

ESF Exploratory Workshop on

**The International Community of Experts
and the Transformation of the Fatherland.
Central Eastern Europe in the European
Context since WWI**

Warsaw (Poland), 11-13 September 2008

Convened by:

Martin Kohlrausch ^①, Katrin Steffen ^② and Stefan Wiederkehr ^①

^① German Historical Institute Warsaw, PL

^② University of Halle-Wittenberg, DE

Scientific Report

Contents:

1. Executive Summary
2. Scientific Content
3. Outcome and further research
4. Final programme
5. Final list of participants
6. Statistical information on participants

1. Executive Summary

Held at the German Historical Institute in Warsaw (GHI) and funded by the European Science Foundation (ESF) and partly by the GHI the exploratory workshop "The International Community of Experts and the Transformation of the Fatherland. Central Eastern Europe in the European Context since WWI" explored the remarkable activities of transnational operating experts, institutions and companies mainly in the region of Central Eastern Europe (CEE) after the year of 1918. However, since the history of the region cannot be analyzed isolated, it integrated examples from Western Europe and the United States as well. Bringing together 27 mainly young scientists from 12 European States plus Canada and the United States the workshop explored the relationship between the evolution of an "international community of experts" and the formation of states in CEE, which was marked by many breaks, during the "short" twentieth century – that is to say the developments that began to take hold after World War I. The workshop aimed to integrate the until now often neglected eastern part of the continent into a comprehensive European history.

After a key note speech by Eva Horn on experts and expertise in general, in the first section the participants discussed the leading role of experts as well as the networks they established in order to answer the question of *how* expert knowledge was generated. Besides examining the concrete bearers of knowledge, the examples selected for this section – international health care politics, the Hungarian Rockefeller fellows, economic debates in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, technological transfer between Germany and Spain and the League of Nations – allowed to explore how expert knowledge transcended borders in international exchange and how it could be changed and mobilized in the course of this transfer. For this sort of mobilization, specific circumstances, constellations, structures, and dispositions were necessary in which an expert could claim for his or her expertise the status of universal and common knowledge.

In the context of the second section, investigating these circumstances meant considering the role of the state, as tensions between the newly evolving international expert cultures and the framework of the nation state within which the experts acted were highly relevant for the topic of the workshop. For the majority of CEE countries, the end of World War I coincided with their state (re)formations. Many experts were thus keen to "modernize" "their" states, which they often strongly identified with emotionally. Therefore the self-understandings of the experts in question, which often oscillated between enthusiastic identification with international associations and an insistence on the "national" element, were scrutinized. At the same time, nation states had high expectations of the academic institutions and experts they funded, as industrial and economic development was often regarded as a key element in the success of the project "nation state". Thus, this section addressed states' management of knowledge and experts. This raised questions surrounding the possibility to instrumentalize knowledge for the aims of the state, the translation of expert knowledge into actual decisions, as well as concrete action and symbolic power. This pertained to the time period immediately after 1918 to the same extent as to the period after 1945, which was discussed in a separate session with examples from the Cold War, Finland and consumerism in Poland in the 1980ies. Here it was shown that during the post-World

War II period, an intimate connection between the expert, the state, and civil society remained intact.

In a third section, communication and translation structures that enabled knowledge transfer across state borders were explored. Examples from the military industry, the automobile industry, microbiology and the sociology of knowledge, political geography, as well as the experiences of engineers, addressed communication networks and possibilities that often served to award experts and consultants their status as such in the first place. An important aspect was addressed at the very outset of this section: the question of languages, which always entailed more than the mere technical aspect, as well as the new sign and documentation systems that enabled exchange.

Looking at the experts in action meant to challenge the master narratives of history such as the dominant role of the nation state or the impermeable border between East and West during the so called Cold War. The chosen perspectives allowed for an innovative, comparative history of transfer and intertwining between East and West, which facilitated new approaches and which this workshop was highly committed to.

