beginning of the 20th century (see e.g. Rowntree, 1906), has provided a scheme by which families can be sorted and has also been used as an independent variable predicting some other elements of population development. The family life cycle has generally been considered as having a varying number of predetermined stages – based on marriage, childbearing, child-rearing, and dissolution through the death of a spouse – that characterize the development of family units. It has also been emphasized that a cluster of social, economic, geographical, health, and other factors influences the timing of the family, which in turn influences the cluster. When combined with the concept of the birth or marriage cohort, the family life cycle has also served as a convenient mechanism for studying change in family structure and process. More recent research in this area has expanded to include information on the interrelationships between the family life cycle and a variety of related life cycle processes, such as schooling and employment.

If we are not limited to the concepts emerging before World War II, then the impact of *exchange and resource theories* should be especially mentioned. Probably because these theories (which first appeared in the West in the 1950s) viewed individuals' relationships as extended "markets", they had little influence on the field in CEE countries until the recent decade. However, starting in the early 1990s, the exchange framework has methodically worked its way into the mainstream of population studies, particularly in family demography.

Finally, although not all demographic analyses carried out in pre-war years can be compared to those of today, the basic *statistical procedures* continue to be an important tool for contemporary demographic scholarship. The ongoing evolution of research tools is mainly a result of developing databases and high-speed computer usage. Also, almost until the mid-1980s, specific theoretical frameworks were usually associated with specific measurement techniques. For example, demographers based in symbolic interactionism applied global self-report measures, while researchers influenced by the family cycle perspective preferred observational measures. In recent years, after much has been written about the complementary uses of various measurement procedures in the study of population phenomena (i.e., the emergence of "critical multiplism"), demographers seem to be more concerned with how to incorporate in their research both quantitative and qualitative instruments of analysis.

New approaches

Though new trends in development of population studies are too numerous to be detailed here, perhaps we may identify their core element as an effort to synthesize the macro- and micro-levels, beginning with the premise that individuals' choices and behaviors are either constrained or enhanced by the structural conditions and the cultural milieu in which they live. This shift away from exclusively structural analysis in favor of more complex conceptual models can be seen in demographers' growing preference for the construct "life course" and the corresponding decline of interest in the construct "family life cycle".

As compared with the family cycle approach, in life-course studies the unit of analysis has shifted from the family as a unit to individuals in the family and the timing of crucial events or transitions in their lives (While some early studies took the perspective of adult society, more recent work is beginning to view life stages from the perspective of all individuals involved in them). The conceptual focus became the choices persons make, along with their consequences, within an ever-shifting structural and cultural context. More recently, as demographers focus on individuals' ongoing reconstruction of their life course over time, increased attention is also being paid to the construct 'control'. Cohort analysis is seen as particularly helpful in life-course research but, as a general rule, the earlier the historical period of the study, the more difficult life-course analysis is.

In the course of the 1990s, the use of new statistical methodologies for demographic research has also been expanded among scholars in the CEE region. At the same time, there are major currents of demographic scholarship that have not yet influenced mainstream population science in the CEE region, for example, gay and lesbian demographic research and radical social theories of the family. As well, the broad cultural movement termed postmodernism began to influence 'Western' demographers already in the late 1980s, but has not been much considered by their 'Eastern' counterparts.

Of the related issues, one that especially intrigues us is the *theoretical heterogeneity or pluralism* in the field. Some scholars take the diversity for granted and view it as natural and constructive. Others are critical of the degenerative nature of bitter disputes between advocates of different theories and conceptual frameworks. Still others are addressing alternative responses to pluralism. At the moment, however, we are not too optimistic that the discussion of that relationship will be acted on in the field very thoroughly or even very rapidly. The main reason is that the existing social system of demography is oriented toward rewarding scholars for substantive, theoretical, and methodological contributions to rather direct and immediate understanding of population development. Hence, there likely will be limited opportunities in the future for many demographers to devote much of their careers to what one can identify as population metascience.

There is no strong antagonism between the quantitative and qualitative methods in population studies. Varying scientific instruments are applied depending on the subject and the propositions of the research. A more serious challenge facing demographers seems to be the *relationship between theory and methods*. Many scholars involved in population studies have been critical of the lack of congruence between the theory, measurement, and analysis used to conduct demographic research (see e.g. Pavlík, 2000). This concern raises questions about the relationship between theory and method more generally. Do particular theoretical positions necessitate the adoption of particular research methods? To date, very little discussion of this kind has however been attempted.

Further systematic consideration is also needed to answer the question about *interdisciplinary work* in demographic scholarship. In recent years, demographers have repeatedly discovered that the interdisciplinary cooperation they aspired to is more or less a pipe dream that is difficult to realize. First, the development of new interdisciplinary (conceptual) frameworks and a new interdisciplinary language seems to be more difficult that had been expected. The institutionalization of interdisciplinary cooperation is even harder. In reality, many research projects that aim at interdisciplinary cooperation are, more often than not, multidisciplinary projects.

4. Thematic orientations and funding

Contemporary demography is a widely ramifying discipline, subdivided into numerous areas of specialized study. The demarcation of these areas follows the institutionalized, functional divisions in society quite closely, answering the effective or assumed demand of the established areas of management.

Though political, economic, and social transition has not been the first-hand or direct object of population studies, its impact on parameters of population reproduction and demographic structures is one of the major topics of present Eastern European demography. Compared with the first half of the 1990s, when population research focused mainly on describing new developments, recent years are characterized by increasing attempts to classify and explain what has happened and where population development is going.

The demographic changes faced by post-communist countries in the last decade have been linked to all the principal components of population reproduction and, therefore, the hierarchy of themes frequently reflects national specificities. Nevertheless, a final selection of topics is determined mainly by the available financial resources. Thus, the thematic orientation of population research and the approaches applied are often guided by the preferences of the main fund providers.

Given the variety of population development over the last decade, any overview of current population research topics is necessarily incomplete. The decline of fertility and its perspectives, changes in mortality and its factors, new forms of family behavior, international migration, its consequences and the integration of migrants, population policy and its acceptance, and population prospects, together with demographic aging, are only the topics of the day. Even if the thematic focus of Eastern European demography has tended to converge with what we can observe in Western Europe, there are still important differences in handling the issues. Most population studies dealing with population development in the CEE region remain quite descriptive, without any deeper attempts to understand and explain factors and processes underlying observed changes.

Perhaps this can be explained in part by the fact that, after 1989, almost all countries in the CEE region have witnessed appreciable reductions in their academic research funding for population studies. In some countries, university finding has come to an almost complete stop due to government policy, and the volume of funds generally available for population research has only recently begun growing, in concordance with emerging problems or threats connected to observed or expected population development. The structure of resources is changing, and the proportion between private and public involvement differs significantly from country to country. In general, the private funds, represented mostly by private or corporate foundations, prevailed in the early 1990s, but about five years ago they started moving their activities from the more to the less affluent countries of the region. Their vacancies were partially filled by public sources – retrieved and new domestic as well as foreign and international funds. At present, population research has explored commercial sources more often. In recent years, the latter’s share of overall funding has rapidly grown in the region, especially because the role of marketing and market research is increasing.

On the other hand, the way population studies projects are currently being financed marks the final product and particularly the scope and nature of the academic output. Demographers in the CEE region are increasingly dependent on financing from third parties and more and more demographic enterprises are commissioned by non-academic institutions; this has modified the venue and character of population research. The research usually must be policy/practice-oriented, and the duration of study is mostly short. Many study projects that are not directly relevant to immediate practical outputs are neglected. Since not all the specific research interests can be tied unambiguously to administrative demands, politics has led to rather scant theoretic results in the recent years.

Conclusion

The field of population studies in the CEE countries has all the characteristics of a scholarly terrain still in its development: numerous foreign influences and the odd impulse for original theory formulation. The most important advances in demographic methodology have occurred mainly due to the cumulative nature of demographic (quantitative) knowledge and to the region's demographers' access to substantial increases in computational power. There has been a shift away from theories emphasizing structure and stability toward theories emphasizing process and change and a concurrent emphasis on causal relationships. Also related to this development has been the change in the significance ascribed to psychology in the evolution of demographic phenomena. The psyche is no longer seen exclusively as a reflection of society, but now has an independent significance and status. A shift has also occurred in thinking on the function and form of ideology. Ideology has recently been seen as more than a false representation of the reality underlying individuals' behavior. This in turn gives rise to research on the relations between normativity, normalization, and subjectivity, i.e., broader application of discourse analysis in population studies.

Reviewing interdisciplinary cooperation, demographic scholarship more often than not continues to merely "tolerate" the knowledge obtained in other fields, and it is still rather uncustomary to take deliberations on new research in existing disciplines as a principle point of departure for studying population phenomena and their changes. We find this "tolerant" attitude in many demographic writings; the advances of neighboring disciplines are noted, but have no effect on the propositions or conceptual frameworks. For population science, the question of the boundaries of the discipline thus remains relevant. This is not because no boundaries have been outlined, but because these boundaries should perhaps be drawn in different places and be more flexible. It is not uncommon in population studies for various research groups to function in the same discipline without taking actual note of each other's work. If we take this into consideration, the existence of an "autonomous" demographic research group alongside other groups cannot be a measure of the success of demographic scholarship.

Finally, in the 1990s, public issues became an important area of demographic scholarship: academic questions were often derived from social questions relevant to population development at that point in time. But the increasing emphasis on practical value and policy relevance is also open to question. Once scientific knowledge is viewed as a politically informed social construction, how does the role of the social scientist differ from that of politician or political activist? If demography as a social science should be "emancipatory", as most practitioners and some scholars believe, then what counterbalancing ethical principles should guide the researcher in interpreting data and generating theory? To use MacIntyre's (1984) term, are there not certain "virtues" in the practice of social science, such as truthfulness, honesty, and openness to new information, that are so central to scholarly integrity as to be uncompromisable, even if the emancipatory effect of the work is thereby diminished? If professional demographers are to contribute to the public dialogue about important social issues – and not just reflect a segment or prevailing opinion, whether radical, liberal, or conservative – then they must be willing to challenge all manner of received wisdom in order to pursue understandings that are probably not present in current public discourse.

As for the future prospects of population science in the CEE countries, our main source of optimism is that more kinds of people are now joining the scholarly dialogue in the field and that more demographers are looking self-awarely at how the world influences their work and how their work influences the world. If demography can become more inclusive as a field and if demographers are open to these new perspectives, then population studies will have resolved existing dichotomies between macro- and micro-research, quantitative and qualitative methods, practitioners and scholars (academicians), advocates of population science as a multidisciplinary field versus population science as a primary discipline, etc. We therefore hope that, for demographers, our report can provide an impulse to further develop of the field, and that, for other readers, it can stimulate further cognizance of the results in their own or other disciplines.

---

1 It is also noteworthy that the spectacular collapse of communism after 1989 has not led to overall contempt for Marx's and Lenin's ideas about population issues. Revised by post-Marxist followers from Central and Eastern Europe as well as from social welfare states, some Marxist-Leninist explanations are still used in analyzing demographic trends and phenomena. Unlike their orthodox predecessors, contemporary Marxist-inspired demographers view the demise of capitalisms and, particularly, class inequality as a necessary but not as a sufficient condition to provide all people with equal possibilities for realization of their choices within and outside the family. In practice, they also often apply other macro-structural approaches, for instance considering family structures and social systems as intervening constructs.

References

Alexander, Jeffrey C. (ed.) (1985): *Neo-Functionalism*, Newbury Park (CA), Sage;

Bogue, Donald J. (1969): *Principles of Demography*, New York, John Wiley & Sons;

Caldwell, John C. (1976): "Toward a restatement of demographic transition theory", in: *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 2 (3-4), 321-366;

Coale, Ansley J. (1972): *The Growth and Structure of Human Populations: A Mathematical Investigation*, Princeton (NJ), The University of Princeton Press;

Coale, Ansley J. (1973): "The demographic transition", in: *International Population Conference 1973, Proceedings*, Vol. 1, Liege, IUSPP;

Coleman, David (2000), "Demography in an intellectual context: A subject in search of a home", in: *Position of Demography Among Other Disciplines*, Zdeněk, Pavlík (ed.), Prague, Charles University in Prague, Dept. of Demography and Geodemography, 27-35;

Hauser, Philip M. and Duncan, Otis D. (eds.) (1959): *The Study of Populations. An Inventory and Appraisal*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press;

Kaa, Dirk J. van de (1987): "Europe's second demographic transition", in: *Population Bulletin*, Vol. 42 (1), 3-53;

Keyfitz, Nathan (1996): "Demography", in: *The Social Science Encyclopedia*, 2nd edition, Kuper, A. and Kuper, J. (eds.), London - New York, Routledge, 176-179;

Land, Kenneth and Rogers, Andrei (eds.) (1982): *Multidimensional Mathematical Demography*, New York, Academy Press;

Landry, Adolphe (1934): *La révolution démographique*, Paris, Librairie du Recueil Sirey;

Léridon, Henri (1981): "Fertility and contraception in 12 developed countries", in: *International Family Planning Perspectives*, Vol. 7 (2);

MacIntyre, Alasdair (1984): *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press;

Pavlík, Zdeněk (1979): "Problemy demographicheskoy revolutsii", in: *Brachnost, rozhdaemost, semya za tri veka* (Issues of demographic revolution, in: *Nuptiality, fertility and family throughout the three centuries*), Moscow;

Pavlík, Zdeněk (1981): "Zákonitosti vývoje demographických systémů" (Laws of Development of Demographic Systems), in: *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Geographica*, Vol.16 (1), 3-31;

Pavlík, Zdeněk (ed.) (2000): *Position of Demography Among Other Disciplines*, Prague, Charles University in Prague, Dept. of Demography and Geodemography;

Rowntree, Benjamin S. (1906/1980): *Poverty: A study of town life*, New York, Garland;

Vishnevsky, Anatoly G. (1982): *Vosproizvodstvo naselenia i obschestvo* (Population Reproduction and Society), Moskva, Nauka.

Marie-Claude Maurel

Central European Geography and the Post-Socialist Transformation. A Western Point of View

Geography, like other social sciences, has the task of analyzing the rapid and large-scale transformations that societies and territories in Central Europe have been going through since the collapse of the communist regimes in 1989. The changes, which are spreading on various spatial scales, affect the new geopolitical map of the whole region as well as leading to the reorientation of movements and the emergence of new territorial dynamics. The changes not only modify spatial configurations. As questions of ethnic, cultural, and national identities return in strength, changes also touch the relationship of ethnic groups and peoples to the territory. The geographer's duty is not simply to observe and analyze the geographical patterns of the post-socialist transformation, it is also to understand how social and spatial changes are linked on the road "from socialism to capitalism".

Are geographers in a position to meet this cognitive challenge? Under what conditions and with what skills do they tackle this new developmental stage of their discipline? What methodologies and theories do they need in order to explain spatial changes happening in the transition countries? These questions require going back to the specific situation of the discipline during the communist time before considering how geographers tried to adapt to the new institutional context and to new requirements. Through the past decade, the transformation of the discipline seems to proceed largely from the renewal of research topics more than from institutional reshaping. It also comes within the scope of an international policy of opening up.

1. Central European geography before 1989

The subordinate place of human geography

The study of geography partially avoided the constraints limiting most of the social sciences. It could do so because it belonged to both the natural sciences and the social sciences. On the epistemological level, this situation carries a lot of implications, which sparked heated debates, especially among Soviet geographers (Maurel, 1985). It is not necessary to go back over this controversial question; we ought to emphasize the role of this epistemological break in the positioning of the discipline in the scientific research system. Divided into two branches, physical geography and human geography, geographical knowledge was segmented into subdisciplines closely defined by their subject of research. During the socialist period, the development of the discipline was characterized by the predominant place given to physical geography. In most of the socialist countries, geography was one of the earth sciences. As a result, contacts with social sciences were quite rare, if they existed at all. Geographers took advantage of this situation, which offered them a degree of protection from the influence of Marxism-Leninism and from the most extreme forms of ideological control. When this control became very restrictive, geographers found refuge in the studies of physical geography (Dragomirescu, 2001).

In several countries in Central Europe, human geography studies were restricted to an inventory of the various fields of economic and human activities, without worrying about their spatial interactions. In their most complete version, these studies led to the achievement of a national atlas. Their framework was invariably based on the same content: some plates describing the natural environmental features and some maps depicting population distribution, the location of various economic activities, mainly industries, and communication networks. The list of the data missing from the atlases of the socialist countries included activities related to defense and security installations, to transportation and communication nodes, and to everything that could be considered a “strategic objective”. Under no circumstances should scientific output be permitted to provide information to the external enemy!

The contributions of Central European geographers to science were usually restricted to the study of their own country. Apart from very rare attempts carried out in the context of bilateral exchanges, such as the Polish-Hungarian seminars organized between the geographical institutes of the two countries’ Academies of Sciences, comparative approaches remained almost nonexistent. Limitations in linguistic ability are not the only explanatory factor. In a more fundamental way, geographers were reluctant to undertake research on countries other than their own. This situation resulted from their position of subordination to a state administration that intended, through the activity plans of each institution, to define the priority study topics. Research carried out in the narrow context of the nation state lacked comparisons and objectivity. It tended to overestimate the potentials and performances of each country and to smooth out, not to say to conceal, the problems of uneven territorial development. Ideological control and censorship, which were exerted in varying degrees in different countries, made it impossible to mention any weakness in the social or economic report on the country concerned.

Within academic institutions, research in “applied geography” depended mainly on territorial planning organizations that functioned directly under Party and state control. Closely subordinated to the objectives of economic planning, territorial planning did not give rise to an independent scientific output from the academic world. However, during the 1980s, regional studies were significantly renewed in two countries, Hungary and Poland. This innovative current developed in relation to the attempt to reform the politico-administrative system at the local and regional levels.

In Budapest, at György Enyedi’s initiative, some human geographers pulled away from the Geographical Institute of the Academy of Sciences, dominated by physical geographers, to create a “Center for Regional Studies” with an original network structure for a multidisciplinary conception. The “Center for Regional Studies” intended to develop studies of territorial development and environmental issues. Political leaders called for its expert evaluation on both the national and regional levels. This evolution fits into the context of the reform movement that foreshadowed the change of system in Hungary.

In Poland, a vast program of studies of local and regional development called “Regional Development – Local Development – Territorial Self-Government” was launched within the framework of the Institute of Spatial Economics of the University of Warsaw during the years 1985-1990. Some two hundred researchers from a dozen scientific centers took part in the program, whose results were published in Polish, English, and French (Kuklinski and Jalowiecki, 1990).

These Hungarian and Polish Research Centers, constantly in close touch with their counterparts in Western Europe, contributed to the diffusion of new approaches and to the acquisition of abilities that would prove useful after the change of political system.

The uneven international opening up of Central European geographies

The quality of research conducted by Central European geographers during the socialist era differed from one country to another. Polish geographers played a predominant role because of their number and because of the influence of their works: “Research in Poland is not only very prolific, but it is also generally more wide-ranging in systematic coverage and method, more accessible to the outside world, more deeply probing of current reality, and more questioning of established ideologies than are most studies in other countries of the region.” (Hamilton, 1990)

Polish geographers came from a long and brilliant tradition, but it could not account for everything. Polish geographers’ opening up to the Western world and their self-assertive presence in international scientific institutions allowed them to keep in touch with the most innovative research centers in Western Europe and North America. After the events of 1956, scientific exchange was never interrupted, with the exception of a few months after the implementation of martial law in 1981. The 1980s experienced an intense development of exchange with French universities and the National Center of Scientific Research in the context of institutional partnerships. Some joint French-Polish teams were able to carry out comparative field research, for example in the context of the Languedoc-Mazowsze project, which brought the Universities of Warsaw and Montpellier together (Savey, 1992).

In a way more limited because of a smaller workforce, Hungarian geographers also contributed to the development of scientific exchange with the West, mainly with Anglo-American geography. Important scientists like Jerzy Kostrowicki in Poland and György Enyedi in Hungary won international recognition, which brought them the support of their respective Academies of Sciences. They regularly took part in the work of the International Geographical Union (IGU), and they chaired some of the most productive commissions of that body. Thanks to their authority and influence, they contributed to saving, at least partially, the study of geography in their countries from the worst effects of Soviet leadership.

Because of the unequal degree of openness to the Anglo-American, German, and French academic worlds, geography in Central European countries was in very disparate situations on the eve of the 1989 turning point. If the Hungarian and Polish geographers, well-integrated in international scientific competition, showed dynamism and a continuous renewal of topics and methods, Czechoslovakian and Romanian geographers, inward-looking in their traditional national schools and deprived of freedom of expression by more coercive regimes, revealed serious shortfalls.

2. Central European geography after the 1989 turnaround

A more pluralistic discipline

By loosening the constraints that limited the development of the social sciences, the communist regimes' collapse paved the way for their revival. The new situation has benefited human geography by gradually reinstating it among the social sciences. The extent of renewal depends on the previous developmental conditions. The rebirth of human geography seems the most dramatic in the Czech Republic and to a lesser extent in Romania. In countries where human geography was underdeveloped, some well-known scientists got involved in the restructuring work. In Poland and Hungary, geography continues its development in the directions previously defined and pays more attention to the question of regional development. In a few years, a readjustment has taken place in favor of human geography, and scientific approaches appear to be more diversified. The international opening up has led to the development of scientific cooperation and a broader diffusion of publications.

However, in most of these countries, research and higher education are still split. Geographical institutes belonging to the Academies of Sciences are not particularly renowned for their great ability to perform innovative work. Universities show a broader receptivity to change and try to reorganize their structures and to introduce new teachings. Among the most significant advancements is the reorganization of geography at Charles University in Prague. If geography still belongs to the Faculty of Natural Sciences, close to earth sciences, it now puts a lot of emphasis on social and political issues within the Department of Social Geography and Regional Development run by Petr Dostal and Martin Hampl. It has become the most important Department of Geography, thanks to the size of its staff and to the quality of its publications. The transformation is less evident at the Comenius University in Bratislava, where the Departments of Geography still belong to the Faculty of Natural Sciences and focus on the four following subjects: "Cartography, Geoinformatics, and Remote Sensing", "Human Geography and Demography", "Physical Geography", and "Regional Geography, Protection, and Planning of the Landscape".

At the University of Warsaw, geomorphology, climatology, and hydrology are well developed within the Faculty of Geography and Regional Studies. The very dynamic "European Institute for Regional and Local Development" (EUROREG), which conducts comparative studies of regional and local development, remains a distinct institution. Among the new subdisciplines that appeared after 1989, some m deal with subjects that were taboo before, like political geography and financial geography. The latter specialization is well covered in Hungary, where "the ever-greater interest in the geography of finances is justified by the booming growth in financial services and information technology" (Gal, 2000).

In most Central European universities, cartography is devoted to the development of new techniques: remote sensing and geographical information systems, and geoinformatics. Those new techniques tend to become autonomous, as appears to be the case at Charles University in Prague and at the Department of Cartography of Eötvös Lorand University in Budapest. Geoinformatics may constitute a separate discipline without trying to establish much connection with the other fields of geography.

Geography remains everywhere a fundamentally academic discipline whose development includes the creation or the expansion of higher education centers in reply to training requirements. Thus, in Romania, six new universities have been added to the three already existing in Bucharest, Iasi, and Cluj, and new reviews have been created.

Reconnecting East and West

By allowing the free movement of ideas and people, the opening to the outside world promoted the reintegration of Central European geographers in the international scientific community. With its commissions and study groups, the International Geographic Union (IGU) set up the right framework to establish contacts and scientific networking. Reconnecting Eastern and Western geographies furthers two different aims: Western geographers' deep interest in post-communist transformation analysis, and Central European researchers' wishes to re-establish close ties with Western geographic schools and to test out new methods. A few commissions and study groups played a particularly active role in the transfer of concepts and methodologies. Central European geographers were full members of commissions on the Organization of Industrial Space, the Geography of Population, Urban Development and Urban Life, the World Political Map, and the Geography of Public Administration. Through their activities, these commissions brought new approaches to young geographers who had earlier been excluded from international scientific exchange.

Among the commissions that played key roles, we would like to emphasize the "Geography of Public Administration" commission, first chaired by the British geographer Robert Bennett, then by the Canadian geographer Max Barlow. Among its main objectives, the Commission sought to encourage research on administrative developments in Eastern Europe and the former USSR. Just before the fall of the communist regimes, two meetings organized in Poland and in Hungary were especially important in emphasizing the re-emergence of local self-government in Central Europe (Bennett, 1989). During the 1990s, the Commission attached significant importance to the re-establishment of local self-government in Central and Eastern Europe, thereby contributing to the post-1989 transformation (Dostal, Illner, Kara, and Barlow, 1992; Maurel, 1993; Bennett, 1994).

The IGU Conference in Prague in August 1994 was the setting for reconnecting Central European geographies. Focused on "Environment and Quality of Life in Central Europe: Problems of Transitions", it regrouped a thousand participants from 69 countries. Organized by Charles University thanks to Secretary General Tomas Kucera, this conference gave Czech and Slovak geographers the opportunity to set out their scientific production to colleagues from all over Europe and beyond. This major event put an end to the long isolation that had seriously affected these countries. The book *Central Europe after the Fall of the Iron Curtain*, which collected the most significant contributions of Central European and Western European geographers, was one of the signs that a new scientific community interested in the study of the post-socialist transformation was appearing (Carter, Jordan, and Rey, 1996).

The reintegration of Central European geographers in international scientific competition essentially took place in the context of bilateral academic exchanges, some of them supported by European Institutions. For example, the project "European Space – Baltic Space – Polish Space" was developed as part of a perfect cooperation between the Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung of Hannover and the European Institute for Regional and Local Development of the University of Warsaw (Kuklinski, 1997). Many French universities keep up regular links with their Polish, Czech, and Romanian counterparts in the form of regular student and professor exchanges. Developing comparative research and fieldwork studies, geographers participate in a very active way. Some remarkable achievements deserve to be mentioned. For example, French-Romanian cooperation led to the preparation of an atlas of Romania then published in two versions, French and Romanian (Rey, 2001).

The range of scientific output (reviews, books, atlas) reveals the deep interest of Central European geographers in the analysis of the post-1989 transformation. The scientific reviews "Geoforum" and "Geojournal" dedicated several issues to the analysis of spatial changes and transformations taking place in Central Europe. They systematically called for papers from these countries' geographers. The improved quality of some geographical reviews published in Central Europe is striking, especially the well known review "Geographica Polonica", which is published in English.

However, a decade of transition has only slightly affected the institutional structures of Central European geography. The replacement of important scientists seems extremely slow. Over the last few years, some leaders have died and few young geographers have emerged. The same specialist names appear in the academic publications. Topics and contents provide better evidence of whether Central European geographers have showed a real receptivity to the changes that took place in their countries.

3. A progressive renewal of topics

Researchers in the social sciences saw in the political and economic upheavals the opportunity to renew topics and conceptual approaches. The analysis of the post-socialist transformation has become a new research field. None of the concerned disciplines had at its disposal a theoretical framework allowing it to comprehend the process of transformation in its entirety and complexity. A transfer of concepts and methods was necessary. Some disciplines – economics, and political science for example – adopted a theoretical framework based on other experiments of political or economic transitions. Thinking through the shift from socialism to capitalism also meant assessing the historical context of Central European countries. Few researchers in social sciences were able to initiate a theoretical approach as fruitful as that of the Hungarian economist János Kornai. There is nothing comparable in the field of geography, in which studies predominantly empirical provide only a fragmentary outline of the observed transformations.

How did geographers position themselves toward the analysis of the post-socialist transformation? Most of them considered the spatial changes as one dimension of a transformation process that originated in the political and economic fields. However, two specific questions can be asked:

1. What effect would the inherited spatial structures exert on the transformation process? The hypothesis that communism's mark on space would hinder the transformation was quite widely shared. So the burden of the communist period's legacy deserved special attention.
2. At what pace would the spatial changes take place? Many geographers were convinced that the changes of spatial structures would turn out to be slower and less visible than the political, economic, and social changes. So the asynchronous nature of spatial changes was expected to slow the transformation process.

The spatial heritage

Spatial structures proceed from history. Long-term settlement distribution trends and the belated spread of the industrial revolution had left a lasting mark on space organization (urban networks, unequal regional development, etc.). During the communist period, socialist industrial patterns (priority given to heavy industries concentrated in large cities), collective agricultural forms, and a spoiled environment deeply changed the organization of space. Landscapes retain the communist legacy's mark: spatial patterns of industrial activities, the location of public facilities, communication networks, and settlement distribution. None of these components would be removed from one day to the next. From the start, geographers tried to assess the inertial effect that spatial patterns peculiar to the socialist system were likely to exert on the transformation process. In the context of a research project on the future of "Eastern and Central Europe 2000" the question was formulated: "Do the new factors of development follow the traditional spatial patterns of particular countries or do they – and will they – change these patterns? (...) Does the shift from socialism to capitalism dramatically change the spatial heritage of the Central European countries?" (Gorzelak, Jalowiecki, Kuklinski, and Zienkowski, 1994).

The notion of spatial heritage can be understood in an even broader sense. Other heritages are present in people's minds. They are related to forms of economic appropriation, to symbolic and political representations of space, and to territorial identities that were formed during the forty years of the communist regime. In various ways, the communist power intervened in the territories' "memory of time": attempts were made to remove the effects of population transfers and boundaries changes imposed just after World War Two, pseudo-national territories (especially in states with a federal organization) were recognized, and administrative units and territorial tiers were reshaped as part of political system reforms. These political manipulations of territorial landmarks had various effects that were difficult to foresee. Their potential to provoke claims makes them a source of political tensions, especially on the level of interstate relations.

New spatial dynamics

From 1990 on, geographers put forward the hypothesis that geopolitical and economic changes would introduce a new and strong differentiation of territories. In the context of neoliberal economic theory, spatial changes were generally analyzed as the expression of the market's differentiating effect. From the moment transition economies came back to a market coordination mode, Central European territories found themselves suddenly exposed to the effects of globalization (Eneyedi, 2000). The political and economic opening therefore entailed integration in the globalization process.

In his analysis of territorial changes in the Czech Republic, Michal Illner quite rightly points out the role of such global and long-term processes as modernization, metropolitanization, and globalization, which had been delayed by the constraints established by the communist regime (Illner, 2001).

The differences in the pace of the implementation of reforms have meant strongly differentiated regional processes. Transition is improving faster in the territories most qualified to fit in the new context, those opening to international exchange and foreign investments, that are economically restructuring, and where trade is booming. Market forces' effect on places and regional spaces is all the harder, because the state no longer intervenes to redistribute financial resources in favor of the weakest ones.

Several geographers referred to the notion of regional or local "potential" to express the idea that the answer to socio-economic changes depended on a set of conditions or properties peculiar to each place or each region (Gorzelak, 1998). The systemic economic change and the new geopolitical order altered factors defining geographical potential. A location, a resource, a patrimony might see their value growing stronger or weaker and thus contributing to revalue or devalue regional potential. The relative positions of places and territories change: the effect of proximity can be either favorable or unfavorable. Some regions keep their position, while the positions that other regions possessed in the former socialist system have changed. Transformation is taking place on different tracks. Across the relative positions of regions in the planned economy and then in the post-socialist transformation, a typology of regional tracks can be distinguished: positive continuity, positive discontinuity, negative discontinuity, and negative continuity (Horvath, 1999).

Regional differentiations: West-East asymmetry

With the geopolitical opening and the reorientation of exchange and traffic with the West, countries and regions in contact with the European Union member countries found their situations greatly improved. People tended to see geographical proximity with developed areas as a factor explaining the greater growth of Western regions compared with Eastern regions close to countries of the former Soviet Union (Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova), which suffered from their “dead end” location. This explanation could seem a little limited if the new geopolitical order does not overcome older disparities of development. Here we should recall the temporal lags that left their mark on “the long history” of the Central European space. The West-East “gradient of modernity” is the consequence of a temporal lag in the spatial diffusion of innovations, of the development of industrial activities, and of urbanization. The question is the extent to which visible regional divides are the products solely of the reactivation of old and long-standing inequalities.

The model of West-East asymmetry seems pertinent to the current disparities of development, both on the supranational level of Central and Eastern Europe and on the macro-regional scale in each of the countries: Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, and, less obviously, the Czech Republic (Gorzelak, 1996).

Let’s take the well-known case of Poland. The present territory bears the long-standing mark of an old asymmetry hardened by the historical partitions of this country. In the same way, the former German border, historically stable until 1945, can be spotted on maps of development levels. The duality affecting the Polish territory affects not only the material legacies fixed in the context of spatial patterns or in infrastructures, but also other structural features of civil society, such as electoral behavior, the results of local governments, and the various dynamics of associative networks. Grzegorz Gorzelak and Bohdan Jalowiecki put forward the hypothesis that the West-East gradient would affect social actors’ behaviors, their receptivity to change, and their degree of activism. They predicted that the administrative units (gmina) of the western and northern territories as well as those of Great Poland would exhibit a broader social mobilization and a more developed sense of innovation and of entrepreneurship than the administrative units of the old Galicia or of the former “Congress Poland”. In the territories acquired in 1945 and resettled by Polish populations coming from the former eastern territories, the migratory mingling would have contributed to renewal and strengthened the ability to adapt (Gorzelak, 1998).

