



Kedves Zsuzsa!

Hálás vagyok a sorsnak, hogy több mint három évtizede együtt tevékenykedhettünk a szociológia képzés megalapozásában és kivitelezésében az ELTE-n.


A stációk:

Csoport, Tanszék, Intézet címek – változó feltételek és „éghajlati viszonyok” csak múltba veszeti körülmények. Egy biztos, ez a terep végig aláaknázott volt.

Az is öröömre szolgált, hogy ez az intézmény adott otthont a Szociálpolitikai Tanszék majdani megalakításának.

Lendületed, munkaszereteted és tudásod az „ügy” iránti elkötelezettséget mindig csodáltam.

Boldog születésnapot!



The History of Modern Sociology in Hungary

Tibor Huszár

While assessing Comte's work in the 1870s, the eminent Hungarian historian Gyula Pauler once wrote: "By the time Western ideas and institutions reach us, they usually become obsolete at home and are about to be replaced by other ideas in their own country."¹ A few years later Károly Tagányi repudiated that view in the same journal: "it's nonsense to say that thoughts are delayed by a century before they reach us, or that all the ideas we have, have been brought here from abroad."² In a strange way, there was some truth in what both men said as far as Hungarian social science in general, particularly sociology, was concerned.

HUNGARY'S INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL SCIENCES

In the 1840s, a time when desire for social and political reform reached a high pitch, political writers and young scholars tried to "subject elements of social structure to analysis" and reregulate the "fundamental institutions of society," for example, family, marriage, and wealth.

"Collecting information about the fatherland" was the slogan of the day. *Athenaeum*, an outstanding journal of the time, carried numerous articles in this vein. Despite the seductiveness of the slogan, many scholars at universities remained indifferent to this initiative because they were conservative and were committed to the self-contradictory tenet of reform-minded nationalism.³

The demand for social sciences reemerged following the Compromise of 1867. The exponents of this movement were statesmen who were familiar with international social science literature. They wanted to modernize and liberalize Hungary. They were influenced by the works of Auguste

Comte, Herbert Spencer, John Stuart Mill, and Adolphe Quetelet. They aspired to what they described as "authentic knowledge" and reliance on what they called "scientific experience."⁴

Some of them had set out to explore the country during the heady years of the reform-minded 1840s. After the disastrous social effects of a crushed revolution and the ensuing stifling of political thought and culture, these statesmen supported efforts to examine social conditions in their reality.

Those in the vanguard of this movement were aware of related achievements in more advanced parts of Europe. Károly Keleti and his associates laid the foundations of statistics in Hungary by introducing advanced techniques of collecting data about society and applying the comparative method.⁵ Leó Beöthy and Gyula Pauler tried to modernize attitudes and techniques in historiography and the study of society. They took it for granted that these disciplines employed the methodology of the natural sciences.⁶

Unfortunately, the steam of the movement was spent on causes lying outside science. The intellectual elite opted for caution in the face of crises which accompanied the political scuffles over suffrage.

At that time attempts were made to reinterpret and reconcile the contradictions of reform-minded nationalism, but all these efforts led to the conclusion that liberalism could not be reconciled with democracy, provided the latter was consistently asserted. It was feared that if nationalities were granted the status of nationhood, Greater Hungary would disintegrate.

Social sciences were not the only disciplines to be affected by these changes in approach. During this era the entire language of research and politics was restructured. Social scientists, who (among other things) studied the process in which the institutions of science were created, were more aware of the changes than others.

The most popular argument of the time went as follows: in the course of history Hungarians became the dominant nation of the Carpathian Basin through natural selection, and therefore they did not have the right to voluntarily give up this "evolutionary achievement." Consequently, they have to subordinate the struggle among classes to that among nationalities.⁷

This tenet emerged in various forms in the works of several noted thinkers of the era.⁸ To use the terminology of Thomas Kuhn, marked differences in views apart, there was consensus over a paradigm which, perhaps with an updated set of arguments, consolidated the positions of historicism and the conservative and hierarchical approach to social issues.

On one hand, more and more essays were devoted to the works of Comte, Quetelet, and Spencer.⁹ On the other, members of the academic establishment dismissed positivism as a theory dangerous to the Hungarian nation's supremacy, the family, property, and the state.¹⁰

HUNGARY

399

The exponents of this paradigm were hostile to scholarly efforts which attempted to expose social conflicts and reveal other aspects of reality.¹¹ Moreover, the advocates of this school of thought rejected the theory and method of positivism. They were convinced that scholars preoccupied with the facts of life could not grapple with notions like national spirit (*Völkergest*), national character, national soul, national temperament, and national genius.

This attitude was eloquently set forth in a paper written by Ferenc Toldy on the causes of Hungary's backwardness in science.¹² He presented the paper in 1868, yet his arguments were embraced well into the middle of the 1870s—even by thinkers who had urged a fresh start on collecting first-hand information about Hungary in the years following the Compromise.

Modernization picked up speed in Hungary during the 1880s and 1890s. All branches of the economy were affected by the rise of capitalism. The massive response to this development was socially heterogeneous. The attitude of the landed aristocracy differed from that of some advocates of reform-minded conservatism¹³ who belonged to the new middle class, which rose from the landless gentry and the bureaucracy.

Although this newly formed elite had some affinity to sociology, they aspired to adopt only those non-Hungarian research findings that could be connected with what they termed as organic processes rooted in the past of the Hungarians. Once again, the criterion for determining what was good or bad was whether a tenet served to maintain the integrity of Greater Hungary.

There was a new element in their approach, though: in addition to considering capitalism as a force that disintegrates traditional patterns, they exaggerated the importance of the role of purportedly rootless, but in effect assimilated, German and Jewish intellectuals. Consequently, they used whatever doctrines they could find to counterbalance the sway of liberalism and to promote organization, equilibrium, cohesion, solidarity, and the perpetuation of traditions. Creating a theory of their own was beyond them. They concentrated on evolving the institutions for social policy, primarily agricultural policy.¹⁴

THE "FIRST WORKSHOP OF SOCIOLOGY IN HUNGARY," 1900–1918

Initial Steps/Failures

Having established its economic position, the bourgeoisie sought influence on the country's intellectual life. Also, the progress of research and arts abroad had an impact on research and arts in Hungary. At the turn of the century, in response to this neoconservatism the Hungarian Society

HUNGARY

425

lish before the congresses; they are active in the working groups and in projects organized by the Vienna-based UNESCO center.

101. The Institute for Social Sciences, which was founded in 1967, became the hub of research on social stratification by the middle of the 1970s. The periodical it published, *Társadalomtudományi Közlemények* (Issues in Social Science), became an important forum. Other noteworthy workshops of sociology were the Research Center for Higher Education, the Institute for Culture Research (founded in 1980), and the Institute for Educational Research (founded in 1981). They too had a periodical of their own: *Kultúra és közösség* (Culture and Community), launched in 1979, which grew to be the most important journal for Hungarian sociology of culture. From 1980 the Research Institute for Mass Media published a periodical entitled *Jel-Kép* (Symbol and Image). The Research Center of Cooperatives (founded in 1967) fostered rural sociology.

102. After becoming an independent institute, the department of sociology of the Faculty of Arts at ELTE University launched a sociology course in 1971. Initially it was an evening course, but in 1972 it became a day course. The post-graduate training of lecturers of sociology started in 1980. Sociology has been taught at the Budapest University of Economics since 1972; the research group for economic sociology started operation in 1980, and training started at the Institute of Sociology in 1980. A department of sociology was set up at the Szeged University in 1979, and at the Pécs University in 1981. At the Debrecen University a sociology group was set up in 1978 and a department of sociology in 1985.

103. The Hungarian Sociological Association was formed in 1978. Its first president was Sándor Szalai.

104. The projects were coordinated by the Institute for Social Sciences. The surveys focused on the following issues: how to measure and classify social differences, how to describe the social strata and evolve a comprehensive model of strata. See: "Stratification Model Investigation. I." Budapest, Institute for Social Sciences, 1982. Rudolf Andorka and István Harsa, *The Short-Range and Long-Range Modernization of Hungarian Society, Measured by Social Indicators 1870-1984*, 2 vols., Budapest, 1986. University of Economics, Department of Sociology, Research Reports; István R. Gábor and Péter Galasi, *A "második gazdaság": Tények és hipotézisek* (The "Second Economy": Facts and Hypotheses), Budapest, 1981; Elemér Hankiss, *Érték és társadalom* (Values and Society), Budapest, 1977; Hankiss, *Diagnózisok* (Diagnoses), I and II, Budapest, 1982 and 1986.

105. Those were authors who considered the regime as state socialist, a party-state, or a "soft dictatorship," and referred to the "state of workers" as a state that represses its workers. They either retreated into literary sociology or found it impossible to publish in Hungary at all. Some of them published their works abroad or in samizdat form at home in the genre of political essays. István Kelemen, "The Unregistered Economy in Hungary," *Soviet Studies*, vol. 3, no. 34, 1982, pp. 349-66; Kemény, "A második gazdaság Magyarországon" (The Second Economy in Hungary), *Magyar Füzetek*, Paris, 1984, no. 13; Kemény, "Hongrie économie et société civile," *L'Autre Europe*, 1987, no. 13, pp. 38-59; Péter Kendi, Ed., *A létező kecske. Dialógusok a mozgásról* (The Existing Goat: Dialogues about the Room of Maneuver), *Magyar Füzetek*, Paris; Iván Székelyi, "The Prospects and Limits of the East European New Class Project. An Auto-Critical Reflection on 'The Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power,'" *Politics and Society*,

vol. 2, no. 15, 1986–1987, pp. 103–44; Széleányi, *Socialist Entrepreneurs: Embourgeoisement in Rural Hungary*, Cambridge, 1988.