2. Scientific content

The aim of the workshop was to analyze the phenomenon of the transfer of knowledge and technological expertise in Europe after the First World War, mainly focussing on CEE. In order to use this focus, the workshop explored the following perspectives: experts and the media of knowledge-communication; the role of the state and finally the relation of expertise and power. CEE was analysed in its connections to the West and the East.

In their outline of the conception of the workshop the convenors pointed out that despite the great incursions of the First World War the interwar period was characterised by an immense expansion of professional communication. Forums developed in existing and specially created organisations, which drew their dynamics from the need to keep up with the accelerating pace of technological development. A tense interrelationship between nation states and expert-knowledge was observable, which continued under radically changed circumstances after the Second World War. On the one hand this expert-knowledge was developed in the framework of a universal understanding of knowledge, on the other hand, it was intended to serve the progress-oriented development of the respective national society. Especially in the case of the newly founded states of CEE these issues are of high relevance for understanding the history of the 20th century. The analysis of the relationship between technological innovation and transnational communication of knowledge has long been neglected by historiography. These questions were rarely followed up prior to 1989 as a result of the general political situation. This also required linking eastern and western narratives to develop a new synthesis of the history of technology and science and its transfer in Europe, as seen from the outside.

Eva Horn (Basel) gave the introductory lecture "Experts or Impostors? Blindness and Insight in Secret Intelligence". Secret intelligence is in many ways an extreme case of expert knowledge. Therefore it is a good example to point out the very characteristics of experts and expertise. According to Horn's definition expertise is highly exclusive. The

expert status is attributed by other experts, i.e. peers. Double checking in secret intelligence does not follow the pattern of falsifying in Popper's sense. What is questioned is not the information itself, but rather its source. The institutionalized knowledge management in secret services leads to epistemological pathologies, i. e. to a blindness that consists in asking the wrong questions or looking for answers in the wrong direction. In his comment, Johannes Paulmann (Mannheim) stressed the role of the secret agent as a "self-proclaimed expert". He pointed out that, when analyzing if states are able and willing to learn from experts, we should make a difference between democratic states and dictatorships. It might on the one hand turn out that public debate in democracies hinder the transfer of expert knowledge into decision-making; on the other hand knowledge does not have the same epistemological quality in authoritarian societies than in democracies.

The second session focused on examples from CEE, though questions of general importance remained in the centre. Paul Weindling (Oxford) started with a paper on "Public Health in Central Europe. National and International Expertise". The paper dealt with the example of eugenics and showed, to what a striking extend the respective discourse was not only present in Central and Eastern Europe and can thus not be described as following a simple West-East direction. The respective states were rather subjects than – as commonly assumed – objects in this discourse.

Weindling interpreted this as part of the extremely important role public health played in the newly established states in the region. Respective ministries, profiting from the lack of established structures, were set up almost a decade before their counterparts in Western Europe. It goes without saying that this development offered considerable chances for the experts in the field which also exceeded those of their Western counterparts. They could build on growing legitimacy which helped them to successfully challenge both old values and old elites.

Weindling presented public health as an extremely dynamic area and in doing so hinted at continuities between the interwar period and the communist era. Moreover, he stressed the importance of the international transfer of organisation models.

Connecting to this Erik Ingebrigtsen (Trondheim) looked at an intriguing example of such a transfer in his paper on "The Agency of Knowledge Transfer: Hungarian Fellows of the Rockefeller Foundation, 1922-1939", which offered much more than a case study. Ingebrigtsen demonstrated the high impact Hungarian Rockefeller fellows could enfold at home due to the reputation of their international research and the reputation of the Foundation, but also against the background Weindling highlighted before. Ingebrigtsen also made clear, however, that the Rockefeller Foundation had a very clear idea, what to expect from their fellows, where to send them, and was strict in obliging fellows to return home in order to prevent a brain drain for the respective countries. On the other hand, the influence of the scholars in their home countries was much stronger than could be expected given the comparatively small number of fellows taking part in the programmes.

