
ABSTRACTS

GABRIELLA ILONZSKI-DAVID JUDGE

REPRESENTATION AND REPRESENTATIVE ROLES THEORY AND HUNGARIAN EXPERIENCES

The article seeks to examine the degree to which standard "western" conceptions of representation have developed in a context where alternative conceptions of democratic centralism had for most of the post-war period provided the parameters of representation, and one in which a mixed pattern of "eastern" and "western" representational roles had emerged before transition.

In examining representational roles in Hungary some insight can be gained into the comparative utility of conceptions of representational role. This first attempt at measuring such roles in Hungary underscores the point that asking legislators what they think they do reveals different and often discordant answers to what they actually do in Parliament. This points to the need to examine the legitimacy and prescriptive purposes of representative theories alongside their descriptive potential. Hungarian parliamentarians obviously feel the need to espouse their independence of thought and to emphasize their own conscience in decision making, but equally they recognise the need for linkage with their constituency, where appropriate, and for the articulation of national interest.

The fact that these perceptions do not align themselves neatly along the two parallel continua of trustee/delegate and nation/constituency points to the unrealistic model first articulated in the pioneering studies of representational roles.

HANS J. LIETZMANN

POLITICAL PLANNING AND ITS SOCIAL RISK

Karl Mannheim was entirely right when he had pointed out already in his book *Ideology and Utopia* that Karl Schmitt's writing, *The Concept of Politics* and its interpretation of politics were diametrically opposite to that of his. More over, he referred to Karl Schmitt's

directly as the counter-concept of his own interpretation of politics. Meanwhile Karl Schmitt was rightly interpreted by Mannheim as propagating the re-politicisation of decisions by the state.

In Schmitt's view the dominant dilemma of the age was the loss of the "political", in other words, the loss of the essential freedom of decision-making in the face of a society becoming pluralistic, and realising its differentiation in the political process, and also the disintegration of state sovereignty. In his view the concepts of "neutralisation" and "depoliticisation" described the challenge, together with the discourse on the disintegration of state authority.

Despite all differences of terminology, it becomes clear at least in the struggle against the heterogeneity of democratic societies and the contingency of democratic politics, how close Mannheim's and Schmitt's analysis of social policy were to each other and how similar was not only their respective crisis scenario but even their strategies of solution.

In fact both of them derived the danger threatening what Mannheim as well as Schmitt considered the most important in the world from society and from people associated within it. More precisely, what Mannheim called "rationalisation", or "factors that had not been controlled earlier, becoming reflexive ones", and what was interpreted by Schmitt as regaining the guaranteed competencies of decision-making by the state, are irritably in conflict with the undomesticated desire for participation of a politically emancipating society. "Democratisation" and "pluralisation" are the concepts hiding the danger threatening the central potential of control both were aiming at. They held that the undisputed competency of management, of the elites and the sovereignty of the state were exposed to the danger of failing at the risk of social mediation. The contingency and haphazardness of the processes of political decision-making and will and the relative unreliability of society's readiness to agree irritate the autocratic planners self-confident beyond all measure.

MICHAEL TH. GREVEN

MANNHEIM AND THE PROBLEM OF DEMOCRACY IN THE AGE OF "MASS SOCIETY"

The place and influence of Karl Mannheim in the history of social sciences are linked to the outline of the "sociology of knowledge". Today his thesis that each social consciousness is "linked to existence", and the formula of "free-floating intelligentsia", originally adapted from Alfred Weber, belong to the readily quoted topics of half-baked knowledge in social sciences. However, the obvious political and diagnostic intentions and connections of his age of his main work, *Ideology and Utopia*, which played a significant role at the time of their first reception right up to 1933, are already missing from the

image styling Karl Mannheim a classic of sociology. This holds all the more true for the later writings of the thirties and forties: they are either totally deleted from the historical self-image of sociology, or remain the subject of the learned philological interest of small Mannheimian circles.

In the case of a political writer who had never left any doubt about the practical political nature of his interventions and about the assessing and polemical edge of his writings despite his brilliant participation in the contemporary scholarly and philosophical disputes, such an afterlife of his career is rather surprising. He was far from looking only for an academic answer to the basic epistemological crisis of the early twentieth century with the help of his "sociology of knowledge". On the contrary, he outlined it as a political science *sui generis*, in other words not as a science striving towards objectivity in the sense of modern political science, but as a *political answer for a specific group of social actors* to the crisis of the modern age sensed by him and by others.

