

SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES IN THE WEST: SHORTCOMINGS AND PROSPECTS

KJELL MAGNUSSON (Uppsala)

Introduction

Had anyone said a year ago, that Eastern Europe in the second half of 1989 would undergo a period of dramatic and radical transformation, leading to the demise of communist governments in most East European countries, few would have believed him. Similarly, the specialists on the Soviet Union did not anticipate the far-reaching consequences of the policies inaugurated by Michail Gorbachev four years earlier.

If the purpose of the social sciences is not only to explain, but also to predict future events, the results are modest indeed in the field usually referred to as Soviet and East European Studies. It is of course always easy to criticize in retrospect, and, to be fair, one should admit that there are great difficulties in predicting the outcome of any social process, if it is at all possible.

Nevertheless, the example of Soviet and East European Studies is very instructive when discussing the role of scholars in the contemporary world. And I think the failure to foresee the end of "real socialism" has to do with central methodological and theoretical concerns, as well as with moral issues.

East European Studies were born in a period of cold war and arose as an answer to the need for reliable knowledge about the socialist countries of Europe. Among the pioneers was a substantial number of scholars born in Eastern Europe, living as refugees in the West. There was also a more or less pronounced interest from various governmental agencies dealing with problems of political and strategic security. This often meant a strong anti-communist commitment, coupled with a pragmatic approach. By the passage of time, however, a discussion started trying to legitimate EES as a scholarly field in its own right. In practice, though, it was difficult to define the subject matter of EES. To some it was an outgrowth of Slavic Studies and other linguistic and cultural disciplines, which had existed for a long time, and whose concern was the study of Russian, Central European or Balkan culture and society. That is, the definition was based on the criteria of cultural area and cultural tradition, like Indology, Sinology or Islamic Studies.

However, there were others who preferred to use characteristic features of the political system as the main criterion. According to their view Soviet and East European studies were concerned with the investigation of socialist states in Europe - and elsewhere. In its most pure form the field was referred to as Communist Studies, and it was emphasized that it belonged to the social sciences, and should, if possible,

use the more sophisticated methods increasingly being available in post-war social science, such as factor analysis and other advanced multivariate statistical methods. Sometimes, this position tended to differentiate itself almost completely from the humanities (Fleron 1971).

An interesting problem was whether Yugoslavia should be classified as an East European or "Soviet-type" society. To the purists it should not, as it was not a traditional planned economy, and as the decentralized political system differed too much from the Soviet prototype. In my opinion, however, Yugoslavia must be included, and this view is supported by several Yugoslav authors (e. g. Golubović 1987) who point out that the basic dimensions of post-war European socialist society were simply there: a one-party system, a conscious promotion of an official Marxist ideology, and a dominance of the political system in the economy and other spheres of society.

Incidentally, the view of the purists was shared by official Yugoslav representatives, stressing the unique features of self-management society. The ironic thing is of course, that Yugoslavia was to be one of the last European countries still identifying itself as a socialist one-party state.

If the purist definition of the field is accepted, then, in the light of recent developments East European Studies should actually cease to exist. Personally I do not agree with this conclusion, but more about this issue later on.

Theories and Methods

A particular feature of Soviet and East European Studies has been a rather sterile theoretical discussion about which out of four or five existing models of socialist society was most adequate (Meyer 1979, von Borcke & Simon 1980). At first there was the totalitarian model, which maintained that Eastern Europe was distinguished by the totalitarian character of its political and social system, leading to the disappearance of civil society. In the 1960s this idea was much criticized and superseded by other approaches, known as the group or elite theories, the theory of modernization and the bureaucratic model.

It was argued that Soviet society was not as monolithic as the totalitarian model presupposed, and that, moreover, coercion as an instrument of social control had radically declined. Those who favoured the interest group approach tried to show that there existed within the *nomenklatura* various more or less articulated interests which affected political decisions. Against this it was stated that one could not speak about interest groups in Soviet-type societies, as the only legitimate interests possible to articulate were those of the monopolistic party. Instead it was suggested that it would be better to understand the Soviet Union as a huge bureaucratic system, having much in common with industrial and commercial corporations in the west.

Others tended to look at the Soviet Union as a modernizing society, which meant that western theories of modernization would be applicable, and that one would expect the same or similar developments as in other countries, in the end perhaps leading to a pluralist market-oriented system.

What is peculiar about this discussion are the sometimes rather simple arguments used to refute the various models. For example, as there was no single dictator in command of state power, and as terror was not on the scale of the 1930s, it was wrong to use the term totalitarian. On the other hand, as there were no independent political institutions it was wrong to use the concept of interest groups.