Among many other points highlighting general problems of knowledge transfer in the interwar period what became clear here was the symbolic dimension of expert communication in its international dimension. This aspect loomed large in Michal

Pullmann's (Prague) paper on "The Economic Debates in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia in the 1980s: Between Affirmation of Facticity and Critical Approach". Pullmann directed the workshop's attention to specific languages and codes employed by Czechoslovakian experts in a strongly hierarchical discourse with the Soviet Union. Preferably, mathematical or prognostic models served as a mode of communication. Information was often communicated as natural demands. Thus Pullmann touched upon a central question of expert-cultures: How can the system be effectively criticized from within?

In his comment Karl Hall (Budapest), stressed the intentional use of prestige e.g. through referring to the United States or – in the case of Pullmann's examples – to the Soviet Union. Moreover, Hall stressed the role of utopian concepts, of "Zukunftsmusik" as driving force in the communication of experts. Expert always also have to be seen in their public capacity and their need to strive for funds allowing them to pursue their goals – or, as Eva Horn had put it earlier: experts have a cause. However, as was stressed in the discussion, one should not forget that experts were always taking part in reproducing the existing order even if they were criticizing things.

The third session considered examples beyond the region in order to avoid describing certain developments as typical for CEE without further contextualizing these phenomena. Marcus Funck (Toronto) started with a paper on the "The Role of the League of Nations in the Internationalisation of Aviation during the Interwar Period". As recent studies have stressed the League was one of the major agents of technical standardization and scientific exchange in the interwar period. Going beyond this Funck presented aviation as a highly significant arena of exchange between national and international factors. One reason was technical development, which brought about an ever wider reach of air traffic and therefore demanded international exchange of experts. This was particularly true for the important field of security standards but also for the many aspects touching on national issues of national sovereignty. However, the significance of the example of aviation in CEE went beyond technical aspects. Against the background of international relations the Eastern routes were of political importance e.g. for French aviation politics and were thus subsidized. On the other hand the new states of Eastern Europe saw aviation as a matter of both strategic and symbolic significance well suited to demonstrate their claims of a prominent place on the international stage.

Albert Presas y Puig (Berlin) connected in a number of ways to these topics with his paper on "Technical Relations between Germany and Spain: technological Transfer and International Policy in the 20th Century". Presas demonstrated how mechanisms of exclusion – in the case of Germany after the First World War – brought about new forms of exchange. Spain served as a testing ground and place of experiment for technologies prohibited in Germany through the Treaty of Versailles. The Spanish government on the other hand hoped to gain key technologies. Thus in particular the most problematic – and illegal – forms of technology like poison gas led to very strong exchange in which figures like the German officer Max Bauer functioned as "brokers of evil". The networks emerging here were strongly depended on personal relations and even friendships. Therefore, they would outlast numerous regime-changes both in Spain and Germany and last well into the Postwar period.

In his comment Roland Pohoryles (Vienna) pointed out the importance of national innovation cultures. In the discussion the importance of the self-perception of experts, but also the importance of different styles of experts, which goes beyond the phenomenon of tacit knowledge and national innovation cultures was stressed. Moreover, connected to Paul Weindling's paper it was stressed that international exchange does not necessarily bear – as often assumed – a positive character.