If a long-standing West-East asymmetry seems to convincingly explain the regional contrasts in development, we should hesitate to apply this hypothesis too generally. We should not claim that the western regions of Central European countries close to the border of European Union member states almost automatically enjoy a “border effect” beneficial to economic activities. In a study published in 2001, Michal Illner admits that the scenario concerning Bohemia he had worked out in 1993 probably overestimated the West-East gradient, and that many border areas in the Czech Republic do not appear very dynamic (Gorzelak, Ehrlich, Faltan, and Illner, 2001). This assessment can be applied to Polish regions close to the German border. After a few years, the outcomes of some “Euro regions” located along this border seem a little disappointing.

Cross-border relations

Cross-border cooperation is another topic very present in recent research by Central European geographers. It is generally presented as a factor of regional development and as the beneficial result of the borders’ opening and of the easy crossing made possible by geopolitical change. Encouraged by European Union regional policy and financial support, the “Euro region” model seems to have met with some success. However its implementation can lead to reservations when the territorial claims between peoples and neighboring states are not completely subdued. In addition, the disagreements that have cropped up about ecological risks (nuclear plants, hydraulic constructions, etc.) disclose deeper-rooted political tensions.

The question of cross-border relations appears more complex and invites geographers to look more closely and precisely at the accessibility of the crossing points, the terms of contacts between the populations, and the goods and services exchanged on both sides of the border. Such an approach was developed for Hungary (Rechnitzer, 1999; 2001). This country has no fewer than seven different neighbors on an 1800-kilometer border, and the situation of the border regions seems more and more differentiated after a decade of changes. Only the regions next to Austria and Slovenia experienced successful development. When Hungarian territories on the "periphery" (in the economic sense of the word) border other peripheral regions (western Slovakia, Ukraine, Romania), cross-border cooperation is hampered by the similarity of the problems experienced (excess of labor in comparison with job opportunities, absence of capital to develop resources, etc.). On the other hand, in the South of the Great Hungarian Plain, contacts with Serbia, focused on the cities of Szeged and Baja, grew as part of a "gray economy" active in time of war. The new geography of borders and cross-border relations, seen in the context of the European continent, thus offers geographers an advantageous field of study.

The post-socialist urban transition

The major cities and especially those that were capitals had the best new conditions for a market economy. As points of receipt, diffusion of innovation, and attraction for foreign investments, their economic structures recorded the fastest transformations, both in privatization and in the growth of service. The author of a recent study of the transition of Hungary's regional system maintains that in Budapest the old structures gave way to new ones and that in this city the transition is now complete (Rechnitzer, 2000). The same could be said about other capitals of Central Europe – Prague and Warsaw – which are the transition's most advanced points of diffusion on the scale of their respective territories.

Many studies have been devoted to the analysis of the characteristics of post-socialist transformation in cities, particularly those on the upper levels of the urban hierarchy. Geographers have tried to draw up a model of the urban transition from "state-controlled socialism" to "global capitalism" that would account for the complexity of the processes as well as the tendencies of the functional and structural reorganization of urban space (Kovacs, Sailer-Fliege, 1997). New functioning conditions of the labor and housing markets, which result from market coordination, account for the spatial structures' changes in the process of transition. These topics triggered many analyses of large cities and capitals in particular (Rykiel, 1999; Weclawowicz, 2000). A new urban order is taking shape with active processes of polarization and segregation.

Conclusion

Transition countries have very specific historical tracks, so the forms that spatial structure changes take are hard to read. Spatial structures are reorganizing themselves, combining rearrangements of inherited organizational forms with genuinely new forms. This offers geographers a field of study with new research subjects and new conceptual approaches. We are not able to draw a complete overview of this. Central European geographers analyzed the labor market trends, particularly unemployment, residential population mobility, industrial sector restructuring, and the decollectivization process in rural areas. Comparative studies are still too rare to be able to establish a global theoretical approach to spatial transformation. However, some research went beyond the too-limited national framework and too-narrow disciplinary approach. In a comparative and prospective view, some social science researchers tried to develop a diagnosis and some scenarios to foresee changes under way (Gorzelak, Ehrlich, Faltan, and Illner, 1994). With the hindsight of seven years, they are reworking and updating their analyses. The hypotheses put forward in their first works were generally confirmed by facts (Gorzelak, Ehrlich, Faltan, and Illner, 2001). Not all the studies recently published have the same scope or the same methodological interest.

The geography of post-socialist transformation is constantly evolving. The transformation process leads to a rearrangement of spatial structure by modifying the relative positions of places and regions. Let's not forget that during this process, territories are increasingly differentiating, development directions are diverging, and the economic gap between the two sets of poles (capital/countryside and West/East) is widening. Transition is moving forward at unequal speeds. This is not due to a mere delayed ignition that penalizes this or that region, but to the effects of a crisis of the destruction of old organizational forms (mining and industrial complexes, collective farms, etc.), a crisis whose depth and duration depend on place and regional space.

These rearrangements have not yet consolidated and are likely to change; regional structures are moving closer to and further away from each other, disclosing the uncertain futures of "the spaces of the transition" (Rechnitzer, 2000). The process seems largely spontaneous. Resulting from the free effect of economic forces, it is not yet controlled or alleviated by regional policy measures. Through the past decade, governments' primary attention was not given to regional development. The establishment of democratic institutions in different tiers of the territorial system absorbed all efforts, whereas the lack of budget resources limited the possibilities of regional development support. The question of regional development clearly emerges in connection with the prospect of European integration.

One Hungarian researcher states that "the future of the spatial structure of Hungary basically depends on the decentralization strategy that Hungary will apply in the use of the new resources available after EU accession" (Horvath, 1998). This prospect involves setting up real development strategies if we wish to avoid seeing some territories sink into unemployment, poverty, and a "gray economy". It is also the researcher's responsibility to highlight the problems that have arisen from a liberal conception of transition, which can endanger the cohesion of Central European societies.

References

Bennett, Robert (ed.) (1989): *Territory and Administration in Europe*, London and New York, Pinter Publishers;

Bennett, Robert (ed.) (1993): *Local Government in the New Europe*, London, Belhaven Press;

Bennett, Robert (ed.) (1994): *Local Government and Market Decentralization. Experiences in Industrialized, Developing and Former Eastern bloc Countries*, Tokyo-New York-Paris, United Nations University Press;

Carter, Francis, Jordan, Peter and Rey, Violette (1996): *Central Europe after the Fall of the Iron Curtain*, Frankfurt am Main;

Dostal, Petr, Illner, Michal, Kara, Jan and Barlow, Max (eds.) (1992): *Changing Territorial Administration in Czechoslovakia: International Viewpoints*, University of Amsterdam;

Dostal, Petr (2000): "The European Spatial Development Perspective and the Accession Countries: Polycentric Guidelines Versus Uneven Spatial Development", in: *Informationen zur Raumentwicklung*, No. 3-4, 183-192;

Dragomirescu, Serban (2001): "Quelques réalisations marquantes de la géographie roumaine à l'aube du XXIe siècle", in: *Acta Geographica*, No. 1502 bis, Paris, 152-156;

Eberhardt, Piotr (1999): "Ethnic minorities in Central-Eastern Europe", in: *Geographia polonica*, Vol. 72, No. 1, 125-142;

Enyedi, György (2000): "Globalization and Regional Development in Hungary", in: *Ter es Tarsadalom*, No. 1, 1-10;

Gal, Zoltan (2000): "The new trends of Regional Science: Financial geography", in: *Ter es Tarsadalom*, No. 2-3, 9-32;

Gal, Zoltan (2000): "Challenges of Regionalism: Development and Spatial Structure of the Hungarian Banking System", in: *Geographia Polonica*, 73, No. 1;

Hamilton, Ian and Enyedi, György (eds.) (1990): "East-Central Europe in Social and Economic Transition", in: *Geoforum*, Vol. 21, No. 2, Oxford, New York, Pergamon Press, 276;
Geojournal (1999): "Post-socialist urban transition in East Central Europe", Vol. 49, No.1;
Geojournal (2000): "Human Resources of Eastern Europe", Vol. 50, No. 2-3;
Gorzelak, Grzegorz (1998): *Regional and local potential for transformation in Poland*, Warsaw, EUROREG;
Gorzelak, Grzegorz, Jalowiecki, Bohdan, Kuklinski, Antoni and Zienkowski, Leszek (1994): *Eastern and Central Europe 2000*, Brussels, European Commission, studies 2, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities;
Gorzelak, Grzegorz, Ehrlich, Eva, Faltan, Lubomir and Illner, Michal (2001): *Central Europe in transition: Towards EU Membership*, Warsaw, Scholar Wydawnictwo naukowe;
Hajdu, Zoltan (1999): *Regional processes and spatial structures in Hungary in the 1990s*, Pecs, Hungarian Academy of sciences;
Horvath, Gyula (1998): "Perspectives of Regional Delopment and Policy in Europe",in: *Ter Es Tarsadalom,* No. 3, 1-26;
Horvath, Gyula (1999) "Regional effects of the transition in East Central Europe", in: *Regional processes and spatial structures in Hungary in the 1990s*, Hajdu, Zoltan (ed.), Pecs, Hungarian Academy of sciences, 9-33;
Jalowiecki, Bohdan (1990): *Local development in Europe, Experiences and Prospects (Développement local en Europe, l'expérience et l'avenir)*, Regional and Local Studies, No. 5, University of Warsaw, Institute of Space Economy;
Kuklinski, Anton and Jalowiecki, Bohdan (eds.) (1999): *Local Development in Europe. Experiences and Prospects*, Regional and Local Studies, No. 5, University of Warsaw, Institute of Space Economy,;
Kuklinski, Anton (1997): *European Space - Baltic Space - Polish Space*, Part one and Part two, Hannover-Warsaw, EUROREG;
Maurel, Marie-Claude (1985): "La géographie soviétique (1953-1983). Le paradoxe de la marginalité", in: *Revue d'études slaves*, Paris, 239-257;
Maurel, Marie-Claude (ed.) (1993): "Changements administratifs et territoriaux dans la nouvelle Europe", in: *Bulletin de la Société Languedocienne de Géographie*, No. 3-4, 347;
Meusberger, Peter and Jöns, Heike (eds.) (2001): *Transformations in Hungary, Essays in Economy and Society*, Heidelberg, Physica-Verlag;
Regionalism and Integration, Culture, Space, Development (2000), Timisoara, Universitatea de Vest din Timisoara;
Rechnitzer, Janos (2000): "The Features of the Transition of Hungary's Regional System", in: *Discussion Papers*, No. 32, Pécs, Centre for Regional Studies, 74;
Rey, Violette (1994): *Transition, fragmentation, recomposition, la Tchéco-slovaquie en 1992*, Fontenay-Saint Cloud, ENS Editions;
Rey, Violette, Groza, Octavian, Ianos, Ioan and Patroescu, Maria (2000): *Atlas de la Roumanie*, Paris, La Documentation française;
Rykiel, Zbigniew (1995): "Polish Core and Periphery under Economic transformation", in: *Geographia Polonica*, Vol. 66, 111-124;
Savey, Suzane (1992): "Languedoc Mazowsze, dix ans de campagnes polonaises", in: *Bulletin de la Société Languedocienne de géographie*, No. 1-2, 7-15;
Weclawowicz, Grzegorz (2000): "The socio-spatial structures of the Polish City as a component of Urban theory", in: *Przeglad Geograficzny*, No. 3-4, 395-410.

Grażyna Skąpska

Law and Society in a Natural Laboratory: the Case of Poland in the Broader Context of East-Central Europe

The new situation in which socio-legal studies currently find themselves in East-Central Europe is marked by the necessity to deal not only with the economic, political, cultural, and moral effects of the collapse of communism, but also with the planned enlargement of the European Union.[1]

It is a situation in which history once more offers a real-life laboratory, where one can again test scientific concepts, research tools, and methods and devise new ones to better grasp the newly emerging reality. My paper will be devoted mostly to the development of socio-legal studies in Poland in the context of new challenges and hopes, against a broader background of similar challenges and hopes faced by these studies in other East-Central European countries.

Although focused on the present, this paper's main argument is the importance of the historical and cultural factors and intellectual traditions, on the one hand, and the tensions and contradictions within a "scientific field" for the development of socio-legal studies after the collapse of communism, on the other. Martin Krygier argues that culture counts and "...our cultural context is not only inhabited, but it inhabits, shapes and moulds those brought up in it. ... One's thoughts, values, symbols, are enveloped and to a large extent constituted by the given." (Krygier, 1999: 88) And quoting another author, Krygier emphasizes "...novelties continually occur, but they do so 'within an already existing idiom of activity'"(Krygier, after Oakshott, *ibidem*: 89).

In light of this argument, independently of the great change, intellectual traditions influence socio-legal studies in two ways: either as a source of concepts and role models, or adversarially – as a negative frame of reference, a warning for future development.

With regard to the tensions and contradictions characteristic of the "scientific field" as a source of scientific development, I will try to subordinate a description of the development of Polish sociology of law to the classical problems of the sociology of science, or, more generally, the sociology of knowledge.[2]

Following this, I will characterize the socio-legal community, its distinguishing features, as well as dominant paradigms but also tensions and contradictions that structure and influence the undertaken research. Further, I will venture to describe the changes occurring on the level of conceptualization of the studied object.

Finally, I will try to outline the content of current empirical research and of the more theoretical debates after the collapse of communism, in the wake of European Union enlargement eastwards.

Socio-legal studies in the environment of legal pluralism

Eastern, but above all East-Central Europe has a complex and multifarious legal heritage of Roman law, Byzantine law, Muslim law, and local customary law that determined the development of legal institutions and cultures, was mirrored in legal mentalities, law perceptions, and modes of reasoning, and was an important factor in the application of law. East-Central Europe is a place of long public legal history of a struggle for control over political power and protection of public rights and for the self-determination rights of nations (Paczolay, 1999). The latter were stressed as early as the fifteenth century (by a Polish international lawyer, Paweł Włodkowic, professor at the Jagiellonian University). However, it is also a place – at least in some parts – where personal freedom was not granted to peasants until as late as the middle of nineteenth century.

Central to Polish history is the special period of the partition of Poland, which resulted in the implementation of three different legal cultures on its territory. One of these was the Prussian *Rechtsstaat* culture, the culture of a strong but law-bounded state and of uncorrupted civil service;

another was the Austro-Hungarian multicultural society under one legal regime, with broad political and intellectual freedoms and liberties and skilled and uncorrupted administration. In the part of Poland annexed by Austria-Hungary, Eugen Ehrlich developed the foundations of the sociology of law. The third specific legal culture was imposed by Russia, where law was basically understood as a kind of disguise for the sheer power of the absolutist monarch, who was in no way controlled or subordinated to any higher authority, accompanied by a highly corrupted civil service. Some very prominent Russians contrasted this with the right and noble feelings for justice of the Russian folk, particularly of peasants.[3] The legacy of these three legal cultures still poses an interesting and open question about the conceptualization of law and its social functions, promoted by Polish sociologists of law.[4]

Thus, East-Central Europe is a mosaic of overlapping religious, cultural, and political influences, especially the long-lasting effects of the overlapping political orders of the German, the Turkish Ottoman, and the Russian Empires, of the Habsburg monarchy, and, after the Nazi occupation, of the Soviet system. Here not only can the clash of civilizations be traced; the accommodation of various cultural influences is also visible. Apart from that, in some parts of East-Central Europe, especially in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, it is argued, interest in law and support for the rule of law was limited to social elites and found neither comprehension nor support among peasants – the overwhelming majority of the population.[5] Therefore, one can plausibly argue that, historically in East-Central Europe, the study of cultures and of social stratification was an important part of legal studies. Nor have these studies lost their importance in the meantime, under conditions created by democratization after the collapse of the dictatorial system and by the harmonization of laws as a result of the prospective European Union enlargement. The thesis of the complexity of the system of law, and in fact of many overlapping systems of law, is formulated with regard to the current situation (Oerkeny and Scheppele, 1999). This thesis, based on empirical research, was applied to Hungary, but it can be easily generalized to Poland, as indicated by studies on the restitution of nationalized property, and possibly also to other East-Central European societies (Skąpska, 2000).

It is not astonishing that, in the historical context outlined above, famously original society-oriented legal theories were formulated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The cultural and legal context produced scholars who won an established place as pioneers of socio-legal studies. Their theories stressed the complex structure of legal phenomenon, its social and socio-psychological embeddedness, and the links between law and other social normative systems, above all morality and culture, as represented in customs. Among these pioneers of socio-legal studies was Eugen Ehrlich, who was active in a province of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy that became part of Romania after World War One. We are indebted to this scholar for ideas on law's reality within a context of broader and more deeply binding norms of human associations, based on shared understanding or negotiated compromises, as well as for his statements about the uncertain and problematic relationship between norms of decision applied by state agencies and the patterns of thought and behavior actually existing in society. Another such pioneer was Leon Petrażycki, professor of law in Russia and, after the revolution of 1917, sociology professor at Warsaw University in Poland, who was concerned with law as a psychological phenomenon consisting of associated feelings of rights and duties. Leon Petrażycki also developed a civil society-oriented psychological theory of law and morality that stressed the mutual enhancement of civic morality and the development of legal institutions. Authors who, like Eugen Ehrlich, were also legal practitioners and judges concerned with the local accountability of their verdicts underlined the importance of empirical studies on "living law" or "unofficial law" and stressed the plurality of interlocking orders – or plurality of laws – within a given society, as opposed to legal studies focused primarily on legal texts. Such concerns were either functionalistic and pragmatic – one had to reach a binding decision and implement it in a culturally differentiated social milieu in order to maintain the relative coherence of the multicultural monarchy – or more theoretical. In both cases, the society-oriented concepts of law presented a strong foundation of empirical studies of "living law", law's legitimacy, law's efficiency, and the effectiveness of legal policy.

Socio-legal scholars as public intellectuals

Two characteristic features distinguish scholars interested in socio-legal studies in Poland. These features seem also to be common, to varying degrees, in other East-Central European countries. First, we observe the social and political commitment, the participation in public debates, and the fulfillment of civic responsibilities by many prominent scholars of the sociology of law; and second, the socio-structural characteristics of socio-legal scholars.

Sociologists of law, like other professional groups with a predominantly, but not uniquely humanistic education and/or a free profession, belonged to a very specific Eastern European structural phenomenon, the *intelligentsia*. To belong to the *intelligentsia* in Poland and elsewhere in this region meant to contribute to the struggle for national independence – and at least for some representatives of this social group, also to struggle for a place within Western culture. As the distinctive social class, the *intelligentsia* was seen as having a special mission to watch over the souls and spirits of the nations in the name of freedom and justice. Being a part of the overall Polish *intelligentsia*, sociologists of law had a very special status. First, they were and predominantly still are lawyers or combine legal and sociological education (Kojder, 1990). Their special interest in the social aspects of the functioning of law and the sociological concept of law some of them proposed distinguishes them from their professional peers, but also makes them defend their views, which are unorthodox from a legal standpoint. They had and have to struggle to give the sociology of law a place in the academic curriculum, and to look for support for their concepts. This they often find in public debates.

The specific situation of the *intelligentsia* generally changed after World War Two, and it is changing again now. First, after the Second World War, the social character of the *intelligentsia* changed. Lawyers are a special case here. As a result of their almost complete extermination during the Second World War, their further extermination or at least persecution by the new, communist authorities, and the strict instrumentalism according to which the law was conceptualized as a tool to transform the whole social system into socialism and people into "socialist citizens", lawyers had to be specially and rapidly educated. Some of them finished only special courses, not attending university at all. The state needed lawyers educated in the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology and conforming to the demands of the new economic and political order based on a state-owned, planned economy and one-party rule. Moreover, in the Stalinist era, i.e., roughly between 1945-1956, it was difficult to even mention the sociology of law, since it ceased to exist as an academic discipline and was banned from university curricula, together with other disciplines dangerous to Marxist orthodoxy (Kurczewski, 1991).

However, as I will describe more thoroughly in the following sections of this paper, after the "thaw" of 1956, scholars of the sociology of law could pursue their activities and contribute to the stabilization and prestige of the sociology of law in the law community, as well as in the broader sociological community, thanks to the underground educational activity of some scholars even during Stalinism and thanks to the personal engagement and activity of their students.

The second characteristic feature of the socio-legal community in Poland is its public commitment and public engagement. In the first, inter-war period, in the recent period of the first democratic governments and presidency, and in the wake of European Union enlargement, its most prominent members were not only engaged in public debates about the development of a democratic and liberal society, but have also held high positions in Parliament or the government or were active in promoting democratic development and democratic education. This is not to say that the entire socio-legal community in Poland was unanimously anticommunist, pro-democratic, engaged, and independent-minded. Many examples of political and intellectual opportunism and political servility could be cited to the contrary (Podgórecki, 1992). However, precisely from the point of view of the development of the discipline, its unorthodox concept of law, and the content of the research carried on, the engagement of some intellectuals has great importance as a source of some still valid arguments.

The direct roots and models for the contemporary development of Polish sociology of law are found in the inter-war period. Thanks to the activities of Leon Petrażycki, the first Chair of Sociology was established at Warsaw University (Kojder and Kwaśniewski, 1985; Kojder, 1990). The challenge for lawyers in the inter-war period was enormous: they were responsible for the development of the basic legal framework of the new state, and they could contribute to the further democratic development of their country. In such a vein, Petrażycki was co-author of the final draft of the Act of Academic Schools. It sanctioned a high degree of self-administration at universities in Poland at the beginning of the 1920s. Leon Petrażycki demonstrated his social commitment by the publication in 1920 of his pamphlet "How to Rescue Polish Intelligentsia and Science" as well as by his involvement in promoting the rights of women in public and political activities (Skąpska, 1987).

From the end of the Second World War until 1956, even to teach such subjects as the sociology, theory, or philosophy of law required great courage. These subjects were forbidden, erased from the syllabi, and, in their place, a simplified version of Marxism-Leninism was taught. But even during that darkest Stalinist period, the sociology, theory, and philosophy of law were taught unofficially. At the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, Jerzy Lande, a disciple of Leon Petrażycki, taught the sociology of law at a private, officially forbidden seminar held at home. Needless to say, mere participation, not to mention the organization of that seminar, could be severely punished as an act of political disobedience.

The period of the political "thaw" after 1956 was characterized in Poland by the development and academic stabilization of the sociology of law.

Thanks to Adam Podgórecki, a prominent student of Jerzy Lande's "private seminar", the first Chair for the Sociology of Law was set up at the Institute of Sociology of Warsaw University. In 1972, Podgórecki established the Institute of Social Prophylactics and Resocialization, also at Warsaw University. Owing to his organizational activities and his initiative, the Section of the Sociology of Law was organized within the Polish Sociological Association, thus also creating the conditions for the non-academic institutionalization of the socio-legal community. Professor Podgórecki describes the struggles with governmental authorities and communist party functionaries that accompanied his intellectual activity and organizational efforts in his book, "Polish society" (Podgórecki, 1992).

Another leading Polish sociologist of law and student of Jerzy Lande's private seminar, Maria Borucka-Arctowa, was strongly and successfully engaged in making the sociology of law an obligatory subject of syllabi in legal departments at Polish universities within the framework of a legal education reform.

Recent history has also been marked by the engagement of some of the discipline's prominent representatives in the underground activities of the democratic opposition. It was also marked by educational engagement in the so-called "flying university" (a series of fairly regularly held underground lectures, conducted in private homes, mostly in Warsaw, that dealt with topics not taught officially) and the "workers university" (also consisting of lectures and seminars, hosted mostly on premises of the Catholic Church, mostly, as far as is known, in Kraków and Wrocław). This period was also characterized by enormous activity by Polish intellectuals, among them sociologists of law, in publishing in the framework of the so-called "second circulation" – a network of underground printing presses and distributors that grew to be more voluminous than anything else known in Eastern Europe. This period in the intellectual development of Polish sociology of law can also be described as the "functioning of an academic discipline in the shadows of legality", since the same persons were teaching officially at the state universities and unofficially at the "flying" or "workers universities"; publishing officially, semi-officially (i.e., in books or journals that were printed in editions of only 100 copies, which could be distributed only to a very limited extent), and unofficially; and performing official and unofficial functions (the latter as advisors to the democratic opposition).

The culminating moments of this heroic period in Poland were the Gdańsk Agreement in 1980 and the Round Table Agreement in 1989.

In the countries whose economies are liberalizing and whose political systems are democratizing after the collapse of totalitarianism, the public engagement of intellectuals, sociologists of law among them, was initially greatly applauded. However, after 1989, in these same societies interest in socio-legal studies dwindled. Initially, the former original ideas seemed no longer compatible with the new realities. No pluralism of legal orders was taken seriously when the rule of law was declared in the constitution and, with the prospect of future membership in the EU, domestic law had to be subordinated to *acquis communautaire* anyway. Many scholars once engaged in socio-legal studies undertook more practical tasks. But socio-legal studies are currently undertaken anew; they focus on the development of post-communist law, on the compatibility of legal institutions with the legacy of the former system and with the new challenges, and on the importance of extra-legal norms for the functioning of official law. These studies indicate once more the public concerns of socio-legal scholars and illustrate the fact that, although the traditional role of the *intelligentsia* is no longer in demand, an empty space has appeared and waits to be filled by the learned opinions of publicly engaged intellectuals in order to conduct an informed and critical examination of post-communist law and of the processes of legal integration under EU law.

The "unexpected" career of functionalism during communism

Eugen Ehrlich – himself a judge – tried to integrate indigenous law into the concept of law, and Leon Petrażycki stressed unofficial law. The dominant paradigms of early socio-legal studies were cultural functionalism and psychologism. One has to make binding decisions in a culturally differentiated legal environment where the central authorities are far away. Differentiated legal and cultural legacies have to be integrated in one coherent legal system of the newly created states, and official law has to find sources of legitimacy.

The later socio-legal studies in Poland were certainly not one-dimensional. On the contrary, they were, and still are conflicting, and their sources are many. They can be analyzed in the light of a theory stressing the importance of a scientific, critical debate and of theoretical, critical self-reflectivity. They can be also debated in the light of a theory that investigates the emergence of a dominant scientific discourse within a field of a discipline, of a dominant paradigm, and of the marginalization of other concepts and theories.

The first approach underlines the importance of an exchange of arguments that brings about the enrichment of theory and research. From this perspective, the first phase in the development of the sociology of law in Poland seems to be characteristically effective, influential, and setting a model for current research. Works and debates initiated by Leon Petrażycki and his students often conflicted with the dominant legal doctrine. Eventually they contributed to the development of legal, and not only socio-legal, studies, resulting in the development of a multidimensional concept of law in its ontological and methodological version, in the development of the concept of conscious legal policy, and in the stress on the motivational and educational functions of law. Both versions of the multidimensional concept that law is a complex phenomenon composed – most importantly for Leon Petrażycki – of legal norms that are primarily psychological phenomena and of official legal texts, and its methodological version that called for the complex methodological approach to the analysis of law, the consideration of law's social functioning, its psychological aspects, and its doctrinal analysis, proved to be not only useful, but also able to be broadened and developed. Similarly, the concept of a rational legal policy and of educational and motivational functions of law contributed greatly to the development of the theory of law as a social phenomenon. Thanks to Petrażycki's theoretically elaborated idea of conscious legal policy based on the concept of the civilizational role of law in the education of citizens and in the development of social cooperation, Polish scholars also currently find a sound theoretical basis for their research on the interconnections between the development of law and civil society (Petrażycki, 1985; see also Petrażycki, 1959).

The dark period after the Second World War was characterized by a dramatic closing of possibilities of any scholarly debate and by harsh persecution of potential participants in such debate. Some of the characteristic questions became the subject of limited and controlled public debate after 1956, but especially after 1962, when Adam Podgórecki published his *Sociology of Law*, and after Maria Borucka-Arctowa published her *On the Social Operation of Law* in 1967. Scientific, informed debate suffered another blow after 1968 when, fleeing the politically initiated "top-down" anti-Semitic hysteria, many prominent intellectuals, including sociologists of law and lawyers interested in sociological studies on law, left Poland and went to work in Great Britain, the USA, and elsewhere.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the new concepts and empirical research on legal phenomena were often elaborated against the narrow and primitive concept of legal positivism, proposed mostly by politicians and imported together with the foundations of Marxism-Leninism. Within such a political context, one may point to several domains of open and often dramatic tensions permeating the development of socio-legal debate in Poland, which also have consequences for contemporary debates and studies.

Two clearly contesting positions were elaborated toward law as an object of research. The first conformed to the official ideology and to the simplistic, primitive, and often hypocritical version of legal positivism promoted by the communist party functionaries. It identified law with an order issued by political authority, backed by state force, formulated as legal text, and conforming to the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. The content of the latter principles was their current interpretation by the top communist party apparatus. The theoretical foundation of this legal positivism was Marxism; Marxist theory was envisioned as a part and formative factor of social reality. Thus, in this period, the simplified version of legal positivism was accompanied by a very anti-positivistic approach to social and political reality.

Of course, the mechanisms of interconnections between political theory and political reality, especially between such a practically oriented theory and political actions, pose one of the most interesting theoretical problems. These problems can be approached either by searching for the abovementioned "idiom of activity", or by looking for holistic, systemic explanations, or both.

According to Niklas Luhmann, the holistic "semantics" offered by Marxist theory presents a special case here. Marxism presented itself "...as a unity of science and ideology, a particular kind of science. In line with this, it expresses its own theory as a condition of legitimization." (Luhmann, 1990: 18) In more simple language, Marxism contributed to the shaping of reality in the former communist countries by providing the language and the concepts in which the political systems of those countries described and differentiated themselves from their "capitalist" and "imperialist" environments, in this way legitimizing their own existence. Marxism also provided important ideas influencing the frames of minds of these country's ruling elites and eventually also of their citizens.

Thus, the self-referential theory provided law with its semantic steering mechanism – an Orwellian "newspeak" – thanks to such concepts as "socialist legality", "socialist product quality", and "socialist legal consciousness", which were compatible with the conceptualizations of systemic rules known as "Diamat" (dialectical materialism) or "Histmat" (historical materialism). Marxism provided language and concepts with which the new political system could differentiate itself from capitalism without needing empirical evidence of its truths.

Once applied, the symbolic laws absolved functionaries and citizens even further from responsibility for individual actions and their results. It sufficed to apply semantic rituals, to proclaim new laws on "socialist product quality", to change names and words, and not bother with the details of legal acts that would enable the enforcement of the laws on socialist quality or equal treatment. It was enough to introduce the rituals of elections and have a symbolic reality compatible with theoretical requirements and thus protect the coherence of the system. This idea of a “system” provided the intellectual and moral context for the social operation of law as a “subsystem” within the socialist society system. In accordance with Marx’s thesis about the economic “base” and the intellectual “superstructure”, but in a much more subtle and profound way, the idea of an overarching, all-determining “system" supplemented the discourse about law with arguments about law’s role in the development of the social system. The law was reduced not only to a means of oppression one social class uses to its own advantage, as the first naive Marxists believed. It was not even perceived as a “grand-scale instrument” of social change anymore, but came to be conceptualized as a coherent system of techniques, including discursive techniques, completely desocialized and depersonalized, inevitable, totally subordinated to the laws of socialist system development, and therefore beyond any moral judgment.

On the other hand, when the actual social processes clearly diverged from theory, it was no longer possible to hide the uncomfortable facts contradicting ideological/theoretical assumptions about the overwhelming presence and development of the socialist system. Then the law acquired the purely symbolic quality of a superstructure legitimized by a visionary theory, as part of an unquestionable system-related discourse, to which conventional categories of truth did not apply. Here we had such examples of “systemic hypocrisy” as laws stipulating the equal treatment of private farmers and national agricultural enterprises or stipulating the protection of small business entrepreneurs. Further hypocrisies lay in symbolic laws regarding education for sobriety in a country where the statistical data on the consumption of strong alcohol were alarming and nothing was undertaken to combat this; in the symbolic law on the socialistic quality of products under conditions of universal scarcity, where anything produced was immediately sold; and in symbolic anti-pollution laws in the most polluted regions in Europe.

Niklas Luhmann’s neo-functionalist system theory would say that a politically interpreted dominant theory, rather than social reality, informed the conformist and even servile legal studies of this period. Here, the concept of legal positivism promoted by the proponents of such studies means law as existing in legal texts, on the one hand, and its legitimization in a specific theoretical reality, i.e., in a reality created within politically interpreted Marxist theory, on the other.