Reading this literature one is sometimes at a loss. It would, after all, seem reasonable to understand the different models or theories as *ideal types* in Max Weber's sense, as

heuristic devices serving as a point of departure in empirical research or theoretical analysis. When speaking about totalitarianism, for example, it would be enough as a distinguishing mark that Soviet-type societies all had the ambition to control social life in its totality. And it is hard not to agree with Kolakowski on this point:

In short: as totalitarianism designates the complete control of the state in all areas of life, and the unlimited power of an artificial state ideology over human minds, perfection can be attained only when resistance of both natural and intellectual reality is overcome, or, in other words, when reality is completely destroyed. Therefore, when we speak of totalitarian regimes, we do not refer to perfect systems, but to those which constantly strive to achieve perfection, to swallow all channels of human communication and to destroy all spontaneous forms of social life (Kolakowski 1989:187, transl. KM).

Another somewhat strange characteristic of this discussion is the idea that one must look for a single theory or model capable of describing society as a whole, rather than developing theories that would explain social processes on different levels.

In the end it seems that these perspectives are not, in fact, mutually incompatible, as they focus on different aspects or levels of society, and nothing actually prevents us from using them simultaneously. Soviet and East European socialist society might thus be understood as a - in some cases - modernizing society, where the institutional structure as a whole shows distinct bureaucratic features of a specific kind, and where the political system is basically totalitarian in nature, although various factions or interest groups compete for power.

The fundamental issue in this debate was thus whether these societies were radically different or not, if they could really be analyzed by western concepts like modernization or interest groups. Indeed, the Russian philosopher Aleksander Zinoviev (1989) seriously advocated the idea that western scholars were not able to understand the system at all, however hard they would try.

Although it is true that social science theory, for obvious reasons, is influenced by cultural and social conditions in western society, the problem is, nevertheless, not so much a matter of having to develop a new (general) theory to account for sociocultural or political processes in Eastern Europe. Existing theories and concepts within the social sciences should in principle be possible to use, which in no way denies that empirical reality in Eastern Europe might be different. However, this different reality should, until shown otherwise, be thought of as a specific case of a more general pattern. If that is not possible, one would have to change the theory accordingly.

The point is that man must be considered to be the same, whether he is from Scandinavia or the Balkans. Any human behaviour or social institution should therefore be discussed within the same general theoretical framework.

It is a different matter, however, and of great interest, to investigate to what extent general social processes in the specific structural and systemic environment of Eastern Europe have produced effects that are different from those existing in western Europe.

Take the theories of modernization. What is important when applying these theories to socialist countries is not whether East European society on the surface looks like Western Europe, has developed exactly the same type of social or political institutions. The point is, rather, that the process of modernization, involving industrialization, urbanization, growth of literacy and mass media, in a fundamental way changes the relationship of individuals and groups towards formal and informal social institutions. New attitudes and socio-cultural identities are created which on a certain level of abstraction are comparable to similar phenomena in any modern society.

Let me give another example of how existing theories could explain specific aspects of socialist society. One of the most important features of a totalitarian society is what Czeslaw Milosz (1980) called *ketman*, the tendency to speak and act contrary to one's belief. This could actually be understood as a special case of what Irving Goffman (1972) has referred to as *role distance*. That is, a social actor does not identify with a role, which is normally the case, but deliberately plays it without inner conviction.

This is a typical phenomenon in modern society and it is interesting to note that there are striking similarities between attitudes and behaviour of the actors in Zinoviev's *Yawning Heights* and those of the main characters in Joseph Heller's novel *Something happened*, or the personalities in the satirical novels of the Swedish author GOran ffigg. This is, in the American corporation, in the Swedish state bureaucracy, as well as in the Soviet *kolektiv*, people are acting according to Hobbesian rules, trying to maximize their own interests.

Now, an interesting point would be whether *ketman* as a more extreme version of this type of behaviour will have lasting effects on the social psychology of socialist society.

When criticizing the theoretical discussion in East European Studies, one has to bear in mind that it was to a large extent a function of a lack of reliable sources. Indeed, Soviet and East European Studies have in this respect been compared to medieval studies, and it is a fact that in the study of countries where the situation was more "normal", such as Yugoslavia, and later on Poland, or Hungary, there was more of empirical research based on a variety of sources, and less of scholastic debates. This state of affairs also explains the development of the much ridiculed methods of Kremlinology, the sometimes "journalistic" analysis, and the frequent preoccupation with the role of individual politicians.

Sociology and East European Studies

Let us return to the problem of prediction. It seems, allowing for what was just said, that a major reason why scholars failed to predict the dramatical changes in Eastern Europe has to do with their basic understanding, not only of East European society, but of society in general, especially of the role of culture and ideology.

It is a peculiar fact that sociology has played a comparatively minor role in EES, which for a very long time was dominated by political science of a highly American variety.

One reason is that, while western sociology in the 1960s and 1970s was preoccupied with its rediscovery of Marxism, very few Marxist sociologists in the west showed any interest in applying their theories to the study of East European society. Instead they often had an idealized picture of "real socialism".