The following two sections considered "The Role of the State" for the mobilization of expert knowledge, taking also into account the tensions between the newly evolving international expert cultures and the framework of the nation state within which the experts acted and the self-understandings of the experts in question. And since nation states had high expectations of the academic institutions and experts they funded, these sections also addressed the states' management of knowledge and experts in various areas. To this area referred the paper of Stefan Rohdewald (Passau), who opened the sections with his reflections on "Networks of Technocracy and Scientific Management in Poland between the Wars?" Introducing the concept of technocracy to the workshop Rohdewald showed how this concept, meaning governing by technical decision making in numerous variations, made its way from the Czechoslovakian Republic, where in Prague in 1924 the First World Congress of Management had been organized, to Poland. Polish concepts of combining science, government and new means of communication stood in a very close relationship to the earlier American and Czech examples. The transfer of knowledge therefore functioned by adjusting foreign concepts to the local conditions of the Second Republic of Poland. Staying with the example of Poland in the interwar period, Ingo Loose (Berlin) took a closer look on "How to run a state: The question of know-how in public administration in the first years after Poland's rebirth in 1918". On the example of the region of Wielkopolska and by looking at the experts Loose developed a fresh view on the history of the newly starting Polish administration after the long period of being divided lands. Instead of perceiving this period as a clash of nations and period of Polish-German hostility Loose was able to show that the process of exchange of elites and groups of experts was a gradual one, accompanied by an intensive German-Polish communication, since the functional systems had to avoid the loss of their functionality and self-organization. Loose chose a perspective that showed how fruitful the focus on experts in a micro-perspective can be for a challenge of established historical narratives. The next speaker Kenneth Bertrams (Brussels) focussed on the transnational circulation of ideas that took place in the two postwar eras between Western Europe and the United States in the field of economic policy, social regulation and planning. Specifically he addressed the question of the emergence of a "corporate liberalism" in Belgium, France, and the U.S.A. in the 1920s and its re-appropriation after 1945 as a key instrument in fostering a stabilized and concerted growth. This example from Western Europe showed the eagerness for more efficient administration by the state and how the "expert" was included into state policies and Bertrams also showed a dialectic legitimacy: The state offers social recognition and the experts legitimize the state. And as Georg Wagner-Kyora (Hannover) stressed in his comment to the section – these were examples for a widening of perspective in European history; a perspective taking into account different forms of state-modernization. He also pointed to the intertwining of domestic processes with national models of knowledge. The tension between national objectives and rather international, European thinking of experts stood in the centre of the following talk by Dagmara Jajeśniak-Quast (Erfurt). In her paper "Polish Economic Circles and the Question of the Common European Market after World

War I" she outlined the fate of the Pan-European idea in Poland, the universal idea for giving up the nation state in favour for a European union and a common European market. Jajeśniak-Quast made though clear that the tension between national interests and the intended European union were to sharp for the latter: The Pan-Europeanists who constituted experts often coming from economic circles and often high-ranking free-masons, were accused to be traitors of the Polish nation; above that the economic crisis gave rise to economic nationalism. So this time, and this underlines the assumption that the success or the failure of an expertise and an expert is highly depended on the environment and the circumstances in which he is able to act, the state turned out to be an obstacle for the experts ideas.

The following speaker Sari Autio-Sarasma (Helsinki) in her talk on "Knowledge through the Iron Curtain. Transferring Knowledge and Technology in Cold War Europe" advocated a new perspective on the history of the Cold War and a re-evaluation of the Iron Curtain as a strict and impermeable division line of Europe into two blocs. Again, focussing on the actors and the experts mainly from small states from a micro-perspective, Autio-Sarasma called for an emphasis on the dynamics of a continuously changing interaction between East and West. This emphasis turns out to be especially convincing from the point of view of transferring ideas, knowledge and technology, thereby not only focussing on a transfer from the West to the East but also vice versa and on a re-evaluation of centre-periphery relations.

Yet another challenge to existing research, this time on consumerism, offered the paper by Małgorzata Mazurek (Potsdam): "Between International Community of Experts and National "Carnival of Revolution": Consumerism and Decline of the Communist System in Poland", since research is mainly focussing on the politics of consumption in the capitalist world. In contrast, Mazurek pointed to the state-consumer relations in Poland on the example of "The Federation of Consumers" in Poland, emerging in 1981 and – due to the existing of the Solidarity movement – a quite unique phenomenon of a semi-autonomous consumer movement manifesting a political consumer consciousness existing in all economies where items of consumption assume a particular relevance and political importance. Mazurek characterized the consumer experts not as agents of the state but plausibly as an intermediary organization concerned with the condition of society and economy influenced by international ideas of consumerist thought. Again, a micro-perspective on the experts enabled an insight into the functioning not only of state-experts-relations but also on the given civil society as Catherine Gousseff (Berlin-Paris) underlined in her comment to this section, stressing also the importance of considering the counter tendencies in history, often deconstructing the master or established narratives.