106. István R. Gálbor, "Reformok, második gazdaság, államszocializmus," *Valóság*, 1981, no. 7–8; László Bruszt, "Jogformálás, társadalom és legitimitás" (Law-making, Society and Legitimacy), Institute for Social Sciences, research report, Budapest, 1984; Iván Széleányi and Róbert Manchin, "Piac, redistribúció és társadalmi egyenlőtlenségek a kelet-európai szocialista társadalmakban" (Market, Redistribution and Social Inequalities in the East European Socialist Societies), *Medvetánc* (Bear Dance), 1988, no. 2–3. See also *Magyar gazdaság és szociológia a nyolcvanas években* (Hungarian Economy and Sociology in the 1980s), Comp. Tamás Miklós, Budapest, 1988; Attila Bicskeházi, "A világgéppé kívüli ráció mítosza" (The Myth of Reason That Turned into a World View), *Valóság*, 1989, no. 8, pp. 52–61.

for Social Sciences (MTT) and the journal *Huszadik Század* (Twentieth Century) were formed.

Their appearance marked a new chapter in the history of social sciences in Hungary. The first issue of *Twentieth Century* carried a letter by Herbert Spencer.¹⁵ He expressed his pleasure over the decision to launch a journal that was committed to the propagation of scientifically sound ideas on social issues. The publication of this letter marked a milestone in the history of the Hungarian reception of this eminent British sociologist.

The journal and the Society became the first Hungarian workshops for sociology. They rallied gifted, erudite thinkers and journalists, old and young. Their patrons were Ágost Pulszky and Gyula Pikler, renowned professors at the Budapest Faculty of Legal and Administrative Sciences, and Bódog Somló, lecturer at the Oradea (then called Nagyvárad) law school. Their early works can be indirectly associated with Leó Beöthy's writings on primitive society.¹⁶

The young social scientists, law school graduates, and political writers rallying behind *Twentieth Century* sought positive solutions for the challenges posed by modernization. These responses included the growing role of people with college or university diplomas in industry and trade in Budapest and certain other regions. Simultaneous to the evolution of a modern public administration and the development of transport and communication infrastructure, the size of certain groups of professional men rapidly increased. Social mobility and migration accelerated. New interpretations were given to the history of the Hungarian intelligentsia when these developments were discussed by members of the Society.¹⁷

The professionalization and institutionalization of a discipline do not necessarily take place simultaneously, and their criteria are not identical. For a discipline to reach maturity it must reach a certain level in terms of content, theory, terminology, and method.¹⁸

Two crucial questions emerge when the actions of the Society are examined: Why were these intellectuals unable to formally institutionalize sociology in Hungary? Why was this workshop not integrated into Hungary's network of academic (and collegiate) institutions, when such integration would have created the basis for the professionalization of sociology?

All went well in the beginning. The patrons were respected professors of the Budapest Law School. The leaders and members of the Society were popular and influential. Some members of the Society and of the editorial staff of *Twentieth Century* were in contact with noted sociological workshops abroad. They published numerous sociological and other social science works in the series "Társadalomtudományi Könyvtár" (Social Science Library). Surveys were made about nearly all social strata. A section of sociology was set up under the auspices of the Society and it took part in an international comparative project.

HUNGARY

401

The Society failed to institutionalize sociology for a number of reasons, not the least of which was the asymmetrical modernization of Hungarian society. Although modernization in general accelerated, Hungarian agriculture continued to be dominated by large estates. The aristocracy and the major churches wielded a strong influence, whereas the bourgeoisie had only a limited influence.

In such a situation the alliance of the liberal-conservative national¹⁹ intellectuals, and of the radical bourgeois intellectuals, could not last for long. The members of the liberal-conservative national wing left the Society in 1906 to form their own association (MTE) and journal (MTSz).

The increasingly marked division showed—among other things—that the intellectual elite of the first workshop of sociology in Hungary could not find a common platform for evaluating Hungarian historical conditions, patterns of thought, and values.

There were additional barriers to the institutionalization and professionalization of sociology in Hungary. The radical camp failed, even within its own ranks, to firmly establish the intellectual, structural, and methodological aspects of a cognitive identity. At that time sociology was treated as a natural science. The (so-called) organic theory was initially more widely embraced than any other theory. The theoretical debates concentrated on the reception and critical analysis of Spencerism, later of Marxism. By contrast, seminal works by French and German thinkers were examined either belatedly or not at all.²⁰

Oszkár Jászi visited É. Durkheim as early as 1905. After their discussion Jászi realized how backward Hungarian sociology was in terms of theory. However, having reservations about the theories of this French sociologist, Jászi did not adopt such Durkheimian terms as "social fact," "division of labor," "solidarity," and "anomie."²¹

Conflicts rent the Society for Social Sciences in 1905 through 1906 and obliged the members of the association, and particularly Jászi, to give unequivocal wording to their political conclusions.²² In response to passionate contributions during the general meeting at which the split of the Society was decided, Jászi declared that differentiation between theory and practice would become increasingly marked. He added that theory and praxis, science and politics, would benefit from this differentiation.²³ He argued that this process was in line with the universal law under which progress necessitates functional differentiation. This tendency, he went on, may only unfold entirely in advanced societies where a nation is developed enough to facilitate an articulated social division of labor.²⁴ Jászi conceded that the lines of division were not rigid, yet phenomena that qualify as exceptions in functionally differentiated societies can become the rule in backward and hardly differentiated societies.²⁵ He concluded that the Society for Social Sciences, the scientific body of an extremely undifferen-

tiated society, may not confine itself to pursuing pure science. Instead it should lay down in its bylaws the commitment to tackle, among other things, issues of social policy. Furthermore, it should organize public readings and debates. He said that with these activities the Society could launch practical movements.²⁶

These statements were motivated by real social needs, as there was a genuine thirst for new ideas. Jászi wished to steer the Society toward using observations of the facts of life for "writing out appropriate recipes for curing social ills."²⁷ It is clear from Jászi's words that he was committed to progress. Unfortunately, the program he outlined was suitable neither for turning sociology into a modern specialized discipline nor for adequately institutionalizing it.

It seems from the nature of the debates going on at the time that the members of the Society were not aware of the theoretical debates which took place during an early phase of the development of sociology in Germany on delimiting sociology, social policy, and politics, nor were they aware of the works of Max Weber.²⁸ Although cognitive identity was not reached in German sociology prior to World War I, the debates and empirical experiments carried out there enabled German sociologists to elaborate the essential questions of theory and method. It was on this basis that later, during the Weimar Republic, sociology became a mature discipline and was accepted as such.²⁹

In Hungary no member of the movement, not even the best informed, noticed that the intellectual map of Europe had been redrawn. They failed to realize that the crisis of naturalist positivism resulted in (1) the renaissance of neo-Kantian tendencies, and (2) the conclusion that science may aspire to more than mere observation of empirical reality. The question of how to use outward traits of human behavior to trace inner motivations (i.e., how to subject to analysis the meaning of human behavior) was not raised in Hungary either.

The Society for Social Sciences retained its appeal well into the first decade of this century: numerous young and able scholars joined the program of surveying traditional Hungarian social values.³⁰

While the *Twentieth Century* carried profound essays on timely social issues, the changes in the social and political climate gradually turned the attention of the brightest minds of the Society to politics. Thus they became divorced from the academic establishment. Professors embracing national conservatism and/or status quo liberalism came to dominate the universities. With time the theoretical questions of social science decreased in importance in articles published by the *Twentieth Century*.

Another noteworthy development occurred when a group of talented and progressive young men realized that the tenets of positivist sociology had become obsolete. They turned to the method of *Geisteswissenschaften* (sciences of the mind, or human sciences). At first they published articles

HUNGARY

403

in the *Twentieth Century* and participated in its discussion evenings. Then they opted for a path of their own by launching the journal *Szellem* (Mind) and the Free School of Geisteswissenschaften.³¹ György (Georg) Lukács, Lajos Fülep, Károly (Karl) Mannheim, Arnold Hauser, and Frigyes Antal were some of the notable names among these editors and lecturers.

They concentrated on the theory of knowledge, on logic and psychology. Lukács—who, with Lajos Fülep, was the spiritual leader of this group—came into contact with intellectuals in Heidelberg. He attended seminars by Max Weber. Simmel read some of his essays.

It was probably due to the influence of these thinkers that the group did not reject sociology as such. On the contrary, Lukács's writings on the history of drama are believed to have helped found the sociology of literature.³² Oszkár Jászi and Ervin Szabó also attended some of the meetings organized by this group, and they were prepared to accept critical remarks about their views. Conditions were favorable for a constructive dialogue between 1916 and 1918, as the various camps were undergoing realignment and many participants in the debates had modified their position.

In the meantime, the advocates of the conservative-liberal tendency continued their efforts to evolve a Hungarian institution for sociology.³³ They were preoccupied with protecting and improving indigenous institutions and opposing what they described as a "forcible adoption of alien models." On these grounds they became hostile to theory. More precisely, they attempted to replace theoretically founded analyses of society in Hungary, and elsewhere in Europe, with writings that were confined to abstract generalities and speculation. They tried to make the empirical research of society a function of the social welfare system.³⁴

It was a logical consequence of their interpretation of sociology that no committee of sociology was set up under the auspices of the Hungarian Association for Social Sciences, nor was any section of the *Hungarian Social Science Review* devoted exclusively to sociology.³⁵

The Association and the *Review* came to take positions close to reform-minded agrarian tendencies,³⁶ and there was interpenetration between these organizations.³⁷

There was a bourgeois democratic revolution in Hungary in October 1918. It was as short-lived as the communist dictatorship that followed it in 1919. This episode of a few months had positive and negative consequences for the institutionalization of sociology in Hungary.