At the same time sociology had difficulties in attaining an autonomous status, and was periodically banned from public life in many East European societies, or was controlled by party and state institutions.¹

In fact, there existed in Eastern Europe an official way of explaining social and political processes which might be labelled pseudo-sociology, and which had many things in common with American functionalism (Magnusson 1986).

¹ For a discussion on sociology in East and West see Gouldner (1971).

It was based on the idea that there were no social conflicts in these societies, neither between classes nor ethnic groups. Society was held together by common interests, and above all by the official Marxist ideology. It was claimed that an understanding of Marxism-Leninism, or, in the Yugoslav case, of *Self-Management Theory*, was a necessary precondition for participation in social and political affairs. Consequently it was important to educate the young generation in this ideology. Therefore, when conflicts did arise, they were looked upon as consequences of hostile propaganda, or as the result of activities of the enemies of socialism, and, invariably, after social upheavals there was a new stress on ideology, Marxist education was again reinforced. This was the case, for example, with Yugoslavia in the 1970s. The underlying assumption was always that it is possible to regulate patterns of thought and world-views within a given society.

Western scholars have often too easily accepted this idea, and believed that, just because the ideology was taught as a subject at school, or disseminated by propaganda or public rituals, it was also identified with and believed in. One reason why this view has been so popular, is that it was consistent with a widespread functionalist approach, where a fundamental aspect is the idea that every society must have a common ideology or world-view; otherwise people would have no identity, and society would not be held together.

However, from the point of view of sociology of knowledge and symbolic interactionism, or social psychology in general, it would follow that a common ideology of this kind is not necessary - in fact hardly probable in a modern situation - and that any perspective or world-view will be transmitted and perceived as real only if the individual during the process of socialization assimilates specific frames of references, which are later sustained by continuing social interaction. Thus, by knowing even crude data about social structure and cultural tradition in a given society, one would predict, on purely theoretical grounds, that the official ideology would have serious difficulties in being accepted, both among peasants/workers and the educated strata, albeit for different reasons. In fact one would expect that the ideology even in cases where it had been genuine to begin with, was on the one hand blocked by a more or less traditional rural culture, and, on the other hand, subject to a process of secularization similar to the process simultaneously affecting religion in urban areas.

The point I wish to make is that the social sciences have to account for the cognitive dimension in sociocultural life. Any sociology wishing to explain human behaviour and social processes as the result of human action must deal with the problem that reality is not experienced directly, but by means of perspectives, frames of references, roles, or whatever term is used, structuring perception and modelling action. Value orientations and ideologies are not just drifting around in the air, as it were; they are sedimented in social roles constituting parts of specific cultural patterns which are tied to a concrete social setting.²

In view of the predominance of political science, the lack of a more comprehensive sociological perspective, and the unfortunate tendency to exclude the humanities, it is understandable that culture, whether broadly or narrowly defined, was neglected in much of EES. This is the more unfortunate, since, at first, political processes in Eastern Europe during the 1980s have to a large extent started and developed in the area of culture: in literature, philosophy, historiography or the social sciences. Secondly, a sociological approach of the kind referred to here, sensitive to broad socio-cultural processes, is necessary in order to account for two of the most important social phenomena in contemporary Eastern Europe: the secularization of ideology, and the rise of nationalism.

I do not claim that this theoretical orientation is able to predict exactly when specific

² These issues have been discussed in detail by Magnusson 1989.

events will occur, but at least one would have looked differently on the legitimacy of ideology or the alleged stability of East European society. And it is symptomatic that recent East European sociology, preoccupied with the problem of political change, has been very interested in the theories of social movements, which implicitly, or explicitly, are compatible with our perspective.³

Responsibility of Scholars

I hesitate, for several reasons, to bring up the problem of scholarly responsibility in this context. In general I believe that the primary responsibility of the social scientist is that of a craftsman. He should actually try to do a good job and he should be honest about it. In the pursuit of knowledge he must use the best methods available within his field, and carefully state his theoretical assumptions. Above all, he must always, whether dealing with theoretical arguments or empirical data, look for evidence which contradicts his own favourite ideas. Preferably, he should write in a language as clear as possible, refraining from emotions and bias. That is, he should do the job for which he is trained, and which will not be done by anybody else.

As Max Weber pointed out, one has to make a choice. If one is not willing to do the tedious, and perhaps futile work, trying to corroborate an argument, one should choose another profession than that of the scholar (Weber 1974a).

Likewise, although it might be very tempting to become a politician, one must in that case be prepared to adopt a set of principles that are essentially contrary to intellectual work. In the exercise of power one has to be ready to go against one's convictions and judgements. And to do this with open eyes, not trying to find excuses in some moral principles (1974b).

I believe Weber is basically right. In general one should not mix scholarship and ideology. The history of our century is after all a history of how intellectuals have made terrible mistakes in this respect.

They were the creators of irrational ideologies and movements, they helped to spread dubious messages, defended crimes and even refused to believe unequivocal evidence. All because of some higher principles.