This official, doctrinal position was challenged by the very idea of empirical research on the social functioning of law. It was contested by the followers of Leon Petrażycki’s theory of law, first and foremost by Adam Podgórecki. According to Petrażycki’s psychological theory of law, the law is a realistic phenomenon, composed of a practical judgment, i.e., a judgment assigning a pattern of conduct to imperative/attributive emotions. Propositions inherent in such a concept of law and linked with the concept of unofficial, intuitive law were reflected in Podgórecki’s research on the prestige of law, on law and morality, and in studies on legal subcultures, social pathology, and social control (Podgórecki, 1966b; 1969; Podgórecki, 1971; Podgórecki, 1975).

Empirical studies of law were based on the concept of law as a multidimensional phenomenon in the methodological sense, proposing a methodologically complex approach to law. They were studies on the social functioning of law, attitudes toward law, legal consciousness and social change, and social functions of law (Podgórecki, 1969; Podgórecki, 1971; Borucka-Arctowa, 1964; Borucka-Arctowa, 1974; Borucka-Arctowa, 1981; Skąpska, 1981).

However, such imminently positivistic components of law (according to definitions from John Austin to Max Weber) as its political and social legitimacy, Max Weber’s theory of law as a component of economic development, or Émile Durkheim's concept of “strong institutions” were not broadly debated either in Poland nor, to my knowledge, elsewhere in East-Central Europe until the 1980s and 1990s. Another subject characteristically not a topic of discussion and research, a subject that would be fully compatible with legal positivism, was the history and traditions of legal institutions in the context of modernization processes. One exception was a broad study on divorce and changing opinions toward it, conducted by a specialist in private law, Jan Górecki (1967). These subjects were of practical interest to authorities, though. In the 1960s and especially in the 1970s, the political authorities in Poland and elsewhere in Eastern and Central Europe, especially in Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, and the former Soviet Union, became interested in legal efficiency and legal consciousness, and they launched large studies on these subjects.

Controversies and conflicts related to the scope and self-definition of the sociology of law as a discipline followed the main controversy on the concept of law as an object of studies. The clearly outlined positions consisted in the proposition made by Adam Podgórecki of a broad concept of the sociology of law as a theoretical discipline, aimed at constructing a sociological theory of law, which was conceptualized as a primarily social phenomenon – as a social construct – supported by empirical studies. Such conceptualization of the sociology of law stayed in close connection with proposals to study law in a context of broader normative phenomena within a society. The opposing view was also formulated, defining the sociology of law as a predominantly empirical discipline subordinated to the study of legal doctrine and using sociological methods and techniques of empirical research in order to supplement lawyers' knowledge of the consequences of particular regulations.

The postulate of conscious legal policy opened the way to further theoretical studies and empirical research. It resulted in the concept of socio-technics, as a method of enlightened reform, with consideration of psychological, cultural, and macro-systemic factors. Socio-technics was defined as "a number of general directives telling how, taking into account the existing social valuations, to carry out the changes in consciousness in order to attain the socially-intended aims" (Podgórecki, 1966a: 27).

The author of this concept also dealt with the problem of the main social values that were the basis of the social effectiveness of law, thus formulating the hypothesis of the three modifiers of the law operation. The first independent variable was the content that the type of socio-economic system gives to legal regulation; the second was the type of subculture existing within a given socio-economic system; and the third was the type of personality of the recipient of a given rule (Podgórecki, 1966c: 7).

An example of uneasy relations between the development of socio-legal studies in Poland, the public and ethical engagement of their authors, and the political system within which those studies were carried out was provided by the methodology of socio-legal research and its theoretical foundation within sociological studies of law. Quite strikingly, functionalism provided such a theoretical basis and gave studies on law a new theoretical and methodological paradigm, after their initial rejection as a "bourgeois theory". Afterward, however, it became very fashionable to combine functionalism with Marxism, after adapting the positivistic and functionalist concept of law as an instrument of social change to functionalistic and systemic premises, with the stress on the educational function and effectiveness of law. Adoption of this paradigm roused political authorities' great interest in research on legal consciousness.

The positive reception of functionalism after its initial rejection may well be interpreted in the light of a political thesis that was especially popular in the propaganda of the 1970s: the thesis of the "political-moral unity" of the "developed socialist society". The ontological status of such a thesis was very unclear: often it was presented as actual reality in accord with Niklas Luhmann's propositions, but because party functionaries also had some doubts, there was a need to support or to construct such a unity. Hence stress was put on the abovementioned studies of legal and moral consciousness and on the educational function of law. Interest was directed to broad research on attitudes toward law, knowledge and opinions about law, and social deviance. But many sociologists of law in East-Central Europe, including Poland, used this interest to carry out unorthodox and critical research, producing some very interesting material.

The tensions that characterize the academic debate may also be analyzed as those that structure the "scientific field", because of the process of dominance/marginalization within an academic community. Such an analysis reveals new features of the production of theoretical concepts and of the interpretation of research data: official and unofficial pressures and power structures that contribute to the formation of the mainstream discourse and the main paradigms within a discipline. Here we can indicate the dominant theoretical and conceptual approaches, dominant discourses, and processes of marginalization of those concepts that do not conform to the dominant approach.

The obvious example of the structuring of the socio-legal research field in conformity with power relations determined by ideology is provided by the ideological domination described above. The supervision and control of research topics and political censorship within an academic community belonged to everyday scientific practice in the 1960s and 1970s, even though Poland, along with Hungary, was counted as one of the happier and freer barracks in the socialist camp. This was complemented by a degree of opportunism and even intellectual, political, and moral cowardice on the part of scientists, which was so interestingly described by Adam Podgórecki (Podgórecki, 1992). Even where this debate seemed free, some topics, like the legitimacy of law, were simply not discussed. The efforts to debate them were rebuked in Poland by an authoritative statement that "Polish theory of law has already said everything there is to say on the *validity* of law".

The field of socio-legal research is also structured by more subtle personal influences on the formation of paradigms and discourses and by personal loyalties that influence the development of a discipline and which still await proper investigation.

Considering the still hypothetical importance of such invisible factors in the mainstream socio-legal debate and their contribution to the development of mainstream theoretical approaches, it is interesting to note that some highly promising concepts were hardly incorporated in socio-legal debate in Poland and nowadays have been forgotten, for the most part.

The post-communist societies are confronted with the disappearance of the old system-thinking and with the emergence of multiple options, though these are fragile, unstable, and untried. The response to these options depends greatly on informed, enlightened debate and the capability to critically explore their consequences. They struggle with the political heritage and ideology of law as an uncontrolled, dictatorial political power's instrument deliberately used to transform whole societies and all social systems: economic, political, and cultural (Skąpska, 1994). They also look for new paradigms. Nowadays, such paradigms are promised by sociological theories on late modernity or post-modernity, theories oriented more toward social agency and discourse and that explore more subtle power relations, are influenced by cultural anthropology, or are informed by post-structuralist concepts of legal phenomenon that are less rigid, less hierarchical, and open to optional interpretations. Important for these studies are new ideas of the legal system as being characterized by contingency and growing complexity, with the overlapping of many partial and non-hierarchical systems. "The King's Many Bodies" proposition (Teubner, 1997: 763) reflects power decentralization and the overlapping of many heterarchical legal systems – national, local, international, and European – in forms of professional self-regulation, technical standardization, emerging international labor and corporate law, or the new Law Merchant. Apart from that, in the whole region of East-Central Europe, sociologists of law are faced with new challenges that result from the stress on strict and efficient legal expertise, the dominant economic approaches to law, and the political commitment to goals that do not seem to be critically debated. Among them are the transformation of post-communist law in a specific process of imitation and mixing and the implementation of *acquis communautaire* in hasty proceedings that often indeed recall the construction of a new Prince Potemkin's villages (6).[6]

In search of new concepts and methods: socio-legal studies after the collapse of communism

The symbolic year 1989 posed a serious challenge to socio-legal studies in Poland and elsewhere in East-Central Europe. It happened independently, but also maybe because of the great hopes for the rule of law and the revival of interest in the concept of the rule of law that East-Central European "peaceful revolutions" brought about worldwide. This era is commonly understood in terms of democracy or the market economy, but is has equally important legal dimensions. It was preceded by growing criticism of the dominant political ideology and the dominant functionalistic paradigms, but it succeeded in the astonishing initial revival of legal positivism and the simultaneous vanishing interest in studies of the social operation of law. Suffice it to say that the sociology of law, once obligatory, is currently an elective subject. The revival of legal positivism was accompanied by the seemingly deep and persisting belief in the written law as an instrument of social change, i.e., in the "new legalism" (Sajo, 1994), or "new instrumentalism" (Skąpska, 1992; Turska, 1992; Cywiñski, 2000). Such a "new" and naive legalism was often accompanied by the equally naive belief in the efficient implementation of legal institutions (developed in Western democracies) in societies experiencing overwhelming social change and dealing with the institutional and mental burden of the very recent totalitarian past. In the "institutional optimism" that is a part of naive legalism, Central Europe represents a "tabula rasa" to be filled by institutions and concepts brought in from outside in order to achieve the planned goals of a working democracy, an efficient market economy, a robust civil society, and the rule of law. Such institutional optimism was based on a crucial proposition, in whose light societies in this region are treated as "new savages" waiting for souvenirs and enlightenment (Sajo, 1997: 44 -49).

It is not astonishing that socio-legal scholars once again contest the dominant views and concepts of law. The arguments of governments, lawyers who work as experts for the government, parliamentary commissions, officials responsible for the implementation of *acquis communautaire*, and the more critical sociologists of law determine the current tensions and contradictions characteristic of legal studies after 1989. Criticism is predominantly of the discrepancy between the statutes and their application and of the still-existing symbolic and ritualized attitudes of lawmakers and politicians who still think merely changing statutes or putting the democratic legal state in the new constitutions means a shift in reality. The criticism questions their optimism, which results from their tacitly assumed sociological theories of social change and their still "systemic" views on law as something imposing itself on society without due consideration of mentalities, cultures, and interests. In contrast to this optimistic and simplified institutionalism, the more sophisticated, contemporary propositions are based on the assumption that there is no simple, linear directionality nor any ultimate goal in change. On the contrary, social change is often characterized by discontinuity and often involves crisis; nor is it inevitable or irreversible. Accordingly, some maintain that the history of post-communist societies – even if they adopt legal institutions promoting liberal constitutionalism, the protection of civil society, and the market economy – does not necessarily have a direction, much less a liberal one. All sorts of reversals and backlashes are possible, especially if the proponents of institutional reforms do not consider the societies' hopes and expectations (Alexander and Skąpska, 1994; Skąpska, 1996, in the broader context of Szacki, 1994). It is also argued that the naive belief in the law as an instrument of social change introduced "from above" or "from outside" into an empty space of post-communist societies is premature, and that what is going on takes place not "*on* the ruins of communism" but "*with* the ruins of communism". In this view, the remnants of the former system make the important contributions to the emerging new political and economic orders (Stark, 1992).

Let us glance at the new approaches and new methodology applied in research on "unofficial law" in *statu nascendi* and the processes of its formation in real life situations. This was the character, for instance, of the research on the formation of strictly observed and binding norms regulating actions of people queuing for rare commodities – the most frequent daily life situation of Poles in the 1980s (Kurczewski, 1985). Important are also studies of conflict resolution, with the stress on extra-legal norms influencing the definition of a conflict and its redefinition as a legal dispute; extra-legal arguments used in the conciliatory proceedings (Kurczewski , 1982; Borucka-Arctowa, 1988); and studies on legal and political socialization (Borucka-Arctowa and Kourilsky 1991). The methodology of these studies was based on in-depth interviews, analyses of documents, and participatory observation.

Within this broad context are some particularly pertinent questions. The first is about the very concept of law and the rule of law at the time of democratization; the second concerns the ability of law and legal institutions to deal with transformation, on the one hand, and with the legacies of the past, on the other. In this regard, the socio-legal debate in East-Central Europe, including in Poland, contributes to the general, worldwide debate on "legal institutions in crisis". The starting point here is the aforementioned critique of "new legalism" or "new instrumentalism". Dysfunctional consequences of such approaches to law were empirically explored and critically debated, even before the change, in a book published in Poland in 1988 (Turska and Łojko, 1988). Currently, the narrow, technocratic conceptualizations of law are juxtaposed with concepts that are relevant for the societies. There are ideas on law once nurtured by members of the democratic opposition, images of law characteristic of societies that experience a great transformation not only of political and legal systems, but of their life-worlds (Kurczewski, 1993; Priban, 1998). These took the form of the propositions of the Czech philosopher Jan Patocka that culture and tradition matter for law and put distinctive limitations on public activity, especially if this culture and tradition appeals to human rights as "a higher law" (Havel et al., 1985). Such proposals to involve culture and tradition in legal reasoning make us think more about the past, investigate past laws and values connected with them, and conduct research on the past verdicts of our supreme courts or constitutional tribunals as important limits on the visions of social change. The stress is put on the axiological component not only of the concept of the rule of law, but of the very concept of law as an important part of social culture (Kojder, 2000).

In these debates, the characteristic East-Central European ideas on law that were nurtured by the first socio-legal scholars return. They link legal studies with the studies on societal moral fabric: conceptualizations of rights, human dignity, and justice. However, as is also observed, another important feature of modern societies is the impact on lawmaking of lobbying groups, NGOs, and spontaneous social movements of civil society. These new developments seem to be both inevitable and benign, but the question arises how, after the collapse of communism, the social contract will be possible in the face of the pluralism of values and lifestyles and the increasing differentiation of collective interests. In light of this, the issue arises of legal certainty and legal security as the attributes of the principle of the rule of law, together with the issue of stable and reliable foundations for legislation, adjudication, and legitimacy of the democratic state ruled by law. In contemporary democracies, such stable foundations of the legal and political system are sought in the concept of inalienable human rights and in the principle of human dignity that is enshrined in many constitutions, notably in those proclaimed after the collapse of totalitarian or authoritarian regimes. This increasingly important approach to law takes inalienable human rights as the higher standards for evaluating the functioning of the democratic and the legal system, a final test measuring the quality of the democratic and legal order. The relationship between democracy and law in modern complex and pluralistic societies is analyzed and evaluated in terms of universal standards set off by human rights interpreted and applied in the changing social and differentiated cultural conditions of the modern world, quite in accord with the pre-1989 traditions (Kurczewski, 1993).

Furthermore, as maintained by socio-legal opponents of the dominant technocratic view of law, the increasingly technical character of legal reasoning and of the legal system, the growing complexity of democratic institutional arrangements characteristic of contemporary complex societies, and the increasing importance of the executive branch of government are challenged by the new developments and the emerging new ideas about democracy and law. First, one observes the growing importance of judicial review, above all of constitutional review, as controlling not only the application of the law in individual cases, but also the conformity of governmental decisions and parliamentary legislation with the constitution. Hence the proposal to study the interdependence of, and not only the separate processes of lawmaking or law application. Second, in accordance with the concepts and theories of Jürgen Habermas, which are very popular in East-Central Europe, stress is put on contemporary demands to interpret law in terms close to local experiences and the equal application of universal legal standards. Within this model, proceduralization also means growing stress on the role of constitutional courts and judicial review in general in relation to the political legislative process (Sajo, 1997, idem, 1999). Hence, the proposal to investigate the formation of democratic will in the form of a "grassroots constitutionalism" (Skąpska, 1999), to critically review constitutional law and constitutional adjudication from the perspective of its compatibility with the conditions of post-communist societies under transformation, and to study the formation of constitutional equity.

Hence the need for studies of institutions, first and foremost of the new, post-communist constitutions, to explore the conditions of the adaptation of liberal constitutional principles in the given cultural and social context. Kim Lane-Scheppele proposes new approach to constitutionalism, the constitutional ethnography based on sociological hermeneutic methods for sociologically informed research on post-communist constitutionalism.

The model of procedural democracy and of the proceduralization of law leaves some questions open. It also indicates the fragility of legal and political systems in modern democratic societies. In post-communist democracies, this fragility of the legal and state systems consists in the low level of law enforcement, usually analyzed as a consequence of a "weak state". So we need to study the application and enforcement of the law and the importance of extra-legal, i.e., organizational norms that contribute to the efficiency of the application of the law and the impact of the mentalities of its main agents – lawyers, judges, prosecutors, and civil servants – on this application. These issues are addressed in studies of the application of law in courts and governmental agencies and of the corruption of their officials.

Such studies oppose the dominant view of law as a "system" that imposes itself on passive functionaries. Systemic passivity is replaced by the assumption of pragmatic attitudes of legal professionals, public servants, and citizens and by the critical evaluations of individual and collective interests, values, and passions. These theoretical postulates consist in replacing the ritualistic activities of a "system's" puppets by real people who promote their own interests. Let us think of legal professionals as people who have personalities and characteristic features of courage or cowardice or opportunism, are well or not so well trained, more or less intelligent, more or less wise, and responsible for their decisions, judgments, and verdicts according to the principles of law. Such a theoretical and methodological turn, reflecting the more general pragmatic turn in sociological theory, prompts one to investigate the formation and application of law as reflecting the cultural, social, and individual properties of law's agents.

The challenge specific to post-totalitarian socio-legal studies is also connected with the procedures of the lustration and decommunization of lawyers, within the more general framework of issues of "facing the totalitarian past". In this way, very sensitive and sometimes strongly contested research on decommunization, lustration, and "dealing with the past" once more contributes to a growing awareness of the importance of applying the law and of basic legal principles in this sensitive sphere in which politics and law overlap (Łoś and Zybertowicz, 1999).

Next to the political transformation, the crucial change for these societies was brought about by the introduction of capitalism and the free market. One speaks here about a civilizing effect of law on social and individual activity, of taming anti-social passions, of promoting cooperation, and of protecting and promoting interests. In short, the change consists first in the recognition of the protective function of law, second, in the recognition of the necessity of legal regulations for mutual interactions, and third, in the recognition of the enabling, and not only restraining role of law in society and of the fact that sophisticated legal instruments are important for sophisticated entrepreneurial, financial, or political activities. Our empirical research already provides us with examples of the changing attitudes toward law characteristic of businessmen – a category of citizens for whom the importance of law but not necessarily obedience to it is growing (Turska, 1999; Skąpska, 2002). This change consists in the more pragmatic, down-to-earth, but also more demanding attitudes toward legal regulations. The law, especially private law, comes to be treated as kind of a toolbox from which one selects an instrument to use as needed, to one's own advantage. This change results in growing criticism of symbolic law and legal hypocrisy, perceived as violations of the abovementioned protective and enabling functions of law.

The most recent phase of development of socio-legal studies in Poland is also characterized by growing awareness of deficiencies of the traditional approach, which was based on the criticism of legal positivism and “official law”. This problem is presented in a research program titled “What Law Do Poles Need?” The question was raised whether the broad concept of law can still be paradigmatic for socio-legal research conducted in present-day Poland, or whether one should look for inspiration to the theory of Max Weber, connecting the development of a formal, rational law with the development of the market economy.

The question is all the more important, the more the development of informal networks, contrary to existing “official law”, and connections based on the *do ut des* principle are revealed by studies of the mechanisms of corruption (Kwasniewski and Kojder, 1979; Kwasniewski and Kojder, 1982; Kwasniewski, 1984; Kojder, 1995b), by studies on the impact of collective, vested interests on the functioning of the economy, especially the “second economy” (Łoś, 1989), and norms and rules as social capital important for the effective operation of law (Skąpska, 2002).

Concluding remarks

The transitional period in the development of socio-legal studies in Poland is certainly not finished yet. Conveners of these studies try to analyze the transformation of the political order, of the economy, and of the new constitution-formation processes and to define a place for law in the specific reconstitution of society after the collapse of communism. In this paper, I have tried to show how they respond to new challenges and how the traditional paradigms influence research, but also how they change. This report on Polish sociology of law, against the backdrop of the development of socio-legal studies elsewhere in East-Central Europe, is certainly not complete. Many other important studies have been conducted that were not discussed here, for instance the feminist studies of law, the comparative studies of legal and political socialization conducted in Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, France, Spain, the United States, and Russia, comparative studies of the formation of totalitarian law and its importance for the processes of transformation, and studies of values in law (Pałecki, ed., 1998). Considering the scope and range of these studies, one hopes that the great opportunity offered once more by the “natural historical laboratory” will enable the elaboration of new concepts and new theories of the social operation of law.

Socio-legal studies already contribute to the new conceptualization of law. In light of their results, we can speak of the legal system as a system of legal institutions, norms, and rules that are open-ended, polisemic, subject to interpretation, incoherent, and certainly imperfect. Under conditions of law’s growing complexity and contingency, as well as of growing social and political complexity, the actors face an even greater challenge – functionaries of law are no longer confronted with authoritative certainties, but with such principles as the margin of free interpretation, subsidiarity, the necessity of negotiating the meanings of legal concepts in the pluralistic reality of post-totalitarian societies, and the harmonization of laws from the bottom up rather than top down, in both the national and the international context. One possible interpretation is based on unquestioned relativism, another, more demanding one is commitment to the fundamental universal principles of law and justice, valid also in the changing conditions of late modernity and more specifically of post-communist reality: the principles that wrongs should be righted and crimes punished.

Therefore, the compatibility of the complex, contingent, and dynamic legal system with the complex, contingent, and dynamic society is deeply connected with the initial traditions and research methods developed by sociologists of law. Thanks to such traditions, socio-legal scholars are prepared for the search for new paradigms.

---

1 See Kojder and Kwaśniewski (1985), Skapska (1987), Kojder (1990), Kojder (1978).

2 See Kuhn (1962), Bourdieu (1975).

3 Extremely informative and insightful in this respect is the (indirect) controversy between two men, representing quintessentially different ideas of law: Leo Tolstoy, not only a prominent writer, but also a strong proponent of ideas praising the pure and uncorrupted Russian peasants, for whom the law symbolized the cynical justification of sheer and corrupted power, and Leon Petrażycki, a former student of law at German universities, proponent of the concept of law as being closely related to the education and formation of citizens (for a description of this controversy, see Kojder, 1993).

4 Apart of the strong solidarity bonds between participants in that forbidden private seminar, one learns about criticism leveled at Jerzy Lande by some of his students, when Lande was called to make public "self-criticism" in the presence of his colleagues and students at a meeting held on the Jagiellonian University (a public self-accusation combined with a promise of reformation) because of his wrong scientific opinions and teaching.

5 See Pogany "A New Constitutional Dis(order) for Eastern Europe" in: idem (eds.), 1995: 217 ff.

6 See the special issue of *East European Constitutional Review* under the characteristic title "The Ordeal of EU Enlargement" EECR, Vol. 9, No. 4, Fall 2000.

References

Alexander, Gregory and Skapska, Grażyna (1995): Introduction, in: *A Fourth Way? Privatization, Property and the Emergence of New market Economies*, Alexander, G. and Skapska, G. (eds.), London-New York, Routledge;

Borucka-Arctowa, Maria (1967): *O społecznym działaniu prawa* (On the Social Operation of Law), Warszawa, PWN;

Borucka-Arctowa, Maria (ed.) (1974): *Świadomość prawna robotników* (Legal Consciousness of Workers), Wrocław, Ossolineum,;

Borucka-Arctowa, Maria (1981): *Świadomość prawna a planowe zmiany społeczne* (Legal Consciousness and Planned Social Change), Wroclaw, Ossolineum,;

Borucka-Arctowa, Maria (ed.) (1982): *Społeczne poglądy na funkcje prawa* (Social Opinions on Functions of Law), Wroclaw, Ossolineum;

Borucka-Arctowa, Maria (ed.) (1988): *Ugoda sądowa* (Dispute Settlement), Wrocław, Ossolineum;

Borucka-Arctowa, Maria (1998): "Koncepcja sprawiedliwości proceduralnej i jej rola w okresie przemian systemu prawa. Analiza teoretyczna i funkcjonalna" (Concept of Procedural Justice and Its Role in the Period of Legal System Change. Theoretical and Functional Analysis), in: *Podstawy aksjologiczne prawa w procesie tranzycji* (Axiological Foundations of Law in the Process of Its Transition), Pałecki, K. (ed.), Kraków;

Borucka-Arctowa, Maria and Kourilsky, Chantal (1994): *Socjalizacja prawna* (Legal socialization), Warszawa;

Bourdieu, Pierre (1975): "The Specifity of the Scientific Field and the Social Condition of the Progress of Reason", in: *Social Science Information*, 14(6), 19-47;

Cywiński, Zbigniew (2000): "Zaniechana rewolucja. Rzecz o polskim prawie ostatniej dekady XX wieku" (Abandoned Revolution. On Polish law of XX. century last decade), in: *Prawo i ład społeczny* (Law and social order), *Festschrift for Professor Anna Turska*, Warszawa, Warsaw University Press;

Górecki, Jan (1970): *Rozwód. Studium socjologiczno-prawne* (Divorce. A Socio-legal Study), Warszawa, PWN (1965), English edition: Divorce in Poland. A Contribution to the Sociology of Law, The Hague, Mouton;

Kojder, Andrzej (1978): "Documentation. Sociology of Law in Poland. Selected Bibliography", in: *Sociologia del Diritto*, Ferrari, Vincenzo (ed.), Milano, Giuffre Editore

Kojder, Andrzej and Kwaśniewski, Jerzy (1985): The Development of Sociology of Law in Poland, in: *International Journal of the Sociology of Law,* Vol. 13, No. 3, 261-262;

Kojder, Andrzej (1988): "Dysfunkcjonalności kultury prawnej. Polskie doświadczenia lat ostatnich" (Disfunctionalities of Legal Culture. Poland's Experiences in Recent Years), in: *Studia Socjologiczne*, No. 2, 245-259;

Kojder, Andrzej (1990): "The Sociology of Law in Poland: Past and Present", in: *Developing Sociology of Law. A World-Wide Documentary Inquiry*, Ferrari, Vincenzo (ed.) Milano, Giuffre Editore, 632-659;

Kojder, Andrzej and Kwaśniewski, Jerzy (ed.) (1992): *Między autonomią i kontrolą* (Between Autonomy and Control), Warszawa, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Polskie Towarzystwo Socjologiczne;

Kojder, Andrzej (1993): Moc (nie)jest prawem (Force is (not) the law), in: *Prawo i życie*, 27.02.1993;

Kojder, Andrzej (2000): *Siła i godność prawa* (Dignity and Power of Law), Warszawa, Oficyna Naukowa;

Kojder, Andrzej (1995): "Corruption", in: *Crime Control in Poland*, Jasiński, J. and Siemaszko, A. (ed.), Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa;

Krygier, Martin (1999): "Institutional Optimism, Cultural Pessimism and the Rule of Law", in: *The Rule of Law After Communism*, Krygier, M. and Czarnota, A. (eds.), Ashgate, Dartmouth;

Kuhn, Thomas (1962): *The Structure of Scientifical Revolution*, Chicago, Chicago University Press;

Kurczewski, Jacek (1982): *Spór i sądy* (Dispute and the Tribunals), Warszawa, Institute of Social Prevention and Resocialization;

Kurczewski, Jacek (ed.) (1985): *Umowa o kartki* (Contract on Food Coupons), Warszawa, Institute of Social Prevention and Resocialization;

Kurczewski, Jacek (ed.) (1987): *Niedzica Castle Papers on Rights and Duties*, Warszawa, Institute of Social Prevention and Resocialization;

Kurczewski, Jacek (1992): "Na przełomie ustrojów. Prawa i obowiązki obywateli" (Breakthrough in the Social Order: Polish Public Opinion on Civic Rights and Duties), in: *Między autonomią i kontrolą*, Kojder, Andrzej and Kwaśniewski, Jerzy (eds.), Warszawa;

Kurczewski, Jacek (1991): "Rządy mroczne i krwawe" (On the gloomy and bloody reign), in: *Stalinizm* (Stalinism), Kurczewski, Jacek (ed.), Warszawa;

Kurczewski, Jacek (1993): *Resurrection of Rights in Poland*, Oxford, Clarendon Press;

Kwaśniewski, Jerzy and Kojder, Andrzej (1979): "Postawy mieszkańców Warszawy wobec zjawisk i zachowań dewiacyjnych" (Attitudes of Warsaw Inhabitants towards Deviant Behavior and Phenomena), in: *Studia Socjologiczne*, 1, 158-179;

Kwaśniewski, Jerzy (1984), *Society and Deviance in Communist Poland: Attitudes towards Social Control*, Berg, Leamington;

Kwaśniewski, Jerzy and Kojder; Andrzej (1982): "Social Perception of Deviance", in: *The Impact of Sociology of Law on Government Action*, Frankfurt-Bern, Peter Lang Verlag, 160-168;

Kwaśniewski, Jerzy (1992): "Ontologiczny status patologii społecznej" (How a Social Pathology Comes into Existence), in: *Między autonomią a kontrolą*, Kojder, Andrzej and Kwaśniewski, Jerzy (eds.), Warszawa;

Luhmann, Niklas (1990): *Political Theory in the Welfare State*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter;

Lenin, Vladimir (1964): "The State and Revolution", in: *Collected Works*, Moscow, Progress Publishers;

Łoś, Maria (1989): "From Underground to Legitimacy. The Normative Dilemmas of Post-Communist Marketization", in: *The Second Economy in Marxist State*, Los, M. (ed.), Hampshire, Macmillan;

Łoś, Maria and Zybertowicz, Andrzej (1999): "Is Revolution a Solution? State Crime in Communist and Post-Communist Poland (1980-1995)", in: *The Rule of Law After Communism*, Krygier, M. and Czarnota, A. (eds.), Ashgate, Dartmouth;

Oerkeny, Antal and Scheppele, Kim Lane (1999): "The Complexity of Legality in Hungary", in: *The Rule of Law After Communism*, Krygier, M. and Czarnota, A. (eds.), Dartmouth, Ashgate;

Paczolay, Peter (1999): "Traditional Elements in the Constitutions of Central and Eastern European Democracies", in: *The Rule of Law After Communism*, Krygier, M. and Czarnota, A. (eds.), Ashgate, Dartmouth;

Petrażycki, Leon (1959): *Teoria prawa i państwa w zwiazku z teorią moralności* (Theory of Law and State on Account of Thoey of Morality), PWN, Warszawa;

Petrażycki, Leon (1985): *O nauce, prawie i moralności. Pisma wybrane* (On Science, Law and Morality. Selected Writings), Licki, J. and Kojder, A. (eds.), Warszawa, PWN;

Podgórecki, Adam (1966a): *Zasady socjotechniki* (The Principles of Sociotechnics), Warszawa;

Podgórecki, Adam (1966b): *Prestiż prawa* (The Prestige of Law), Warszawa;

Podgórecki, Adam (1966c): "Three Modifiers of the Operation of Law", in: *Polish Sociological Bulletin*, 1;

Podgórecki, Adam (1969): *Patologia życia spolecznego* (Social Pathology), Warszawa, PWN;

Podgórecki, Adam (1971a): *Zarys socjologii prawa* (The Outline of the Sociology of Law), Warszawa, PWN;

Podgórecki, Adam et al. (1971b): *Poglądy społeczeństwa polskiego na moralność i prawo* (Opinions of the Polish Society on Morality and Law), Warszawa, KiW;

Podgórecki, Adam et al. (1975): *Zagadnienia patologii społecznej* (Problems of Social Pathology), Warszawa, PWN;

Podgórecki, Adam (1992): *Polish Society*, Westport, Praeger;

Pogany, Istvan (1995): "A New Constitutional (Dis)Order for Central Europe?", in: *Human Rights in Eastern Europe*, Pogany, I. (ed.), Aldershot, Edward Elgar;

Priban, Jiri (1999): "Legitimacy and Legality After Velvet Revolution", in: *The Rule of Law in Central Europe*, Priban, J. and Young, J., Dartmouth, Ashgate;
Sajo, Andras (1990): "New Legalism in East Central Europe: Law as an Instrument of Social Transformation", in: *Journal of Law and Society*, 17, 329;
Sajo, Andras (1996): "How the Rule of Law Killed Hungarian Welfare Reform", in: *East European Constitutional Review*, Vol. 5, No. 1;
Sajo, Andras (1997): "Universal Rights, Missionaries, Converts and "Local Savages", in: *East European Constitutional Review*, Vol. 6, No 1;
Sajo, Andras (1999): *Limiting Government. An Introduction to Constitutionalism*, New York, CEU Press;
Skąpska, Grażyna (1981): *Społeczne podłoże postaw wobec prawa* (Social Background of Attitudes towards Law), Wroclaw, Ossolineum;
Skąpska, Grażyna (1987): "Polish Sociology of Law. Polemics, Problems, Social Commitment", in: *Journal of Law and Society*, 3, 353-365;
Skąpska, Grażyna (1992): *Prawo i dynamika społecznych przemian* (Law and the dynamics of social change), Kraków, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellonskiego;
Skąpska, Grażyna (1994): "The Legacy of Anti-Legalism", in: *Marxism and Communism. Posthumous Reflections on Politics, Society, and Law*, Krygier, M. (ed.), Amsterdam-Atlanta, Rodopi, 199-218;
Skąpska, Grażyna (1996): "From Rights to Myths", in: *Western Rights? Post-communist Application*, Sajo, Andras (ed.), Amsterdam, Kluwer;
Skąpska, Grażyna (1999): "Paradigm Lost? The Constitutional Process in Poland and the Hope of a 'Grass Roots Constitutionalism'", in: *The Rule of Law After Communism*, Krygier, M. and Czarnota, A. (eds.), Dartmouth, Ashgate,;
Skąpska, Grażyna (2000): *Overlapping Legalities in the Process of Reprivatization in Poland*, Working Paper No. 2, mimeo;
Skąpska, Grażyna (2002): "Kultura prawna polskich przedsiębiorców" (Legal Culture of Entrepreneurs), in: *Boddenbrookowie czy piracy* (Buddenbrooks or Pirates?), Skąpska, G. (ed.), Kraków, Universitas;
Stark, David (1992): "Can Designer Capitalism Work in Central and Eastern Europe", in: *Transition*, Vol. 3, No. 5;
Szacki, Jerzy (1994): *Liberalizm po komunizmie* (Liberalism after Communism), Kraków, Znak;
Teubner, Gunther (1997): "The King's Many Bodies: The Self-Deconstruction of Law's Hierarchy", in: *Law and Society Review*, Vol. 31, No. 4;
Turska, Anna (1982): *Samorządność osiedlowa. Studium empiryczne* (Municipal Government. An Empirical Study), Warszawa, Książka i Wiedza;
Turska, Anna and Łojko, Elżbieta (ed.) (1988): *Kultura prawna i dysfunkcjonalności prawa* (Legal Culture and Disfunctionalities of Law), Warszawa, Warsaw University;
Turska, Anna (1992): "Dynamika ładu normatywnego w społeczeństwie posttotalitarnym" (Dynamics of Legal Order in Posttotalitarian Society), in: *Prawo w zmieniającym się społeczeństwie* (Law in a Changing Society), *Festschrift for Professor Maria Borucka-Arctowa*, Kraków;
Turska, Anna (1999): "Biznesmeni i ich wizerunki prawa" (Businessmen and their images of law), in: *Społeczne wizerunki prawa* (Social images of law), Turska, Anna (ed.), Warszawa, Biblioteka Studia Iuridica.

