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János Mátyás Kovács (Institute for Human Sciences, Vienna)
Ágnes Gagyí, Zoltán Ginelli, András Pinkász (The Working Group for Public Sociology “Helyzet”)

12.00 - 14.00 Panel 2 - Chair: Karl Hall
Egle Rindzeviciute (Kingston University London) - “The Rise of System-Cybernetic Governmentality”
Vítězslav Sommer (Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Institute for Contemporary History) - “The Politics of Social Knowledge in Late Socialism: Socialist Governance in Czechoslovakia and Limits of Lay Expertise, 1970s–1980s”

15.00 - 17.00 Panel 3 - Chair: Balázs Trencsényi
Nenad Stefanov (Humboldt University of Berlin) - “Entanglements and Fragile Networks between the Intellectuals of West Germany and Socialist Yugoslavia”
Agata Zysiak (University of Łódź) - “Postwar Modernization and University for Working Class in Poland”
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9.00 - 11.00 Panel 4 - Chair: Ioana Macrea-Toma
Marcia Holmes (Birkbeck, University of London) - “Legitimate Resistance: Cold War Brainwashing, Interrogation, and the Behavioral Sciences”
James Mark (University of Exeter) - “Alternative Globalizations: Between Eastern Europe and the ‘Global South’”

11.30 - 13.30 Panel 5 - Chair: Constantin Iordachi
Aliki Angelidou (Panteion University)
Călin Cotoi (University of Bucharest)

14.30 - 15.30 Roundtable discussion - workshop conclusions and future plans
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In recent years, researchers of the “Cold War conjuncture” have decidedly developed an interest in postwar epistemic shifts. The geographies of the Cold War, having expanded to illustrate its truly global nature by incorporating processes of decolonization and the role of the “Global South,” are now further revised. Globalization itself is shown not to have been the exclusive undertaking of the capitalist West, with alternative globalization projects put forward during the Cold War being reappraised (Bockmann 2015). Moreover, it is now argued that the intellectual production of the non-Western world was equally a Central and East European concern. Consequently, studies of the emergence and development of the idea of “a socialist world” in the postwar period focus on the epistemic outcomes of the encounters between the so-called Second and Third Worlds (Mark, “Socialism Goes Global”).

Temporalities of the Cold War are also approached with a renewed interest in the production of knowledge. The literature on the politics of memory in the socialist and especially post-socialist period is ever expanding. Comparatively less interest has been shown, until recently, in the ways in which the continuities and ruptures between the interwar and postwar orders have been historically constructed and reconstructed, especially in Central and Eastern Europe (Cirjan, Ghiț, and Grama, “Assembling the Post-Liberal Order in Central and Eastern Europe,” 2015). But arguably one of the most spectacular and least pursued topics is the emergence of “the future” in the first decades of the postwar period as an object of scientific study and global governance (Andersson, “FUTUREPOL: A Political History of the Future”).

Finally, recent literature has also explored the thickness of interaction and complexity of the transnational and international networks which circulated knowledge and expertise in the postwar period, arguing for a new understanding of the co-production of Cold War epistemic regimes and shifts across the East-West divide. The emerging histories have been programmatically transnational (Bockman 2011; Andersson and Rindzevičiūtė 2015), have sought to integrate Eastern and Western European strategies of cooperation in the face of globalizing trends (Romano and Romero 2014), and aim to analyze local knowledge production in the social sciences as fundamentally embedded into global structures (Eber et al. 2015).

The workshop takes heed of these broad lines of inquiry, of ongoing projects on the comparative history of economic thought under communism (Kovács, “Between Bukharin and Balcerowicz”), psy sciences (Pick, “Hidden Persuaders?”), economization of the social and emergence of social complexity (Leendertz, “Economization of the Social”), as well as of the
now numerous existing accounts of the history of various disciplines of the social sciences during the Cold War, East and West. Whereas the broad agenda of the workshop is to bring into fruitful conversation such diverse approaches to the topic of Cold War epistemics, it also specifically aims to zoom in on the twin issue of resistance and legitimation in postwar social sciences.

First, this entails exploring how social scientific knowledge production simultaneously worked to consolidate the emerging postwar social and political orders, while opening up spaces for dissent and critical reflection. This has already been observed in the subversive effects of predictive knowledge (Andersson and Rindzveicuite 2015), but could also been shown to stand in the case of the global configuration of neoliberalism, the quantitative turn in the social sciences and associated claims at scientific objectivity, the intellectual production of the idea of a “socialist world,” etc. Second, resistance and legitimation can be understood as intellectual, professional, and existential strategies developed in the unstable context of the postwar expansion and reshuffling of the social sciences, marked by disciplinary boundary wars, shifting solidarities, and the uneasy relationship between science and (Party-)state. In this sense, they might be considered as mutually enabling, rather than mutually exclusive responses to the challenges of postwar reconstruction. Finally, the topic of intellectual resistance and legitimation is itself a product of the Cold War divisions and hierarchies of epistemic power. Especially in Central and Eastern Europe, the supposed dichotomy between the two was widely adopted, adapted, and interiorized as one of the major symbolic tropes of the transition from socialism, to this day structuring the ways of engaging with the knowledge produced during the period of state socialism. Historicizing resistance and legitimation as twin strategies of Cold War epistemics, rather than outcomes of local exceptionalism, and as responses to the unequal distribution of power and resources within transnational networks of knowledge production, would also serve the purpose of reintegrating Central and Eastern Europe into a transnational history of postwar epistemic shifts.

**Workshop Format**

The workshop will bring together 8–10 specialists who have conducted research in recent years on Cold War epistemic regimes and the history of the social sciences in Central and Eastern Europe and beyond. They are invited to present their findings and reflect on the theme of the workshop from the viewpoint of their specific research interests.

Participants will present their papers in 30–40 minutes in small thematic panels. For each panel, a respondent will offer comments and moderate the discussion. The workshop will conclude with a roundtable discussion on future plans for research and collaboration.
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