There is also the banal but distressing discrepancy between the moral pretensions of intellectuals and their sometimes almost total lack of honesty in ordinary, every-day life, recently documented by Paul Johnson (1988).

Therefore, I find it very difficult to speak about any special responsibility of the intellectual. Everyone has a moral responsibility, and when an intellectual engages in social and political affairs I think he should do so, not as an intellectual, but as a human being, a citizen together with fellow citizens. The idea that he possesses some kind of esoteric knowledge that sets him apart from others, and makes him destined to be their ideological leader, is dangerous.

Now, what is the relevance of this general attitude for a student-of East European affairs? If we look at the subject matter of EES, i.e. the social development of Eastern Europe in the 20th century, it is to a very large extent the history of intellectual failure and abuse of the values represented by science and scholarship. But it is also a history of moral courage of intellectuals. It is clear that the words and behaviour of people like Solzhenitsyn, Milosz,

³ One example is Elemer Hankiss (1988) original discussion of the "second society". On social movements in general, see Touraine (1985).

or Havel, have served as models and encouragement in difficult times, and that intellectuals at crucial moments have played a very important political role in Eastern Europe. They have acted in situations where normal conditions no longer existed, when language itself was contaminated, and the integrity of culture endangered.

In view of all this, it seems futile to ask how the scholar from the West should behave. Among those dealing with EES there has been a variety of attitudes towards the socialist system. From those of the bitter refugee to those of the cynical or naive outsider. From those of the neutral observer to those of the ardent believer or vehement opponent. It is of course impossible to be indifferent to ideas and political solutions that have played such a crucial role in our time, while at the same time being highly controversial. And it is not hard to detect the influence of ideological currents in the discussion within EES. Perhaps one could say, that if anti-communism was typical of the earlier period, there was during the 1970s and, to some extent, in the 1980s, a tendency to overlook the problematic nature of the political and economic system of Eastern Europe. This attitude was in one sense a natural reaction towards earlier scholarship, but also influenced by changing political circumstances and a different cultural atmosphere.

It is difficult to formulate a principle valid once and for all, although I believe the foreign scholar should try to downplay his personal views. Again, I think, a choice has to be made. Either You try to bring about change by means of political activity, including writing, or You go on working as a scholar, trying to document a situation or process to the best of your ability.

However, even this might be problematic, and the foreign scholar has often been forced into a situation where it was assumed that he did have some sinister reasons for his research. In the East European context there was a dichotomy between the role of the "enemy" or perhaps "spy", and that of "the friend of our country". After

all - an official would often reason, even at the University - why should anybody from abroad care to learn this obscure language, why should he read all these books? There must be something wrong. Such officials usually preferred sympathetic scholars and intellectuals who were not specialists in the field. It seldom occurred to them that for You, the reason for being there, was simply a genuine interest in their country, regardless of the character of the system.

Thus, whether he liked it or not, the student of Eastern Europe might find himself in the position of a hostage. He could perhaps not say everything he knew, either because this would have prevented further access to the area of study, or, because it might compromise friends or colleagues. Sometimes he was not sure whether anyone was reporting on him, and returning home, there was even, ironically enough, the possibility that some governmental agency would feel his interest in Eastern European affairs a bit excessive.

Or again, in his own country he might be faced with embarrassed silence or irritated disbelief, when merely trying to describe a given situation or process, as the description itself - even if it was phrased in an unemotional language and free of value judgements - was contrary to views prevalent in mass media or among officials and politicians.

But, one might ask, are there not situations, such as serious violations of human rights, when it would be natural for a scholar to react? It is true that the foreigner could protest publicly on various issues, but the question is whether this really constituted a proof of courage or moral integrity. After all, he would not face the consequences of his colleagues in the East.

My point, then, is that the position of the intellectual in Eastern Europe differs from that of the foreign scholar. And it is difficult to see how the principles of critical sociology would have been of any help in this respect. For one thing, it is not easy to say what ideological position at a given moment would have been the more "critical" or "progressive".⁴ Moreover, it is doubtful if ideological commitment have contributed to a greater understanding of developments in "Soviet-type".⁵ Both those who were against and those sympathetic towards the project of socialism have tended to overestimate the stability of social order in Eastern Europe.

foundations.⁵

It i

⁴By critical sociology is meant the perspective which argues that the social scientist should not only describe or analyze social reality, but also has the obligation to bring about change. A basic problem with this approach is that, in order to be valid, one has to accept that it is possible to make a correct choice between values and ideologies. Moreover, the perspective was often connected with a Marxist understanding of society which, although critical of existing institutional solutions, was basically in favour of East European socialism, which was felt to be an advancement in relation to western industrial society. In retrospect, one can only note that today many of the proponents of critical sociology no longer endorse its ideological

true that those critical of the system, calling attention to the "dark" aspects of these societies, in a sense contributed to a deeper understanding of the complexity of soviet-type societies, while those who - for ideological reasons and/or a commitment to a modern scientific approach - wanted to overcome "nihilistic criticism" and concentrated upon more "neutral" topics have run the risk of giving a trivial view of the situation. However, there is no necessary connection between values and research in this respect. It should be possible to approach and investigate most topics, regardless of ideological conviction, and even "sensitive" issues could, in principle, be discussed without value-judgements.