Only two aspects of the developments need to be described. In November 1918, acting on the initiative of the Ministry of Culture, the Faculty of Legal and Administrative Sciences of Budapest University admitted to its staff Bódog Somló "without observing the relevant stipulations of the university bylaws." The minister granted him full professorship (ignoring

the schedule of appointments) on December 3, 1918.³⁸ A week later the minister, in a letter to the university, recommended the appointment of additional professors and the creation of departments of economic policy and of political sociology.³⁹

The ministry intended to reform the faculty by transforming it into one of legal, administrative, and social sciences. However, the leadership of the faculty considered the proposals to be a violation of the university's autonomy and rejected all of them.⁴⁰

In January 1918 Zsigmond Kunfi, a leading personality in the Association, became minister of culture. On January 22, realizing that the leaders of the faculty were not prepared to transform the faculty at their own initiative, the new minister proposed the creation of new departments and appointed the head of the newly established department of sociology. But the faculty's resistance increased. On February 4, 1918, the minister appointed Oszkár Jászi government commissioner of the university. He did not serve on the post for long. After March 21, 1919, during the communist dictatorship, university faculties lost their independent status, several faculty members were banned from teaching, and Oszkár Jászi resigned.⁴¹

Following the fall of the communist dictatorship, in autumn 1919, the seven professorial appointments made during the bourgeois democratic revolution were declared illegal. They were found to be "unsuitable" for teaching at the university.⁴² (The authorities wished to treat the case of Bódog Somló as an exception, but he refused to accept his renewed appointment. In 1920 he committed suicide in Cluj, then called Kolozsvár.) The newly established departments were also dissolved. It signaled the end of the first attempt to win university recognition for sociology.

The other blow that scholarship in Hungary suffered from this turn of events was the emigration of numerous scholars who had started their careers in the first workshop of sociology in Hungary and/or in the Sunday Circle. Many became noted sociologists abroad.⁴³

SOCIOLOGY IN THE INTERWAR PERIOD (1919–1945)

There was no real progress in institutionalizing sociology between the two world wars for several reasons. Conservatives and reform-minded intellectuals formed a social science section within the Ethnographical Society as early as 1920. Later the section continued under the name Social Science Society (TT) and launched a journal called *Social Science*.

These names were selected in order to neutralize the influence of radicals. As there was no other journal devoted exclusively to sociology at that time, the Social Science Society and its journal became the principal institutions for sociological issues. They regularly organized discussion meetings and sent representatives to international sociological conferences. The journal, just like the *Social Science Booklets* which were

HUNGARY

405

launched in 1925, regularly carried (among other things) statistical analyses and essays on social history which helped popularize sociology.

In the absence of any domestic institutions devoted to the training of sociologists, the Social Science Society could not recruit more students to study sociology. The periodical did not foster a workshop to encourage sociological research in Hungary. The writings it carried, especially the sociological ones, were abstract and lacked originality. The sociological contributors lacked a clear-cut theoretical position. Their writings eclectically mixed aspects of pure science and/or an endeavor to establish Hungarian national sociology, as well as syntheses of remedial programs to heal the ills of society.⁴⁴

In 1921 the essentials of sociology and economics became a school subject in colleges and in the eighth class of the grammar schools. It also became an optional subject at the Faculty of Economics of Budapest University, at the Academy of Law of Kecskemét, and at some church schools. But these attempts at institutionalizing sociology remained isolated due to certain tendencies in the official scientific life and ideology of the time. In the late 1920s and early 1930s the *Geisteswissenschaften* method gained broader currency. This development was encouraged by the framers of the official scientific policy, even though there were differences in the evaluation of this method by the scientific policy makers and the framers of the policy of higher education. The makers of scientific policy ensured preference for so-called national sciences when deciding which new institutions to create. Theoretically speaking, they supported historicism and an approach that centered on the concept of nationhood.

They were not consistent in asserting these considerations, though. One reason for this inconsistency was the natural alternation between reform-minded conservatism and national radicalism, which happened in connection with changes in the international political environment of the country.

That decision making was often improvised in moments of crisis (even though certain attitudes and conditions were there to stay for a long period) was proven by the wrangling over the establishment of certain departments at the Budapest University, little veiled resistance to their establishment, the isolation of the advocates of their establishment, and the virtual failure of attempts to institutionalize sociology.⁴⁵

Hans Freyer served as a visiting professor at the Faculty of Arts of the Péter Pázmány University between 1939 and 1944.⁴⁶ He did not teach sociology but held lectures on German cultural history under the auspices of the Institute of German Studies.

Although the opening sociology courses by professors of some prestigious university departments of social sciences did not directly mean the adoption of sociology as an independent university discipline, it signaled an important stage on the road of professionalization.

Hungarian works on the history of domestic sociology mix facts with myths. It is an often-quoted fact that in the course of his research into the theory of law Barna Horváth, professor of the Faculty of Legal and Administrative Sciences of the Szeged University, became attracted to sociology. In 1934 he published a monograph in Germany entitled *Rechtssoziologie*.⁴⁷ He called attention to numerous debated issues of Ferenc Erdei and István Bibó, two scholars who were to play a major role in the history of Hungarian sociology later, and his theoretical teaching activity had a positive influence on their thinking.⁴⁸ However, Barna Horváth was not among the founders of sociology (of law) as a full-fledged discipline in Hungary, nor did he play a pioneering role in elaborating cognitive aspects, which are so vital to the institutionalization of each discipline.⁴⁹

By contrast, István Hajnal's research output was of seminal importance in the field of social history, the comparative method, and the sociology of history. Furthermore, his sociological analysis of the history of written records was already up to international standards in the 1920s. In his essay "Történelem és szociológia" (History and Sociology) he surveyed the sociological literature of his time and made an ambitious theoretical attempt to contrast historical and sociological methods and to reinterpret some categories of social theory (socialization, the rise of forms, intellectualization, and regional development).⁵⁰

It is little wonder that his disciples wrote outstanding works in the field of sociology, sociography, the sociology of history, and the sociology of law.⁵¹

Immediately prior to World War II critical tendencies could not gain ground. Bourgeois radicalism could not recover from the loss caused by the emigration of its brightest minds. The journal of this camp (*Századunk*) continued, but its editors (Sándor Braun, Ruzssem Vámbéri, and István Varró) could not create a new intellectual workshop. The Marxists were doctrinaire and were hostile to sociology. It was exclusively for political considerations that they supported critical sociography. Conditions were not suitable for field work. In this respect an essay by Ferenc Földes was exceptional.⁵²

Rural sociography was a noteworthy tendency among the critical schools. Describing this movement would go beyond the scope of this chapter.⁵³ We only address one question. Why did Ferenc Erdei, Gyula Ortutay, and Béla Reitzer, all with scholarly ambitions, abandon their plan to pursue the theoretical and methodological questions they defined during the formative 1930s, when these questions would have been essential for the cognitive institutionalization of sociology and for their own professionalism?⁵⁴

Paradoxical as it may sound, these thinkers could not promote the institutionalization of sociology because at that time conditions necessary

HUNGARY

407

for the efficient operation of sociology did not exist. In fact, the institutions under whose auspices they could have operated had not even come into existence. What is more, they could not establish lasting relations with international workshops of sociology for various reasons. Furthermore, they could not entirely distance themselves from the influence of *Geisteswissenschaften*-related Hungarian studies which treated social conflicts as "fateful questions" (*Schicksalsfrage*).⁵⁵ They would not entirely adopt the value considerations of "official" Hungarian studies: the critical attitude is "the art of seeing the essential things," the capability for empathy, which "obliges one to announce the prophecy of possibility."⁵⁶

The advocates of Hungarian studies did not question the importance of field work, yet they gave preference to a writer's method of collecting material over the systematic scholarly method of collecting data. This was true even for the two most important projects of the time: *Magyarország felfedezése* (Discovering Hungary) and the activities of *Szolgálat és írás Munkaközösség* (Team for Service and Writing).

It is possible to classify the works published between 1936 and 1938 according to types. Taking as criteria patterns of description and interpretation, it is possible to differentiate between works belonging to scholarly sociography, journalism with sociographical ambition, and literary sociography. The works created in these years shared the trait of utilizing a literary approach.⁵⁷

Involvement in politics diverted the attention of representatives of rural sociology from some of the professional issues of sociology, but their literary instinct showed even in their politically motivated writings.

That their writing is called "literary" should not be counted as a denigration of the output of these "founding fathers" of sociography. Their writings were informative and had a powerful appeal to readers. Rural sociologists outdid all others in portraying the peasantry vividly and with artistic authenticity. However, sociologically speaking, their achievement was deficient. Ferenc Erdei stated in 1941: "Had any of us been able to synthesize our findings, a brilliant social theory, say, a sociological tendency, would have been born. . . . But we were not able to."⁵⁸

In the early 1940s there was a shift toward scientifically sound sociology. The most noteworthy works in this respect belonged to Ferenc Erdei: *A magyar paraszttársadalom* (The Society of Hungarian Peasants) and an unfinished work on the structure of Hungarian society.⁵⁹ His cooperation with István Hajnal was a key factor in his shift toward sociology proper. Hajnal's original thoughts on the evolution of social forms, and on the characteristics of the development of European regions, inspired both Erdei and István Bibó. They benefited from Hajnal's methodology of examining the emergence of the middle class. Erdei later discussed this phenomenon in the context of Hungary's complex social structure, in which traits of vassalage, feudal estates, and capitalism coexisted.⁶⁰

In the early 1940s Ferenc Erdei was also engaged in field work sponsored by the Research Center for Country and People. He made a sociological study of the history of the village of Nagykőrös in cooperation with István Márkus and Jolán Majlát.