ILJA SRUBAR

MANNHEIM'S "PLANNED FREEDOM" AND RADICAL LIBERALISM

Mannheim's analysis on this relationship, which had constituted the basis of his diagnosis of the age, obtains a new, current relevance. Though it is true that Mannheim gave information rather on problems caused by the shift from liberalism to planning, but what can we learn from the transition from planning to liberalism? Isn't it just the end of the socialist experiment proving that his outlook was just as faulty as it has been maintained by his neoliberal adversaries? When we approach the interrelationship between liberalism and totalitarian society, the first encouragement received from Mannheim – and how else would it be – is at once of the critique of ideology and of historicist: the relationship in question should not be studied on the plane of the struggle between dogmas, but on the plane of the concrete social effects only, for which the dogmas had served as legitimation. It is only in this way that liberalism and the totalitarian dictatorships can be regarded as solutions to the problems of social order, which have reacted upon concrete historical situations, which happened to be also the products of the effects of these solutions structuring society. And it can only be recognised in this way how far do the problems exist yet, or again, to which an answer was given by the totalitarian dictatorships, and which of the historically available repertory of "social techniques" would be suitable to help avoid these problems. Meanwhile one should not be reluctant - says Mannheim - to study what techniques had been applied by dictatorships for overcoming social problems, once it was identified that democracy to

be achieved or to be preserved would have to struggle with similar problems, threatening its very existence.

Thus Mannheim, in order to obtain criteria to the assessment of such crisis situations, and to get means to overcome them, studied transition from liberalism to totalitarian dictatorships, while the latter ones were defined as reactions to the dysfunctional social impacts of the former ones. Though Mannheim treated liberalism in a rather undifferentiated manner, as it was repeatedly stated by others (he did not always clearly differentiate between the ideological development of liberalism and the political and economic forms of liberalism, and he summarised the social impact of these factors, manifest on different planes under the concept of "laissez faire liberalism"), yet there were such elements in his analysis, which made the interrelationships studied by him structurally plausible ones. It is true all the more so as his analyses have been compatible with other reliable results of sociological and historical research.

CONTENTS

PAPERS

<i>Gabriella Honszki–David Judge: Representation and Roles of Representatives. Theory and Hungarian Experiences.</i>	5
<i>Hans J. Lietzmann: Political Planning and Its Social Risk</i>	25
<i>Michael Th. Greven: Mannheim and the Problem of Democracy in the Age of „Mass Society”</i>	39
<i>Ilja Srubar: Mannheim’s „Planned Freedom” and Radical Liberalism</i>	53

CONFERENCE

THEORETICAL CHALLENGES AND DILEMMAS

<i>Csaba Gombár: On Journalism, on Specialist Discipline and on Ridiculousness</i>	71
<i>István Balogh: Sketch on the Almond-Model</i>	80
<i>Béla Pokol: Empirical versus Intellectual Democracy</i>	86

WHAT IS THE TRADITION OF HUNGARIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE AND IS THERE ONE?

<i>András Láncki: Politics as Tradition</i>	92
<i>István Schlett: Hungarian Political Science – Science and Publicistics</i>	109

ORIENTATION: THE SITUATION OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AMONG OUR NEIGHBOURS

<i>Otmar Höll–Thomas Weninger: The Situation of Political Science in Austria</i>	114
<i>Adolf Bibič: Political Science in Slovenia</i>	124

DISCUSSION

PARTIES AND VOTERS

<i>Tamás Fricz: To the Question of Democratism in Party Organisation</i>	151
--	-----

ORIENTATION

<i>Kálmán Kulcsár: Political Thinking and Political Science in Canada</i>	169
---	-----

BOOKS

<i>István Stumpf: Political Socialisation: Old Dilemmas, New Challenges</i>	197
<i>Ildikó Szabó: Tracing Political Socialisation</i>	214
<i>Selected Bibliography of Hungarian Political Science</i>	222

NEWS	227
-----------------------	-----

INFORMATION	243
------------------------------	-----

ABSTRACTS	253
----------------------------	-----