The problem arises when the scholar avoids mentioning "positive" tendencies which might contradict his position, or if he, in spite of empirical evidence, is not willing to accept, for example, the shortcomings of Soviet agriculture, environmental problems in Central Europe, or the power structure in the Yugoslav self-management system. It is similarly problematic if the conceptual apparatus of modern social science is used primarily as a weapon against a more "negative" attitude.

However, the failure to anticipate change is, in my opinion, above all related to the neglect of available theoretical and methodological instruments which might have provided a more comprehensive view of East European society.

The Future of East European Studies

What is happening in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe means that East European Studies as they have been conducted during the last 30 or 40 years is a thing of the past. The common characteristics of socialist countries in Eastern Europe - the predominance of Marxist ideology in a one-party system characterized by a politically controlled economy - simply do not exist any more.

If East European studies should continue, which I think they should, scholars are confronted with new demands. Among other things, it will no longer be possible to produce studies from a macro perspective, based on scant sources and involving sweeping generalizations.

In a situation when the social sciences - notably sociology - are going through a renaissance, and when Russian and East European scholars not only will have direct access to new sources, but will also possess the same - or better - knowledge of general theories and methods, the western scholar specializing in East European affairs will have to work hard in order to become an equal. That is, he must possess linguistic and cultural skills on a high level, as well as being an expert within his own scholarly discipline, just to be able to engage in a dialogue with his colleagues.

Then, why not leave the field to those who are familiar with these societies in the first place? I do believe that, if for no other reason, then for purely selfish motives, countries like Sweden will have to develop an expertise of their own in this area.

It is obvious that intensified commercial and industrial relations, aid programs, tourism, migration, as well as government interests, mean that Western Europe is increasingly in need of accurate informations about a broad range of socio-economic and political processes.

Besides these pragmatic needs, and more important, there is however a cultural and moral dimension. A half-forgotten and neglected part of Europe is reentering the European scene, and we must be able to communicate with and understand these societies. We must rediscover their history and cultural traditions, they are our neighbours and often their citizens live in our midst. Moreover, our own self-understanding - in a process of European integration - will have to change when confronted with the historical experience of the nations and cultures of Eastern Europe. This is especially true of Sweden, with its peculiar mixture of an American-dominated mass culture and strong etatistic tendencies. Neither should one forget that what has happened in Eastern Europe in our century to a large extent has been determined by ideology and politics in the West.

However, also from a strictly scholarly point of view there are enough reasons for promoting the studies of East European societies and cultures in Western Europe. Not only is it natural that there are international specialists on the cultures and societies of the countries in Eastern, Central and Southeastern Europe, in the same way as there is an international community of scholars devoted to the study of China, India or the Islamic world. The development of individual disciplines in the

humanities and social sciences actually requires an integration of this type of knowledge. This is equally valid for studies concerning "real socialism", as well as the contemporary process of change.

Among potential areas of research let me just mention a few: Political sociology is an obvious candidate, but also sociology of language, religion and culture. Or, more concretely: the study of social and political movements, ideological and moral attitudes; the whole process of transformation from a monistic to a pluralist society, including the creation of a new political discourse; further, the problem of religion and society, in particular the sociology of orthodox Christianity and Islamic studies, and finally, the important area of ethnic processes.

Another field is of course history, which would surely benefit from an integration of the sometimes very specific historical experiences of East and Southeast Europe into a general history of Europe.

One of the most interesting aspects of the present situation is thus the possibility of truly comparative studies in the areas just referred to. However, perhaps the most exciting prospect would be a possible theoretical synthesis bridging the gap between social sciences and the humanities. I am thinking of the integration of semiotics and sociology, or, in more general terms, the study of the relationship between individual, cultural tradition and social structure.

Such an undertaking can build on the pioneering research in semiotics done in the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe, including Yugoslavia. In the field of sociology both sides would be able to make valuable contributions, and finally, in some areas, e.g. advanced statistical methods, countries like Sweden - I am thinking of LISREL and computer linguistics - would have something to offer.

A scholarly cooperation of this kind means that EES would contribute to the general development of a science of man and culture. Thus, it would finally make use of the interdisciplinary potential existing in the field, but until now rarely exploited.