István Hajnal regarded this project as noteworthy and pointed out its merits and shortcomings. If the achievements of the Erdei team had attracted greater professional attention and served as a general topic of discussion, they could have created a research workshop wherein a leap could have been made toward professionalization and genuine theoretical analysis.⁶³ World War II, the events after, and changes in the careers of the people concerned postponed this opportunity. In 1945 István Hajnal made an attempt to institutionalize this workshop, but the conditions necessary for success did not then exist. Now that nearly fifty years have passed, it is clear that the influence of the work of István Hajnal, Ferenc Erdei, István Bibó, and later of István Márkus, István Kemény, and their students, was there to stay, even if (at times) in disguise. When sociology became institutionalized in the second half of the 1960s, their thoughts forcefully resurfaced.

The demand for modernization, and the increasing reliance on the central state redistribution of goods (the war economy), created a need for empirical surveys in areas where no such surveys had been made before. Two examples include (1) the empirical research related to the modernization of public administration (carried out in part by the Research Center for Country and People and in part by the University Department of Hungarian Public Administration and Financial Law under Professor Zoltán Magyary); and (2) the empirical surveys covering the condition of factory workers, carried out by the Hungarian Research Institute for Economy.⁶² It was probably the team of these researchers who, with the mediation of Gyula Rézler, initiated the trail-blazing empirical survey of a machine-building factory in the Kispest district of Budapest.⁶³ This survey was conducted by Rezső Hilscher.⁶⁴

The end of World War II in 1945 marked the beginning of a new chapter in the history of sociology in Hungary. The Society for Social Sciences was relaunched, and the editors of the journal *Valóság* (Reality) started rallying a new generation of sociographers. There were signs that sociology might be recognized as an academic discipline. István Hajnal, the dean of the Faculty of Arts of Budapest's ELTE University, proposed the creation of a department of sociology as early as April 1945.⁶⁵ In September 1945 the chance arose to put this idea into practice. After István Dékány resigned, the post of head of the department of social theory became vacant. Hajnal set up a committee under László Mátrai to seek a successor, and

HUNGARY

409

he recommended the invitation of Károly Mannheim from London to fill the post.⁶⁶

Hajnal also proposed the creation of a department of sociography with Ferenc Erdei as head. The minutes of the meeting at which he spoke do not reflect how heated the debate over his proposal was, yet a letter Hajnal sent to Jolán Majlát does.⁶⁷ The opponents to this proposal argued that Ferenc Erdei was working as a government minister at the time.

No rapid decision was made. The letter in which Mannheim politely dismissed the proposal was read aloud at a meeting on December 13, 1945.⁶⁸ Mannheim cited his engagement in London but remained silent about his chief motivation—his relationships with György Lukács, Béla Fogarasi, and József Révai (who had assumed control over the official intellectual life of Hungary) had turned sour in the early years of his emigration.⁶⁹ Mannheim knew that if a political turn for the worse took place in Hungary, he would be trapped. In a related development, in 1947 Fogarasi published a pamphlet (written in 1930) attacking Mannheim.⁷⁰

The Council of the Faculty of Arts set up another committee. Following a proposal submitted during a council meeting on July 11, 1946, the application of Sándor Szalai was accepted. He was appointed full professor of the department of social theory on August 18, 1946.⁷¹

The plan to set up a department of sociography did not come to fruition.⁷² Although groups of students submitted a petition proposing Ferenc Erdei for the professorship,⁷³ the university's leadership was divided on the issue and he himself rejected the offer. The issue was finally taken from the agenda in 1946.

By contrast, the department of social theory appeared to have gotten into the best of hands. Sándor Szalai (age 34 at the time) did not have Erdei's prestige by virtue of his sociological works, but thanks to his excellent skill as a lecturer, it took little time for him to make sociology a popular subject. The lectures he held, and the seminars he conducted, made the Szalai name and sociology synonymous in students' minds.

To lay the theoretical foundations of teaching this discipline—to achieve cognitive identity—he wrote *Társadalmi valóság és társadalomtudomány*.⁷⁴

In 1948 he published *Bevezetés a társadalomtudományba* with the sole purpose of helping teach sociology at the university. In the second book he adhered to the theoretical position of the first but presented a more comprehensive overview of the sociological tendencies of the time. He devoted an entire chapter to teaching sociology and its importance in teacher training.⁷⁵ Apart from the concessions he had to make to the Marxist ideology of the time, it is a merit of his works that they established sociology as a full-fledged discipline, made an attempt at finding its place in the system of social sciences, and defined its relationship to social practice, especially politics and social policy.⁷⁶

In the early postwar years universities worked under adverse conditions. The department of social theory had an especially difficult time, as it lacked the traditions which helped maintain more established departments.⁷⁷

At that time István Bibó started a course in sociology at the Faculty of Legal and Administrative Sciences at the University of Szeged. His lecture notes have come down to us, but he did not have the time to write a textbook. However, the essays he published in *Valóság* and *Válasz* (Response) opened new vistas for the sociological analysis of sociopsychological phenomena.⁷⁸

These promising beginnings could not reach fruition owing to changes in ideological and political conditions, and to a radical alteration of the sociocultural environment. Hostile journal articles heralded the start of an offensive against the department of sociology. Concrete measures followed.⁷⁹ Even though Sándor Szalai agreed to make several concessions, the Institute of Social Sciences first lost its independence, then was closed. Szalai was fired and became a defendant in a show trial. The professorship of István Bibó was suspended, and both were expelled from the Academy of Sciences. Sociology and sociography were branded as bourgeois science and silenced. Once again the institutionalization and professionalization of sociology was stopped in Hungary.

THE PROBLEMATIC PROCESS OF PROFESSIONALIZATION AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION DURING THE YEARS OF STATE SOCIALISM

Sociology was to be revived in Hungary after the suppression of the 1956 revolution under conditions of crisis. Open physical and intellectual repression was the order of the day until about 1960. The crisis, which affected all strata of society, called for a novel, critical attitude to social phenomena.

The first initiatives to revive sociology were rejected with rigorous ideological arguments.⁸⁰ The pioneering "free groups" were rather heterogeneous in background.⁸¹ The political leaders of the country were ambiguous in their attitude to sociology. They agreed with the intention to maintain the primacy of ideology, but unlike in 1948, they neither obstructed nor encouraged the slow and controlled process of the institutionalization of sociology.

The process of sociology's institutionalization and becoming a full-fledged discipline was full of setbacks well into the 1970s and 1980s. No monograph has yet been written about this era, and the scope of this chapter allows little room for more than an outline of major events.

The post-Stalinist regimes adhered to the party-state pattern, continued

HUNGARY

411

to rely on the central redistribution of goods, and adhered to one-party rule and rubber-stamp parliamentarism. The autonomy of sciences was restricted.

Yet for several reasons (which cannot be described in this chapter) and despite cruel repression after 1956, Hungary had a relatively flexible version of the Stalinist model. Pre-1956 institutions were maintained, but the room to maneuver was greater in the economy and intellectual life, and there was greater freedom of speech than in the other countries of Eastern Europe. In other words, at stake in the behind-the-scenes infighting was—depending on the ebb and flow of developments in the Soviet Union—the narrowing or broadening of elbow room.⁴²

The development of the intellectual sphere in general, and that of the individual disciplines in particular, could not be strictly associated with the dates just given, especially in the case of autonomous disciplines. However, these historical junctures were of importance in the history of attempts to secure the emancipation of sociology in Hungary. During this period sociology lacked strong institutions and consolidated international relations, and initially it had limited room to maneuver.

The process of the institutionalization of sociology started in the early 1960s. The most important event in this context was the foundation of the sociological group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.⁴³ Sociology began to be taught at several universities,⁴⁴ and empirical surveys were launched.⁴⁵ Sociography, which had a long-standing tradition in Hungary, was also revived.

As the number of strictly scientific surveys increased, sociographers were keen to emphasize their independence from academic sociology. However, the influence of sociology remained limited at that time. This was due to several factors: the network of institutions was underdeveloped, the cognitive aspects of sociology were not elaborated, and professionalism was at a low level.

As far as cognitive aspects were concerned, the debates in the early years of the 1960s made it clear that however cautiously the object and method of sociology were defined by the thinkers who had the courage to "reopen this case," concessions to the Marxist system were inevitable. There was no other option in the sociocultural environment of the time but to present sociology as a Marxist discipline.

For some sociologists this was no concession at all. This group intended to treat sociology as part of a Marxist social theory, free of dogma. During the 1960s this meant advocacy of the line represented by György Lukács. Ágnes Heller, a member of the staff of the research group for sociology, was an outstanding representative of this school.

Marxism was the dominant ideology of the time and as such served mainly functional aims. After the publication of the first few major sociological works, some of which synthesized the findings of empirical sur-

veys,⁸⁸ it became evident, both in content and method, that there was no way to avoid drawing a demarcation line between the findings of the surveys on society and what the political regime considered as a legitimate image of society. The preparations that were made in the middle of the 1960s to introduce a reform of central economic management allowed an increasing role for the articulation of conflicting views. It can now be seen that the opening at that time was temporary. Of importance were András Hegedűs's essay on the structure of society, which appeared in 1964,⁸⁹ and the survey on social stratification carried out under the auspices of the Central Statistical Office with the participation of Zsuzsa Ferge and István Kemény. Ferge published an article and a book on this topic.⁹⁰ These works challenged both the then prevalent dichotomous structural pattern of society and the theoretical foundations of class structure in general.