Index

User Note

The index structure corresponds to the country structure of the volume. Institutions relevant to the three disciplines in question are sorted by country and stem only from country reports (institutions named in other contributions are not included in the Index). The Index includes those institutions that were important for the development of the discipline before 1990 and during the ’90s. The main focus, however, was on the last decade. In most cases, institutions that do not exist anymore were not included in the Index because it was not always possible to verify their historical names. Public and private institutions as well as administrative and supporting institutions were included. Due to the problem of translation, one institute may appear under more than one name, though we tried to avoid such oversights. Departments and similar sub-institutions were subordinated to their higher units. In some cases, we thought another attribute of the respective institution more important (e.g., the proper name, e.g. Charles University, Prague) and favored it for the index entry. For a complete review please confer the CD-ROM.

In contrast to the Institution Index, the Person Index is structured alphabetically and includes all persons mentioned in all contributions, except persons mentioned in tables, references, or selected bibliographies. However, such an approach seems somewhat unjust, because the structure of the reports strongly differs: some authors named many persons in the text, while others preferred to mention them in the references and bibliographies. To get a complete picture of all persons the reader is referred to all the three sources. In rare cases, the authors did not supply the first names of the persons mentioned in their contributions. If we were not able to identify them, they do not appear in the Index.

Institutions

Bulgaria

Academy for Social Sciences and Social Management **36**, **213**
Agency for Economic Analysis and Forecasts **41**
Agricultural Academy **42**
Alpha Research **217**, **397**
ASSA-M **397**
Balkan Near East Institute of Political Sciences **35**
BBSS Gallup Bulgaria **217**
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences **34**, **36**, **38**, **42**, **214**, **215**, **218**, **387**
  Institute of Contemporary Social Theories **213**, **214**
  Institute of Economics **36**, **38**, **41**, **42**, **43**
  Institute of International Affairs **214**
  Institute of International Relations **213**
Bulgarian Economic Society **35**
Bulgarian National Bank (BNB) **38**
Bulgarian Political Science Association **213**, **214**, **216**, **222**
Bulgarian Sociological Association **386**, **387**
Center for Social Practices **215**, **222**
Center for the Study of Democracy **215**
Economic Commission for Europe **36**
Economic University, Varna **43**
European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) **222**
European Political Science Network **222**
European Union (EU) **39**, **40**, **44**, **45**, **222**, **392**, **393**, **396**, **398**, **399**, **401**
Gallup International **397**
GfK **397**
High School of Business, Svishtov **35**
High School of Business, Varna **35**
Institute for International and Regional Studies **215**
Institute for Political and Legal Studies **215**
Institute of Culture **387**
Institute of International Relations and Socialist Integration **38**, **41**
Institute of Political Studies, Paris **215**
Institute of Trade Union Problems **387**, **390**
Institute of Youth Studies **387**, **390**, **397**
International Federation of Social Science Organizations **387**
International Labor Organization **36**
International Political Science Association (IPSA) **213**, **222**
International Social Science Council **387**

International Sociological Association (ISA) **387**
Market Test **397**
MBMD **397**
Ministry of Agriculture **42**
Ministry of Finance **38**
National Agency for Evaluation and Accreditation (NAEA) **38**, **42**
National Archive of Sociological Studies **387**
National Center for Study of Public Opinion **397**
National Fund for Scientific Research **399**
NATO **44**, **221**
New Bulgarian University, Sofia **215**, **218**
Open Society Foundation **399**
SABRE Foundation **44**
Sova-Harris **217**, **397**
St. Cyril and Methodius University, Veliko Tirnovo **42**, **215**
UNESCO **399**, **401**
United Nations (UN) **36**
University for National and World Economy **222**
University of Sofia **213**, **214**, **215**, **218**, **387**, **388**
- Department of History and Theory of Politics **213**
- Department of Political Theory **215**
- Faculty of Philosophy **215**
- Laboratory of the Study of Bulgarian Political Life **216**
- Statistical Institute for Business Studies **35**

Vitosha Research **397**
Volkswagen Foundation **44**
World Bank **399**

Czech Republic

Association for the Study of International Relations (ASIR) **238**, **239**
Austrian Imperial Council **51**
Austrian Institute for Economic Research **54**
Bratislava School of Economics **59**
British Know How Fund **414**
Center for Public Opinion Research **413**
Center for Social and Economic Strategies **417**
Central and East European International Studies Association (CEEISA) **239**
Central European Political Science Association (CEPSA) **239**
Central European University (CEU), Budapest **233**
Charles University, Prague **52**, **55**, **56**, **59**, **227**, **228**, **230**, **235**, **239**, **245**
- Center for Economic Research and Graduate Education (CERGE) **55**, **56**, **60**, **239**
- Center for the Social and Economic Strategies **413**
- Department of Informatics and Operations Research, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics **54**
- Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts **413**
- Faculty of Law **51**, **230**
- Faculty of Social Sciences **58**, **407**, **409**, **413**, **417**
- Grant Agency **58**, **414**
- Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences **56**

College of Public Administration and International Relations, Prague **235**
Czech Academy of Sciences **54**, **56**, **407**, **413**, **418**
- Economics Institute **56**
- Graduate School of the Institute of Economics **53**
- Grant Agency **58**, **414**
- Institute of Economics **53**, **54**, **55**, **56**, **58**
- Institute of Forecasting **54**, **55**
- Institute of Sociology **239**, **407**, **408**, **409**, **413**

Czech Economic Society **59**
Czech National Bank **58**
Czech Political Science Association (CPSA) **236**, **237**, **238**
Czech Society for Operations Research **59**
Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences
- Institute of Philosophy and Sociology **406**
- Institute of Public Opinion Research **406**, **407**
- Institute of Sociology **406**

Institute of the State and Law **228**
Oriental Institute **228**
Czechoslovak Association of Political Science **228**
European Commission **414**
European Political Science Network **239**
European Union (EU) **56**, **234**, **237**, **239**, **415**, **416**
Ford Foundation **414**
Friedrich Ebert Foundation **414**
Government Committee for Research (GCR) **59**
Grant Agency of the Czech Republic (GACR) **58**, **414**
Hlavka Foundation **58**
Institute of Economics
Laboratory of Mathematical Economics **54**
Institute of International Relations (IIR), Prague **230**, **231**, **237**
International Institute for Political Studies (IIPS), Brno **230**, **231**, **236**, **237**
International Political Science Assiociation (IPSA) **228**, **238**
International Sociological Association (ISA) **405**
Jan Masaryk Centre of International Studies **230**
Lawrence University, Appleton **231**
Masaryk University, Brno **227**, **230**, **231**, **232**, **235**, **239**
Department of Political Science of the School of Social Studies **232**
Faculty of Law **230**
Faculty of Social Studies **407**, **409**, **413**
Ministry of Education, Youth and Physical Culture **417**
Ministry of Finance **58**
Ministry of Foreign Affairs **231**, **417**
Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs **417**
Ministry of Regional Development **417**
Ministry of the Interior **417**
NATO **234**
New York University **235**
New York University, Prague **235**
Open Society Fund **414**
Osteuropa-Institut, Munich **54**
Palacký University, Olomouc **239**, **405**
Department of Political Science and European Studies **230**
Political Science Association (PSA) **240**
Prague School of Economics **58**, **59**
Department of Econometrics **54**
Rockefeller Brothers Fund **414**
School of Political and Social Sciences, Prague **228**
Sociological Data Archive **413**
University of Appleton **229**
University of Economics, Prague **230**, **239**
Faculty of International Relations **230**, **239**
University of Edmonton **54**
University of Frankfurt/Main (J.W. Goethe) **54**
University of Groningen **229**, **231**
University of Hagen (Fernuniversität) **54**
University of Lancaster **54**
University of Pittsburgh **56**, **229**
University of Reading **54**
University of St. Gallen **54**
University of Stockholm **54**
US Agency for International Development (USAID) **56**, **60**
Vienna Institute of International Economic Comparisons **54**
Volkswagen Foundation **414**

Estonia

Academy of Sciences of Estonian SSR
Institute of Economics **65**
Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law **250**
Academy of Sciences of the USSR **71**
Central Institute of Mathematical Economics **66**
AS EMOR **427**
Bank of Estonia **65**, **66**
Center for International Economic Growth (ICEG) **75**
Central European University (CEU), Budapest **75**
College of Bentley **76**
Columbia University, New York **250**
Computing Center of Radio Estonia **254**

Council of European Social Science Data Archives (CESSDA) **428**
ES Market Research **427**
Estonian Academy of Sciences **65**, **66**, **73**, **76**, **254**, **427**, **428**
  Institute of Economics **250**
Estonian Agricultural Academy **68**
Estonian Agricultural University
  Department of Agricultural Accounting and Statistics, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences **68**
  Department of Mathematical Economics, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences **68**
  Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences **65**, **68**, **69**
Estonian Institute of Agrarian Economics (Saku) **68**
Estonian Science Council **65**
Estonian Science Foundation **71**, **72**, **253**
Estonian Social Science Data Archives (ESSDA) **254**, **255**, **428**
EU Information Agency **255**
European Commission **251**
European Union (EU) **69**, **71**, **72**, **74**, **76**, **250**, **253**, **254**, **427**, **430**, **433**
Finnish Institute of National Economy (VATT) **75**
Gallup **427**
GESIS **428**
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
  Institute of Economics **75**
  Institute of Global Economics **75**
Institute of Foreign Affairs, Tallinn **250**, **255**
Institute of International Studies and Social Science (RASI) **428**
International Association for Evaluation of Educational Achievements **252**
International Sociological Association (ISA) **426**
Ministry of Agriculture **68**
Ministry of Education **66**, **72**, **253**, **428**
Ministry of Social Affairs **428**
Nordic Council **76**
Open Estonia Foundation **254**, **255**, **428**
Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) **251**
Pedagogical University, Tallinn **249**, **252**, **253**, **256**, **428**
  Department of Government **251**, **252**
  Institute of International and Social Studies (IISS) **248**, **249**, **250**, **251**, **253**, **431**
Polish Academy of Sciences
  Institute of Economic Sciences **75**
  Institute of System Research **75**
Research Institute of the Finnish Economy (ETLA) **75**
SAAR Poll **427**
Soros Foundation **249**
Soviet Sociological Association **426**
Statistical Office of Estonia **427**, **428**
Technical University, Tallinn **249**, **251**, **428**
  Estonian Institute of Economics **65**, **66**, **67**, **73**, **74**, **75**
  Faculty of Economics and Business Administration **65**, **69**
UNESCO **251**
United Nations (UN) **251**
United Nations Development Agency **251**
University College Galway **251**
University of Aarhus **248**
University of Connecticut **249**
University of Helsinki **251**
University of Jyväskyla **251**
University of Manchester **251**
University of Michigan **251**
University of Oslo **248**, **249**, **251**, **252**
  Department of Politial Science **249**
University of Tampere **251**
University of Tartu **249**, **250**, **252**, **253**, **254**, **255**, **425**, **426**, **427**, **428**, **429**, **431**, **432**
  Department of Philosophy **247**
  Department of Philosophy and Political Science **249**
  Department of Political Science **249**, **250**
  Department of Public Administration and Social Policy **250**, **251**
  Department of Sociology **431**
  Faculty of Economics and Business Administration **65**, **67**, **68**, **75**, **76**
  Faculty of Social Sciences **249**, **250**, **428**
  Laboratory of Sociology **425**
University of Toronto **250**

University of Turku **255**
University of Umea **252**
University of Uppsala **251**, **255**
University of York **75**

Hungary

American Economic Association **93**
American Political Science Association (APSA) **264**
Budapest School of Economics **265**, **266**, **268**, **269**
Department of Political Science **264**, **266**, **271**
Hungarian Center for Democracy Studies **269**
Budapest University of Economics (BUES) **85**, **438**, **439**, **446**
Department of Sociology **442**, **447**
Budapest University of Economics and Public Administration (BUESPA) **85**, **86**, **93**
Central European University (CEU), Budapest **86**, **259**, **266**, **267**, **269**, **270**, **271**
Department of Political Science **264**, **271**
Club of Rome **93**
College of Communication, Budapest **267**
Collegium Budapest **271**
Committee for Economic Reform **88**
Council of European Social Sciences Data Archives (CESSDA) **446**
Econometric Society **91**, **93**
Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE), Budapest **265**, **439**, **446**
Department of Political Science **270**, **271**
Faculty of State and Law **265**, **266**, **268**, **269**, **270**, **271**
Instiute of Sociology **438**
Political Science Institute **265**
European Association for Comparative Economic Studies **93**
European Consortium of Sociological Research (ECSR) **447**
European Economic Association **91**, **93**
European Federation of Industrial and Production Management Associations **93**
European Political Science Network **271**
European Sociological Association (ESA) **447**
European Union (EU) **86**, **88**, **90**, **92**, **94**, **95**, **96**, **258**, **263**, **265**, **267**, **271**
Financial Research Inc. **87**
Fulbright Foundation **264**
Gallup **270**, **439**
GESIS **441**
GKI Economic Research Institute **87**
Gyula Andrássy University, Budapest **267**
Hungarian Academy of Sciences **84**, **86**, **87**, **93**, **95**, **260**, **266**, **437**, **438**
Institute of Economics **84**
Institute of Foreign Affairs **266**
Institute of Political Science **260**, **266**, **268**, **269**, **270**, **447**
Institute of Regional Studies **266**
Sociological Committee **439**
Hungarian Economic Association (HEA) **94**
Hungarian Political Science Association (HPSA) **258**, **260**, **267**, **268**, **269**, **271**
Hungarian Sociological Association **439**, **446**, **447**
Institute for Economic Growth **87**
Institute for Economic Research **88**
Institute for Financial Research **87**
Institute for Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna **271**
Institute for Party History **259**
Institute for Social Sciences **259**
Institute for World Economy **88**
Institute of Political History **259**, **260**, **269**, **270**
Institute of the 1956 Revolution **259**, **269**
International Association of Economic Historians **93**
International Economic Association **93**
International Political Science Association (IPSA) **258**, **268**, **271**
International Sociological Association (ISA) **447**
Károli Gáspár University, Budapest **259**
King Sigmundus University, Budapest **267**

Kopint-Datorg Economic Research **87**
Marketing **270**
Media **270**
Medián **267**, **439**
Ministry of Education **266**, **444**, **446**
Modus **270**
National Bank of Hungary **87**
National Foundation for Scientific Research (OTKA) **444**, **446**
NATO **258**, **267**
New School of Social Research, New York **262**
Open Society Foundation **267**
Open Society Institute **271**
Open University **271**
Péter Pázmány Catholic University **83**, **259**
Rudolf Andorka Social Science Society **439**, **446**
Soros Foundation **260**, **271**
Századvég-Budapest School of Politics **266**, **267**, **269**
Szonda-Ipsos **267**, **270**, **439**
TÁRKI **267**, **270**, **271**, **439**, **442**, **446**, **447**
Technical University, Budapest **86**
TREND Forecast Group **87**
University of California **262**
University of Connecticut **262**
University of Miskolc **265**, **266**
University of Szeged **265**
World Federation for Sourcing and Management **94**

Latvia

Academia Petrina, Jelgava **102**, **103**
Academy of Culture **457**
Academy of Sciences of the USSR **106**
Association of Literature and Art **103**
Association of Scientists **108**, **109**
Baltic Data House (BDH) **114**, **457**, **460**, **462**
Institute of Social Sciences **457**
Baltic International Center for Economic Policy Studies (BICEPS) **111**, **115**
Baltic Media Facts **457**
Baltic Russian Institute **111**
Baltic Social Research Center **114**
Baltic Sociological Association **453**
Baltic Strategic Center **278**
Baltic Studies Center **457**
Bank of Latvia **111**
Banking College of Higher Education **111**
British Council **281**
Brussels Free University **279**
Business Institute RIMPAK, Livonia **111**
Center for European and Transition Studies **111**
Center for Human Rights and Ethnic Studies **278**
Central Department of Literature (Glavlit) **105**
Council of Higher Education **109**
Cultural Capital Fund **112**, **114**
Danish Research Council **108**
Daugavpils Pedagogical University **111**
Deputy Commission on Education, Science, and Culture **109**
European Commission **107**, **110**, **117**, **458**
European Union (EU) **112**, **113**, **114**, **116**, **117**, **281**, **461**
Finnish Gallup Media **457**
Free University Berlin **281**
German-Latvian Social Science Center, Riga **281**
Higher Education Institution for Economics and Culture **111**
Institute of Social Technology **111**
International Institute of Practical Psychology **114**
International Monetary Fund **107**
Konrad Adenauer Foundation **280**
Latvian Academy of Agricultural and Forestry Sciences (LAAFC) **109**
Latvian Academy of Sciences **102**, **104**, **105**, **108**, **109**, **111**, **112**, **114**, **115**, **280**, **281**, **453**, **454**, **456**
Institute of Economics **104**, **105**, **112**, **114**, **115**
Latvian Agriculture Academy, Jelgava **104**, **106**, **108**
Latvian Council of Science **108**, **109**, **112**, **113**, **115**, **456**, **457**, **459**, **461**, **462**
Latvian Development Agency **111**
Latvian Facts **457**

Latvian Institute of International Affairs **278**, **280**
Latvian Intelligentsia Union **114**
Latvian Social Science Data Archive (LSZDA) **462**
Latvian Sociological Association **461**, **462**
Latvian State University, Riga **453**
Department of Applied Sociology **452**
Latvian Telecommunication Association **114**
Lillehammer University College **279**
Maria Skłodowska-Curie University, Lublin **458**
Ministry of Economics **112**, **113**
Ministry of Education, Culture and Science **109**, **110**, **112**
Ministry of Finance **113**
Department of Macroeconomic Analysis **111**
National Defense College of Sweden
Department of Strategic Studies **280**
NATO **281**
Nicholas Copernikus University, Toruń **458**
Pedagogical Higher School, Liepaja **111**
Polytechnic Institute, Riga **103**
Research Council of Norway Scholarships **281**
Rezekne Higher School **111**
Riga Business School **111**
Riga Institute of International Economics **111**
Riga International College of Economics and Business Administration **111**
Riga Polytechnic Institute **103**, **453**
School of Business Administration Turiba **110**, **114**
Socially Correlative Data Systems **457**
Soros Foundation **112**, **458**, **461**
Soros Fund Latvia **280**
Soviet Sociological Association **453**
Stockholm Institute of Transition Economics (SITE) **115**
Stockholm School of Economics, Riga **110**, **112**
Swansea University College **279**
Technical University, Riga **110**
UNESCO **458**, **464**, **465**
University of Aarhus **279**
University of Agriculture, Jelgava **111**, **457**
University of Daugavpils **458**
University of Latvia, Riga **103**, **104**, **106**, **108**, **110**, **111**, **115**, **275**, **276**, **278**, **279**, **280**, **454**, **457**
Academic Social Sciences Association **454**
Department of Philosophy **458**
Department of Political Science **278**, **279**
Faculty of Economy and Law Sciences **103**
Institute of Philosophy and Sociology **278**, **457**, **461**, **462**
Institute of Social Sciences **454**
University of Massachusetts **278**
University of Oslo **279**, **280**
Department of Political Science **279**
University of Umea **279**
Ventspils College **111**
Vidzeme College of Higher Education, Valmiera **111**, **278**
Department of Political Science **279**
Volkswagen Foundation **281**
World Bank **105**, **107**, **110**, **459**

Lithuania

Algirdas Brazauskas Foundation **292**
Baltic International Center for Economic Policy Studies (BICEPS) **132**
Baltic Surveys **290**
Bank of Lithuania **130**
Monetary Policy Department **128**
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) **126**
Center for Nonviolent Action **292**
Center of Political Information and Analysis **292**
Center of Strategic Studies **291**
Council of the Baltic Sea States **131**
DAAD - German Academic Exchange Service **297**
European Economic Association **132**
European Sociological Association (ESA) **479**
European Union (EU) **130**, **131**, **290**, **293**, **295**, **296**, **297**, **298**, **474**, **480**
Free Market Institute **471**

Friedrich Naumann Foundation **293**
Hamline University **297**
Institute of Democratic Politics **291**
Institute of Economic Planning and Research, State Planning Committee of Lithuania **127**
Institute of Economics and Privatization **127**
Institute of Economics, Vilnius **127**
Institute of Labor and Social Research **475**, **478**
Institute of Scientific Research of Social Sciences (INION) **122**
International Political Science Association (IPSA) **292**, **297**
International School of Management, Kaunas **127**
International Sociological Association (ISA) **479**
Kaunas Polytechnic Institute
- Sociological Research Laboratory **467**

Konrad Adenauer Foundation **292**
Law University, Vilnius
- Department of Political Science **291**

Lithuanian Academy of Agriculture **125**
- Research Institute of Agriculture **125**

Lithuanian Academy of Sciences **477**
- Department of Philosophy, Sociology and Law **467**
- Institute of Economics **124**
- Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law **471**, **478**
- Lithuanian Institute of Philosophy and Sociology **471**, **476**, **478**

Lithuanian Banking, Insurance and Finance Institute, Vilnius **128**
Lithuanian Department of Statistics, Vilnius **128**, **129**, **471**, **473**, **478**
Lithuanian Human Rights Center **471**
Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics, Vilnius **128**
Lithuanian Institute of the Economic Planning and Research **125**
Lithuanian Institute of the Free Market Economy **128**, **130**
Lithuanian Political Science Association (LPSA) **292**
Lithuanian Political Science Network **289**
Lithuanian Scientific Fund **476**
Lithuanian Sociological Association **479**
Lithuanian State Science and Studies Foundation **298**
London School of Economics **121**
Military Academy
- Department of Political Science **291**

Ministry of Economy **131**
Ministry of Foreign Affairs **295**, **298**
Municipal Training Center, KTU **297**
National Democratic Institute **297**
Open Society Fund Lithuania **126**, **297**, **476**
Pedagogical University, Vilnius
- Department of Political Science and Sociology **291**

Political Research Center **295**
Social Information Center **290**
Soros Foundation **126**
State Planning Committee of Lithuania
- Institute of Economic Planning and Research **125**

State Science and Studies Fund of Lithuania **476**
Swedish Institute **297**
Technical University, Vilnius
- Faculty of Business Management **127**

Thames Valley University **297**
Theological Seminary, Kaunas **469**
University of Bergen **291**, **297**
University of Florida **291**
University of Kansas **291**
University of Klaipėda **290**, **477**
- Department of Political Science **290**
- Faculty of Social Sciences **127**

University of Latvia **131**
University of Linköping **290**
University of Šiauliai
- Faculty of Social Sciences **127**

University of Tartu **131**
University of Technology (KTU), Kaunas **130**, **291**, **292**, **295**
- Faculty of Economics and Management **127**
- Faculty of Social Sciences **127**
- Policy and Public Administration Institute **291**, **298**
- Public Administration Department **291**

University of Uppsala **297**

University of Vilnius **121**, **124**, **125**, **130**, **286**, **287**, **288**, **289**, **290**, **292**, **297**, **298**
- Faculty of Economic Cybernetics and Finance **124**
- Faculty of Economics **127**
- Faculty of Industrial Planning **124**
- Faculty of Law **288**
- Faculty of Trade **124**
- Institute of Eastern European Research (IEER) **286**
- Institute of International Relations and Political Science (IIRPS) **289**, **290**, **292**, **293**, **295**, **296**, **297**, **298**
- International Business School **127**
- Kaunas Faculty of Humanities **127**, **130**
- Laboratory of Sociological Research **478**
- School of Political Science **286**
- Sociological Research Laboratory **467**

US Agency for International Development (USAID) **130**
Vilmorus **290**
Vilnius Bank **130**, **131**
- Economic Research Team **128**

Vilnius Institute of Engineering and Building **125**
Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas **121**, **286**, **287**, **290**, **291**, **294**, **297**, **477**
- Department of Political Science **290**, **291**
- Faculty of Economics and Management **127**
- Institute of Political Science and Diplomacy **290**, **291**

West Point Military Academy **291**
Women's Information Center **471**

Poland

Academy for Social Sciences **484**, **486**
Academy of Political Science **307**
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań **484**
Adam Smith Research Center, Warsaw **144**
American Council of Learned Societies **484**
American Political Science Association (APSA) **209**, **318**
Batory Foundation **317**
British Political Science Association **318**
Catholic University, Lublin **143**
Center for Media Research **484**
Center for Public Opinion Research (OBOP) **484**
Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) **144**, **316**, **317**
Central European Political Science Association (CEPSA) **318**
Central European University (CEU), Budapest **486**
Central Statistical Office **143**
Committee of Futures Studies Poland2000Plus **143**
Congress of Democratic Liberals **144**
Economic Council **138**
European Association of Evolutionary Economics **146**
European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) **318**
European Political Science Network **318**
European Science Foundation (ESF) **318**
European Sociological Association (ESA) **495**
European Union (EU) **141**, **314**, **318**, **497**
Ford Foundation **144**, **484**
Friedrich Ebert Foundation **486**
Fulbright Foundation **484**
Gdańsk Institute for Market Economics (IBnGR) **144**
German Marshall Fund **144**
High School of Political Science, Warsaw **307**
Independent Self-Governed Trade Union Solidarity **139**
Information Processing Center **496**
Institute for Basic Problems of Marxism-Leninism **484**, **486**
Institute of Eastern Affairs, Wilno **307**
Institute of Public Affairs **316**, **317**
International Labour Organization **136**
International Political Science Association (IPSA) **317**, **318**
International Sociological Association (ISA) **485**, **495**
Jagiellonian University, Cracow **136**, **307**, **308**, **309**, **484**

KARTA Center Foundation **316**
Łódź Society of Science and Letters **494**
London School of Economics **136**
Main School of Economics, Warsaw **137**, **143**, **147**
Main School of Planning and Statistics **137**, **139**
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin **484**
Mazurian University, Olsztyn **312**
Ministry of Education **143**
Ministry of Foreign Affairs **316**
Ministry of Higher Education **308**
Ministry of Labor and Social Policy **311**
Nicholas Copernicus University, Toruń **484**
Philadelphia Institute for Scientific Information **495**
Polish Academy of Sciences **143**, **310**, **314**, **315**, **316**, **486**
  Committee of Political Science **314**, **317**
  Committee on Sociology **486**, **494**, **497**
  Institute of Economic Sciences **143**, **147**
  Institute of Philosophy and Sociology **306**, **310**, **315**, **486**, **488**, **491**, **493**, **494**
  Institute of Political Studies **310**, **315**, **494**
Polish Association of Political Science **307**, **317**
Polish Economic Society **145**
Polish Political Science Association **308**, **317**, **318**
Polish Society of Political Studies **317**
Polish Sociological Association **308**, **485**, **486**, **487**, **488**, **497**
Polish Sociological Institute **308**, **494**
Public Opinion Research Center (CBOS) **484**, **496**
School of Entrepreneurship and Management **143**
Silesian University, Katowice **484**
  Institute of Sociology **488**
Society of Polish Economists **145**
Society of Political Science **307**
Soros Foundation **144**, **486**
State Committee for Scientific Research (KBN) **486**, **496**
Transparency International **489**
UNESCO **143**
University Council for Economic and Management Education Transfer (UCEMET) **146**
University of Chicago **136**
University of Gdańsk **484**
University of Łódź **484**
  Economic Faculty **147**
  Institute of Sociology **488**
University of Lwów **307**
University of Poznań **307**
University of Szczecin **484**
University of Warsaw **137**, **147**, **312**, **315**, **484**, **491**, **493**
  Center of European Studies **315**
  Economic Faculty **144**
  Institute of Applied Social Sciences **315**
  Institute of Social Studies **496**
  Institute of Sociology **315**, **488**
  Migration Research Center **493**
University of Wilno **307**
University of Wrocław **484**
Warsaw School of Economics **311**
Warsaw Stock Exchange **140**, **144**
Washingtonian Freedom House **144**
World Bank **140**, **142**, **147**, **148**, **149**

Romania

Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest **155**, **156**, **157**, **158**, **161**, **162**
  Center of Economic Calculation and Economic Cybernetics **155**
  Economics Department **156**, **157**, **162**
  Management Seminar **156**
Academy of Political and Social Sciences **324**
Ann Arbor University, Michigan **503**
Association of Romanian Sociologists **511**
Austrian School of Economics **159**
Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj **158**, **328**, **329**, **331**, **337**
  Academic Center for Social Studies **329**
  Department of European Studies **328**
  Department of Political Science **328**, **329**, **334**, **336**
  Department of Political Science and Public Administration **330**
  Department of Sociology **512**
Banatul University, Timişoara **329**
Bertelsmann Foundation **161**

Bogdan Vodă University, Baia Mare **329**
Department of Political Science **329**
Center for Economic Policies **158**
Center for Legislative and Constitutional Policy (COLPI), Budapest **161**
Center for Political Studies and Comparative Analysis (CPSCA) **333**
Center for Public Policy **158**
Center for Urban Sociology (CURS) **331**
Christian University Dimitrie Catemir, Bucharest **329**
Economic Forecast Institute **159**
European Commission **161**
European Institute of Romania **162**
European Union (EU) **160**, **161**, **162**, **510**, **512**
Ford Foundation **161**
Foundation for the Development of the Civic Society **161**
Foundation Minoritas **512**
Freedom House **161**
General Association of the Economists of Romania **157**
General Directorate for Statistics **502**
Governmental Department of Public Information **337**
Institute for Economic Research **502**
Institute for Financial and Monetary Researches **160**
Institute for Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna **161**
Institute for Human Studies, USA **159**
Institute for International Economics **160**
Institute for Marketing and Surveys (IMAS) **331**
Institute for National Economy **155**
Institute for Prognosis **160**
Institute for Quality of Life Research **160**
Institute National de la Jeunesse et de l'Education Populaire, Paris **512**
Institute of Agricultural Economics **160**
Institute of European Studies **158**
Institute of Hygiene **502**
Institute of Industry Economics **160**
Institute of Liberal Studies **158**, **161**
Institute of Moral and Political Sciences **323**
Institute of National Economy **160**, **161**
Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations **329**, **330**
Institute of Social Theory **329**, **333**, **336**
IRIS Center Romania **161**
Lucian Blaga University, Sibiu **328**
Ludwig von Mises Institute **159**
MetroMediaTransilvania **331**
Ministry of Culture and Cults **510**
Ministry of Defense **337**
Ministry of Education and Research **334**, **337**
Ministry of Foreign Affairs **337**
Ministry of Justice **337**
Ministry of Labor and Social Solidarity **510**
Ministry of Youth and Sport **510**
National Agency for the Protection of Children's Rights **510**
National Bank of Romania **154**, **157**, **158**, **159**, **337**
National Commission of Statistics **155**
National Council for University Scientific Research **510**, **511**
National Direction of Statistics **155**
National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies **155**
National School of Political Studies and Public Administration **322**, **327**, **329**, **330**, **334**
Department of Political Science **327**
NATO **161**
New Europe College **510**
New School of Social Research, New York **325**
Open Society Foundation **161**, **162**, **510**, **511**, **512**
Open Society Institute **161**, **333**, **512**
Open Society Institute, Budapest **161**
Petre Andrei University, Iaşi **329**
Polytechnic University of Bucharest **328**
Radio Free Europe **325**
Raiffeisen Financial Advisers **161**
Research Institute on Ethnic Minorities, Budapest **512**