LITERATURE

- von Borcke, Astrid & Simon, Gerhard (1980) *Neue Wege der Sowjetunion-Forschung. Beiträge zur Methoden- und Theoriediskussion*. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden. Osteuropa und der internationale Kommunismus, Band 6. Herausgeber: Bundesinstitut für ostwissenschaftliche und internationale Studien, Köln.
- Feron, Frederic J. Jr (1971) (Ed) *Communist Studies and the Social Sciences: Essays on Methodology and Empirical Theory*. Rand McNally & Company, Chicago.
- Goffman, Irving (1972) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Golubovid, Zagorka (1987) *Novije teorijske paradigme za uporedno istraživanje aktuelno postojedeg socijalizma. Teorija i praksa realnog socijalizma. Rezultati uporednog istraživanja. Zbornik radova i diskusija sa naučnog skupa održanog u Centru za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju u Beogradu 22-24 decembra 1984. godine*. U redakciji dr Zagorke Golubovid. Izdavački zavod Filip Višnjić/Centar za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju Instituta društvenih nauka, Beograd, pp. 9-40.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. (1971) *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. Avon Books, New York.
- Hankiss, Elemér (1988) *The "Second Society": Is There an Alternative Social Model Emerging in Contemporary Hungary?* *Social Research*, Vol 55, Nos 1-2, Spring/Summer, pp. 13-42
- Johnson, Paul (1988) *Intellectuals*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London.
- Kolakovskii, Lešek (1989) *Davo u istoriji*. Gias, Banjaluka.

- Magnusson, Kjell (1986) *Theoretical Perspectives in Yugoslav Sociology of Religion*. Uppsala University, Department of Sociology.
- Magnusson, Kjell (1989/1986) Jugoslaver i Sverige. *Invandrare och identitet i ett kultursociologiskt perspektiv*. (Yugoslavs in Sweden. Immigrants and Identity in a Cultural-Sociological Perspective). Uppsala Multiethnic Papers, 17.
- Meyer, Gerd (1979) *Sozialistische Systeme. Theorie - und Strukturanalyse*. Ein Studienbuch. Leske Verlag und Budrich GmbH, Opladen.
- Milosz, Czeslaw (1980) *The Captive Mind*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth.
- Touraine, Alain (1985) An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements. *Social Research*, Vol. 52, No. 4, Winter, pp. 749-788.
- Weber, Max (1974a) Science as a Vocation. (Ed) Gerth, H.H. & Wright Mills, C.: From Max Weber *Essays in Sociology*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, London/Boston, pp. 129-156.
- Weber, Max (1974b) Politics as a Vocation. (Ed) Gerth, H.H & Wright Mills, C. From Max Weber *Essays in Sociology*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, London/Boston, pp. 77-128.
- Zinoviev, Alexander (1989) Why the Soviet System is here to stay. Urban, G.R. (ed) *Can the Soviet System Survive Reform? Seven Colloquies about the state of Soviet socialism seventy years after the Bolshevik revolution*. Pinter Publishers, London and New York in association with John Spiers, pp. 45-107.

Kjell Magnusson

СОВЈЕТСКЕ И ИСТОЧНОЕВРОПСКЕ СТУДИЈЕ НА ЗАПАДУ: НЕВОЉЕ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЕ

Како се могло десити да Совјетске и Источноевропске Студије (у даљем тексту: СИС) нису биле у стању да предвиде драматичне промене које се управо дешавају у Источној Европи?

Овај текст се бави теоријским, методолошким и етичким темама везаним за ово питање. Теоријска дискусија у оквирима СИС била је сувише уско ограничена на поље политичких наука и на углавном жалове дискусије о дескриптивним моделима. То је, донекле, било условљено недостатком поузданих извора, што је довело и до сужавања поља применљивости могућих модела.

Изгледа, међутим, да би шири приступ, пре свега свест о социјалним психолошким механизмима који утичу на формирање погледа на свет и односа према њему, као и отвореност првма хуманим наукама, обезбедиле реалистичнији увид у темељне социо-културне процесе у Источној Европи, нарочито у идеолошке токове и социјалне покрете.

Научни рад у области СИС често се налазио у центру сукобљених интереса и у Источној Европи и у сопственој земљи. Занимљиво је до које је мере ово утицало на теорију и методе, као и на интегритет западних научника.

Следеће важно питање је: да ли у будућности, из перспективе најновијих догађаја, уопште постоји потреба за Совјетским и Источноевропским Студијама.

SERBIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ARTS

ACADEMIC CONFERENCES

Volume LXV

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Book 11

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE AND INTELLIGENTSIA

SYMPOSIUM ORGANIZED BY THE SERBIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
AND ARTS AND THE SWEDISH ROYAL ACADEMY OF LETTERS,
HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES

Accepted at the V session of the Department of Language and Literature on 25th June 1991,
according to the recommendation of *Aleksander Despit* and *Predrag Palavestra*, Members
of the Academy

Editor

PREDRAG PALAVESTRA

Member of the Academy

BELGRADE 1992

CONTENTS

PREFACE	VII
DuSan Kanazir, <i>Opening Address</i>	1
Aleksandar Despid, <i>Science and Politics</i>	5
Александар Деспић, <i>Наука и политика</i>	12
Carl-Gustaf Andren, <i>The Responsibility of Scholars for Ethical Problems in Research Work -A European View</i>	13
Carl-Gustaf Andren, <i>Одговорност научника за етичке проблеме у истраживачком раду: један европски поглед</i>	20
Mihailo Markovid, <i>Choice of Future and the Responsibility of Intellectuals</i>	21
Михаило Марковић, <i>Избор будућности и одговорност интелектуалаца</i>	27
Sven TŠgil, <i>Ethno-National Conflict and Cooperation in the Nordic Countries</i> ..	29
Sven Tagil, <i>Етно-национални сукоб и сарадња у нордијским земљама</i>	40
Stig StrOmholm, <i>The Intellectuals and the Powers that Be. Reflections on the Swedish Tradition and Scenario</i>	41
Stig StrOmholm, <i>Интелектуалци и снаге на власти. Размишљања о шведској традицији и сценарију</i>	49
Predrag Palavestra, <i>Intellectuals and Writers as Makers and Critics of Ideologies</i>	51
Предраг Палавестра, <i>Интелектуалци и писци као оснивачи и критичари идеологија</i>	55
Radovan SamardZid, <i>Islam Penetration into South East Europe</i>	57
Радован Самарџић, <i>Продор ислама у Југоисточну Европу</i>	74
Jan Hјzgre, <i>Islamism - the Analysis of Function and Dysfunction of Religion in Weak and in Strong Societes</i>	75
Јан Hјзгре, <i>Ислам - функција и дисфункција у јаким и слабим друштвима</i>	84
DuSan Kanazir, <i>Molecular Biology and its Impact on the Future of Man- kind. Facts and Speculations</i>	87
Душан Каназир, <i>Молекуларна биологија и њенутицај на будућност човечанства</i>	98
TorbjOrn TannsjO, <i>Ethics and Genetics</i>	101
TorbjOrn TannsjO, <i>Етика и генетика</i>	107
Џубисав Ракић, <i>The Natural Sciences and their Relation to Man</i>	109
Јубисав Ракић, <i>Природне науке и њихов однос према човеку</i>	117
VI	
Fiona BjOrling, <i>Science from an Ecological or Human-Ecological Point of View</i>	119
Fiona BjOrling, <i>Наука из еколошке или хумано-еколошке перспек-</i>	

<i>тиве</i>	126
Stevan Karamata and Nikola Pantid, <i>Destruction of the Environment and the Responsibility of the Intelligentsia</i>	127
Стеван карамата и Никола Пантић, <i>Уништавање околине и одговорност интелегенције</i>	133
Tor Ragnar Gerholm, <i>Science and Values</i>	135
Tor Ragnar Gerholm, <i>Наука и вредности</i>	142
Dobrica Ćosić, <i>Is Our Civilization Abolishing Enlightenment?</i>	143
Добрица Ћосић, <i>Да ли наша цивилизација одбацује просвећеност!</i>	147
Kjell Magnusson, <i>Soviet and East European Studies in the West: Short comings and Prospects</i>	149
Kjell Magnusson, <i>Совјетске и источноевропске студије на западу: невоље и перспективе</i>	159
Kosta Čavoški, <i>The Role of Intelligentsia in the Implementation of Human Rights</i>	161
Коста Чавошки, <i>Улога интелегенције у заштити основних људских права и слобода</i>	167
Ivan Maksimović, <i>Intelligentsia in Economics and the Influence of Politics</i>	169
Иван Максимовић, <i>Интелигенција у економским наукама и утицај политике</i>	Y11
Milorad Ekmečić, <i>The Religious Origin of the Yugoslav Intelligentsia as It Motivated Its Historic Responsibility</i>	179
Милорад Екмечић, <i>Религиозно порекло југословенске интелегенције као мотив њене историјске одговорности</i>	187
Birgitta Holm, <i>Feminism in Theory and Practice</i>	189
Birgitta Holm, <i>Феминизам у теорији и пракси</i>	195
Harald Runblom, <i>Multiethnicity, Threat or Opportunity</i>	197
Harald Runblom, <i>Вишеетничност, претња или погодност</i>	202
Miloš Maćura, <i>Traditional Customs Affecting the Status of Woman in Yugoslavia</i>	203
Милош Маџура, <i>Утицај народних обичаја на статус жене у Југославији</i>	217
Sven Gustavsson, <i>Walking a Tightrope - Thirty Years as a Slavist</i>	219
Sven Gustavsson, <i>Ходање по жици - тридесет година као слависта</i>	225
Slobodan Selenid, <i>History and Politics as a Fate</i>	227
Слободан Селенић, <i>Историја и политика као судбина појединца. Есеј о главним токовима савременог српског романа</i>	231
ХРОНИКА СКУПА.....	233
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....	235

PREFACE

The Symposium of Swedish and Serbian intellectuals, entitled *Responsibility of Contemporary Science and Intelligentsia*, was held in Belgrade and at the Kopaonik Mt. in June 1990, organized by the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts and the Royal Academy

of Letters, History and Antiquities of Sweden. It was the second Swedish-Serbian symposium, organized within the framework of the Agreement on the Scientific co-operation between the Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities and the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts. The first Swedish-Serbian Symposium was held in Stockholm, 26-29 November 1987, entitled *Tradition and Modern Society*. The Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities published in 1989 the proceedings from the Symposium in its regular edition *Konferenser 21*, under the editorship of Professor Sven Gustavsson, Member of Academy.