The works written by György Konrád and Iván Szelényi, together or separately, defined a new paradigm: they systematically described the latent and manifest dysfunctions of the socialist economic system of central redistribution.⁹¹

The publication of classic works of sociology, which had been banned for many years, resumed.⁹² This helped popularize sociology. The series *Társadalomtudományi Könyvtár*⁹³ was relaunched, and several aptly edited omnibus volumes were published on sociology. These books helped a specific section of intellectuals to acquire a new language for argumentation. New sociological institutions were created, research was carried out in more and more places, and training was also done in more and more institutions.⁹⁴

Sociology in Hungary in the late 1960s was beset by contradictions when, in the wake of student movements in the United States and Western Europe and of the events of 1968 in Paris, the New Left tendency reached Hungary. So-called critical sociology gained ground here.

In the early 1960s positivism, due to its genuine or ostensible objectivity, was a widely accepted form of tacit opposition to official ideology, but critical sociology proved to be a much more effective tool to use in opposition to Marxist ideology. Consequently, the views of C. Wright Mills, Alvin Gouldner, and Alain Touraine had an appeal, not only to radical groups of young sociologists but also to several former followers of the structuralist-functional school. These researchers decided to give preference to the critical function of sociology over its objective merits.⁹⁵ This resulted in peculiar instances of consensus between representatives of the markedly nonconformist neo-Marxist tendency and that of critical sociology. At the time important sociological works highly critical of alienated labor and lifestyles carried references to Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Jürgen Habermas, and the young Georg Lukács side by side.

Furthermore, in this period a counteroffensive by conservative forces

HUNGARY

413

took place. This was another consequence of 1968, especially of the intervention in Czechoslovakia. Hungary's political leaders strove to create the impression that a reform would be introduced in science policy.⁹⁴

However, it took but a short time for fundamentalists, who enjoyed international support, to gain the upper hand. Thinkers like András Hegedűs, Ágnes Heller, and Mária Márkus, who used to be neo-Marxists, were publicly criticized.⁹⁵ Iván Szelényi and the internationally renowned writer György Konrád were harassed by the police.⁹⁶ Surveys, led by István Kemény, which focused on poverty and the conditions of gypsies, received no further funds and were later banned.⁹⁷ With the exception of András Hegedűs, they were all forced to emigrate between 1973 and 1976.⁹⁸

These thinkers addressed themes the political leadership considered taboo, but average academic sociology in Hungary either fully ignored or only tacitly touched upon—themes such as the mode of production under state socialism, the one-party system, the social hierarchy that was partly bureaucratic and partly feudalistic, and the interplay between the prerogatives of certain hereditary elite groups and poverty.

In Hungary victories and defeats were always temporary in the tug-of-war between fundamentalists and reformers. The "left-wing" turn that occurred between 1973 and 1975 showed that the reforms could hardly be fully implemented within the framework of the given social system. There was another conclusion: due to the widening economic recession, the scope for further reforms was continuously recreated—within certain limits.

Although Hungarian sociology was suffering from a serious blow, it could survive if it made certain concessions. During the mid-1970s one form of survival was putting strong emphasis on the requirements of professionalization.⁹⁹

This incentive to professionalize sociology and bring it up to international standards was powerful enough to finally, at least in part, achieve these long-desired goals. Hungarian sociology was integrated into international sociological life better than ever before.¹⁰⁰ Surveys were of higher standards theoretically and methodologically. In some areas (social stratification and social mobility) research was absolutely at a par with international standards.

Progress was most dynamic in institutionalization. New research centers were created and existing ones increasingly turned toward sociology.¹⁰¹ Sociology was introduced as a subject to more university and college departments.¹⁰² The Hungarian Sociological Association was established.¹⁰³

From the second half of the 1970s an increasing number of surveys were commissioned, often with the cooperation of several institutions. Some of the surveys covered sizable samples.¹⁰⁴

The sophistication of methods promoted both institutionalization and

professionalization. However, the Weberian creed of objectivity could not be consistently implemented. Members of the various sociological schools of thought shared the view that the differentiation of society could only be portrayed in multidimensional fields, and that the features of this differentiation were related to the reproduction of social inequalities. This reasoning led to the conclusion that there were conflict-ridden, definable, and quantifiable differences in interests and values in Marxist societies as well as in capitalist societies.

At this juncture sociology, willy-nilly, entered the realm of politics. It became clear that the opportunity—or lack of it—to articulate interests, the size of the income, the quality of education, and social policy in its broadest sense are all structure-forming factors. In other words, the social structure is not a mere derivative of objective processes that are independent of people's actions.

Sociological findings, synthesized in part with the tenets of critical sociology, were used to further explore reality and discard myths about it. Some taboo subjects were also challenged.

However, the most fundamental issues raised between 1968 and 1974 were only addressed on the level of abstract generalities, or were relegated to questions of method. This was the price paid to the existing polity for institutionalization. The sociologists on the staff of government-subsidized institutes made indirect criticism of the model of existing socialism, but they either accepted its existence as historically given or carefully avoided an open challenge to its legitimacy.¹⁰⁰

Professionalization was therefore problematic, and cognitive consensus was based either on hushing up questions or on using an esoteric code for questions left unanswered by Marxist theology. This lack of professionalization was the consequence of the following facts: the precondition and a key component of the professionalization of all disciplines, including sociology, is autonomy—autonomy in the sense that scholars are given free reign to evaluate, reject, or reward rival views among themselves independently of government politics.

The ever more manifest legitimization crises of the socialist societies in the 1980s gave rise to new processes in sociology. They led toward the definition of a new paradigm.

Sociological works were published in Hungary that discussed the following themes: how the Communist party and government officials are recruited, and what privileges they have; what dysfunctions are caused by the over-politicization of all spheres of life; what are the problems in national identity; which irregularities in the assessment of student and scholarly performance are due to restrictions in the autonomy of universities and research institutes; what does the so-called second society (the tolerated, at times encouraged, private market) really consist of, and so forth. These issues were raised in the broad context of the rise of the middle

HUNGARY

415

class and of modernization.¹⁰⁶ Some researchers openly called for the re-definition of the premises of the theory of sociology.

The history of the institutionalization and professionalization of sociology in Hungary offers an important message for those who fought for the new paradigm: the expansion and smooth operation of the network of sociological institutions are indispensable preconditions to professionalization, but they are not sufficient in themselves. Full professionalization, the perfection of the cognitive dimensions of institutionalization, may only take place provided the functions of a scholar (lecturer and researcher) are clearly separated from those of a politician and a social policy official—in short, under conditions of autonomy.

Hungary's newly won freedom, the institutions of parliamentarism, offer its scholars new opportunities in this respect, yet it will take some time before Hungary's East European backwardness can be overcome.

NOTES

1. Gyula Pauler, "Auguste Comte és a történelem" (Auguste Comte and History), *Századunk*, 1876, pp. 70–71.

2. Károly Tagányi, "Styl és történelem" (Style and History), *Századunk*, 1884, p. 503.

3. As early as the reform era of the 1840s, the thinkers realized that there could be no modernization without the rise of a middle class, an officially approved and used mother tongue, and national consciousness. They also saw that the evolution of these might be a challenge to the territorial integrity of the multinational Kingdom of Hungary.

4. Tibor Huszár, "Az értelmiségiszociológia és szociográfia hazai történetéhez" (On the History of the Sociological and Sociographical Study of the Intelligentsia in Hungary), in *Nemzetfelfogás—nemzetudat—értelmiség* (National Existence—National Consciousness—Intelligentsia), Budapest, pp. 115–22.

5. For a vivid description of the process, see *Statistikai Nemzetgazdasági Közlemények* (Statistical Bulletin on the Economy), I–VII, Pest, the volumes of 1865–1871.

6. Gyula Pauler, "A pozitívizmus hatása a történetírára" (The Influence of Positivism on Historiography), *Századok*, 1873; Leó Beöthy, "Auguste Comte társadalomtani nézetei" (Auguste Comte's View of Society), Budapest, 1879; cf. *A társadalomfelfogás kezdetei* (The Early Stage in the Evolution of Society), I–II, Budapest, 1882.

7. See János Asbóth, *Három nemzedék* (Three Generations), Budapest, 1873; cf. *Irodalmi arcképek* (Portraits of Writers), Budapest, 1976.

8. See Gábor Zsigmond, *A magyar társadalomfelfogás kezdetei* (The Birth of Ethnography in Hungary), Budapest, 1974; Béla G. Németh, "Létfarc és nemzetiég. Az irodalmi értelmiség felső rétegeinek ideológiájához 1876. után" (Struggle for Life and the Nationalities. On the Ideology of the Upper Strata of Literary Intelligentsia after 1876), in *Létfarc és nemzetiég*, Budapest, 1976, pp. 6–42.

9. József Buday, "Comte Ágost: a pozitivizmus jövője. Comte Ágost szociológiája nyomán" (Auguste Comte: The Future of Positivism. In the Footsteps of Auguste Comte's Sociology), *Magyar Philosophiai Szemle* (Hungarian Philosophical Review), I–IV, 1887; I–IV, 1888; I–V, 1889; IV, 1890. Leó Beöthy, "Auguste Comte társadalomtani nézetei" (Auguste Comte's View of Society), *Budapesti Szemle* (Budapest Review), 1879, pp. 19–20. László Pápay, "Quetelet és a társadalmi természet" (Quetelet and the Science of Society), *Természettudományi Közlemény* (Natural Science Gazette), 1872, pp. 167–71.

10. Gyula Pauler, "Konzervatív liberalizmus" (Conservative Liberalism), *Adhucrum*, V, 1879. Referring to Cimet (as so many thinkers did), Pauler attacked liberalism, which he described as the policy of material prosperity. He contrasted liberalism with the duty to foster time-honored morals and ideals.

11. Dominant as this tendency was, it was not the only one in existence. Other tendencies are represented by articles printed in the journal *Figyelő* (Observer), 1871–1875, or are expressed in the words of István Hegedűs.