The Sections on "Communication and Transfer of Knowledge" explored communication and translation structures that enabled knowlegde transfer across state borders. In her paper "People's Cars and People's Technologies: Škoda and Fiat Experts face the American Challenge (1918-1948)" Valentina Fava (Florence) showed that studying and promoting Taylorism Czech and Italian engineers were aware of the fact that the American model of production had to be adapted to local conditions in order to be effective. Therefore they actively appropriated only selected components. Whereas the loyalty of FIAT's experts focused on their company, Czech engineers regarded Americanization and "Scientific Management" as a means of nation-building. Following a similar general argument, Elisabeth van Meer (Charleston) stressed in her paper on

"Engineers without Borders? Scientific Management in Interwar East Central Europe" the anti-German impetus of the idea of "Scientific Management" and its character as a strategy to develop the whole region of CEE. In comparison to this, as Pál Germuska (Budapest), in his paper "Copy-paste in Technologies? Soviet Advisers in the Hungarian Military Industry in the 1950s" the Hungarian case of "copy-paste" of Soviet military technology reflects an externally imposed change. The Soviet Union tried to establish power relations towards its new satellite by forced export of second-rank technology and reproducing its own model of production without taking into account existing structures. What is to be considered a success in terms of colonisation and stalinisation was a complete failure in terms of technical progress. As Christoph Mick (Warwick) stressed in his comment, (Stalinist) Soviet science was organized in a very specific manner: Whereas Western engineers experimented intensively and stepped forward by "trial and error", in Soviet science failing experiments and loss of raw materials could be deadly for the researcher. Soviet scientists (and advisers in Hungary) therefore strictly followed existing patterns of thinking and orders from above instead of taking the risk of innovation.

The Soviet-Hungarian case also reflects the problem of lingua franca in international exchange of expertise. Sovietisation of CEE after World War II meant the enforcement of Russian as a lingua franca in the new satellites. Three decades before, the outcome of World War I also led to important changes in usage of languages in the multi-national scientific community. The boycott of German science at the beginning of the interwar period went hand in hand with the decline of German as a means of transnational scientific communication. As Roswitha Reinbothe (Duisburg-Essen) pointed out in her talk on "Languages of International Scientific Communication in Central Eastern Europe after World War I", this was a result of the policy by the winning coalition and the newly formed states in CEE.

Justyna Górny (Berlin) introduced into "The Life and Thinking of Ludwik Fleck in and outside Poland (1896-1961)", whereas Guido Hausmann (Dublin) presented a case study under the title "Political Geography Travels East: Stepan Rudnytsky and the Emergence of an Ukrainian Political Geography, 1914-1926". Writing the biographies and analyzing the scholarly work of this Polish-Jewish microbiologist and philosopher of science as well as this Ukrainian geographer again allows to show the micro-level of knowledge transfer and transnational networks in a period of war, border changes and formation of new states. Rudnytsky's reputation at home depended clearly on the fact that he successfully addressed an international community of peers. On the other hand, his Ukrainian origin was too big an obstacle to become a geographer of European influence.

3. Outcome and further research:

The final discussion of the workshop stressed that researching the phenomena of the expert – in particular in the region CEE – leads directly to essential problems of Europe's age of extremes. There was also a common understanding that the term expert – with all its different meanings and strong normative connotation serves as an extremely useful tool of investigation, especially when starting of from micro-level case studies in the region of CEE and embedding the results into a larger European framework.