Romanian Academic Society **158**, **161**, **333**
Romanian Academy, Bucharest **154**, **157**, **158**, **160**, **161**, **163**, **325**, **329**, **335**, **336**, **510**, **512**
 Center for Economic Information and Documentation (CIDE) **161**
 Center of Demographic Research **512**
 Institute for Quality of Life **511**, **512**
 Institute of Social Theory **511**
 Institute of Sociology **329**, **504**, **511**, **512**
Romanian Association for the Club of Rome **154**, **157**, **163**
Romanian Association of Political Science **325**, **327**, **339**
Romanian Association of Sociology **511**
Romanian Center for Comparative and Consensual Economics **158**
Romanian Center for Economic Policy (CEROPE) **161**
Romanian Commercial Bank **161**
Romanian Institute for Free Initiative **157**
Romanian Institute of Management (IROMA) **327**
Romanian Social Institute **323**, **505**
Romanian Society of Economics **157**, **158**
Ştefan Gheorghiu Academy for Training and Advancement of the Leadership Cadres of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party **324**, **325**, **327**
Studies and Research Center in the Problems of the Young (C.S.C.P.T.), Bucharest **504**
University of Bucharest **161**, **162**, **323**, **327**, **328**, **330**, **334**, **337**
 Center of Political Research **329**
 Department of Philosophy **328**
 Department of Political Science **327**, **329**, **330**, **334**, **337**, **339**
 Department of Sociology and Social Work **512**
 Faculty of Sociology and Social Work **511**
 Institute for Political Research **329**, **330**, **334**, **336**
University of Cernăuți, **323**
University of Oradea **328**
US Agency for International Development (USAID) **161**
West University, Timişoara **162**
 Center for Social Science Research **158**
 Department of Political Science and Communication **328**
World Bank **160**, **161**, **162**, **333**, **334**, **504**, **507**, **510**, **517**
World Economy Institute **159**
World Learning **161**

Slovakia

Academia Istropolitana Nova, Bratislava **173**, **174**
Academia Istropolitana, Bratislava **173**, **174**
Agricultural University, Nitra **173**
Austrian Central Bank **177**
Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs **174**
Bratislava University of Economics
 Faculty of Business Management, Košice **174**
British Council **351**
Center for Economic and Social Analysis (M.E.S.A.) **174**
Center for Economic Development **174**
Center for Social Analysis **523**
Central European University (CEU), Budapest **175**, **177**
Charles University, Prague **175**, **177**
Chuo University, Tokyo
 Japan Institute of Social Sciences **528**
Comenius University, Bratislava **173**, **175**, **344**, **345**, **346**, **352**, **521**
 Department of Political Science **346**, **353**, **522**
 Department of Sociology **519**, **521**, **528**
 Faculty of Management **175**
 Institute for Social Analysis (CSA) **523**
 Institute of Applied Mathematics, College of Mathematics and Physics **173**
 Political Science Department **345**
 Social Work Department, Pedagogical Faculty **522**
 Sociological Seminar **518**
Czechoslovak Institute of Public Opinion **344**
Czechoslovak Political Science Association **346**

European Commission **522**, **526**
European Union (EU) **351**, **529**
Faculty of Political Science and International Relations, Banská Bystrica **347**
FOCUS **350**, **523**
Ford Foundation **351**
Friedrich Ebert Foundation **351**
Harvard University **347**
Institut für Europäische Politik, Bonn **347**
Institute for Public Affairs (IVO), Bratislava **348**, **349**, **350**, **523**
Institute for Public Opinion Research **523**
Institute of Slovak and World Economics **174**, **177**
International Center for Family Studies, Bratislava **523**
International Political Science Association (IPSA) **346**
Journalist Research Institute **522**
Konrad Adenauer Foundation **351**
Manchester Metropolitan University **347**
Markant Agency **350**
Matej Bel University, Banská Bystrica **173**, **346**, **352**
Matica Slovenská, Martin
  Sociological Department **518**
Milan Šimečka Foundation **524**, **525**
Military Service
  Office for Sociological Research **523**
Ministry of Culture
  Research Institute of Culture **522**
Ministry of Defense **523**
Ministry of Education
  Institute for Education and Information **522**
Ministry of Education and Science **347**, **351**, **524**
Ministry of Labor **523**
Nicholas Copernicus University, Toruń **528**
Open Society Foundation **351**
Rene Descartes University, Paris **528**
Research Institute for Economics and Organization of the Building Industry **522**
Research Institute of Labor and Social Affairs **523**, **527**
School for Politics and Social Sciences **344**
Slovak Academy of Sciences **174**, **175**, **177**
  Department of Social Research **519**
  Institute of Economics **174**
  Institute of Legal and Economic Sciences **174**
  Institute of Philosophy **519**
  Institute of Political Science **347**, **349**
  Institute of Sociology **519**, **520**, **521**, **522**, **523**, **527**, **528**, **529**
Slovak Association of Research Agencies **523**
Slovak Central Bank **177**
Slovak Grant Agency for Science (VEGA) **524**, **526**
Slovak Political Science Association (SPSA) **345**, **346**, **352**
Slovak Society for Operations Research **177**
Slovak Sociological Association (SSA) **520**, **522**, **523**, **527**
Slovak Statistical Office **523**
Supreme Accreditation Commission **522**
Technical University, Vienna **175**
The Market Review Institute GfK **350**
Trinity College, Dublin **177**
UNESCO **528**, **529**
United Nations (UN) **174**
University of Bonn **175**
University of Cardinal Wyszyński, Warsaw **528**
University of Chicago **177**
University of Cologne **528**
University of Constantinus Philosopher, Nitra **346**
University of Cyril and Methodius, Trnava **346**, **347**, **352**
University of Economics, Bratislava **170**, **173**, **177**
University of Economics, Vienna **177**
University of Groningen **347**
University of Leiden **347**
University of Leipzig **347**
University of Leuven **347**
University of Nitra
  Department of Political Science and European Studies **347**
University of P. J. Šafárik, Košice **346**

University of Paris (Sorbonne) **518**
University of Pittsburgh **173**, **174**, **175**
University of Prešov **346**
  Department of Political Science **347**
University of Technology, Vienna **174**
University of Tilburg **528**
University of Trenčín **173**
University of Trnava **346**, **352**, **522**, **528**
  Department of Sociology **522**, **528**
University of Žilina **174**
World Bank **529**

Slovenia

Atlantic Council Society **362**
Bank of Slovenia **191**, **192**
Center for Organizations and Human Resources **541**
Center for Spatial Sociology **541**
Central and East European International Association **362**
Central European Political Science Association **362**
College for Political Science, Ljubljana **359**
College of Political Science, Sociology and Journalism, Ljubljana **359**
Diplomatic Academy **364**
European Community Studies Association **362**
European Consortium for Political Science (ECPR) **362**, **363**
European Research Group on the Military and Society **362**
European Union (EU) **189**, **362**, **367**, **542**
Faculty of Humanities, Koper **538**
Institute of Ethnic Studies, Ljubljana **364**, **365**, **541**
Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis **364**, **365**, **366**
International Political Science Association (IPSA) **360**, **361**, **362**, **367**
Ministry of Education, Science, and Sport **190**, **364**, **367**
NATO **366**, **367**
Office for Macroeconomic Analyses **190**
Open Society **367**
Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) **366**
Peace Institute **364**, **366**, **367**
Public Opinion and Mass Communications Research Center **539**, **541**
School of Public Administration, Ljubljana **364**
Slovene Social Science Archive, Ljubljana **542**
Slovene Sociological Association **542**, **543**, **544**
Slovenian Political Science Association **362**, **367**
Society for Defense Studies **362**
Society for International Law **362**
Soros Foundation **542**
Trans-European Policy Studies Association **362**
Union of Political Science Associations of Yugoslavia **360**, **362**
University of Ljubljana **189**, **359**, **360**, **363**, **364**, **538**
  Center for Public Opinion and Communications **364**
  Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences **363**, **364**
  Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts **536**, **538**
  Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences **538**
  Economic Institute of the Law School **188**
  Faculty of Arts **364**, **538**
  Faculty of Economics **364**
  Faculty of Law **364**
  Faculty of Social Sciences **358**, **359**, **360**, **362**, **363**, **364**, **368**, **537**, **538**
  Institute of Social Sciences **536**, **541**
  Law School **188**
  School of Economics **188**, **191**
University of Maribor **189**, **360**
  Department of Sociology, Faculty of Education **538**
  European Center for Ethnic, Regional, and Sociological Studies **541**
  Faculty of Pedagogy **536**

Names

A

Abraham, Dorel **331**, **507**
Abramowski, Edward **306**
Adam, Frane **365**, **366**, **536**, **538**, **539**
Adamová, Karolína **238**
Adamski, Władysław **494**
Adelman, Irma **168**
Ágh, Attila **258**, **264**, **265**, **268**
Aizsilnieks, Arnolds **104**, **116**
Akihiro, Ishikawa **526**
Aleksa, Jonas **469**
Alijevová, Dilbar **523**, **530**
Alunans, Juris **103**
Alvarez, Sonia **381**
Ananieva, Nora **214**
Anastasiu, Călin **331**
Anderson, Barbara A. **430**
Anderson, Benedict **479**
Anderson, Oskar N. **35**, **168**
Andorka, Rudolf **86**, **415**, **441**, **442**, **445**, **446**, **447**
András, Gergely **270**
Andrási, György **265**
Andrej, Findor **524**
Andrejeva, Galina Michailovna **519**
Angel, Iosif **155**
Angelusz, Róbert **443**, **445**
Angvik, Magne **474**
Antal, László **90**
Antal-Mokos, Zoltán **88**
Antić, Milica **366**
Antohi, Sorin **8**
Antoine, Charles **469**
Antončič, Vojko **537**
Aquinas, St. Thomas **286**
Arendt, Hannah **335**
Aristotle **23**, **286**
Aron, Raymond **21**
Arons, Matīss **103**
Arrow, Ken **201**
Artisien, Patrick **366**
Arzensek, Vladimir **537**
Aschaffenburg, Karen **443**
Asmane, Maija **453**
Astra, Lina **474**
Aven, Piotr **199**
Avramov, Roumen **34**
Axenciuc, Victor **164**

B

Babiński, Grzegorz **493**
Bădescu, Gabriel **330**
Bădescu, Ilie **502**, **505**, **507**
Bagdonavičius, Vaclovas **467**
Bajt, Aleksander **168**, **187**, **188**
Bajza, Jozef Ignác **169**
Bakunin, Michail **168**
Balamesov, Stefan **216**
Balassa, Béla **87**
Balcerowicz, Leszek **90**, **144**, **145**, **199**
Balodis, Eduards **103**
Balodis, Kārlis **103**
Balogh, István **260**, **265**
Balogh, Thomas **87**, **168**
Balugjanskij, Michail Andrejevich **169**
Banciu, Dan **508**, **512**
Bara, Zoltán **93**
Baran, Paul Alexander **137**, **168**
Barbu, Daniel **330**, **336**
Barlow, Max **581**
Barons, Krisjanis **103**
Barša, Pavel **233**
Barto, Martin **175**
Baszkiewicz, Jan **308**
Baudrillard, Jean **458**
Bauer, Peter **87**
Bauman, Zygmunt **24**, **308**, **409**, **470**, **487**, **494**, **495**, **519**, **553**
Bayer, József **260**, **265**, **268**, **270**
Beblavý, Miroslav **175**, **176**
Bebler, Anton **360**, **365**, **366**
Beck, Jiří **54**
Becker, Gary **60**, **429**, **506**
Becker, Ulrike **7**
Behar, Nansen **214**
Behrens , Fritz **168**
Bělohradský, Václav **229**, **231**, **233**, **408**
Benáček, Vladimír **55**, **57**
Bence, György **260**
Benda, Václav **228**
Beneš, Edvard **227**, **405**
Benko, Vlado **360**, **366**
Bennett, John **562**
Bennett, Robert **581**
Beresovsky, Boris **199**
Berg, Eiki **253**
Berger, Peter **409**, **429**, **479**
Berlin, Isaiah **335**
Bernik, Ivan **365**, **538**, **539**

Bertalan, László **440**
Berzevici, Gregor František **169**
Berzeviczy, Gergely **83**
Bērziņš, Alfrēds **276**
Beyme, Klaus von **234**
Bibič, Adolf **359**, **360**, **365**, **366**
Bibó, István **261**, **268**
Bielek, Anton **170**
Biezbardis, Kaspars **103**
Bihari, Mihály **258**, **260**, **265**, **268**, **269**
Biliński, Leon **136**
Birkerts, Peteris **454**
Bíró, Anna **10**
Blaas, Gejza **523**
Bláha, Inocenc Arnošt **227**, **405**
Blaug, Mark **136**, **168**
Blishnashki, Georgi **218**
Blondel, Jean **17**, **24**
Blum, Rem **255**
Boari, Vasile **328**
Bobbio, Norberto **335**, **336**
Bobrowski, Czesław **138**
Bogardus, Emory S. **507**
Bognár, József **87**, **93**
Boh, Katja **537**
Boháček, Radim **55**
Böhm, Bernhard **174**
Böhm-Bawerk, Eugen von **60**
Boisguilbert, Pierre de **567**
Bokros, Lajos **30**, **89**, **199**
Bole, Velimir **191**
Bonjean, Charles M. **479**
Boreysza, Andrius **286**
Böröcz, József **264**
Borries, Bodo von **474**
Bortkiewicz, Ladislaus von **168**
Borucka-Arctowa, Maria **591**, **593**
Botez, Mihai **325**
Boudon, Raymond **513**
Bourdieu, Pierre **409**, **440**, **470**, **487**, **506**, **550**
Bouška, Jiří **54**, **60**
Bozóki, András **264**, **269**
Brada, Josef **54**, **55**
Bráf, Albín **51**, **170**
Brentano, Luji **121**
Brezhnev Leonid **277**
Brglez, Milan **366**
Brinar, Irena **366**
Briška, Rudolf **170**, **177**
Bródy, András **93**
Brokl, Lubomír **228**, **233**
Broom, Dorothy H. **479**
Broom, Leonard **479**
Brucan, Silviu **335**
Brunovská, Alena **174**
Brus, Włodzimierz **90**, **137**, **138**, **139**, **148**, **168**
Bruszt, László **260**, **264**
Brzozowski, Stanisław **306**
Bučar, Bojko **360**, **365**, **366**
Buček, Ján **526**
Buchanan, James **93**
Buckle, Henry T. **437**
Budrys, Dzidas **121**
Budzinauskas, Vladas **287**
Bujak, Franciszek **472**
Bukharin, Nikolai Ivanovich **168**
Bukodi, Erzsébet **443**
Bukowski, Charles **366**
Bunčák, Ján **523**, **526**, **528**
Burawoy, Michael **19**
Burke, Edmund **217**
Bútora, Martin **350**, **519**, **521**, **522**, **523**, **528**, **529**, **530**
Bútorová, Zora **350**, **521**, **522**, **523**, **524**, **525**, **526**, **528**, **530**, **531**
Búzik, Bohumil **520**, **521**
Bystroń, Jan Stanisław **484**

C

Cabada, Ladislav **234**
Calmuschi, Vladimir **164**
Campbell, John Y. **146**
Câmpeanu, Pavel **325**, **503**, **506**
Caramelea, Vasile V. **558**
Carey, Henry Charles **51**
Carnap, Rudolf **455**
Carr, Edward Hallett **137**
Čas, Bojan **536**
Cassel, Gustav **51**
Castoriadis, Cornelius **381**
Ceauşescu, Elena **12**
Ceauşescu, Nicolae **12**, **152**, **153**, **325**, **503**
Čechrák, Cyril **170**
Celms, Teodors **275**
Čermák, Vladimír **231**, **233**, **237**
Cernea, Mihail **504**, **507**
Černý, Martin **54**
Cesevičius, Domas **121**, **128**
Chałasiński, Józef **494**, **554**

Chalupný, Emanuel **227**
Chavannes, Alexandre **559**
Chayanov, Alexander Vasiljevich **154**, **168**
Chelcea, Septimiu **503**, **507**
Chernyshevski, Nikokai **168**
Chikán, Attila **93**
Chleborád, Ladislav **51**
Chobot, Michal **54**, **171**
Chorvát, Ivan **526**
Cicero **286**
Clark, Colin **136**
Codiță, Cornel **327**, **506**
Cohen, Mitch **10**, **12**
Coleman, David **567**
Coleman, James **429**
Comanescu, Cristian **159**
Comte, Auguste **437**, **454**, **469**, **549**
Constantinescu, Nicolae N. **158**
Conte, Edouard **10**
Covrig, Sorin **156**
Cox, Terry **366**
Crick, Bernard **261**
Csaba, László **89**, **168**
Csákó, Mihály **10**
Csikós-Nagy, Béla **88**, **93**
Csite, András **444**
Csizmadia, Ervin **269**
Csontos, László **440**
Čukan, Karol **523**
Czajka, Stanisław **468**

D

Dąbrowski, Marek **144**, **145**
Dahl, Robert **313**, **335**
Dahrendorf, Ralf **335**, **506**, **550**
Dăianu, Daniel **152**, **155**, **156**, **158**, **159**, **199**
Dainov, Evgeni **217**, **219**
Dāle, Pauls **275**
Danailov, Georgi **35**
Dančák, Břetislav **234**
Darwin, Charles **469**
Datculescu, Petre **331**
Dauge, Pauls **103**
Daukantas, Simonas **472**
Davis, John **137**
Dědek, Oldřich **54**, **55**
Dellenbrant, Jan Ake **252**
Demostenov, Simeon **35**
Dethier, Jean-Jacques **89**
Deutsch, Karl W. **344**
Didier, Michel **156**, **163**
Dilthey, Wilhelm **454**
Dimitrov, Dimitar **217**, **219**, **221**
Dîncu, Vasile **331**
Dišlers, Kārlis **275**, **276**
Disman, Miroslav **408**
Djordjević, Jovan **359**, **360**
Dlouhý, Vladimír **54**, **55**, **56**
Dmitriev, Vladimir Karpovich **168**
Dobb, Maurice **137**
Dobrescu, Emilian **155**
Dobrescu, Paul **327**
Dobrogeanu-Gherea, Constantin **324**
Dobrowolski, Kazimierz **554**
Dogan, Mattei **324**
Doktór, Tadeusz **492**
Dolejš, Jiří **57**
Domański, Henryk **489**, **490**
Domar, Evsey **137**, **187**
Donskis, Leonidas **290**
Dostal, Petr **580**
Downs, Anthony **313**
Drábek, Zdeněk **55**
Dumont, Arsène **568**
Durkheim, Émile **388**, **440**, **454**, **468**, **484**, **538**, **562**, **594**
Duțu, Alexandru **330**
Duverger, Maurice **216**
Dvořáková, Vladimíra **231**, **233**, **238**, **239**
Dyba, Karel **53**, **54**, **55**
Džambazovič, Roman **523**
Dzerve, Pauls **112**

E

Eatwell, John **168**
Ehinat, Piret **255**
Ehrlich, Eugen **589**, **592**
Ehrlich, Stanisław **307**, **308**
Eisenstadt, Samuel N. **415**
Eizen, Johann Georg **102**
Elias, Norbert **376**, **380**
Elster, Jon **23**, **551**
Engels, Friedrich **105**, **122**
Engliš, Karel **52**, **56**, **170**
Enyedi, György **579**, **580**
Enyedi, Zsolt **264**
Eötvös, József **261**
Erbenová, Michaela **55**
Erdei, Ferenc **437**

Erdős, Tibor **90**
Erhard, Ludwig **199**
Eucken, Walter **27**

F

Falťan, Ľubomír **521**, **523**, **526**, **530**
Fándly, Juraj **169**
Farkas, Edit **10**
Fehér, Ferenc **260**, **438**
Feldman, Grigorii Alexandrovich **168**
Fellner, William **87**
Ferfila, Bogomil **365**, **366**
Ferge, Zsuzsa **440**, **441**, **442**, **445**
Festenstein, Matthew I. **23**
Fiala, Petr **231**, **237**, **238**
Fidrmuc, Ján **177**
Fidrmuc, Jarko **168**, **173**, **174**, **175**, **177**, **178**
Filadelfiová, Jarmila **525**, **526**
Filkus, Rudolf **172**, **176**
Fink-Hafner, Danica **365**
Fiorina, Morris **313**
Fischer, Josef Ludvík **227**, **405**
Fischer, Stanley **144**
Fisher, Irving **51**
Fismeistare, Daina **453**
Flere, Sergej **538**
Florian, Radu **325**, **329**
Földes, Béla **83**
Foucault, Michel **440**, **458**, **550**
Fouillée, Alfred **469**
Frait, Jan **59**
Frejka, Ludvík **52**
Frentzel-Zagórska, Janina **490**
Freud, Sigmund **453**, **468**
Frič, Pavol **520**
Fricz, Tamás **269**
Friedman, Milton **27**, **60**, **84**, **137**, **144**
Friedrich, Walter **468**
Frois, Gilbert Abraham **156**, **157**
Fromm, Erich **519**
Frühwald, Wolfgang **14**
Fulbright, James William **344**
Fundárek, Jozef **177**
Furtado, Celso **154**

G

Gaber, Slavko **365**
Gabriela, Lubelcová **526**
Gaďourek, Ivan **229**, **231**
Gaidar, Yegor **144**, **199**
Gaidys, Vladas **467**, **468**, **473**
Gál, Fedor **520**, **521**, **530**
Gál, Tomáš **54**
Galbraith, John Kenneth **137**, **154**
Ganev, Venelin **216**
Gantar, Pavel **365**
Gardner, Ava **14**
Garreton, Manuel A. **381**
Gáspár, Miklós Tamás **260**
Gáspár, Pál **89**
Gáti, Charles **260**
Gazsó, Ferenc **443**
Gebethner, Stanisław **308**
Geertz, Clifford **509**
Gellner, Ernest **408**, **409**, **479**
Genov, Nikolai **401**
Georgescu, Vlad **325**
Georgescu-Roegen, Nicholas **153**, **158**, **159**, **168**
Geremek, Bronisław **141**
Gerschenkron, Alexander **84**, **168**
Gheorghiu, Mihai Dinu **502**
Giddens, Anthony **409**, **429**, **458**, **470**, **479**, **550**
Girod, Fred **9**
Glaser, Barney G. **509**
Gliszczynska, Ximena **468**
Glückaufová, Dagmar **54**
Godina, Vesna **538**, **559**
Goffman, Erving **458**
Goldmann, Josef **52**, **53**, **60**, **168**
Goldthorpe, John **429**, **445**
Gombár, Csaba **258**, **260**, **267**, **268**, **269**
Gomułka, Władysław **139**
Goodin, Robert **295**
Goodman, Norman **495**
Gorbachev, Mikhail **277**, **287**
Górecki, Jan **594**
Gorzelak, Grzegorz **584**
Gosar, Andrej **536**, **538**
Gouldner, Alwin **376**
Grabowska, Mirosława **490**, **491**
Grad, Franc **365**
Gramsci, Antonio **137**
Graunt, John **568**
Gray, John **313**
Greskovits, Béla **89**, **264**
Grigas, Romualdas **474**
Grindea, Dan **155**
Grizold, Anton **365**, **366**

Grosfeld, Irena **142**
Gross, Feliks **307**
Gross, Zygmunt **307**
Grzybowski, Konstanty **307**, **308**
Gumplowicz, Ludwig **469**
Gunther, Richard **217**
Guráň, Peter **526**
Gusti, Dimitrie **323**, **324**, **502**, **558**
Gutenberg, Erich **202**
Gyarfášová, Oľga **350**, **525**

H

Habermas, Jürgen **335**, **409**, **429**, **440**, **539**, **550**, **598**
Habr, Jaroslav **54**, **60**
Hadžiyski, Ivan **388**
Hájek, Mojmír **53**, **54**
Hajnovič, František **172**
Halász, József **258**
Hallik, Klara **430**
Halpern, László **89**
Hamala, Milan **54**
Hampl, Martin **580**
Hankiss, Elemér **9**, **264**, **441**, **443**
Hann, Chris **558**
Hanousek, Jan **55**, **57**
Hanovs, Deniss **275**
Hansen, Morten **83**, **102**, **117**
Hansson, Leeni **431**
Haraszti, Miklós **260**
Harcsa, István **443**
Haret, Spiru **506**
Haskó, Katalin **270**
Haulíková, Lucia **175**
Hausner, Jerzy **146**, **497**
Havel, Jiří **50**, **55**, **169**
Havel, Václav **523**
Havlík, Petr **54**
Hayek, Friedrich August von **26**, **51**, **60**, **93**, **126**, **136**, **137**, **147**, **335**
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich **323**, **551**
Heidmets, Mati **429**
Hejda, Jaroslav **54**
Hejl, Lubomír **54**
Heller, Ágnes **260**, **438**
Heller, Farkas **84**
Henry, Louis **568**
Herder, Johann Gottfried **102**
Heretik, Štefan **171**
Hertz , Aleksander **307**
Hesse, Jens-Joachim **10**
Hetei, Márta **10**
Hexner, Ervin **170**
Heyne, Paul **156**, **163**
Hicks, John **84**
Higley, John **217**
Hilferding, Rudolf **137**
Hirner, Alexander **518**, **530**
Hirschman, Albert O. **335**
Hirszowicz, Maria **519**
Hlaváček, Jiří **50**, **55**, **60**
Hobbes, Thomas **23**
Hochfeld, Julian **308**
Hockuba, Zbigniew **147**
Hodža, Milan **169**, **178**, **344**
Hofer, Tamás **563**
Hoffman, Pavel **172**
Holub, Tomáš **55**
Holy, Ladislav **560**
Holzer, Jan **234**
Homans, George **550**
Horkheimer, Max **380**
Horniaček, Milan **175**
Horvat, Branko **168**, **187**
Horváth, Július **83**, **177**
Houbal, Dalibor **237**
Houdek, Fedor **170**
Hozlár, Eduard **171**
Hrdlička, Aleš **559**, **563**
Hribar, Tine **539**
Hrnčíř, Miroslav **55**
Hroch, Miroslav **233**
Hromádka , Ján **177**
Hrubý, Pavel **52**
Hubert, Salomo **102**
Hülvely, István **260**, **265**, **270**
Huntington, Samuel **313**
Huoranszki, Ferenc **270**
Hupel, August **102**
Hurt, Jakob **246**
Husák, Gustáv **53**
Husár, Jaroslav **176**
Hušek, Roman **171**
Hysko, Miroslav **171**

I

Iancu, Aurel **156**
Iliescu, Ion **154**, **157**
Illner, Michal **583**, **584**
Ionescu, Alexandra **330**, **336**
Ionescu, Ghita **323**

Iordan, Marioara **164**
Iša, Ján **171**
Isărescu, Mugur **154**
Ivan, Marcel **324**
Ivanov, Dimitar **217**

J

Jacikevičienė, Ona **475**
Jahn, Egbert **289**
Jakobson, Carl Robert **246**
Jakoby, Marek **175**
Jakubowska-Branicka, Iwona **489**
Jalowiecki, Bohdan **584**
Jalušič, Vlasta **358**, **365**, **366**
Jameson, Fredric **440**
Janáček, Kamil **55**
Jankauskas, Algimantas **286**, **292**
Jankov, Georgi **217**
Jannau, Heinrich Johann **102**
Janos, Andrew C. **339**
János, Andrew C. **262**
Jansons, Janis **103**
Jászi, Oszkár **261**, **437**
Jawłowska, Aldona **492**
Jelušič, Ljubica **358**
Jeraj, Josip **536**
Jerovsek, Janez **537**
Jessop, Bob **146**
Ježek, Tomáš **53**, **55**, **56**, **57**
Jinga, Victor **153**
Jivkov, Todor **38**
Jodl, Miroslav **228**
Jogan, Maca **366**, **536**
Jokubaitis, Alvydas **292**
Jonáš, Jiří **55**
Judik, József **84**
Jurevičs, Pauls **275**
Jurgutis, Vladas **121**, **128**
Jurkovič, Samuel **170**

K

Kaase, Max **7**, **206**
Kadakmaa, Heigo **255**
Kadlec, Vladimír **54**
Kahanec, Martin **168**
Kaisl, Josef **51**
Káldor, Nicholas **87**, **137**, **168**
Kalecki, Michał **60**, **136**, **137**, **139**, **168**
Kallas, Siim **248**
Kamiński, Antoni **489**
Kanev, Dobrin **217**, **218**, **219**, **220**, **221**
Kánovský, Martin **527**
Kánský, Karel **54**, **55**
Kant, Immanuel **102**
Kantorovich, Leonid **27**, **52**, **123**, **155**, **168**
Karaivanova, Penka **214**
Karasimeonov, Georgi **214**, **217**, **218**, **219**, **220**, **221**
Kardelj, Edvard **187**, **361**
Kārklinš, Jānis **103**
Karvaš, Imrich **170**, **177**
Kasekamp, Andres **250**, **253**
Kastrinos, Nikolaos **10**
Katinaite, Palmyra **467**
Kautsky, Karl **137**
Kautz, Gyula **83**
Kavolis, Vytautas **471**, **474**
Kelam, Aili **431**
Kelecki, Michał **90**
Kellner-Hostinský, Peter **170**
Kemény, István **438**, **444**
Kemėšis, Fabijonas **470**
Kemėžis, Feliksas **121**
Kempa, Vera **10**
Kempny, Marian **492**
Kende, Péter **260**, **269**
Kennedy, Michael **430**
Keohane, Robert O. **313**
Kéri, László **258**
Kerner, Manfred **281**
Kerševan, Marko **536**
Kessler, Malte **12**
Keyfitz, Nathan **567**
Keynes, John M. **27**, **51**, **84**, **136**, **137**, **147**, **154**, **156**
Kideckel, David **506**
Kidrič, Boris **187**
King, Gary **313**
Kinkel, Ivan **35**
Kiranov, Prokopi **35**
Kirch, Aksel **253**, **430**
Kirițescu, Costin **153**, **158**, **159**
Kis, János **267**
Kitschelt, Herbert **23**
Klacek, Jan **53**, **55**, **56**, **169**
Klaniczay, Gábor **7**
Klaus, Václav **53**, **55**, **56**, **57**, **168**, **176**, **199**
Klíma, Michal **231**, **240**
Klingemann, Hans-Dieter **7**, **9**, **206**, **207**, **295**, **336**