12. It is both a rewarding challenge and a dangerous dream for us, Hungarians, to aspire to contribute to universal scientific progress. The price to be paid for that may be the loss of national integrity. Universal science is cosmopolitan. It may undermine a nation's healthy sense of danger. As the territory of our country is vast and there are a lot of nationalities, dangers from the outside may combine with those from the inside. Our task therefore is to create a national science, one that can supply intellectual and emotional ammunition for the nation's struggle for life.

Ferenc Toldy, "Tudománybéli hátramaradásunk okai s ezek tekintetében Akadémia feladata" (On the Causes of Our Backwardness in Science and the Related Tasks of Our Academy), 1868, pp. 144–49.

13. On how the neoconservative ideology and movement feature in the social sciences, see Miklós Szabó, "A kontinentális Európa konzervatív ideológiájának új vonásai a századfordulón" (New Features of Conservative Ideology in Continental Europe on the Turn of the Century), pp. 7–47; Miklós Szabó, "Középosztály és újkonzervatizmus" (Middle Class and Neoconservatism), pp. 176–90.

14. It is worth examining the history of the National Széchenyi Federation [OSzSz]. See Mihály Kerék, *Az Országos Széchenyi Szövetség története, működése és hivatása* (The History, Operation and Calling of the NSzF), Budapest, 1932. See also Jenő Czettler, *Magyar mezőgazdasági szociálpolitika* (Social Policy in Hungarian Agricultural Policy), Budapest, 1914.

15. *Huszadik Század*, vol. 1, no. 1, in *A magyar szociológia első műhelye* (The First Workshop of Sociology in Hungary), ed. György Litván and László Szűcs, 1979, p. 64.

16. See Leó Beöthy, *A magyar társadalmi fejlődés kezdetei, I–II* (The Earliest Phase of Social Development in Hungary), Budapest, 1882; B. Somló, *Der Güterkehr in der Urgesellschaft*. The first related publication in German: "Entwicklung und Literature der Soziologie in Ungarn," *Monatschrift für Soziologie*, vol. 10, 1909, pp. 325–35.

17. For the programs of and the names of participants in the approximately fifty evenings devoted to debates, see *The First Workshop of Sociology*, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 537–48.

HUNGARY

417

18. When talking about a full-fledged discipline, we mean (at least in this century) a complexly articulated social subsystem, not (as was the case earlier) a loose integration of researchers busy pursuing similar projects. Major scientific organizations have the trappings of a bureaucracy, but unlike the situation in agencies of public administration, scholarly achievements are evaluated by international scientific discussions instead of administrative or legal institutions. Ideally, therefore, the vehicles of scientific tradition are teams of researchers who enjoy varying degrees of autonomy. Scientific tradition imparts a social form to scientific content and innovative effort. From the beginning of this century the institutionalization of a discipline has ensured it the conditions for efficient and well-coordinated operation. Lepienes, *Geschichte der Soziologie. Studien zur kognitiven, sozialen und historischen Identität einer Disziplin*, p. 1. Robert L. Geiger, "Die Institutionalisierung soziologischer Paradigmen: Drei Beispiele der Frühzeit der französischen Soziologie." In: W. Lepienes, vol. 2, pp. 140–45. Victor Karády, "Strategien und vorgehenweisen der Durkheim Schule im Bemühen und die Anerkennung der Soziologie." In Lepienes, vol. 2, pp. 231–32.

19. The first president of the Society was the Count Gyula Andrássy, a widely respected personality of his age. The liberal-conservative wing within the Society included Gusztáv Gratz, Loránt Hegedűs, and Pál Wolfner. In 1905 there was a political crisis in Hungary, the details of which would go beyond the scope of this chapter. It sparked a series of events, one of which was this wing's departure from the Society in the summer of 1906. Andrássy resigned from the post of president. There was an unsuccessful attempt to seize power within the Society, and then the 37-member conservative-liberal wing of the Society also left the Society. (For the history of the crucial general meeting, see *Huszadik Század*, 1906, II, pp. 147–75.) The organization that was subsequently formed received the name Hungarian Association for Social Sciences (MTSE). Its president was István Apáthy. The editor-in-chief of its journal, the *Magyar Társadalomtudományi Szemle* (Hungarian Social Science Review, or MTSz), was Menyhért Palágyi.

20. See Bódog Somló, "A társadalmi fejlődés elméletéről és néhány gyakorlati alkalmazásáról" (On the Theory of Social Progress and Some of Its Practical Applications), *Huszadik Század*, vol. 1, 1903, pp. 397–409. Ervin Szabó, "Természet és társadalom" (Nature and Society), *Huszadik Század*, vol. 2, 1903, pp. 747–72. Gyula Pálker, "A materialista történelmi felfogás legnagyobb hiánya" (The Most Important Deficiency of the Materialistic Interpretation of History), *Huszadik Század*, vol. 1, pp. 138–40. Oszkár Jászi, *A történelmi materializmus állambölcsélete* (The Theory of State as Interpreted by Historical Materialism), Budapest, 1908.

21. Oszkár Jászi's letter to Ervin Szabó, March 12, 1905, in *Szabó Ervin levelezése* (E. Sz.'s Correspondence), Budapest, 1978, pp. 75–76.

22. Oszkár Jászi, "Tudomány és politika" (Science and Politics), in "A szociológia első magyarországi műhelye" (The First Workshop of Sociology in Hungary), in *Magyarországi műhelyek*, Budapest, vol. 1, 1973, pp. 60–80.

23. Oszkár Jászi, op. cit., p. 70.

24. "Why should a Durkheim or a Ribot interfere in politics when that job is done properly by a Jaures, a Guesde or a Clemenceau?" Oszkár Jászi: op. cit., pp. 70–71.

25. Oszkár Jászi, op. cit., p. 72.

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid.

28. Even Bódog Somló, who was better informed in theoretical questions than any of his contemporaries, embraced the ideas of Spencer. On occasions when he went beyond positivism, he addressed questions other than sociological. Works by Bódog Somló, *Az objektív szociológia* (Objective Sociology), Budapest, 1903; *A helyes jog elmélete* (The Theory of Proper Law), Budapest, 1904; cf. *Gedanken zu einer ersten Philosophie*, Berlin-Leipzig, 1925; cf. *Juristische Grundlehre*, Leipzig, 1927.

29. R. Maria Lepsius, "Die Soziologie der Zwischenkriegszeit. Entwicklungstendenzen und Beurteilungskriterien," in *Soziologie in Deutschland und Österreich, 1918–1945*, p. 23. On how the theory of evolution and positivism lost ground in the beginning of this century, see I. W. Burow, *Evolution and Society*, London, 1966.

30. Oszkár Jászai, "Tíz év" (Ten Years), *Huszadik Század*, vol. 1, pp. 1–10.

31. For further details, see *A vasárnapi kör* (The Sunday Circle), Documents. Compiled and introduced by Éva Karádi and Erzsébet Vezér, Budapest, 1980.

32. Georg Lukács, *A modern dráma fejlődésének története* (A History of the Development of Modern Drama), Budapest, 1911. Georg Lukács, "Zum Wesen und zur Methodik der Kultursociologie," in *Schriften zur Soziologie der Kultur*, Ed. A. Weber, vol. 1, Jena, 1913. Karl Mannheim, *Seele und Kultur*, Budapest, 1918.

33. See Jenő Gaál, "A Magyar Társadalomtudományi Szemle rendeltetése" (The Mission of the Hungarian Social Science Review, MTSz), vol. 1, 1908, pp. 1–8. Dr. István Apáthy, "A Magyar Társadalomtudományi Egyesület legelső teendői" (The First Priorities of the Hungarian Association for Social Sciences), MTSz, 1908, pp. 8–13.

34. See the Programme of the Hungarian Association for Social Sciences, MTSz, vol. 3, 1910, pp. 555–58.

35. The following committees operated in 1905: legal, economic, social science, social policy, labor, and finally, one devoted to private and liberal education. Op. cit. Supplement to MTSz, 1909, pp. 32–33.

36. Miklós Szabó, "Magyar konzervatizmus" (Conservatism in Hungary), in *Politikai kultúra Magyarországon, 1898–1986* (Political Culture in Hungary, 1898–1986), 1989, p. 15.

37. István Bernát, József Hajós, Endre György, Károly Schandl, and later, Jenő Czettler, who was promoted to a senior post in a university in the 1920s, advocated the institutionalizing of interest associations and social policy organizations, first in the domain of social policy for agriculture. For an encyclopedic summary of these experiments, see Jenő Czettler, *Magyar mezőgazdasági szociálpolitika* (Social Policy in Hungarian Agriculture), 1914.

38. Ferenc Eckhardt, *A Jog- és Államtudományi Kar története, 1867–1935* (A History of the Faculty of Legal and Administrative Sciences, 1867–1935), Budapest, 1936, p. 647.

39. Ibid., p. 648.

40. The minutes of the meeting of the leadership of the Faculty of Legal and Administrative Sciences, January 17, 1919.

41. *A Jog- és Államtudományi Kar története*, op. cit., pp. 647–49.

42. The government, called Council of People's Commissioners, made Hungary a Soviet-type republic in 1919. Ibid., pp. 651–52.