However, a number of open questions deserve to be mentioned here and are at the same time points in need of further elaboration and further research:

3.1. Does the region CEE deserve special treatment or are the developments treated in the workshop of a more general nature which can be found in the other parts of Europe in the same way? This seems particularly obvious for the paradigm of planning, for planning as a tool and as an end. Above that it should be examined, if – as the structuring of the workshop did – it makes sense to look at the long term perspective, or if the changes the Second World War and the rise of communism brought about were so substantial that one should rather look at both periods separately. On the one hand there are certainly personal continuities from the pre-war to the post-war period. Even if the Soviet Union and its satellites constitute a form of states that has never been there before those states could only function by overtaking certain functional systems as well as in politics, economics or the sciences from former times. On the other hand, the differences to the pre-war period, mainly considering the role of the state, need clearly to be defined and researched. Concerning the region it is also especially important to look at the real or imagined borderlines further east of CEE and to include countries like the Ukraine, in former times with centres like L'viv a cultural part of Central Europe but today, due to political borders, not fully included.

3.2. The two single aspects which constantly came up in the workshop in favour of special characteristics of the region were the deep and numerous changes in the political systems – with the most radical form being occupation –, and the legacy of the empires. Those questions also do require further research since it is not always clear where the legacy starts and where it ends. Nevertheless, this stimulated multiple loyalties but also a strong interplay of a seemingly neutral technological rationale and political convictions.

3.3. It was also stressed, that the state played a comparatively prominent role in the region, and we face the problem of the meaning and the implications of nation states that came – on an European scale – rather late into being in the sense of territorialisation. The state as an agent of modernization processes offered chances for experts to lift their status but also entailed manifold ways of politics of force. Complex power relations between the state and the expert are here to be researched as well as a bargaining position of experts. Not at least due to their international contacts experts were able to offer legitimacy to the state. The question arises, if internationalism in the region might have been comparatively more attractive than in the “established” countries, since international expert knowledge was demanded for the so much wished “modernization” of the state and for not falling behind against the predecessor states. An interesting problem that came up within the workshop was the linkage between industrial modernity and state existence, the question also, how much a state identifies with the companies on its soil – a highly relevant question also for states all over the world today. These questions of the limits of exchange and existing ambivalences came into our view which certainly constitute interesting research questions for the future: It is extremely important to look closely at the tensions between an emerging international scene of experts and the national frameworks in which these experts acted. In doing so, one should analyse the loyalties of experts vis-à-vis the state and/or the nation and attempts by the state or the nation to exploit the experts for its need, or if there exists such a dichotomy at all.

3.4. Regarding also methodological questions the question emerged how expert-styles could be researched, how maybe a typology of experts could be achieved, how different "thought-styles" are to be scrutinized. For this it would be necessary to involve more explicitly questions of gender, ethnicity and also of age and generation. Biographies or collective biographies seem to be useful to deepen the analysis in this respect. Helpful suggestions to grasp the figure of the "Expert" could also come from postcolonial studies. A further question, and this might also be researched by looking at biographies, concerns the question of failure and success: If an expert is successful or if he has failed is not always easy to define and there always remains the question who defines this. Again, the circumstances in which an expert is able to make his or her expertise something from other or even universally accepted, must be looked at very carefully. It also makes a difference, from where the expert gets his or her knowledge.

3.5. Yet another area of research to be addressed in the future are the systems of expert transfer itself and the systems in which expert transfer occurs, the communication strategies that lay behind those processes and the different layers and spheres that are affected and involved such as the public, maybe civil society, private initiatives, the state. The system "Rockefeller Foundation" on the one hand and the Soviet System on the other seem to be extremely different, but perhaps they have more in common than we think, since the basic assumptions offer also similarities, for example both systems seemed to be useful to somehow influence knowledge transfer. And of course there are many more systems of knowledge transfer to be taken into account, be it the free-masonry as in the case of Poland in the interwar period, be it something like a "Czechoslovak model" for incorporating Taylorism or Fordism. Here one has to be also careful in framing and labelling certain processes.

3.6. It is intended to follow up the mentioned questions with further research, organized in workshops and possibly a network on questions on the "expert" and "expertise" including the speakers of this conference but further scientists as well, centering around the region CEE. As a first step a publication of the conference papers is planned.