Kmenta, Jan **54**, **55**
Kmet, Tomáš **175**
Kočenda, Evžen **55**
Kočtúch, Hvezdoň **172**, **176**
Kohlmey, Gunther **168**
Kohn, Meir **93**
Kohn, Melvin L. **490**
Kolaja, Jiří **408**
Kolarič, Zinka **365**
Kolarova, Rumjana **217**, **218**, **221**
Kolarska-Bobińska, Lena **490**
Kolbergas, Oskaras **472**
Koleva, Svetla **386**
Kołodko, Grzegorz **143**, **199**
Kolosi, Tamás **441**, **442**, **445**
Komárek, Valtr **54**
Komarnicki, Wacław **307**
Komenda, Bohumil **53**
Kompiš, Peter **170**
Kon, Igor **425**
Kondratiev, Nikolai Dmitrievich **168**
Konrád, György **260**
Konüs, Alexander Alexandrovich **168**
Koopmans, Tjalling **27**
Kopernik, Mikołaj **137**
Korček, Ľudovít **171**
Korda, Bedřich **54**
Kornai, János **28**, **60**, **88**, **89**, **90**, **93**, **155**, **168**, **169**, **192**, **196**, **200**, **506**, **559**, **582**
Körösényi, András **263**, **268**
Košnár, Jozef **176**
Kosta, Jiří **53**, **54**, **55**, **169**
Kostrowicki, Jerzy **580**
Kosztolány, André **96**
Kotrba, Josef **55**
Kotulán, Antonín **55**
Kouba, Karel **53**, **54**, **55**, **57**, **171**
Kovách, Imre **443**, **444**
Kovács, János M. **9**, **83**, **95**
Kovács, Sándor **265**
Kovalevskij, Maxim **469**
Köves, András **89**
Kowalik, Tadeusz **83**
Kožušník, Čestmír **53**
Kraigher, Boris **187**
Král, Josef **405**, **518**
Králiček, Vladimír **177**
Kramberger, Anton **366**, **541**
Kranjc, Stane **366**
Kranjec, Marko **191**
Krasnaselski, Vladimir **504**
Krasnodębski, Zdzisław **484**
Krašovec, Alenka **365**, **366**
Krastev, Ivan **217**, **218**, **219**, **220**
Krasteva, Anna **221**
Krejčí, Jan **54**
Krejčí, Jaroslav **408**
Krek, Janez Evangelist **536**
Krikštopaitis, Juozas A. **474**
Krivý, Vladimír **350**, **522**, **523**
Křížkovský, Ladislav **238**
Kroeber, Alfred R. **562**
Krofta, Kamil **227**
Król, Marcin **309**
Kronvalds, Atis **103**
Kropivnik, Samo **365**
Krupavičius, Algis **288**, **292**
Krygier, Martin **588**
Krzemiński , Ireneusz **491**
Krzywicki, Ludwik **306**, **484**
Kubát, Michal **234**
Kubiak, Hieronim **490**, **553**
Kubik, Ian **24**
Kučera, Rudolf **228**, **231**
Kučera, Tomáš **9**
Kučerák, Jozef **169**, **172**, **176**, **178**
Kučerová, Olga **9**
Kuhn, Thomas **326**
Kulcsár, Kálmán **258**, **268**, **269**, **270**
Kulesza, Ewa **206**, **207**
Kulpińska, Jolanta **496**
Kumar, Krishan **550**
Kunc, Jiří **231**, **233**
Kundzins, Karlis **453**
Kunszt, Márta **265**
Kupka, Václav **55**
Kurczewski , Jacek **489**
Kūris, Egidijus **290**, **292**
Kurnik, Andrej **365**, **366**
Kuroń, Jacek **142**, **148**
Kurtán, Sándor **268**, **269**
Kürti, László **265**, **559**
Kusá, Zuzana **524**, **525**, **530**
Kustec, Simona **366**
Kusý, Miroslav **344**, **345**
Kutsar, Dagmar **431**
Kuzmanić, Ante **365**, **366**
Kuznets, Simon **168**
Kvelde, Rita **453**
Kwaśniewicz, Władysław **487**, **495**
Kýn, Oldřich **54**, **55**, **171**

Kyselková, Dana **50**

L

Labriola, Antonio **137**
Lagerspetz, Mikko **425**, **429**, **430**
Laiferová, Eva **518**, **523**
Laitin, David **430**
Lajčiak, Jan **518**
Laki, Mihály **90**
Lámfalussy, Alexandre **87**
Lánczi, András **258**, **269**, **270**
Landau, Ludwik **136**
Lande, Jerzy **591**
Landry, Adolphe **568**
Lane-Scheppele, Kim **599**
Lange, Oskar **90**, **136**, **137**, **138**, **155**, **168**, **196**, **307**
Lányi, Kamilla **90**
Lapiņš, Jãnis **275**
Laščiak, Adam **171**, **176**
Lash, Scott **440**
Lauber, Josef **171**
Laurėnas, Vaidutis **290**, **292**
Lauristin, Marju **425**, **429**, **430**, **431**, **432**
Lavrov, Peter **469**
Lazarčik, Gregor **170**
Lazarsfeld, Paul **550**
Legutke, Anette **206**, **207**
LeLoup, Lance **366**
Lemnij, Igor **155**, **156**
Lengyel, György **442**, **447**
Lengyel, László **258**, **260**, **267**
Lenin, Vladimir **105**, **122**, **124**, **168**, **277**, **467**
Leonas, Petras **469**, **472**
Leontief, Wassily **137**, **155**, **168**
Lerner, Abba **168**
Levada, Juri **425**
Levčík, Bedřich **52**, **53**, **54**
Levínský, René **56**
Lichard, Daniel **170**
Linhart, Anton Tomaž **358**
Linz, Juan **217**
Lipiński, Edward **137**, **168**
Lipset, Seymour Martin **313**
List, Friedrich **51**, **83**, **154**
Litvinienė, Julija **475**
Lízal, Lubomír **56**
Löbl, Eugen **52**, **169**
Locke, John **23**, **335**
Loit, Aleksander **248**
Lomonosov, Mihail **102**
Loorits, Oskar **246**
Lopata, Raimundas **290**, **292**
Lotka, Alfred J. **568**
Lowi, Theodore **322**, **339**
Lubyová, Martina **175**, **177**
Luckmann, Thomas **409**, **429**, **538**, **539**
Luhmann, Niklas **539**, **550**, **594**, **595**
Luiga, Juhan **246**
Lukács, György **437**, **559**
Lukas, Vit **95**
Lukáš, Zdenek **54**
Łukasiewicz, Piotr **491**
Lukšič, Andrej **365**
Lukšič, Igor **358**, **365**, **366**
Luptáčik, Mikuláš **168**, **170**, **177**
Luxemburg, Rosa **137**, **168**

M

Maceina, Antanas **287**, **469**
Macek, Josef **52**, **56**, **170**
Macháček, Ladislav **521**, **523**, **528**, **530**
Machiavelli, Niccolo **286**, **567**
Machonin, Pavel **228**, **406**, **550**
Machotka, Otakar **518**
MacIntyre, Alasdair **576**
Made, Tiit **248**
Madgearu, Virgil **154**, **157**, **158**, **324**, **334**
Makarovič, Matej **536**, **539**
Malešič, Marjan **365**, **366**
Mali, Franc **536**
Malinov, Svetoslav **217**, **219**, **220**
Malinowski, Bronisław **554**, **562**, **563**
Malița, Mircea **163**, **325**
Mallock, Wolfgang **10**
Malnar, Brina **365**
Malthus, Thomas **568**
Maňas, Miroslav **54**, **57**, **60**, **171**
Manchin, Robert **441**
Mandič, Srna **366**
Manent, Pierre **336**
Maniu, Mircea Teodor **152**
Mankiw, Gregory **93**
Mann, Thomas **14**
Mannheim, Karl **437**
Manoilescu, Mihail **153**, **154**, **158**, **159**, **166**, **168**, **324**, **334**
Mansfeldová, Zdeňka **226**, **233**

Marcel, Gabriel **12**
March, James G. **313**
Marčincin, Anton **175**, **176**
Marcuse, Herbert **519**
Mareš, Miroslav **235**, **237**
Mărginean, Ioan **503**
Markarjan, Eduard **560**
Markiewicz, Władysław **553**
Markuš, Jozef **172**, **176**
Marody, Mirosława **497**, **550**
Marschak, Jacob **168**
Marx, Karl **51**, **85**, **103**, **105**, **122**, **124**, **132**, **187**, **188**, **189**, **276**, **277**, **326**, **338**, **437**, **454**, **456**, **467**, **468**, **469**, **549**
Masaryk, Tomáš G. **60**, **227**, **405**, **518**, **554**
Masiulis, Kęstutis **475**
Mastnak, Tomaž **361**, **365**
Matakas, Juozas **291**
Matějů, Petr **237**
Matonytė, Irmina **292**, **475**
Matulionis, Arvydas **474**
Matulník, Jozef **522**
Maunier, Emmanuel **469**
Maurel, Marie-Claude **9**
Máyás, Antal **96**
Mayer, Georg **121**
Mazowiecki, Tadeusz **309**, **554**
Mazurkiewicz, Piotr **306**
McDougall, William **453**
McDowell, Christopher **507**
Meichsner, Jana **10**
Mejstřík, Michal **55**, **57**
Melchior, Małgorzata **493**
Mencinger, Jože **199**
Menders, Fricis **103**
Mendras, Henri **495**
Menger, Carl **51**, **60**
Menshikov, Vladimir **458**
Merkel, Garlieb Helwig **102**
Mertl, Jan **227**
Merton, Robert **409**, **484**, **550**
Mežnarić, Silva **366**
Michnik, Adam **309**
Mickevičius, Vincas **470**
Mihailescu, Vintila **564**
Mihalchev, Dimiter **388**
Miháliková, Silvia **350**, **526**
Mihályi, Péter **88**
Miheljak, Vlado **365**
Mikkel, Evald **252**
Mikloš, Ivan **172**, **176**
Mikus, Krogzemju **103**
Mill, John Stuart **23**, **147**, **548**
Mills, Charles Wright **454**, **519**
Mills, Richard **289**
Mincer, Jacob **168**
Minchev, Ognjan **217**, **218**, **219**, **221**
Minev, Duhomir **401**
Miroiu, Adrian **327**
Miroiu, Mihaela **506**
Mises, Ludwig von **51**, **126**, **136**, **168**
Mitev, Petar-Emil **217**
Mitsos, Achilleas **10**
Mládek, Jan **55**
Mlčoch, Lubomír **53**, **55**, **57**
Mlinar, Zdravko **537**, **541**
Mlynář, Zdeněk **228**, **229**, **240**
Mlynarovič, Vladimír **54**
Modzelewski, Zacharij **286**
Moisil, Grigorie **155**
Mokrzycki, Edmund **489**
Montesquieu, Charles de **23**
Morar, Filon **330**
Morgan, Thomas Hunt **469**
Morvay, Karol **175**
Možný, Ivo **405**, **410**
Mucha, Janusz **495**, **496**
Müller-Rommel, Ferdinand **24**
Munck, Gerardo **381**
Mungiu-Pippidi, Alina **322**, **333**, **507**
Münich, Daniel **56**
Munteanu, Costea **152**, **156**, **157**
Murgescu , Costin **153**, **159**
Murray, Milgate **168**
Musil, Jiří **405**, **406**, **409**

N

Nagy, András **89**, **90**, **96**
Nagy, Endre **437**
Nagy, Imre **84**
Naisbit, John **154**
Naneş, Marcela **164**
Narbutas, Teodoras **472**
Narusk, Anu **431**
Narwa, Daniel **56**
Navracsis, Tibor **268**
Navratil, Ákos **84**
Negoiță, Virgil **155**
Nehněvajsa, Jiří **229**, **408**
Nekrašas, Evaldas **288**

Nemchinov, Vasily **52**, **123**, **168**
Nešporová, Alena **55**
Newman, Peter **168**
Nordhaus, William **60**
Novagrockienė, Jūratė **292**
Novák, Miroslav **229**, **231**, **234**, **237**
Novak, Mojca **541**
Nove, Alec **137**, **139**, **168**
Novozhilov, Vasily **52**, **168**, **169**
Novozhilov, Viktor **123**
Nowak, Stefan **308**
Nowicka, Ewa **493**
Nowotny, Helga **7**

O

O'Donnel, Guillermo **217**, **381**
Obrdlik, Anton **518**
Očenášek, Radomír **54**
Offe, Claus **146**, **429**, **550**, **551**
Ogris, Albin **358**
Okólski, Marek **493**
Olexa, Michal **174**
Olsen, Johan P. **313**
Olson, Mancur **313**
Olteanu, Alex **156**
Orbán, Viktor **266**
Ornea, Zigu **325**
Ošavkov, Živko **386**, **388**
Osipov, Gennadij Vasilievič **519**
Ossowski, Stanisław **308**, **485**, **554**, **555**
Ostrom, Elinor **313**
Ostvalds, Eizens **104**
Osuský, Štefan **344**
Oziganovs, Eduards **277**

P

Paczolay, Péter **265**, **270**
Pakštas, Kazys **287**, **299**
Paltarokas, Kazimieras **469**
Papacostea, Alexandru **323**
Papánek, Ján **344**
Papp, Zsolt **260**
Pareto, Vilfredo **196**, **453**, **549**
Park, Andrus **253**
Parsons, Talcott **388**, **455**, **468**, **519**, **550**
Paşcu, Ioan Mircea **327**
Pašiak, Ján **521**, **523**, **529**, **530**
Paškus, Antanas **471**
Pasquino, Gianfranco **336**
Pasti, Vladimir **327**, **506**
Pástor, Luboš **177**
Patocka, Jan **598**
Pătrăşcanu, Lucrețiu **324**
Päts, Konstantin **246**
Pavel, Dan **330**
Pavelescu, Florin Marius **164**
Pavilionis, Rolandas **287**, **288**
Pavlenda, Viktor **176**
Pavlov, Todor **388**
Pázmán, Július **170**, **177**
Pecican, Eugen Ştefan **159**
Perroux, Francois **155**
Pestoff, Victor A. **146**
Péter, Gyorgy **169**
Peter, Puliš **525**
Peters, Rita P. **278**
Petrakov, Nikolai **123**, **169**
Petrażycki, Leon **306**, **484**, **589**, **591**, **592**, **594**, **601**
Petre, Ilut **512**
Petrič, Ernest **360**
Pettai, Vello **246**, **250**, **252**, **253**
Piaget, Jean **468**
Pietrowicz, Krzysztof **484**
Pilat, Vasile **152**, **155**, **156**, **161**, **165**
Pirgova, Marija **218**, **219**, **220**
Piscová, Magdaléna **526**, **528**
Pitamic, Leonid **358**
Pithart, Petr **228**
Pleşu, Andrei **9**, **12**
Plieksans, Janis **103**
Podgórecki, Adam **591**, **593**, **594**, **595**, **596**
Podlimbarski, Fran Maselj **358**
Poenaru, Maria **164**
Pokol, Béla **258**, **260**, **265**, **269**
Polányi, Karl **84**, **437**
Popescu, Florentina **152**
Popov, Kiril **35**
Popper, Karl **335**
Postolache, Tudorel **155**, **158**
Povolný, Mojmír **229**, **231**
Preda, Cristian **330**, **334**, **336**
Preda, Gheorghe **156**
Preobrazhensky, Evgenii Alexeyevich **168**
Primakov, Yevgenij **296**
Prodi, Romano **296**
Prunk, Janko **365**, **366**
Pšeja, Pavel **237**

Pucilowski, Kristup **286**
Puriņš, Kārlis **104**
Purju, Alari **65**
Puşcaş, Vasile **328**
Putnam, Robert **313**, **506**

R

Raciborski, Jacek **491**
Radičová, Iveta **522**, **523**, **525**, **526**, **528**
Rádl, Emanuel **405**
Rădulescu, Sorin **506**, **508**
Rădulescu-Motru, Constantin **324**, **329**, **334**
Ragin, Charles **313**
Raik, Kristi **255**
Ramík, Jaroslav **57**
Randviir, Tiina **252**
Ransdorf, Miroslav **55**, **57**
Rašín, Alois **51**, **170**
Rawls, John **60**, **255**
Rayatskas, Raimundas **124**
Reagan, Ronald **56**
Regep, Mihai **164**
Remeikis, Tomas **289**
Rendlova, Eliška **468**
Rener, Tanja **541**
Ricardo, David **154**, **171**
Říchová, Blanka **231**, **238**, **239**
Richta, Radovan **468**
Rimka, Albinas **121**, **128**
Riomeris, Mykolas **472**
Rizman, Martin Rudi **365**, **366**
Robbins, John, R. **365**
Róber, Péter **442**, **443**, **445**
Robinson, Joan **137**, **147**
Römeris, Mykolas **286**, **287**
Róna-Tas, Ákos **264**
Rose, Richard **473**
Rosenberg, Morris **425**
Rosengren, Karl Erik **430**
Roško, Róbert **520**, **521**, **525**, **530**
Rostoványi, Zsolt **265**
Roter, Petra **366**
Rozins, Fricis **103**
Rozwadowski, Jan **286**
Rudas, László **84**
Rudas, Tamás **441**
Rudlovčák, Vladimír **55**
Rughiniş, Cosima **505**
Rugină, Anghel **158**
Rupnik, Jacques **240**
Rus, Veljko **537**
Rutkevič, Michail Nikolajevič **519**
Ruus, Jüri **253**
Ruutsoo, Rein **253**
Ryazanov, David Borisovich **168**
Rychetník, Luděk **54**, **55**
Rykowski, Zbigniew W. **491**
Ryszka, Franciszek **308**, **309**

S

Saarniit, Jüri **431**
Šabič, Zlatko **358**, **366**, **368**
Sachs, Jeffrey **31**, **144**, **147**
Said, Edward **27**
Sákovics, József **88**, **95**
Šalkauskis, Stasys **287**, **472**
Salner, Andrej **175**
Samek, Jaroslav **171**
Samuelson, Paul **60**, **126**, **137**, **156**, **157**, **188**, **195**
Şandor, Dorel **331**, **333**
Sándor, Péter **268**
Sandu, Dumitru **330**, **506**
Sârbu, Adrian **163**
Sárkány, Mihály **9**
Sartori, Giovanni **234**, **313**, **335**, **336**, **339**
Šaulauskas, Marius P. **473**
Šaulys, Kazimieras **469**
Savisaar, Edgar **248**
Saxonberg, Steven **550**
Schaff, Adam **307**
Schäffle, Albert **51**
Schatteles, Tiberiu **155**, **156**, **159**
Schenk, Juraj **521**, **523**, **530**
Schlett, István **268**, **270**
Schmidt, Péter **258**, **260**, **268**
Schmitter, Philippe C. **146**
Schmögnerová, Brigita **172**, **176**
Schneider, Ondřej **56**
Schöpflin, György **262**
Schubert, Klaus **238**
Schulte, Siman **469**
Schumpeter, Joseph **51**, **60**, **137**, **171**, **381**
Schütz, Alfred **388**, **538**
Scitovsky, Tibor **168**
Scruton, Roger **240**
Sebe, Sorin Gabriel **330**
Secăreş, Vasile **327**

Sedlák, Mikuláš **176**
Sedová, Tatiana **527**
Semov, Mincho **214**, **217**, **218**
Senkane, Sylvija **452**
Šestáková, Monika **171**
Sezemanas, Vosylius **287**
Shibutani, Tamotsu **468**
Shively, Philip W. **289**
Shmitter, Philippe **217**
Shultz, George **84**
Šíbl, Drahomír **171**
Šik, Ota **52**, **54**, **60**, **168**, **171**
Silárszky, Peter **56**
Silver, Brian D. **430**
Šimečka, Milan **228**, **344**
Šimkovic, Ján **171**
Simmel, Georg **454**, **539**
Simon, András **93**
Simon, János **260**, **268**, **270**
Simonovits, András **88**, **93**
Singer, Miroslav **56**
Sirácky, Andrej **530**
Sirc, Ljubo **192**
Skalník, Peter **560**
Škaloud, Jan **228**, **238**
Skąpska, Grażyna **9**
Skinner, Burrhus F. **468**
Skolka, Jiří **54**
Školkay, Andrej **343**
Skotnicka-Illasiewicz, Elżbieta **497**
Skrzydło, Wieslaw **308**
Sláma, Jiří **54**, **55**
Slutsky, Eugen **168**
Smith, Adam **154**, **171**, **201**
Smith, Anthony D. **458**, **479**
Šmulkštys, Julius **289**
Snell, Carl Philip **102**
Sobolewski, Marek **308**
Sojka, Jozef **54**, **171**
Sojka, Milan **50**, **55**, **56**
Sombart, Werner **453**
Sontheimer, Kevin **174**
Sopóci, Ján **521**, **523**, **527**, **528**
Sorokin, Pitirim **453**, **454**, **469**
Soros, George **15**, **254**, **260**, **267**
Sors, Andrew **7**, **10**
Soukeník, Karel **56**
Spagis, Andrejs **103**
Sparschuh, Olga **10**
Sparschuh, Vera **50**, **206**
Spassov, Boris **218**
Spéder, Zsolt **446**
Spencer, Herbert **437**, **453**, **454**, **469**
Splichal, Slavko **540**
Spulber, Nicolas **158**, **164**
Šrubař, Ilja **408**
Stahl, Henri H. **325**, **502**
Stahl, Paul **504**
Stalin, Yosef **137**, **168**, **277**
Staller, George **54**, **55**
Stamboliski, Alexander **35**
Stambolov, Stefan **35**, **39**
Stanevičius, Vitoldas **472**
Staniszkis, Jadwiga **24**, **495**, **550**
Šťastný, Zdeněk **523**, **529**
Steen, Anton **252**
Štefánek, Anton **518**, **529**
Stefanescu, Camelia **164**
Ştefănescu, Ştefan **503**
Stefanov, Ivan **34**, **35**
Stefanova, Milena **219**
Stender, Gottfried Friedrich **102**
Stepan, Alfred **217**
Stere, Constantin **324**, **334**
Stern, Nicolas **144**
Stiglitz, Joe **93**
Stiglitz, Joseph **60**, **142**, **147**, **148**
Štiller, Pavel **54**
Stodola, Kornel **169**
Stokke, Arne **249**, **252**
Stomma, Stanisław **309**
Stopius, Zachary **102**
Stradins, Janis **102**
Strauss, Anselm **509**
Strauss, Leo **17**, **335**
Streeck, Walter **146**
Strmiska, Maxmilián **231**, **234**
Strmiska, Zdeněk **408**
Strnad, Vladimír **54**
Štromas, Aleksandras **289**
Štrougal, Lubomír **60**
Strumilin, Stanislav Gustavovich **168**
Struve, Pyotr Berngardovich **168**
Strzelecki, Jan **308**
Stuchlik, Milan **560**
Stucka, Peteris **103**
Štúr, Ľudovít **169**
Suda, Zdeněk **408**
Sükösd, Miklós **264**
Šulc, Zdislav **54**, **55**, **169**
Šutinienė, Irena **474**
Svejnar, Jan **54**, **55**, **56**, **57**

Svetličič, Marjan **366**
Svetlik, Ivan **537**, **541**
Sweezy, Paul **137**
Swift, Jonathan **18**
Szabó, Katalin **93**
Szabó, Márton **269**
Szabó, Máté **265**, **269**, **270**
Szabó, Miklós **260**
Szabolcs, Tünde **10**
Szakolczai, Árpád **264**
Szalai, Erzsébet **263**, **268**
Szalai, Sándor **437**
Szawiel, Tadeusz **490**
Szczepański, Jan **468**, **485**, **519**, **553**
Székely, István P. **95**
Szelényi, Iván **260**, **438**, **441**, **442**, **443**, **559**
Szlatky, Mária **95**
Szomolányi, Soňa **350**, **521**, **522**, **523**, **530**, **531**
Sztompka, Piotr **9**, **10**, **495**, **496**, **548**, **550**

T

Taagepera, Rein **209**, **248**, **249**, **250**, **252**, **253**
Tajfel, Henri **507**
Tamás, Pál **9**
Tammelo, Ilmar **248**
Tănase, Stelian **330**, **333**, **336**
Tanev, Todor **221**
Tarde, Gabriel **453**
Tardos, Márton **27**, **90**
Tardos, Róbert **440**, **445**
Tarkowska, Elżbieta **492**
Taşcă, Constantin **158**
Tasnadi, Alexandru **152**, **157**
Taylor, Charles **336**
Teodorescu, Alin **331**
Ter-Manuelianc, Antonín **54**
Tešedík, Samuel **169**
Thatcher, Margaret **56**
Theiss, Ede **84**
Tisenkopfs, Talis **460**
Tishkov, Valery A. **563**
Tismăneanu, Vladimir **325**, **504**
Titma, Mikk **248**
Tobin, James **84**
Tocqueville, Alexis de **335**, **437**
Toderoiu, Filon **164**
Todorov, Antony **213**, **217**, **219**, **220**
Todorova, Maria **27**
Toffler, Alvin **154**, **157**
Tőkés, Rudolf **260**, **262**
Tomova, Ilona **401**
Toms, Miroslav **53**, **55**, **57**, **60**
Tõnisson, Ilmar **246**
Tönnies, Ferdinand **469**
Tooding, Liina **428**
Toomla, Rein **252**, **253**
Torday, Emil **563**
Török, Gábor **268**
Toš, Niko **365**, **368**, **539**
Totev, Anastas **35**
Tóth, Ján **175**, **176**
Trăznea, Ovidiu **325**, **327**
Trbanc, Martina **541**
Tříska, Dušan **55**, **56**, **57**
Trnovský, Juraj **171**
Trotsky, Leo **168**
Truger, Arno **365**
Tugan-Baranovsky, Mikhail Ivanovich **168**
Tůma, Zdeněk **55**
Tureikytė, Danutė **473**, **475**
Turek, Otakar **53**, **54**, **55**
Turner, Jonathan H. **495**
Turnovec, František **54**, **57**, **59**
Turowicz, Jerzy **309**
Tvrdý, Josef **518**

U

Uhan, Samo **365**
Ulašin, Vladimír **171**
Ule, Mirjana **365**, **366**, **541**
Unčovský, Ladislav **171**
Ungureanu, Ion **506**
Urban, Luděk **55**, **57**
Urda, Dušan **523**
Ušeničnik, Aleš **536**
Uzdila, Juozas **475**

V

Vajda, Mihály **260**
Valdemars, Krisjanis **103**
Valentiny, Ákos **95**
Valevičius, Vytautas **290**
Vanags, Alf **83**, **121**
Vanagūnas, Stasys **289**
Vaněk, Jaroslav **54**, **168**, **187**
Vares, Peeter **253**
Varga, Evgeny **168**

Varga, István **84**, **88**, **169**
Várhegyi, Éva **90**
Varian, Hal **60**, **93**, **129**
Vasilescu, Adrian **163**
Vass, László **268**
Veber, France **536**
Večerník, Jiří **237**
Vehovar, Urban **365**
Vejvoda, Jaroslav **171**
Vencovský, František **60**
Vepřek, Jaromír **54**, **60**
Verba, Sidney **313**
Verdery, Katherine **506**
Vetik, Raivo **253**
Vičič, Vlasta **536**
Vihalemm, Peeter **425**, **430**, **431**
Vilcins, Talivaldis **453**
Vilkas, Eduardas **124**
Vilms, Jüri **246**
Vilpišauskas, Ramūnas **292**
Vincze, János **90**
Vintrová, Růžena **55**
Vipper, Robert **275**
Víšek, Jan Ámos **57**
Vitkus, Gediminas **288**, **292**, **293**, **295**
Vlach, Milan **54**
Vlad, Laurențiu **330**
Vladikin, Vladimir **216**
Vlasák, František **57**
Vlăsceanu, Lazăr **505**
Vodopivec, Milan **187**
Voicu, George **330**
Voiculescu, Dan **163**
Voinea, Şerban **324**
Völgyes, Iván **209**, **260**, **262**
Vooglaid, Ülo **425**
Vostatek, Jaroslav **55**
Vosyliūtė, Anelė **468**
Voszka, Éva **88**
Voznesensky, Nikolai Alekseevich **168**
Vyke-Freiberga, Vaira **296**

W

Wachlowski, Zenon **307**
Wagener, Hans-Jürgen **9**, **28**, **147**, **168**, **170**
Wagner, Adolf **51**
Wałęsa, Lech **491**
Wallerstein, Immanuel **154**
Walter, Jaromír **54**, **60**
Ward, Benjamin **187**
Wasilewski, Jace **490**
Weber, Max **19**, **84**, **171**, **277**, **338**, **339**, **388**, **405**, **440**, **453**, **468**, **538**, **549**, **555**, **594**, **600**
Weibull, Lennart **430**
Wenninger, Agnieszka **10**
Wesołowski, Włodzimierz **306**, **308**, **496**, **553**
Wessely, Anna **446**
Wiatr, Jerzy **268**, **269**, **308**, **490**, **519**, **553**
Widerszpil, Stanisław **468**
Wieser, Friedrich von **60**
Wightman, Gordon **344**
Wilcsek, Jenő **87**
Wilczyński, Wacław **145**
Winiecki, Jan **145**
Wnuk-Lipinski, Edmund **24**
Wojtyna, Andrzej **135**, **142**
Woleková, Helena **523**
Wolff, Larry **27**
Wörgötter, Andreas **174**
Woroniecka, Grażyna **492**
Woytinsky, Wladimir Savelievich **168**
Wynnyczuk, Alex **54**
Wyplosz, Charles **89**

Y

Yadov, Vladimir **425**

Z

Žagar, Mitja **365**, **541**
Zajc, Drago **358**, **365**, **366**
Žák, Milan **55**
Zakrzewski, Witold **308**
Zalai, Ernő **93**
Zālīte, Pēteris **275**
Zalts, Alberts **104**
Zaman, Constantin **159**
Zamfir, Cătălin **503**, **505**
Zane, Gheorghe **153**, **159**
Zapf, Wolfgang **415**
Zaťko, Peter **170**
Zawadzki, Władysław Marian **168**
Zbořil, Zdeněk **235**
Zelený, Milan **54**, **55**
Zeletin, Ştefan **159**, **324**, **334**
Zemanovičová, Daniela **175**
Žėruolis, Darius **292**
Zhivkov, Todor **213**
Ziber, Nikolaj Ivanovich **168**

Zieleniec, Josef **55**
Zieliński, Janusz **138**
Zielonka, Jan **17**, **24**
Zigic, Kresimir **56**, **57**
Zimmermann, Karel **54**, **57**
Zlate, Mielu **503**
Znaniecki, Florian **468**, **484**, **485**, **494**, **554**
Zukal, Rudolf **54**
Zver, Milan **366**

Appendix

List of participants

Rapporteurs

Frane Adam
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ljubljana
Kadeljeva pl.1
SLO-1000 LJUBLJANA
Phone: +386-1-58 05 219
E-Mail: frane.adam@uni-lj.si
Degrees: Zagreb University, PhD (1981); post-doctoral specialization in Konstanz and Bielefeld;
Position: Associate professor, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Science, Department of Cultural Studies; head of Center for Theoretical Sociology, University of Ljubljana;
Additional information: Research project “Collective Identities and Slovenian Nation” (1995-98).

Paul D. Aligica
Hudson Institute
5395 Emerson Way
US-IN 46226, INDIANAPOLIS
Phone: +1-317-549 41 57
E-Mail: paligica@yahoo.com
Degrees: Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, PhD Economics (1998); University of Bucharest, PhD Sociology (2000); Indiana University Bloomington, PhD (ABD) Political Science (2002);
Position: Research Fellow, Hudson Institute, Center for Central European and Eurasian Studies, Herman Kahn Center Indianapolis; associate professor, National School of Political Science and Public Administration, Bucharest;
Additional information: Member of the East-European Scholars International Relation Theory Group (1999-2001); member of: International Economics and Philosophy Society, International Studies Association and American Political Science Association; member of editorial boards: *Romanian Journal of Politicians and Society*, *Polis*, *The Romanian Journal of Political Science.*

Daniel Barbu
Faculty of Political Science
University of Bucharest
Str. Spiru Haret No. 8
RO-70738 BUCHAREST 1
Phone: +40-1-3141 268
E-Mail: daniel.barbu@icp.ro
Degrees: University of Cluj, PhD History (1991); University of Bucharest, PhD Philosophy (1999);
Position: Professor, University of Bucharest, Faculty of Political Science (1993-); director of the Institute for Political Research, University of Bucharest (1999-); head of the Department of Political Science, University of Bucharest (1994-2000, 2002 -);
Additional information: Presidential Advisor for Domestic Affairs and European Integration, (1997-98); visiting professor: Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris, Universita La Sapienza, Rome, University of Pittsburgh, Pa.; editor-in-chief of *Studia Politica. Romanian Political Science Review* (2001-).

Bohumil Búzik
The Institute for Sociology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences
Klemensova 19
SK-813 64 BRATISLAVA
Phone: +421-2-529 263 21
E-Mail: SU103@klemens.savba.sk
Degrees: Comenius University, Bratislava, PhD Sociology (1981);
Position: Research Fellow at the Institute for Sociology, the Slovak Academy of Sciences, lecturer on civil society and social stratification at Department of Social work Comenius University;
1998- Scientific Secretary of the Slovak Sociological Association;
Additional information: Field of Work: social mobility and social stratification; transformation and transition theories.

Linas Čekanavičius
Faculty of Economics
Vilnius University
Sauletekio al.9 Bldg 2
LT-2054 VILNIUS
Phone: +370-2-349 540, +370-2-366 141
Fax: +370-2-366 284
E-Mail: linas.cekanavicius@ef.vu.lt
Degrees: Vilnius University, PhD Economics (1986);
Position: Head of Department of Systems Analysis of Economy, Vilnius University (1993-); vice-director of EuroFaculty, Vilnius Center (1993-);
Additional information: Head of Working Group for the development of Lithuania´s Strategy on Economic Policies for Environmental Protection, (2001-2002); member of Working Group for the Development of Lithuania's Mid-term Economic Strategy (1998); member of Policy Analysis Working Group, Project "Central-Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy", Harvard Institute for International Development, (1995-98).

László Csaba
International Relations and European Studies
Central European University
Nádor u.9.
H-1051 BUDAPEST
Phone: +36-1-327 30 80
Fax: +36-1-327 32 43
E-Mail: csabal@ceu.hu
Degrees: Hungarian Academy of Sciences, PhD (1984); Dr.sci. (1996); habilitation at Budapest University of Economic Sciences and Public Administration (1997);
Position: Professor, Central European University, Department of International Relations and European Studies, Budapest (2000-); professor, Budapest University of Economic Sciences and Public Administration, Department of Comparative Economics (1997-); professor, University Debrecen;
Additional information: Chair of PhD Program in Economics, University Debrecen (1999-); member of: International Studies Committee, Hungarian Foreign Policy Association, Strategic Task force on European Integration at the Hungarian PM´s Office; member of editorial board of *Intereconomics*, Germany; *Europe-Asia Studies*, Britain; *Russian and East European Finance and Trade*, USA; *Vorprosy Ekonomiki*, Russia; *Acta Oeconomica*, *Közgazdasági Szemle* and *Külgazdaság*, Hungary.