HUNGARY

419

43. Karl Mannheim resettled in Vienna, then in Heidelberg. In 1930 he became a university professor in Frankfurt. He played an important role in institutionalizing sociology in Germany. Between 1933 and his death in 1947 he taught at the London School of Economics. His principal works are *Ideology and Utopia*, English trans. 1936, *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction*, trans. 1940. (Neither have been translated into Hungarian.) Pál Szende did not become a university lecturer. However, two of his works, *Verhüllung und Enthüllung*, Leipzig, 1922, and *Eine soziologische Theorie der Abstraktion*, 1923, are still noted in German-speaking countries. (They have not been translated into Hungarian either.) Arnold Hauser settled in Vienna. From 1933 he lived in London. From 1951 he was a professor at Leeds University. He wrote the following sociological works: *Sozialgeschichte der Kunst und Literatur*, Munich, 1953, and *Soziologie der Kunst*, Munich, 1974. Antal Frigyes first lived in Italy, then, from 1933, in Britain. His principal works are: *Florentine Painting and Its Social Background*, London, 1947, and *Hoggarth and His Place in European Art*, 1962. There was also a delay in the scholarly university career of Karl Polányi in Vienna, his first base. Then he moved to Oxford. Between 1947 and 1953 he was a professor at Columbia University, New York. His principal works are: *The Great Transformation*, New York-Toronto, 1957, and *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*, London, 1957. Oszkár Jászi worked as a professor at Oberlin University from 1925. His *Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy*, Chicago, 1929, has become an often-quoted reference.

44. The most eloquent example from this point of view is "Nemzeti és nemzetietlen szociológia" (National and Un-National Sociology), *Társadalomtudomány* (Social Science), 1927, pp. 337–47. An example for the opposite point of view is "A szociológia feladata" (The Task of Sociology), an article by the eminent economist Farkas Heller (*Társadalomtudomány*, vol. 1, pp. 6–12. However, his initiative had no response and he did not raise this subject in further writings either.

45. BTK KKr. 1930–131. ELTE Archives. June 20, 1931. 1080 DSZ. BTK jkr ih, June 1, 1932. IX. 3. ü. BTK. IV. VII. r. meeting. 41366 DSZ BTK Jkr. March 7, 1939. IV. r. meeting. ih. 1089 DSZ BTK KKr. 22 May, 1939. II. r. meeting. 1316 DSZ. Finally, in 1942 a Department of Social Theory was set up with István Dékány as head. Dékány was a philosopher of society rather than a sociologist. His works on the social phenomena are of a deductive, speculative character. See *Társadalomfilozófia alapfogalmai*, Budapest, 1939.

46. Hans Freyer was a professor of sociology at Leipzig University. His works in social philosophy, history, and ethnography were often referred to by Hungarian scholars. From 1934 he acted as president and the most influential member of the German Sociological Society.

47. Barna Horváth, *Rechtssoziologie*, Berlin, 1934.

48. Tibor Huszár, *Bibó István. Beszélgetések, politikai életrajzok, dokumentumok* (István Bibó. Conversations, Political Biographies, and Documents), Budapest, 1989, pp. 24–25.

49. This was what he had to say of the relationship of sociology and the philosophy of society in 1943:

Research on social reality and values is philosophical provided it aspires to encompass the whole, and it falls under the category of a specialized science provided it focuses on certain partial aspects. It follows from the tenet of "entia praeter necessitatem non sunt multipli-

planda" that we may only speak of specialized social sciences and the theory of society, and the latter may be called sociology or philosophy of society.

"A mai filozófia," in op. cit., pp. 115–16. Oral contribution by Barna Horváth.

50. István Hajnal, "Történelem és szociológia," *Századunk* (Our Century), 1939, pp. 1–32, 137–66; *Írásbeliség, írástörténet a felújítás korából* (The Evolution of Written Records in the Age of Revival), Budapest, 1921; "A kis nemzetek történetírásának munkaközössége" (Joining the Efforts of Historiographers of Small Nations), *Századunk*, 1942, pp. 1–42, 133–65.

51. See György Bónis, *Hűbérték és rendiség a középkori jogban* (Vassaldom and Estates in Medieval Law), Cluj, 1943; Ferenc Erdei, *A magyar parasztsádsadalom* (The Society of Hungarian Peasants), Budapest, 1942; István Bibó, *A kelet-európai kis államok nyomorúsága* (The Misery of the Small States of Eastern Europe), Budapest, 1946; Jolán Majláth-István Márkus, *Nagykorús beilleszkedése a magyar rendi társadalomba a XVIII. században* (The Integration of Nagykorús into Hungary's Society of Estates in the 18th Century), Budapest, 1943.

52. Ferenc Földes, "A munkásság és a parasztság kulturális helyzete" (The Cultural Situation of the Workers and Peasants), in *Válogatott írások* (Selected Writings), Budapest, 1967.

53. For a detailed analysis, see Dénes Németh, *Népi szociográfia, 1932–33* (Rural Sociology), Budapest, 1985; Tibor Huszár, "A tudós és politikus Erdei Ferenc műhelyében" (In the Workshop of Ferenc Erdei, the Scholar and Politician), in *Történelem és szociológia*, Budapest, 1979, pp. 249–553.

54. Gyula Ortutay, "A magyar falukutatás új útjai," *Vigilia*, February 1935, p. 116; Béla Reitzer, "A szociográfia módszertani problémái," *Fiatal Magyarok* (Young Hungarians), November 1, 1934.

55. The concept was borrowed by Hungarian essayists and social scientists from German ethnographical and culture historical works, namely, from Leo Frobenius, *Schicksalskunde im Sinne des Kulturwandens*, Leipzig, 1932.

56. "The real qualification for anyone to practise the scholarship of fate is mankind as it is tried by fate. That has to reach out for the things known." László Németh, "A magyarságtudomány feladatai" (The Tasks of Hungarian Studies), in *Kiadatlan tanulmányok* (Unpublished Essays), vol. 1, Budapest, 1968, p. 383.

57. Ferenc Erdei, the archetype of authors of scholarly sociology, wrote in 1941:

The movement attained an additional marked trait, it became literary. At that time we described it as intellectual. With hindsight now it can be unequivocally classified as one belonging to writers. The social analysis was typical of writers, it was writers who kept the movement going, and the response was also reminiscent of literature: the public reacted as a reading audience.

Ferenc Erdei, "A reformkorszak epilógusa" (Epilogue to the Reform Era), *Kelet Népe* (People of the East), vol. 6, 1941, pp. 3–4.

58. Ferenc Erdei, "A reformkorszak epilógusa" (Epilogue to the Reform Era), *Kelet Népe* (People of the East), vol. 6, 1941, p. 3. Inconsistencies in their method were also criticized by the conservative Gyula Rézler, Gyula Rézler, *Falukutatók és szociográfusok. A magyar társadalom önvizsgálata az elmúlt évtizedben* (Rural Sociologists and Sociographers. The Self-Examination of Hungarian Society in the Past Decade), Budapest, 1943.

HUNGARY

421

59. Ferenc Erdei, *A magyar parasztságadalom*, Budapest, 1942. Now available in *A magyar társadalomról* (On Hungarian Society), Budapest, 1983, pp. 33–217. In English: "The Society of Hungarian Peasants," in Ferenc Erdei: *Selected Writings*, Ed. Tibor Huszár, Budapest, 1988, pp. 156–204. See also "Hungarian Society between the Two World Wars," in *Selected Writings*, pp. 7–95. In Hungarian: Ferenc Erdei, "A magyar társadalom a két világháború közötti," in *A magyar társadalomról*, pp. 291–347.
60. Ferenc Erdei, *Selected Writings*, p. 12.
61. István Hajnal's letter to Ferenc Erdei, November 10, 1943. Archive of the Sociological Institute of ELTE University, Budapest.
62. Zoltán Magyar–István Kis, *A közigazgatás és az emberek* (Public Administration and People), Pécs, 1933. *Magyar gyári munkások. Szociális helyzetkép* (Factory Workers in Hungary. Their Living Conditions), Ed. Gyula Rézler, Budapest, 1946. Gyula Rézler made a pioneering contribution to surveying the lives of factory workers in Hungary well before this book. His major sociographical-historical piece, *A magyar nagyipari munkásság kialakulása (1867–1914)* (The Rise of Factory Labor in Hungary, 1867–1914), could only be published in 1948.
63. The survey of 1,200 workers covered essential sociological data. The questionnaires remained unprocessed but were preserved in the archive of a grammar school of Sárospatak. Miklós Lackó processed them fifty years later. See "Gépgyári munkások az 1930-as években" (Machine Factory Workers in the 1930s), *Szépirodalom*, vol. 1–2, 1989, pp. 2–43.
64. Rezső Hilscher, a lecturer at the Budapest University of Economics, headed the social welfare department of the Institute of Social Policy.
65. Péter Pázmány University, minutes of the council of the Faculty of Arts, April 17, 1945.
66. Ibid., September 21, 1945.
67. See István Hajnal's letter to Ferenc Erdei, Budapest, September 29, 1945. Copy held in the sociological archive of ELTE University. Ferenc Erdei published writings even during his spell as a minister. In May 1945 he presented a paper at a session of the reorganized Society for Social Sciences.
68. Minutes of the Pázmány University's Arts Faculty Council, December 13, 1945.
69. In a letter to Béla Balázs, Mannheim gave a terse explanation for this. Heidelberg, February 15, 1930. In *Vasárnapi Kör* (Sunday Circle), Eds. Éva Karádi and Erzsébet Vezér, Budapest, 1980, p. 145.
70. Published first as Adalbert Fogarasi: "Die Soziologie der Intelligenz and die Intelligenz der Soziologie," *Unter dem Banner des Marxismus*, 1930.
71. Dezső Keresztúry's letter to the rector of the university, August 23, 1946. Archive of ELTE University, correspondence of rectors.
72. Minutes of the Pázmány University's Arts Faculty Council, September 9, 1946.
73. Dezső Keresztúry's letter to the rector of the university, August 23, 1946, ELTE correspondence.
74. Sándor Szalai, *Társadalmi valóság és társadalomtudomány* (Social Reality and Social Science).
75. Sándor Szalai, *Bevezetés a társadalomtudományba* (Introduction to Social

Science), in the series *Nevelők Könyvtára*, No. 4, Budapest, 1948, pp. 149–58, 175–79.