Professor Sven Gustavsson, and Dr Kjell Magnusson participated on the part of Sweden in the preparations of the symposium *Responsibility of Contemporary Science and Intelligentsia* as well, having organized the first Swedish-Serbian symposium in Stockholm in 1987. On the part of Serbia, the following members of the Organizing Committee took part in the preparations for the Symposium: Professor Predrag Palavestra (President of the Organizing Committee) Member of Academy, Professor Aleksandar Despid Member of Academy, Professor Dejan Medaković Member of Academy, Professor Radovan Samardžić Member of Academy, Professor Mihailo Marković Member of Academy and Professor Ljubisav Rakid Member of Academy. Technical assistance was rendered by the Department for International and Inter-academy co-operation of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, particularly by Mrs. Danica Vojnović, Mrs. Gordana Kadibo and Mr. Momir Milidević.

The Symposium *Responsibility of Contemporary Science and Intelligentsia* opened in the main hall of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts on Wednesday, 6th of June 1990. The morning and the afternoon sessions were held on the first day. In the morning, papers were presented by the President of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts Dušan Kanazir, Professor Aleksandar Despid Member of Academy, Professor Carl-Gustaf Andren Member of Academy, Professor Mihailo Marković Member of Academy and Professor Sven Tagil, and in the afternoon by Professor Stig Strömholm President of the Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities, Professor Predrag Palavestra Member of Academy, Professor Radovan Samardžić Member of Academy, and Professor Jan Hjarpe. On 6th of June, H.E. Mr. Jan af Sillen gave lunch in honour of the participants in his residence at Dedinje. In

VIII

the evening of the same day Mr. Slobodan MiloSevid, President of the Republic of Serbia, gave a reception in honour of the participants.

On Thursday, 7th of June, after a short tour of Belgrade, the participants departed by a special coach for the Kopaonik Mt. where they continued their work at the Konaci Hotel. At the afternoon session papers were presented by Professor DuSan Kanazir Member of Academy, Professor Ljubisav Rakid Member of Academy, Professor Fiona BjOrling, Professor Stevan Karamata and Professor Nikola Pantid Members of Academy. On Friday, 8th of June two sessions were held. In the morning papers were presented by Professor Tor Ragnar Gerholm Member of Academy, Mr. Dobrica Cosid Member of Academy; Dr Kjell Magnusson's paper was read on his behalf since he was absent due to illness, and papers were presented by Dr Kosta CavoSki and Professor Ivan Maksimovid Member of Academy. At the afternoon session papers were presented by Dr Birgitta Holm, Professor MiloS Macura Member of Academy, Professor Milorad Ekmedid Member of Academy, and Professor Harald Runblom.

On Saturday, 9th of June only the morning session was held. Papers were presented by Professor Sven Gustavsson Member of Academy, and Professor Slobodan Selenid Member of Academy, after which a general debate took place guided by Professors Sven Gustavsson and Predrag Palavestra Members of Academy. On that occasion a proposal was given that the Third Swedish-Serbian Symposium be held in Stockholm in 1993, under the topic *Europe in the 90's: Integration and Disintegration*. During the lunch break, the participants in the Symposium gave their statements for a special TV Belgrade Report by Mrs. DuSka Vrhovac and in the afternoon they went on a short excursion to visit the grave of Josif Pandid, the first President of the Serbian Academy.

On Sunday, 10th June, all participants in the Symposium were guests at a luncheon given in the Monastery Studenica by the Right Reverend Bishop of Zida, His Eminence Stefan. On that occasion, The Right Reverend, His Eminence Dr Irinej Bulovid, the Bishop of Badka gave his contribution to the Symposium. Following the lunch, in the Cathedral Church of the Studenica Monastery a concert of old Byzantine and Slav spiritual music was given by the Choir of the Institute for Musicology of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts under the conductorship of Dimitrije Stefanovid Member of Academy.

The papers published in the Proceedings are edited in English language in final versions authorized by the authors themselves. The supervision of the manuscript was carried out by Mrs. Mirjana Detelid, assistant in the Committee for Research in Literary. History of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts. Biographies of all participants in the Symposium are included in this publication. The complete tape and video records of the Symposium are being kept in the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts documentation.