Mitko Dimitrov
Institute of Economics
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Aksakov str.3
BG-1040 SOFIA
Phone: +359-2-987 58 79
Fax: +359-2 988 21 08
E-Mail: m.dimitrov@iki.bas.bg
Degrees: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, PhD Economics (1986);
Position: Associated professor, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences; director of the Institute of Economics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, (1999-); associated professor: New Bulgarian University, Sofia University (1996-) and Veliko Turnovo University (1995-);
Additional information: Chairman of the Evaluation Committee, Bulgarian Association for Management Development and Entrepreneurship (1998-); member of the Executive Committee of the European Association for Comparative Economic Studies (1998-2002); research grants: ACE, Phare, 5th FP; research fellowships: United Kingdom, France, Belgium.

Danica Fink-Hafner
Institute of Social Sciences
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ljubljana
P.O.BOX 2547
SI-1001 LJUBLJANA
Phone: +386-1-580 51 73
Fax: +386-1-580 51 01
E-Mail: danica.fink@uni-lj.si, danica.fink-hafner@guest.arnes.si
Degrees: University of Ljubljana, PhD Political Science (1992);
Position: Professor, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences, (2002-); head of Center for Political Science Research, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences, (1997-);
Additional information: President of the Slovenian Political Science Association, (1991-93); vice-dean for Research, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences, (1997-99); member of the editorial board *The Journal of European Public Policy*, Routledge, (1993-99).

Stanisław Gebethner
Institute of Political Science
Faculty of Journalism and Political Science
Warsaw University
Krakowskie Przedmieście 1
PL-00047 WARSZAWA
Phone: +48-22-55 20 187
E-Mail: sgebethner@poczta.onet.pl
Degrees: PhD legal studies; habilitation in political sciences;
Position: Associate professor, Warsaw University; head of Section of Political Systems, Warsaw University, Faculty of Journalism and Political Science, Institute of Political Science;
Additional information: Member of Scientific Board of Institute of Political Science, Warsaw University.

Nikolai Genov
Institute of Sociology
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Moskovska Str. 13A
BG-1000 SOFIAPhone: +359-2-980 61 32
Fax: +359-2-803 791
E-Mail: nbgen.most.risk@datacom.bg
Degrees: University of Leipzig, PhD, (1975); Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Dr.sci. (1986);
Position: Professor, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Sociology, Sofia, (1990-); head of Department of Global and Regional Development, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Sociology, (1990-); professor, Free University, Berlin, (2002-);
Additional information: Chairman of the Social Science Commission, Bulgarian National Commission for UNESCO (1992-); vice-president of the International Social Science Council, Paris (1998-); director, UNESCO/MOST-ISSC International Summer School "Comparative Research in the Social Sciences" (2000-); international editor of *American Journal of Sociology* (1985-1987); member of the Editorial Council of *Comparative Sociology* (2001-).

Jan Holzer
School of Social Studies
Masaryk University
Gorkeho 7
CZ-60200 BRNO
Phone: +420-5-416 151 24
Fax: +420-5-416 151 00
E-Mail: holzer@fss.muni.cz
Degrees: Masaryk University, PhD Political Science (1998);
Position: Associate professor, Masaryk University, School of Social Studies, Department of Political Science, Brno (1998-); member of Committee for PhD Program, Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Politological Studies, Prague, (2001-); chairman of Institute of Central European Studies (2001-);
Additional information: Member of Science Council, Military Academy, Faculty of Command and Staff, Brno (1999-); member of Cabinet of Integrated Typology of Genres, Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts, Institute of Slavonic Studies; member of Czech Political Sciences Association and of European Political Science Network (EPSNet); member of editorial board of the journal *Politika v ČR,* Masaryk University, Brno (1997-).

Július Horváth
Department of International Relations and European Studies
Central European University
Nádor u.9.
H-1051 BUDAPESTPhone: +36-1-327 32 48
Fax: +36-1-327 32 43
E-Mail: horvathj@ceu.hu
Degrees: Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, USA, PhD Economics (1996);
Position: Professor, Central European University, Departments of International Relations and European Studies and of Economics, Budapest;
Additional information: External Consultant, Monetary Policy Division, Czech National Bank (1997).

Michal Illner
Institute of Sociology
Czech Academy of Sciences
Jilska 1
CZ-11000 PRAHA 1
Phone: +420-2-22 22 07 28
Fax: +420-2-22 22 01 43
E-Mail: illner@soc.cas.cz
Degrees: Charles University, Prague, PhD Administrative Law (1968);
Position: Director of Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of Sciences; professor, Charles University, Prague, (1989-);
Additional information: former chairman of Masaryk Czech Sociological Association; participation in DANIDA Public Administration project, Kirgistan; co-operation with: UN Development Program, UN Department of Social and Economic Affairs and in OECD/SIGMA Programs.

Georgi Karasimeonov
Institute for Political and Legal Studies
Geo Milev Str.44, block 35
BG-1111 SOFIA
Phone: +359-2-971 43 74
Fax: +359-2-971 43 74
E-Mail: karas@cblink.net
Degrees: Sofia University, PhD Law (1976); Dr.sci. Philosophy (1989);
Position: Managing director, Institute of Political and Legal Studies, Sofia; professor, University of Sofia, Faculty of Philosophy, Departments of Political Science and of Public Administration, (1991-); visiting professor at the University of Orebro, Faculty of Political Science, Sweden, (1997-);
Additional information: President of the Bulgarian Political Science Association (1991-1998); member of the Political Science Council.

Raita Karnite
Institute of Economics
Latvian Academy of Sciences
Akademijas Laukums 1
LV-1050 RIGA
Phone: +371-722 28 30
Fax: +371-782 06 08
E-Mail: raimara@lza.lv, apsis@lza.lv
Degrees: Latvian Academy of Sciences, Candidate of Economic Sciences, (1987); Latvian University, Dr. oec., (1992);
Position: Director of Institute of Economics, Latvian Academy of Sciences, (1997-); member of the Senate, Latvian Academy of Sciences (1997-);
Additional information: Member of the Advisory Council to the State Audit Office of the Republic of Latvia; member of the National Economy Advisory Council affiliated to the Ministry of Economics; expert in the European Commission ECOS-OUVERTURE (1996, 1997) and European Commission PHARE BSPF (1998).

Robert Klobucký
The Institute for Sociology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences
Klemensova 19
SK-813 64 BRATISLAVA
Phone: +421-2-529 263 21
E-Mail: SU103@klemens.savba.sk
Degrees: Comenius University Bratislava, Faculty of Philosophy, MA Sociology (1996);
Position: Junior Research Fellow at the Institute for Sociology, the Slovak Academy of Sciences, PhD student in Sociology at the Department of Sociology, Comenius University;
Additional information: Editor of the journal *Sociológia*.

Tadeusz Kowalik
Institute of Economic Sciences
Polish Academy of Sciences
ul. Marszalkowska 77/79
PL-00683 WARSAW
Phone: +48-22-849 12 17
Fax: +48-22-629 58 97
E-Mail: tkowalik@wspiz.edu.pl
Degrees: Warsaw University, PhD Economics (1958); Warsaw University, habilitation (1964);
Position: Professor, Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Economic Sciences; professor, School of Social and Economic Studies, Warsaw;
Additional information: Member of editorial board of the journal *Economic Analysis*; member of Council of Socio-Economic Strategy (1994-).

Algis Krupavičius
Institute of Policy and Public Administration
Kaunas University of Technology
K. Donelaicio st. 20
LI-3000 KAUNAS
Phone: +370-7-300 111, +370-7-300 110
Fax: +370-7-300 102
E-Mail: a84601@pikuolis.omnitel.net
Degrees: Academy of Sciences, Moscow, PhD Politics (1989);
Position: Director of Institute of Policy and Public Administration, Kaunas University of Technology, (1999-); professor, Kaunas University of Technology, Department of Public Administration, (2001-), professor, Vytautas Magnus University, Department of Political Science, Kaunas, (1992-);
Additional information: Member of editorial boards of: *Socialiniai mokslai* (1997-), *Journal of Baltic Studies* (1998-); *Viesoji politika ir administravimas* (2002-).

Zuzana Kusá
Institute of Sociology
Slovak Academy of Sciences
Klemensova 19
SK-81364 BRATISLAVA
Phone: +421-7-529 26 321
Fax: +421-7-529 12 361
E-Mail: sukusa@klemens.savba.sk
Degrees: Slovak Academy of Sciences, PhD Sociology (1991);

Position: Senior Research Fellow, Slovak Academy of Sciences, (1992-); Comenius University, Bratislava, Departments of Sociology (1992-) and of Social work (1997-); Academy of Arts, Bratislava (1999-);
Additional information: Editor of *Sociological Diary,* (1991-); member of editorial board of *Biograf,* Prague (1995-).

Maria Larionescu
Department of Sociology and Social Work
University of Bucharest
Bd.Schitu Magureanu 9, sector 5
RO-70761 BUCHAREST
Phone: +40-1-314 03 26
Fax: +40-1-312 52 79, +40-1-315 31 22
E-Mail: crughinis@yahoo.com, larionescu@home.ro, larionescu@instal.utcb.ro
Degrees: Romanian Academy of Sciences, PhD Philosophy (1974);
Position: Professor, University of Bucharest, Department of Sociology and Social Work (1990-);
Additional information: Coordinator of research on „The History of Romanian Sociology since the Beginnings“, Institute of Sociology, Bucharest (1975-95); deputy editor of *The Romanian Journal of Sociology* (1982-).

Matej Makarovič
Faculty of Social Sciences
Department of Sociology
University of Ljubljana
Kadeljeva pl.1
SLO-1000 LJUBLJANA
Phone: +386-1-580 53 16
E-Mail: matej.makarovic@uni-lj.si
Degrees: University of Ljubljana, PhD Sociology (1999);
Position: Assistant, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences;
Additional information: Research fields: social systems theory, political sociology, organizations.

Darina Malová
Department of Political Science
Comenius University
P.O. Box 1, Gondola
SK-81801 BRATISLAVA
Phone: +421 259 244 194
Fax: +421 259 244 405
E-Mail: Darina.malova@fphil.uniba.sk
Degrees: Academy of Sciences, Moscow, PhD Social Science (1990);
Position: Associate professor, Comenius University, Department of Political Science, Bratislava, (1991-); academic director (2000-) and Advisor of European Studies Program (1994-), Academia Istropolitana Nova, Institute for Graduate Studies, Bratislava;
Additional information: Specialization in Slovak politics, European integration and transition to democracy.

Radosław Markowski
Institute of Political Studies
Polish Academy of Sciences
ul. Polna 18/20
PL-00625 WARSAW
Phone: +48-22-825 52 21
Fax: +48-22-825 21 46
E-Mail: rmark@omega.isppan.waw.pl
Degrees: Warsaw University, PhD Political Sciences (1990);
Position: Head of Electoral Studies Section, Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Political Studies, (1991-); vice-chair of Department of Political Science, Warsaw School of Social Psychology; lecturer at the Collegium Civitas, Warsaw;
Additional information: Director and principal investigator of the Polish National Election Study (1996-); member of the Planning Committee of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (ICORE project, 1997-); member of Editorial Board: *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* and *Central European Political Science Review.*

Jože Mencinger
University of Ljubljana
Kongresni trg. 12
SLO-1000 LJUBLJANA
Phone: +386-1-241 86 04
E-Mail: joze.mencinger@uni-lj.si
Degrees: University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, US, PhD Economics (1975);
Position: Professor, University of Ljubljana (1987-); rector, University of Ljubljana (1998-);
Additional information: Ministry of Economy and Deputy Prime Ministry of the Republic of Slovenia (1990-91); member of the Board of the Bank of Slovenia (1991-97), director of the Economic Institute of the Law School, Slovenia (1993-2001); editor of *Gospodarska Gibanja,* (1987-).

Silvia Mihaliková
Department of Political Science
Comenius University
Gondova 2
SK-81801 BRATISLAVA
Phone: +421-7-59 24 41 94, +421-7-59 24 45 24
Fax: +421-7-59 24 44 05
E-Mail: silvia.mihalikova@fphil.uniba.sk
Degrees: Comenius University, PhD Sociology, (1987); Certificate of Achievement, International Human Rights Training Programme by Canadian Human Rights Foundation, Quebec, (1994);
Position: Associate professor, Comenius University, Department of Political Science, Bratislava (1990-); executive director of UNESCO Chair for Human Rights Education, Comenius University (1992-); visiting research fellow, Bremen University, Germany (1999-);
Additional information: President of Slovak Political Science Association (1994-98).

Janusz L. Mucha
Institute of Sociology
Nicholas Copernicus University
Fosa Staromiejska 1A
PL-87100 TORUN
Phone: +48-56-622 76 40, +48-56-611 36 21
Fax: +48-56-622-4765
E-Mail: jmucha@cc.uni.torun.pl
Degrees: Jagiellonian University, PhD Sociology (1976); Habilitation Sociology (1986);
Position: Professor, Nicholas Copernicus University, Institute of Sociology, Torun;
Additional information: Member of Committee on Sociology and on Ethnology (1996-); member of Scientific Council of Institute for Philosophy and Sociology (1999-), Polish Academy of Sciences; editor-in-chief of *Studia Socjologiczne* (2001-); member of Editorial Board of *Regiony Polski* (1999-); member of advisory board of the journals: *Polish Sociological Review* (2000-) and *Mobilization* (1996-).

Dénes Némedi
Department of the History of Sociology
Institute of Sociology and Social Policy
Faculty of Arts and Humanities
Eötvös Loránd University
Pázmány Péter sétány 1/a
H-1117 BUDAPEST
Phone: +36-1-209 055 568 47
Fax: +36-1-372 29 12
E-Mail: dnemedi@ludens.elte.hu, h9096nem@helka.iif.hu
Degrees: Kossuth University, Debrecen, PhD History (1972), Candidate of the Sociological Sciences (1982), Doctor of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Sociology (1996);
Position: Professor, Department of the History of Sociology, Institute of Sociology and Social Policy, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Eötvös Loránd University
Additional information: Member of the Hungarian Sociological Association, member of the Research Committee on the History of Sociology of the ISA.

Pavel Pšeja
School of Social Studies
Masaryk University
Gorkeho 7
CZ-602 00 BRNO
Phone: +420-5-416 152 72
E-Mail: palo@fss.muni.cz
Degrees: Masaryk University, PhD Political Science (2002);
Position: Senior Lecturer, Masaryk University, School of Social Studies, Department of European Studies and International Relations, Brno (1999-);
Additional information: Member of editorial board of the journal *Proglas* (2001-); member of Czech Political Science Association, Masaryk University, International Institute of Political Science.

Tiia Püss
Estonian Institute of Economics
Tallinn Technical University
7 Estonia Avenue
EE-10143 TALLINN
Phone: +372-645 41 61
Fax: +372-630 88 51
E-Mail: tpyss@tami.ee
Degrees: Estonian Academy of Sciences, PhD Economics (1983);
Position: Director of Estonian Institute of Economics, Tallinn Technical University, (1998-); Estonian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Sociology, (1998-); Parnu College, University of Tartu (2000-);
Additional information: Chair of the Scientific Council at the Estonian Institute of Economics, Tallinn Technical University; member of: the Scientific Council of: Tallinn Technical University, the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration; the International Atlantic Economic Society; the Estonian Scientists Union and the board of the Estonian Economists Society.

Péter Róbert
TÁRKI Social Research Information Center
Budaőrsi út 45
H-1112 BUDAPEST
Phone: +36-1-309 76 76
Fax: +36-1-309 76 66
E-Mail: robert@tarki.hu
Degrees: Hungarian Academy of Sciences, PhD Sociology (1986); Eötvös Loránd University, Habilitation (2000);
Position: Associate professor, Eötvös Loránd University, Institute of Sociology, Budapest (1992-); Senior Researcher, TÁRKI Social Research Center (1996-);
Additional information: Hungarian coordinator of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP, 1992-).

Andris Runcis
Department of Political Science
Social Science Faculty
University of Latvia
Lomonosova iela 1
LV-1019 Riga
Phone: +371-7089-859
Fax:+371-7089-852
E-mail: aruncis@latnet.lv
Degrees: Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Institute of Sociology, PhD Sociology (1985);
Position: Associate professor, University of Latvia, Department of Political Science (1990-);
Additional information: Head of the Department of Political Science (1993-1999).

Máté Szabó
Faculty of State and Law
Eötvös Loránd University
Egyetem tér 1-3., Pf. 109
H-1364 BUDAPEST
Phone: +36-1-266 95 03
Fax: +36-1-266 51 98
E-Mail: matedoc@ludens.elte.hu
Degrees: Hungarian Academy of Sciences, PhD Political Science (1987); Eötvös Loránd University, habilitation (1995); Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Dr.sci. (1996);
Position: Professor, Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of State and Law, Department of Political Science (1995-);
Additional information: Member of the Hungarian Political Science Association and the Hungarian Sociological Association; reviewer of the international journal *Mobilization* (1995-).

Aivars Tabuns
Institute of Philosophy and Sociology
Latvian Academy of Sciences
Akademijas laukums 1
LV-1940 RIGA-3
Phone: +371-722 71 10
Fax: +371-721 08 06
E-Mail: atabuns@lza.lv
Degrees: Academy of Sciences, Moscow, PhD Sociology (1989); Latvian Academy of Sciences, Dr.soc. (1992);
Position: Associate professor, University of Latvia, Department of Sociology, (1999-);
Additional information: Chairman of the Board at the Faculty of Social Science, Latvian University; vice-president of Latvian Sociological Association; member of Latvian Council of Science, Senate and Promotion Board in Sociology, Communication Studies and Political Sciences of the Latvian University; member of the EC‘s sub-committee on „Improving the Socio-economic Knowledge Base“; board member of UNESCO Latvian National Commission; member of editorial board of *Proceedings of the Latvian Academy of Sciences* and of Editorial Advisory Board of *Polish Sociological Review*, editorial consultant of journal *Humanities and Social Sciences,* Latvia.

Mikk Titma
Department of Sociology
Tartu University/Stanford University
78 Tiigi Str.
EE-50410 TARTU/ STANFORD CA 94305
Phone: +372-7-376 156, +1-415-723 03 89
Fax: +372-7-375 900
E-Mail: titma@psych.ut.ee, titma@stanford.edu
Degrees: Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Candidate in Sociology (1968); PhD Sociology (1975);
Position: Professor (1979-); Director of Center for Social Research on Eastern Europe, Tallinn (1990-); Senior research scholar, Stanford University, Department of Sociology, US (1994-); professor, Tartu University, department of Social Science, (1998-);
Additional information: Main Research Project: Paths of a Generation (longitudinal study of life careers) in 9 successor states of the USSR (1983-), in Estonia (1966-91).

František Turnovec
Faculty of Social Sciences
Charles University
Opletalova 26
CZ-11000 PRAGUE 1
Phone: +420-2-22 11 23 07
Fax: +420-2-22 11 23 04
E-Mail: turnovec@mbox.fsv.cuni.cz, frantisek.turnovec@tiscali.cz
Degrees: Charles University, Prague, PhD Mathematics (1982); University of Economics, Bratislava, PhD Economics (1990);
Position: Professor, Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute for Economic Studies, Department of Economics of European Integration and Economic Policy (2000-); visiting professor, Wrocław College of Management and Finance (2000-);
Additional information: Member of the Academic Boards of the Faculty of Social Sciences of Charles University, Prague (1995-) and of Masaryk University, Brno (1998-); member of the Scientific Council of the Prague Institute for International Relations (1996-); vice-chairman of the Committee of Ministry of Education of the Czech Republic for evaluation; founding editor of *Czechoslovak Journal for Operations Research* (1992); associate editor of *Central European Journal for Operations Research* (1999-); member of editorial boards of: *European Journal of Political Economy* (1996-), *Journal of European Integration* (1998-), *Politicka ekonomie* (1998-), *Prague Economic Papers* (1998-), *Ekonomicke rozhlady*, Bratislava (1995-).

Ľudovít Turčan
The Institute for Sociology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences
Klemensova 19
Sk-813 64 BRATISLAVA
Phone: +421-2-529 263 21
E-Mail: SU103@klemens.savba.sk
Degrees: Comenius University Bratislava; PhD Sociology (1996);
Position: Senior Research Fellow at the Institute For Sociology, the Slovak Academy of Sciences;
Additional information: Field of work: history of social and sociological thinking in Slovakia, socialisation theories, interlinks of philosophy and sociology.

Raivo Vetik
Institute of International and Social Studies
Tallinn Pedagogical University
Estonia blv.7
EE-10143 TALLINN
Phone: +372-644 30 78
Fax: +372-645 49 27
E-Mail: vetik@iiss.ee
Degrees: Tartu University, Candidate of Philosophy (1989); Tampere University, Finland, PhD (1999); University of Oslo, Institute of Political Science, post-doctoral research training (1991-1992);
Position: Director of Institute of International and Social Studies, Tallinn Padagogical University (1998-); associate professor, Tartu University, Department of Political Science, (1995-).

Anelė Vosyliūtė
Lithuanian Institute of Philosophy and Sociology
Lithuanian Academy of Sciences
Saltoniskiu 58
LH-2600 VILNIUS
E-Mail: vosylan@ktl.mii.lt, marta_vo@hotmail.com
Degrees: Vilnius University, PhD Sociology (1993);
Position: Senior scientific researcher, Vilnius University, Lithuanian Institute of Philosophy and Sociology (1977-); scientific researcher, Vilnius University; vice-president of Lithuanian Sociological Society (1991-);
Additional information: Lecturer, Lithuanian Military Academy (2000-2001); member in Editorial Board of periodical journal *Filosofija. Sociologija*.

Paweł Załęcki
Institute of Sociology
Nicolas Copernicus University
ul. Fosa Staromiejska 1a
PL-87-100 TORUN
Phone: +48-56-611 36 36, +48-56-611 36 22
Fax: +48-56-622 47 65
E-Mail: zalecki@cc.uni.torun.pl, zalecki@post.pl
Degrees: Nicholas Copernicus University, PhD Sociology (2000);
Position: Associate professor, Nicholas Copernicus University, Institute of Sociology, Cultural Studies Department.

Discussants

Roumen Avramov
Center for Liberal Strategies
Alexander Battenberg st.4
BG-1000 SOFIA
Phone: +359-2-986 14 33, +359-2-981 89 26
Fax: +359-2-981 89 25
E-Mail: roumen@cls-sofia.org
Degrees: Higher Institute of Economics, Sofia, PhD Economics (1986);
Position: Program Director of Center for Liberal Strategies Sofia (1994-);
Additional information: Member of the Board of Governors, Bulgarian National Bank (1997-2002); member of Editorial Board of *Most-Most, Economic Policy in Transitional Economies*, Kluwer Academic Publishers (1994-), *Discussion Papers Series* at Bulgarian National Bank (1998-); vice-president of Agency for Economic Coordination and Development (Government of the Republic of Bulgaria) (1991-94).

Vladas Gaidys
Market and Public Opinion Research Center Vilmorus Ltd.
Gedimino ave. 1/1-15
LH-2001 VILNIUS
Phone: +370-2-690 979
Fax: +370-2-690 981
E-Mail: vgaidys@post.omnitel.net, vladas@vilmorus.lt
Degrees: Sociological Research Institute, Moscow, PhD (1981);

Position: Associate professor, Vilnius University, Faculty of Communication, Department of Communication and Information Theory (1995-);
Additional information: Head of Public Opinion Research Center (1989-); director of Market and Public Opinion Research Center Vilmorous Ltd. (1993-); member of European Society for Opinion and Marketing Research (ESOMAR) and World Association for Public Opinion Research (WAPOR).

Mihai Dinu Gheorghiu
Centre de Sociologie Européenne / Center for European sociology
54 Bld. Raspail
F-75006 PARIS
Phone: +33-1 49 54 2097
Fax: +33-1 49 54 2674
E-Mail: Mihaidg@yahoo.fr, gheorghi@msh-paris.fr
Degrees: Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, PhD Sociology (1997);
Position: Associate professor, University of Iasi, Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences (1998-); head of a research team, Maison des Sciences de l'Homme Paris – Conseil Général de Seine-Saint-Denis (1998-);
Additional information: Research fellow in Max-Planck-Institut für Bildunbgsforschung Berlin (1994-1995 ; 1998); Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum Geschichte und Kultur Ostmitteleuropas Leipzig (1997); part-time lecturer in University of Amiens (1999-2002), scientific researcher in Centre d'Etudes de l'Emploi (1999-2001), IRESCO Paris (2002-); member of the Scientific board of the review *Politique et Sociétés,* Société québécoise de science politique, Montréal (1995-).

Deniss Hanovs
Latvian Academy of Culture
Kaniera 18-64
LV-1063 RIGA
Phone: +371-718 73 66
E-Mail: denisslat7@hotmail.com
Degrees: Latvian Academy of Culture, Riga, BA (1999); MA Theory of Culture (2001); Latvian Academy of Culture, Faculty for Theory of Culture, Riga, PhD in process;
Position: Lecturer at the Latvian Academy of Culture, Riga (1999-); scientific assistant to Dr. Hirschhausen (1997-).

Morten Hansen
EuroFaculty
Raina Blvd.19
LV-1586 RIGA
Phone: +371-703 43 70
Fax: +371-782 02 60
E-Mail: mhansen@eurofaculty.lv, morten@sseriga.edu.lv
Degrees: Aarhus University, Denmark, cand.oecon./M.Sc. Economics (1992);
Position: Visiting professor, EuroFaculty, Riga, (1993-94, 1996-); visiting lecturer, Stockholm School of Economics in Riga (1997-); research fellow, Center for European and Transition Studies, University of Latvia (2000-) and Baltic International Center for Economic Policy Studies (BICEPS/2001-);
Additional information: Founding member of Latvian European Community Studies Association (LECSA/1996-).

Jiri Havel
Charles University
Opletalova 26
CZ-11000 PRAGUE 1
Phone: +420-2-2211-2325
E-Mail: havel@mbox.fsv.cuni.cz
Degrees: Prague School of Economics, PhD Economics (1991)
Position: Associate professor, Department of Finance and Capital Markets, Charles University;
Additional information: Chairman of the National Property Fund (1999-2000), vice-president of Czech Economic Society (2001-).

Algimantas Jankauskas
Institute of International Relations and Political Science
Vilnius University
Didlaukio 47-205
LT-2057 VILNIUS
Phone: +370-2-700 089
Fax: +370-2-700 779
E-Mail: algimantas.jankauskas@tspmi.vu.lt
Degrees: Vilnius University, PhD Political Science (1994);
Position: Associated professor, Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University (1996-, research director 1993-);
Additional information: Co-editor of the journal *Politologija*; Secretary General of the Lithuanian Political Science Association (1994-).

Svetla Koleva
Institute of Sociology
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
13A Moskovska str.
BG-1000 SOFIA
Phone: +359-2-980 90 86
Fax: +359-2-980 58 95
E-Mail: skoleva@bulmail.net
Degrees: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, PhD Sociology (1990);
Position: Research associate, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Sociology, (1990-); research associate, University of Quebec in Hull, Canada (1997-) ;
Additional information: Ministry of education (1995-98), member of: the Grand Jury Judging the Finalists in the ISA‘s Third International Competition for Young Sociologists (1997-98), of the Bulgarian Sociological Association (1990-), of the International Sociological Association (ISA, 1994-) and of the International Association of French-speaking Sociologists (1993-).

Zdzisław Marek Krasnodębski
University of Bremen
Innsbrucker Strasse 23
D-28215 BREMEN
Phone: +49-421-218 21 05, +49-421-218 27 70
Fax:+49-421-218 20 23
E-Mail: kras@uni-bremen.de
Degrees: Warsaw University, PhD Sociology (1984); Habilitation (1991);
Position: Professor, University of Bremen, Cultural History of East-Europe (1995-);

Additional information: Member of Polish Sociology and Philosophy Association, International Sociological Institute and Sociological Association, German Association for East European Studies and for Phenomenological Research; member of Scientific Boards at: Charles University, Faculty of Social Studies, Prague (1994-); German-Polish Association, Bremen (1998-); Helmuth-Plessner Association; Sociology Committee of Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw (1999-); member of International Board of *The Polish Sociological Review*.

Mikko Kari Lagerspetz
Estonian Institute of Humanities
Salme 12
EE-10116 TALLINNPhone: +372-641 64 22
E-Mail: mikkokari@solo.delfi.ee, mikko@ehi.ee
Degrees: University of Turku, Dr.rer.pol Sociology (1996);
Position: Professor, Estonian Institute of Humanities , Tallinn (1997-);
Additional information: Rector, Estonian Institute of Humanities (1998-2001); adjunct associate professor, University of Turku (1997); member of the Board, Open Estonia Foundation (2001-); president of Estonian Association of Sociologists (1998-).

Eva Laiferová
Department of Sociology
Comenius University
Šafárikovo nám 6
SK-81806 BRATISLAVA
Phone: +421-2-592 44 111
Fax: +421-2-529 66 016
E-Mail: Eva.Laiferova@fphil.uniba.sk
Degrees: Comenius University, PhD Sociological Sciences (1984);
Position: Head of the Department of Sociology, Comenius University, Faculty of Philosophy, Bratislava (1998-); senior lecturer (1992-).

András Lánczi
Department of Political Science
Budapest University of Economics and Public Administration
Fővám tér 8
H-1093 BUDAPEST
Phone: +36-1-218 80 49
E-Mail: andras.lanczi@polit.bke.hu
Degrees: Eötvös Loránd University, PhD Philosophy (1993); habilitation in political science (2001);
Position: Associate professor, Budapest University of Economics and Public Administration (1991-); „Széchenyi" Professorship Grant (1999-);
Additional information: President of the Hungarian Policy Institute (1997-); scientific senior member of the 21st Institute, Budapest (2001); editor of *Hungarian Review of Political Science*, the *Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought* (1995) and the *Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Science* (2001).

Franc Mali
Faculty for Social Sciences
University of Ljubljana
Kardeljeva pl.5
SLO-1000 LJUBLJANA
Phone: +386-1-2301076
E-Mail: franc.mali@uni-lj.si
Degrees: University of Ljubljana, PhD Sociology and Epistemology of Science (1993);
Position: Associate professor, University of Ljubljana, Faculty for Social Sciences;
Additional information: Member of Editorial Board at *Journal of Social Sciences in Slovenia*; member of the co-ordination committee of the Sociology and Technology Research Network at the European Sociological Association; principal investigator and scientific co-worker in different national and international research projects in the following fields: sociology of science, higher education research, science and technology policy; member of external expert groups for evaluation of sociological departments in CEE countries.

Mircea Teodor Maniu
Faculty of European Studies
Babes-Bolyai University
Str. Em. de Martonne No.1
RO-3400 CLUJ-NAPOCA
Phone/Fax: +40-64-190 251
E-Mail: mmaniu@euro.ubbcluj.ro
Degrees: Babes-Bolyai University, PhD Economics (1997);
Position: Associate professor, Babes-Bolyai University, Faculty of European Studies (1984-); head of Chair, Management of European Institutions (2001-);
Additional information: Director General, Ministry of Education, International Affairs Department, Romania (1998-2000); Contractor, EU-Tempus Phare Educational Project (1996-2001); member of the Board of the Alliance of Universities for Democracy (1992-); Romanian-American Friendship Association; Initiatives for Democracy in Eastern Europe (IDEE), Bucharest.

Zdeňka Mansfeldová
Institute of Sociology,
Czech Academy of Sciences
Jilska 1
CZ-110 00 PRAGUE 1
Phone: +420-2-22 22 06 82
Fax: +420-2-22 22 01 43
E-Mail: mansfeld@soc.cas.cz
Degrees: Charles University, Prague; PhD Empirical Sociology (1988); Faculty of Philosophy, Moscow State University;
Position: Senior research fellow and deputy director of the Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of Sciences; member of executive committee at Czech Political Science Association;
Additional information: Visiting professor, Social Science Research Center Berlin, (1993); fellow at Institute of Advanced Study, Berlin (1999); fellow of Japan Society of the Promotion of Science at Chuo University, Tokio (1998, 2002); Japan Institute of Labour (2000) and Japan Foundation fellow at Chuo University (2000).

Piotr Mazurkiewicz
Faculty of Historical and Social Sciences
Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski University
ul. Dewajtis 3
PL-01-815 WARSAW
E-Mail: Mazurkiewicz@elektron.pl, mazurkiewicz@uksw.edu.pl
Degrees: Academy of Catholic Theology in Warsaw, PhD Sociology (1996); Polish Academy of Science, habilitation in political science (2002);
Position: Pontifical Theological Faculty in Warsaw (1995-); Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski University, Faculty of Historical and Social Sciences, Institute of Political Science (1997-);
Additional information: member of the board of European Society for Research in Ethics „Societas Ethica" (2001-).