76. Sociology goes beyond examining certain phenomena for a practical purpose. It applies scientific methods and seeks general principles. *Ibid.*, p. 171.

77. Elek Karsai joined the department in 1946 as junior lecturer presenting the recommendation of Emma Lóderer. His doctoral dissertation was in the field of history. Evidently, he had no sociological qualifications. The department, which was later to become an institute, had two other full-time staff members: historian Géza Perjés, who worked as librarian, and Iván Sugár, who handled the institute's administrative affairs. In 1947, János Harsányi joined the institute as an unpaid trainee.

78. István Bibó, *A kelet-európai kis államok nyomorúsága* (see note 51); *Eltorzult magyar alkot, zsákutcs magyar történelem* (Distorted Hungarian Character, Dead Alley in Hungarian History), *Zsidókérdés Magyarországon* (Jewish Question in Hungary), in *Válogatott Tanulmányok* (Selected Essays), Ed. Tibor Huszár, Budapest, 1986.

79. The tone of the polemic writings was becoming increasingly sharper. Articles by László Rudas anticipated the subsequent repressive measures. See "Mi változott tavaly ősz óta? Válasz Szalai Sándornak" (What Has Changed since Last Fall? An Answer to Sándor Szalai), in László Rudas, *Elmélet és gyakorlat* (Theory and Practice), Budapest, 1950, pp. 217–250.

80. For the debate, see "A hazánkban folyó szociológiai kutatások helyzete és időszzerű problémái" (The Situation and Timely Issues of Sociological Research in Our Homeland), *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle* (Hungarian Philosophical Review), 1960, no. 2, pp. 615–631.

81. Sándor Szalai, who had been politically rehabilitated, represented the older generation. The majority of the representatives of the middle generation came from disciplines like law, economics, or ethnography. Others came from politics, like András Hegedűs, who had been prime minister of Hungary between 1954 and 1956. Others, for instance István Kemény, got involved in politics in 1956. There were, furthermore, younger people who expected sociology to free social science from ideological content.

82. From the political and economic point of view the periods of 1963–1968, 1968–1973, 1973–1978, 1978–1985 saw alternating waves of partial reform and hard-liners counteroffensive. From 1985 the communist system began to come unstuck. The process led into a negotiated revolution, to free parliamentary elections and take aim at establishing a market economy.

83. Characteristically, the research group for sociology initially operated under the auspices of the Institute of Philosophy. Its independent operation in 1965 was the first step toward sociology becoming a discipline on its own. The founder and head of the group was András Hegedűs.

84. At the department of philosophy of the Faculty of Arts of ELTE University; at departments of law, economics, and legal theory in Budapest, Pécs, and Szeged; at the department of philosophy of the Budapest University of Economics.

85. The most important empirical project was conducted by the economics department of the Central Statistical Office in early 1963. The survey, which covered 15,000 households, focused on the dynamics of social stratification. See "Tár-

HUNGARY

423

sadalmi rétegződés Magyarországon" (Social Stratification in Hungary). KSH (Central Statistical Office), *Időszaki Közlemények*, 1964.

86. See Sándor Csóóri, *Tudósítás a toronyból* (Report from the Tower), Budapest, 1963; Gyula Csák, *Mélytenger áramlás* (Deep-Sea Currents), Budapest, 1963. The series "The Discovery of Hungary" was relaunched at the end of the 1960s. It generally contains works falling under the category of literary sociology. For the so-called scholarly sociology, see *Város és vidéke* (Town and Its Surroundings), Budapest, 1971; István Márkus, *Az ismeretlen főszereplő* (The Unknown Protagonist), Budapest, 1991.

87. András Hegedűs, "A szocialista társadalom strukturális modellje és a társadalmi rétegződés" (Structural Model of Socialist Society and Social Stratification), *Valóság* (Reality), vol. 5, 1964, pp. 1–15.

88. Zsuzsa Ferge, "Társadalmi rétegződés Magyarországon" (Social Stratification in Hungary), *Valóság*, 1966, no. 10. Cf. *Társadalmunk rétegződése* (The Stratification of Our Society), Budapest, 1969.

89. See György Konrád-Iván Szelényi, *Új lakótelepek szociológiai vizsgálatainak problémái* (Problems of the Sociological Examination of New Housing Estates), Budapest, 1969. Konrád-Szelényi, "Új lakótelepek szociológiai vizsgálata," *Valóság*, 1969, no. 8, p. 28. György Konrád, "A késleltetett városfejlesztés társadalmi konfliktusai" (Social Conflicts of Retarded Urban Development), *Valóság*, 1971, no. 12.

90. Durkheim, *Selfide*, 1967. Max Weber, *Economy and Society* (excerpts), Comp. Iván Varga, 1967. Max Weber, *Állam, politika, tudomány* (State, Politics, Science), Comp. István Kemény and Iván Varga, 1970.

91. This series was started in the early years of this century. It includes nearly seventy authors, early and modern. Eminent thinkers from universities and the Academy have been on its editorial board.

92. The research group was transformed into an institute. In 1969 the department for public opinion research of the Hungarian Radio and Television continued as the Institute for Media Research and became a center for domestic sociological surveys. It was headed by Tamás Srećkó. In 1970 a department of social statistics was set up within the Central Statistical Office. Social phenomena that used to be taboo were examined by its three sections with sophisticated methodology. The sections were as follows: social mobility (headed by Rudolf Andorka), social stratification (headed by László Cseh-Szombathy), poverty (headed by István Kemény). Two postgraduate courses, organized by the Institute for Social Sciences, played an important role in the training of sociologists. The courses were led by Tibor Huszár, Iván Szelényi, Zsuzsa Ferge, and Kálmán Kulcsár. A sociology group was set up at ELTE University's Arts Faculty in 1969 and became an independent department one year later. An independent sociology group started at the Budapest University of Economics in 1967 under Tibor Huszár.

93. See András Hegedűs-Mária Márkus, *Ember, munka, közösség* (Man, Labor, Community), Budapest, 1966. Zoltán Zsille, "Fiatal diplomások esélyei" (Young Graduates' Chances of Success in Career), *Valóság*, 1971, no. 7. Lajos Héthy-Csaba Makó, *Munkásmagatartások és gazdasági szervezet* (Patterns of Worker Behavior and Economic Organization), Budapest, 1972.

94. A document entitled "Guidelines for Science Policy" was issued in 1969. It paid lip service to the freedom of research but in effect restricted the scholars'

ability to publish their writings. "MSzMP KB Tudománypolitikai Irányelvei, June 27, 1969," in *Határozatok és dokumentumok 1967–1970* (Resolutions and Documents 1967–1970), Budapest, 1974, pp. 335–67. As initiated by the Secretariat of the Communist party, two men were simultaneously removed from senior posts: the director of the Institute of Philosophy, who was well known for his sectarian and dogmatic views, and András Hegedűs, the director of the Institute of Sociology of the Academy, who played a pioneering role in reviving sociology. "MSzMP Titkárságának határozata" (Resolution of the Communist Party Secretariat), *Pártillet* (Party Life), December 1969.

95. "A Magyar Szocialista Munkáspárt KB. Kulturpolitikai Munkaközösségének állásfoglalása néhány társadalomkutató antimarkista nézeteiről" (Statement of the Culture Policy Panel Set Up by the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party on the Anti-Marxist Views of Certain Social Scientists), *Határozatok és dokumentumok 1971–1975* (Resolutions and Documents 1971–1975), Budapest, 1978, pp. 456–69.

96. *The Road of the Intellectuals to Class Power: Sociological Study of the Intellectuals in Socialism*, New York, 1979, written by György Konrád and Iván Szelenyi, was confiscated by police in typescript form. It was published abroad.

97. The Central Statistical Office dismissed István Kemény; a new head was appointed to the department of social statistics and the department itself was re-organized.

98. In his preface to the Hungarian edition of their book, Iván Szelenyi gives a vivid description of this process. Konrád-Szelenyi, *Az értelmiség útja az osztályhatalomhoz* (The Road of the Intellectuals), Budapest, 1989, pp. 5–6:

From the moment we started working on the book we were clearly aware that the task we had set ourselves was an impossible one: we have to write a book that is unacceptable for the Hungarian political authorities and police and is bound to remain such in the foreseeable future. After all, by the end of 1973 we had become outcasts from the official intellectual life and were jobless. As a result of the reactionary turnabout that took place in Hungary after 1968 and especially in the early 1970s, which we describe in this book as the counter-offensive of the ruling class, the conservative party and secret-police bureaucracy pushed us to the margin of intellectual livelihood. The same happened to many of our friends and like-minded acquaintances. True, it was partly our fault to become outcasts: the more conservative the political regime became, the more radical we grew intellectually. We refused to use the ideological muzzle that was required. On the contrary, we aimed at drawing ever more consistent conclusions from our research. We could not retreat and behave. Our aim was to formulate our ideas as precisely and sharply as possible. We wished to write a book free of taboos and sacred cows. We consciously prepared ourselves for committing "scholarly suicide." We were aware that, once we publish this essay, we cannot work as sociologists in Eastern Europe any more.

99. Kálmán Kulcsár, *Társadalom, politika, jog* (Society, Politics, Law), Budapest, 1974. See also Lajos Héthy-Csaba Makó, "Antimarkista szociológia és a valóságfeltárás" (Anti-Marxist Sociology and Exploring Reality), *Társadalmi Szemle* (Social Review), 1973, no. 11, pp. 19–30. Cf. "A marxista szociológia önismertének kérdéséhez" (On the Question of the Self-Knowledge of Marxist Sociology), *Társadalmi Szemle*, 1974, no. 1.

100. More and more Hungarian researchers attend the congresses of the International Sociological Association. The papers they present are published in Eng-