Ivo Možný
Social Studies School
Masaryk University
Gorkeho 7
CZ-60200 BRNO
Phone: +420-5-49 25 85 41
Fax: +420-5-41 61 52 88
E-Mail: mozny@fss.muni.cz
Degrees: University of Brno, PhD Sociology (1967); Charles University, Prague, CSc Sociology (1989);
Position: Professor, Masaryk University, Brno (1992-); dean of School of Social Studies, Masaryk University, Brno (1998-, director 1995-);
Additional information: Vice-dean of Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Brno (1994-); head of Postgraduate Studies in Sociology, Palacky University, Olomouc (1993-); member of Scientific Council of: Masaryk University, the Faculty of Informatics at Masaryk University and the Faculty of Social Sciences at Charles University, Prague; member of Czech Learned Society and of Czech Sociological Association, Prague; member of editorial board of *Sociologicky casopis* and *Sociological Revue*, Prague.

Endre Nagy
Department of Sociology and Social Policy
University of Pécs
Rókus u. 2.
H-7624 PÉCS
E-Mail: nagyend@btk.pte.hu, szoctitk@btk.ppke.hu
Degrees: PhD (1989); habilitation in historical sciences (1994);
Position: Professor and Head of Department of Sociology and Social Policy (1991-), University of Pécs; professor, Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Department of Sociology, Budapest; professor, Berzsenyi Dániel College, Szombathely (1999-);
Additional information: Vice-dean, Faculty of Humanities, Janus Pannonius University (1996); chair of the Sociological Section of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (1998-); member of editorial boards of *Esély* (1990-), *Polanyiana* (1991-), „*Vigilia*" and *Appraisal* (1995-).

Vello Andres Pettai
Department of Political Science
University of Tartu
Ülikooli 18
EE-50090 TARTU
Phone: +372-7-375 312
Fax:+372-7-375 154
E-Mail: vello@ec.ut.ee
Degrees: Columbia University, New York, MA (1993); M.Phil (1997); PhD (ABD) Political Science;
Position: Lecturer, University of Tartu, Department of Political Science, (1997-); chair of Executive Board, PRAXIS Center for Policy Studies, Tallinn, (2000-); member of Executive Board of EuroCollege, University of Tartu (2000-);
Additional information: Advisor to the President of the Republic of Estonia and Presidential Representative to the Presidential Roundtable on National Minorities (1997-99); member of Steering Committee, European Thematic Network-Political Science (1999-2001); member of Executive Board, Non-Estonians Integration Foundation (1998-2000), EUSSIRF Fellow, European University Institute (2001).

Alari Purju
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
Tallinn Technical University
101 Kopli
EE-11712 TALLINNPhone: +372-620 39 45
Fax: +372-620 39 46
E-Mail: purju@tv.ttu.ee
Degrees: Estonian Academy of Sciences, PhD (1988); Central European University and University of the State of New York, Albany, MA Economics (1995);
Position: Professor (1997-) and Dean (1996-) of Tallinn Technical University, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration; visiting professor, Lappeenranta University of Technology (1998-);
Additional information: Advisor to Minister in Economics Policy Issues, Ministry of Economic Affairs of the Republic of Estonia (1997-99); member of The Estonian Association of Economists (1981-) and of the The American Economic Association (1995-); adviser of thesis at Stockholm School of Economics, Riga (1999-).

Zlatko Šabič
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ljubljana
Kardeljeva pl.5
SLO-1000 LJUBLJANA
Phone. +386-1-580 51 98
Fax: +386-1-580 51 10
E-Mail: zlatko.sabic@uni-lj.si
Degrees: University of Ljubljana, PhD International Relations (1997);
Position: Associate professor, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences, International Relations Division; member of Senate of Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana; director of Research Development, Central and East European International Studies Association (1998-);

Additional information: Editor-in-chief of the *European Journal of International Relations*; Junior Research Fellow at the Center of International Relations at the Faculty of Social Sciences (1990-1997).

Sylvija Senkane
Latvian Academy of Culture
Ludzas iela 24
Riga LV1003
Latvia
Tel: +371-7140175
Fax: +371-7141012
E-Mail: sociology@lka.edu.lv
Degrees: PhD sociology;
Position: Chair of the department of sociology, Latvian Academy of Culture.

Andrej Školkay
Jelacicova 20
SK-821 08 BRATISLAVA
Phone: +421 7 55574179
E-Mail: askolkay@marta.sk
Degrees: Comenius University, PhD Political Science (1997);
Position: Lecturer at the University of SS. Cyril and Methodius, Trnava, Slovakia
Additional information: Special Advisor to the National Council of the Slovak Republic (1995); leader of international research project „Political Communication in Transition: A Comparative Study (1998-2000); member in „Relapse into Communism? The Media and Socio-Political Consciousness in Central and Eastern Europe (1996-97), „Media Reform and Democratization in Eastern Europe“ (1995-96), „Strategies of Collective Protests in Democratizing Societies“ (1994-95).

Antony Todorov
Department of Political Science
New Bulgarian University
21 Montevideo str.
BG-1618 SOFIA
Phone: +359-2-558 309 /ext.1126
Fax: +359-2-955 6291
E-Mail: atodorov@nbu.bg
Degrees: PhD (1988);
Position: Associate professor, New Bulgarian University (1999-); head of Department of Political Science, New Bulgarian University (2000-); director of Institute for Social Values and Structures (1997-);
Additional information: Senior adviser, Research department of the National Assembly (1995-1997); program director, Center for the Study of Democracy (1990-1992); Main research projects: parties and voters in Bulgaria since the independence; elections and democratic transition.

Alf Vanags
Baltic International Center for Economic Policy Studies
Alberta iela 13
LV-1010 RIGA
Phone: +371-703 9317
Fax: +371-703 9318
E-Mail: alf@biceps.org
Degrees: Kings College, Cambridge, BSc Economics 1st Class Hons (1964); MSc Economics (1967);
Position: Director of Baltic International Center for Economic Policy Studies, Riga;
Additional information: Consultant to Ministries of UK Government (1968-81); United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP/1985-91); State Planning Commission PRC, State/Enterprise relations in the PRC (1994); Nordic Council of Ministers Research network on the Influence of EU enlargement on Baltic Societies (1999-2001); Ministry of Finance, Latvia, Costs and benefits of EU accession for Latvia (2000); Member of Royal Economic Society, of European Economic Association, of International Association of Maritime Economists, and of Advisory Board at the Chinese Economic Association (UK); Editor of *Baltic Economic Trends*; Founding member of the Latvian European Community Studies Association.

Milan Vodopivec
Human Development Network
World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
US-20433 Washington, D.C.
E-Mail: mvodopivec@worldbank.org, milan.vodopivec@vssp.gea-college.si
Degrees: University of Maryland, USA, PhD Economics (1989);
Position: Staff member at Research Department, The World Bank, Washington DC, (1989-); project manager of “Labor Market Adjustment in Estonia” and “Labor Market Dynamics During the Transition of a Socialist Economy: Slovenia”;
Additional information: Associate professor, GEA College of Entrepreneurship, Portoroz, Slovenia (1996-98), Dean of the School (1997-98); State Undersecretary, Ministry of Labour, Family, and Social Affairs, Slovenia (1995-96); participation in the preparation of the pension reform in Slovenia (1996-98); advisor for labor market policy, Office of the Prime Minister, Slovenia (1995).

Andrzej Wojtyna
Department of Macroeconomics
Academy of Economics
Rakowicka 27
PL-31510 CRACOW
Phone: +48-12-293 55 355
Fax:+48-12-644 95 94
E-Mail: wojtynaa@ae.krakow.pl
Degrees: Academy of Economics, Cracow, PhD (1982); Dr. habil.(1990);
Position: Professor, Academy of Economics (2001-); head of Macroeconomics Department, Academy of Economics; associate professor, Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Economics; vice-chairman of the Scientific Council of the Polish Economic Association and of the Economics Committee of the Polish Academy of Sciences;
Additional information: Visiting professor at Central European University, Budapest (1997, 98, 99, 2000); member of Council of Socio-Economic Strategy, Polish Government; editor-in-chief of *Gospodarka Narodowa.*

Conference contributors

Sorin Antohi
Central European University
Nádor u. 11
H-1051 BUDAPEST
Phone: +36-1-235 61 45
Fax: +36-1-327 31 91
E-Mail: Antohi@ceu.hu
Degrees: PhD in History, University of Iasi, Romania (1995);
Position: Professor of History, Central European University (CEU) , Budapest (2000-);
Additional information: Member of various professional associations, editorial boards, and scientific councils, consultant (for various bodies, including EU and the World Bank).

Elemér Hankiss
Institute for Political Science
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Úri u. 49.H-1014 BUDAPEST
Phone: +36-1-375 48 91
Fax: +36-1-375 25 37
E-Mail: han8041@mail.iif.hu, han8041@ella.hu
Degrees: Budapest University, PhD Sociology;
Position: Senior research fellow, Institute for Political Science, Hungarian Academy of Sciences (1996-);
Additional information: Senior Scientist at The Gallup Organization, Princeton; visiting professor at European University Institute, Florence and the Central European University, Budapest; research fellow at the Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington, DC (1987-88); visiting fellow at the Institute for Human Sciences, Vienna (1993); director of Hungarian Television (1990-1993).

Hans-Dieter Klingemann
Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB)
Reichpietschufer 50
D-10785 BERLIN
Phone: +49-30-254 913 20
E-Mail: klingem@medea.wz-berlin.de
Degree: University of Cologne, Dr. rer.pol. (1966); University of Mannheim, habilitation sociology (1978);
Position: Director of the research unit “Institutions and Social Change”, Social Science Research Center Berlin; professor, Free University, Berlin;
Additional information: Vice-president of the Council of the Institute for Strengthening Democracy in Bosnia, Sarajevo (1998-); foreign member of the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters (1999-); member of the Board of the Jacob International Society for Collaborative Studies, Warsaw, Poland (1996-).

János Mátyás Kovács
Institute for Human Sciences
Spittelauer Lände 3
A-1090 WIEN
Phone: +43-1-313 58381
E-Mail: Kovacs@iwm.at
Degrees: PhD Economics (1975);
Position: Permanent fellow at the Institute for Human Sciences, (1991-); member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Economics, (1973-), professor, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest (1984-);
Additional Information: Fields of research: history of economic and political thought in Central and Eastern Europe, history of communist economies and polities, political economy of post-communist transformation.

Ivan Krastev
Center for Liberal Strategies
Alexander Battenberg Str.4
BG-1000 SOFIA
Phone: +359-981 89 26
Fax: +359-2-981 89 25
E-Mail: ivan@cls-sofia.org
Degree: University of Sofia, MA Philosophy (1990), PhD (ABD);
Position: Chairman of the board and research director at the Center for Liberal Strategies, Sofia, Public Policy Research Institute, (1994-);
Additional information: Founding member of the Balkan Civic Network; member of the boards of the Atlantic Club of Bulgaria, the Union of Bulgarian Foundations and Civic Associations, the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in the Balkans and the USAID Democracy Network; member of the Advisory Board of Freedom House project in Central and Eastern Europe(1999-) and on Southeastern Europe of the EastWest Institute, New York (2000-).

Olga Kučerová
Department of Demography and Geodemography
Faculty of Science
Charles University
Albertov 6
128 43 Prague 2
Phone: +420-2-8384 2977
Fax: +420-2-2492 0657
E-Mail: kuceras@volny.cz
Degrees: Moscow State University, PhD Economics (1990);
Position: Senior Researcher, Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Science (1997-2001);
Additional Information: Researcher, Foundation East-West Gender Studies (1990-1996).

Tomáš Kučera
Faculty of Natural Science
Charles University
Albertov 6
CZ-12843 PRAGUE 2
Phone: +420 2 219 521 70
Fax: +420 2 249 206 57
E-Mail: Kuceras@volny.cz, kucera@natur.cuni.cz

Degrees: Masaryk University, Brno, PhD Geography (1998);
Position: Associate professor, Charles University, Faculty of Science; head of Department of Demography and Geo-demography, Charles University, Prague, Faculty of Natural Science (1998-99);
Additional information: Member of Board at The Network of Institutes and Schools of Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe (1995-), at Open Society Fund, Advisory Board for Public Administration Programs, Prague, member of: the nominating committee of European Association for Population Studies (member 1988-); project coordinator of EU 5th Framework Program – "Thematic Network for Integrated European Population Studies" (1999-); scientific coordinator of Central and Eastern European Demographic Network, (1996-); member of Czech Demographic (1980-) and Geographic Society (1982-) and Population Association of America (1999-).

Marie-Claude Maurel
Human Sciences Department
National Centre for Scientific Research
3, rue Michel-AngeF-75794 PARIS, Cedex 16
Phone: +33-1-67 14 21 87
Fax: +33-1-67 14 20 52
E-Mail: marie-claude.maurel@cnrs-dir.fr
Degrees: PhD Arts and Humanities;
Position: Director of the Human Sciences Department, National Centre for Scientific Research, (1997-);
Additional information: Professor, Paul Valery University, Montpellier (1970-1997); recipient of the Geographical Society's Alexandre Eckman Prize and the CNRS Bronze Medal (1990); member of the Scientific Board at Paul Valery University; vice-president of the National Geography Committee (1988-1992); chevalier of the National Order of Merit; junior member of the Institut Universitaire de France (1991-1996); member of the International Evaluation Committee of the Maison des Sciences de l'homme (1993-1996).

Andrei Pleşu
New Europe College (Institute for Advanced Study)
Str. Plantelor 21
RO-70309 BUCHAREST
Phone: +40-2-1-327 00 35
Fax: +40-2-1-327 07 74
E-Mail: aplesu@nec.ro
Degree: University of Bucharest, PhD Art History (1980);
Position: Rector, New Europe College (Institute for Advanced Study), Bucharest (1994-); professor of philosophy of religion, University of Bucharest (1990-); member of the National College for the Study of the Former "Securitate" Archives, Bucharest;
Additional information: Romanian Minister of Culture (1989-1991); Minister of Foreign Affairs (1997-1999); founder of the New Europe Foundation, Bucharest (1994-); member of the World Academy of Art and Science (1997-); corresponding member of the Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI) (1998-); member of the Académie Internationale de Philosophie de l'Art, Geneva, Switzerland (1999-); *Dr. phil. honoris causa* of the Albert-Ludwigs Universität of Freiburg, Germany (2000); *Dr. phil. honoris causa* of the Humboldt-Universität of Berlin, Germany (2001); numerous international prizes and awards.

Mihály Sárkány
Research Group on Ethnography
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Orszaghaz u. 30
H-1014 BUDAPEST
Phone: +36-1-375 90 11
Fax: +36-1-386 15 59
E-Mail: sarkany@samu.neprajz.mta.hu
Degrees: Eötvös Loránd University, PhD Ethnography (1977);
Position: Head of the Department of Non-European Studies in the Institute of Ethnology, Hungarian Academy of Sciences; Associate professor in the Department of Cultural Anthropology, Eötvös Loránd University.

Grażyna Skąpska
Institute of Sociology
Jagiellonian University
Ul. Grodzka 52
PL-31044 CRACOW
Phone: +48-12-422 711
Fax: +48-12-430 20 99
E-Mail: skapska@jetta.if.uj.edu.pl
Degrees: Polish Academy of Sciences, PhD Legal Studies (1978); Jagiellonian University, habilitation Sociology (1991);
Position: Professor; Jagiellonian University (1994-); head of the Chair of Sociology of Norms and Organizations, Jagiellonian University, Institute of Sociology, (1995-); vice-president of the International Institute of Sociology;
Additional information: Board member of the Institute for Strategic Studies; visiting professor at: the University of New South Wales, the University of Sydney and the Cornell University, USA; trustee of the American Law and Society Association (1995-1997); research fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (1983-1985) and the American Bar Association (1991).

Piotr Sztompka
Institute of Sociology
Jagiellonian University
Ul. Grodzka 52
PL-31044 CRACOW
Phone: +48-12-411 67 69
Fax: +48-12-422 21 29
E-Mail: ussztompka@cyf-kr.edu.pl
Degrees: Jagiellonian University, PhD Sociology (1970); habilitation Sociology (1974);
Position: Professor, Jagiellonian University, Institute of Sociology (1987-); president of the International Sociological Association (2002-); head of the Department of Theoretical Sociology, Jagiellonian University, Institute of Sociology; head of the Center for Analysis of Social Change “Europe '89”, Jagiellonian University;
Additional information: visiting professor at: Columbia University; The Johns Hopkins University; School of Advanced International Studies, Bologna; Universidad Nacional Autonoma, Mexico; University of California, Los Angeles; St. Catherines College, Oxford; Social Science Research Center Berlin, Center for Advanced Study; member of Academia Europaea (London), the Polish Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (Cambridge, Mass.) and honorary member of the Faculty of Political Sciences at the Universidad del Museo Social Argentino (Buenos Aires); recipient of New Europe Prize (1996).

Pál Tamás
Institute of Sociology
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Úri u.49
H-1014 BUDAPEST
Phone: +36-1-224 67 40
Fax: +36-1-224 67 41
E-Mail: H8756tam@ella.hu
Degrees: Karl Marx University, Budapest, Dr. oec. Macroeconomics and Economic Planning (1977); Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, PhD Sociology (1981);
Position: Professor, Hungarian Academy of Sciences; director of Institute of Sociology, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, (1998-); Szechenyi Professor of Communication, Budapest University of Economics, (1998-); professor, Eötvös Loránd University, Institute of Sociology, Budapest (1992-);
Additional information: Member of Hungarian State Committee of Technical Development, Ad-hoc Study Groups (1972-), Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Research Evaluation Board and Secretary of the Sociology of Science Section, Hungarian Sociological Association (1986-); member of Board at *JEL-KEP*, Hungarian Mass Communication Research Center,(1992-), and International Council for Science Policy Studies (1993-); member of Board of Social Science Information Centre, German Social Science Infrastructure Services, Bonn; of Social Science Board, Hungarian National Science Foundation and of East European Advisory Board of the Stanford Institute for Advanced Studies (1995-); member of European Enlargement Task Force, Foreign Ministry (1996-); member of Editorial Board at *Társadalomkutatás* (1995-); member of Hungarian Academy of Engineering (1998-).

Hans-Jürgen Wagener
European University Viadrina
Postfach 1786
D-15207 Frankfurt (Oder)
Phone: +49-335-55 34 24 92
Fax: +49-335-55 34 28 07
E-Mail: wagener@viadrina.euv-frankfurt-o.de
Degrees: University of Munich, Dr. oec. publ. (1971);
Position: Professor, European University Viadrina; managing director of Frankfurt Institute for Transformation Studies, European University Viadrina; dean of the Faculty of Economics, European University Viadrina;
Additional information: Fellow of the Social Science Research Center Berlin (1999-2000); member of the editorial board of: *Economic Systems*, *Konjunkturpolitik*, *Moct - Most*, *Jahrbuch Ökonomie und Gesellschaft*, *Politekonom*; member of the advisory board of *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought.*

Project collaborators and contributors

Ulrike Becker
Social Science Information Centre
German Social Science Infrastructure Services/Branch Office Berlin
Schiffbauerdamm 19
D-10117 BERLIN
Phone: +49-30-233 611 313,
Fax: +49-30-233 611 310
E-Mail: becker@berlin.iz-soz.de
Degrees: University of Bonn, state examination (1979);
Position: Head of Department "Information Tansfer Easter Europe";
Additional information: Speaker of the GESIS Branch Office.

Edouard Conte
Collegium Budapest
H-1014 BUDAPEST
Phone: +36-1- 224 -8310
Fax: +36-1-224-8313
E-Mail: econte@colbud.hu
Degrees: University of London, PhD Philosophy (Social Anthropology) (1982);
Position: Permanent Fellow, Collegium Budapest;
Additional information: Directeur de recherche au CNRS Laboratoire d´anthropologie social, College de France; 1989 Tenured appointment as Chargé de recherche at CNRS attached to the Laboratoire d'Anthropologie Sociale, Paris; 1994-1997; Research fellow and project manager at the Centre Marc Bloch (Franco-German Centre for Social Science Research), Berlin; 1997- Co-editor (1997-1999) and member of the editorial board (2000-) of *Études rurales*; 1998-1999 Vice-director of the Laboratoire d'anthropologie sociale du CNRS, du Collège de France et de l'EHESS, Paris.

Mihály Csákó
ELTE – Institute of Sociology
Pázmány Peter sétány 1/B. 7.em.99
H-1117 BUDAPEST
Phone: +36-1-209 05 55, +36-1-209 68 45
Fax: +36-1-213 59 39
E-Mail: cs11807@ella.hu, mcsako@ludens.elte.hu
Degrees: Eötvös Loránd University, MA Hungarian Literature and Philosophy (1964); Diplóme d'études supérieures européennes (1969), CEU, Nancy; Eötvös Loránd University, PhD (1970);
Position: Associate professor, Institute of Sociology and Social Policy (ISSP), Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest;
Additional information: 1991-92 and 1994-95 deputy director of the ELTE ISSP. 1992-94 and 1996-99 director of the ELTE ISSP; 1999 and 2001 vice-president, and 2000 president of the Hungarian Sociological Society.

Jens-Joachim Hesse
Internationales Institut für Staats- und Europawissenschaften (ISE)
Behrenstrasse 34
D-10117 BERLIN
Phone: +49-30-2061-399-0

Fax: +49-30-2061-399-9
E-Mail: jjhesse@internationales-institut.de
Degrees: Diplom-Volkswirt (Berlin), MA (Oxon), Dr. rer. pol. (Cologne);
Position: Chairman of the International Institute for Comparative Government and European Policy, Berlin;
Additional Information: Professor of Government and Public Administration in the Universities of Konstanz, Duisburg/Düsseldorf and the Post-Graduate School of Administrative Sciences, Speyer since 1972; Ford-Monnet-Professor of European Institutions and Comparative Government in the University of Oxford, until 1997; Founding Director of the European Centre for Comparative Government and Public Policy, until 2001; Senior Consultant to the OECD (since 1970), the European Union (since 1988), the United Nations (since 1991), the International Labour Office (since 1992), and the World Bank (since 1995); Visiting Professor at the College of Europe Bruges, Belgium (1987-90), and other European as well as American universities.

Max Kaase
Vice President and Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences
International University Bremen
Campus Ring 1
P.O. Box 750 561
D-28759 BREMEN
Phone: +49-421-200 43 40, +49-421-200 43 41
Fax: +49-421-200 49 43 40
E-Mail: mk@iu-bremen.de
Degrees: University of Cologne, Dr. rer.pol. (1964), University of Mannheim, venia legendi political science (1972);
Position: Vice-president and Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, International University, Bremen (2000-);
Additional information: Member of German Science Council (1987-1992), Senate and Executive Committee of the German Research Council (DFG) (1992-1998), member of the European Science Foundation (ESF) Standing Committee for the Social Sciences (1993-1999), Vice President of the ESF (1999-2003), Vice Presdient of the International Political Science Association (IPSA) (2000-2003); Director, Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen (ZUMA) e.V., Mannheim (1974 – 1979); professor of political science at Mannheim University (1980-1993); research professor, Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB), (1993 – 2000).

Nikolaos Kastrinos
Unit “Research on Social Sciences and Humanities”
DG Research/European Commission
E-Mail: nikolaos.kastrinos@cec.eu.int

Manfred Kerner
Freie Universität Berlin
Arbeitsbereich Baltische Länder
Malteserstraße 74-100
D-12249 BERLIN
Phone: + 49-30-83 870 231
E-Mail: baltic@zedat.fu-berlin.de
Degrees: PhD and habilitation in political science;
*Position:*Professor, Freie Universität Berlin ;
Additional Information: Visiting professor, University of Latvia, Riga (1994-1996); member of editorial board of *Arbeitspapiere des Instituts für Internationale Politik und Regionalstudien*.

Gábor Klaniczay
Collegium Budapest
H-1014 BUDAPEST
Phone: +36-1- 224 -8310
Fax: +36-1-224-8313
E-Mail: klaniczay@colbud.hu
Degrees: Eötvös Loránd University, Dr. Phil. (1983);
Position: Rector and Permanent fellow, Collegium Budapest (1997-); Professor, Central European University;
Additional Information: 1976 postgraduate studies in Paris with Jacques Le Goff (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales) and Michel Mollat (Sorbonne); 1991-92 Assistant Dean for International Relations at Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of Humanities. 1992 Getty Scholar at the Getty Center for Arts and the Humanities, Santa Monica. 1992-97 Head of the Department of Medieval Studies at the Central European University, Budapest.

John H. Smith
European Centre for Social Welfare Policy and Research
Bergstrasse 17
A-1090 WIEN
Phone: +43-1-319 450 576
E-Mail: smith@euro.centre.org
Degrees: University of Kent, Canterbury, PhD Political Science (1982);
Position: Research strategy consultant;
Additional Information: Economic and Social Research Council, UK (1976-1984); Head of Unit for Social Sciences at the European Science Foundation (1985-2000).

Andrew Sors
Head of Unit "Research on Social Sciences and Humanities"
DG Research/European Commission
E-Mail: andrew.sors@cec.eu.int

Vera Sparschuh
Collegium Budapest/Social Science Information Centre/Branch Office Berlin
German Social Science Infrastructure Services
Schiffbauerdamm 19
D-10117 BERLIN

Phone: +49-30-233 611 328
Fax: +49-30-233 611 310
E-Mail: sparschuh@berlin.iz-soz.de
Degrees: Humboldt University PhD Sociology (1984); University of Kassel, habilitation Sociology (2001);
Position: Scientific Project Coordinator;
Additional information: Member of the board of the Central-Eastern Europe Section of the German Sociological Society (DGS).

Agnieszka Wenninger
Social Science Information Centre
German Social Science Infrastructure Services
Schiffbauerdamm 19
D-10117 BERLIN
Phone: +49-30-233 611 328
Fax: +49-30-233 611 310
E-Mail: wenninger@berlin.iz-soz.de
Degrees: University of Wrocław, PhD Philosophy (1999);
Position: Research associate, Social Science Information Centre, Berlin.

Włodzimierz Wesołowski
Polish Academy of Sciences
Institute of Philosophy and Sociology
ul. Nowy Świat 72
00-330 WARSAW
Phone: +48-22-657 28 34
Fax: +48-22-826 78 23
E-Mail: wwesolow@ifispan.waw.pl
Position: Professor, Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Warsaw;
Additional information: President of the Polish Sociological Association (2002-); lecturer at the Collegium Civitas, Warsaw.

Institutions responsible for handbook edition

Short outline of Collegium Budapest

The institute began its activities in 1992. Following the model of the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study and other similar institutions, it is the first Institute for Advanced Study in Central and Eastern Europe, hosting humanities, social, and natural sciences. It has sought to rebuild the international contacts of scholars and academic institutions in the CEE region after half- a-century of isolation, by offering a common temporary work place for outstanding Western and Eastern scholars in Budapest. In the course of these ten years Collegium Budapest has emerged as an international academic center and as a model for a new form of academic cooperation. It has also generated many innovative individual and institutional cooperation projects between Western scholars and those from CEE.

Collegium Budapest represents a new type of institute, different both from universities and specialized research institutes. Its main attraction is to offer its fellows temporary liberation from their administrative and teaching obligations and allow them to fully concentrate on their chosen research plan. All disciplines are eligible from the social sciences, humanities, and theoretical natural sciences. The year-long common activities with this multidisciplinary community stimulate methodological enrichment. Besides individual invitations, thematic Focus Groups are also eligible, with a group of Fellows working on a common research topic, and organizing larger workshops. Junior (pre- or post-doctoral) Fellowships are offered, principally for young talents from CEE.

Its activities are based on international funding, which includes contributions from six European countries and several private foundations. Collegium Budapest was successful in receiving several grants from the European Commission, the most prestigious one is the “Centres of Excellence” support.

Collegium Budapest / Institute for Advanced Study (CB)
Szentháromság utca 2
H – 1014 Budapest
Tel.: 0036-1-224 83 00
Fax 0036-1-224 83 10
e-mail: collegium.budapest@colbud.hu
internet: www.colbud.hu

Short Outline of GESIS/IZ (GESIS Branch Office, Berlin)

The Social Science Information Center (IZ) in Bonn was founded in 1969 by the Association of Social Sciences Institutes and has the equivalent of 50 full-time employees; more than half of them are academicians. Since 1986, the IZ has been one of the three institutional members of GESIS (The German Social Science Infrastructure Services). GESIS is jointly funded by Germany's federal and state governments (Internet: http://www.gesis.org/en)

The IZ collects extensive data on ongoing research and literature in the German-speaking countries in the field of social sciences, produces two databases (research and literature information on German-speaking social sciences) that are accessible on-line worldwide, provides information and consultancy services to scientists and practitioners, publishes reference books and documentations on specific topics, and monitors scientific developments. To obtain, process, and use the information efficiently, IZ carries out research & development in information science and in information technology. (Internet: http://www.bonn.iz-soz.de).

Due to the political developments in Central and Eastern Europe, the IZ has extended its international work and established the Department "Information Transfer Eastern Europe" within the GESIS Berlin Branch Office in 1992. The work of eight academicians and three administrative department staff members focuses on the transfer of social science information to and from Central and Eastern Europe. This transfer activity is geared principally to the following objectives:

- Giving social scientists in Central and Eastern Europe access to German social science findings
- Acquiring Central and East European social science information (research findings, institutional descriptions) and distributing it in Western Europe
- Fostering the flow of information between Eastern and Western European social sciences on an European level by supporting both German and international networks in the fields of transformation research, Eastern European studies, and comparative research.

Since 1992, the department has been conducting surveys in Central and East European countries asking social science research institutions and scientists for information on planned, current, and completed research projects and institutional descriptions. A continual survey via the Internet on current research projects in East-Central and Eastern European countries was established in 1999. The reported information is stored in two databases (Social Science Research PROjects in Eastern Europe – PROEastE; and Social Science Research INstitutions in Eastern Europe – INEastE). There is also en extensive Internet offer of all information related/relevant to the social sciences in Central and Eastern Europe (i.e., a conference calendar and the SocioGuide "Central and East European Internet-Sources of Social Sciences"). A network of institutions also offers integrated access to German-speaking information on/from Central and Eastern Europe in the Internet (http://www.osteuropa-netzwerk.de).

Publications (a selection)

Newsletter "Social Sciences in Eastern Europe"

This Newsletter is published on a regular basis four times a year. It contains current information on all questions pertaining to the social sciences in Central and Eastern Europe: – social science institutes and their research focus / tables of contents of important journals / short essays / references to: monographs or studies, researchers, databases / information on scientific societies and current conferences. The Newsletter is a source of information for all persons dealing with the situation, the abrupt changes, the developments, and the innovations in the new Central and Eastern Europe (free of charge, printed version and two electronic ones: email and Internet http://www.berlin.iz-soz.de/publications/en/newsletter).

SoFid Eastern Europe
SoFid stands for “Sozialwissenschaftlicher Fachinformationsdienst” (Social Science Information Service). This publication offers more than 650 items of current information annually on the latest social science publications and research projects on Eastern Europe that have been produced in German-speaking countries.

Serial “Europe in Comparison. A Series of Guidebooks for the Social Sciences”

This serial is edited in cooperation with the Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung (Center for European Social Research, Mannheim) as an attempt to support comparative social science research on Europe by providing a broad range of meta-information required in comparing societies and polities across Europe.

The first, third, fourth, and fifth volume are subtitled “Sozialwissenschaften im Neuen Osteuropa”. These volumes focus on Central and East European Social Sciences and contains information on research institutions and research projects from all countries in the region.

Elites in Transition. Elite Research in Central and Eastern Europe.

This publication (1997) presents a representative account of elite research in Eastern Europe. Country reports from Eastern European experts describe the situation in Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Russia, the Baltic Countries, the Ukraine, and the New Federal States of Germany. The reports are complemented by bibliographies of the most important publications since 1990.

Social Sciences in Southeastern Europe

This state-of-the art report (2001) is a joint project of the International Social Science Council, Paris and the Social Science Information Center, Bonn/Berlin. It offers contributions on the state of the social sciences in eight Southeastern European countries.

The volume intends to establish an informational basis for a reliable assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of present-day social sciences in this region, for scholarly as well as for practical purposes. The collection of country reports on research projects, research results, and research problems of the social sciences reported by well-known colleagues delivers a comprehensive picture of the social sciences in Southeastern Europe.

GESIS / Social Science Information Center (IZ)
Department “Information Transfer Eastern Europe”
at the GESIS Branch Office, Berlin
Schiffbauerdamm 19
D-10117 Berlin)
Tel: +49 (30) 233611-0
Fax: +49 (30) 233611-310
Email: becker@berlin.iz-soz.de
Internet: http://www.gesis.org/en/gesis_branch_office