4. Final programme

Wednesday 10 September 2008

afternoon *Arrival of participants*

Thursday 11 September 2008

- 09.00-09.15 **Welcome Address**
Eduard Mühle (Director of the German Historical Institute)
- 09.15-09.30 **Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)**
Jacques Dubucs (Standing Committee for the Humanities)
- 09.30-10.00 **Introduction by the Convenors**
- SESSION 1: Transnationalism and Knowledge-Transfer – A Theoretical Approach**
- 10.00-10.30 **Experts or Impostors? Blindness and Insight in Secret Intelligence**
Eva Horn (University of Basel, CH)
- 10.30-11.00 *Coffee break*
- 11.00-11.15 **Comment: Johannes Paulmann** (University of Mannheim, DE)
- 11.15-12.00 **Discussion**
- 12.00-13.30 *Lunch*
- SESSION 2: Experts and Expert Groups I**
- 13.30-13.50 **Public Health in Central Europe: National and International Expertise**
Paul Weindling (Oxford Brookes University, UK)
- 13.50-14.10 **The Agency of Knowledge Transfer: Hungarian Fellows of the Rockefeller Foundation, 1922-1939**
Erik Ingebrigtsen (Norwegian University of Science and Technology Trondheim, NO)
- 14.10-14.30 **The Economic Debates in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia in the 1980s: Between Affirmation of Facticity and Critical Approach**
Michal Pullmann (University of Prague, CZ)
- 14.30-15.00 *Coffee break*
- 15.00-15.30 **Comment: Karl Hall** (Central European University, Budapest, HU)
- 15.30-16.30 **Discussion**
- 19:00-21:00 *Dinner*

Friday 12 September 2008

SESSION 3: Experts and Expert Groups II

09.00-09.20 **The Role of the League of Nations in the Internationalisation of Aviation during the Interwar Period**

Markus Funck (York-University of Toronto, CA)

09.20-09.40 **Technical Relations between Germany and Spain: Technological Transfer and International Policy in the 20th Century**

Albert Presas i Puig (Max Planck Institute for the History of Science Berlin, DE)

09.40-10.00 **Comment: Ronald J. Pohoryles** (ICCR Vienna, AT)

10.00-11.00 **Discussion**

11.00-11.30 *Coffee break*

SESSION 4: The Role of the State I

11.30-11.50 **Networks of Technocracy and Scientific Management in Poland between the Wars?**

Stefan Rohdewald (University of Passau, DE)

11.50-12.10 **How to Run a State: The Question of Know-how in Public Administration in the First Years after Poland's Rebirth in 1918**

Ingo Loose (HU Berlin, DE)

12.10.-12.30 **The 'Techno-Corporatist Bargain' in Western Europe and the United States, 1914-1944. A Case for a Transnational Transfer of Knowledge?**

Kenneth Bertrams (University of Brussels, BE)

12.30-13.30 *Lunch*

13.30-14.00 **Comment: Georg Wagner-Kyora** (University of Hannover, DE)

14.00-15.00 **Discussion**

15.00-15.30 *Coffee break*

SESSION 5: The Role of the State II

15.30-15.50 **Polish Economic Circles and the Question of European Common Market after WWI**

Dagmara Jajeśniak-Quast (University of Erfurt, DE)

15.50-16.10 **Knowledge through the Iron Curtain. Transferring Knowledge and Technology in Cold War Europe**

Sari Autio-Sarasma (University of Helsinki, FI)

16.10-16.30 **Between International Community of Experts and National 'Carnival of Revolution': Consumerism and Decline of the Communist System in Poland**

Małgorzata Mazurek (Center for Research on Contemporary History Potsdam, DE)

16.30-17.00 *Coffee break*

17.00-17.30 **Comment:** **Catherine Gousseff** (Centre Marc Bloch Berlin, DE)

17.30-18.30 **Discussion**

19.30-21.30 *Dinner*

Saturday 13 September 2008

SESSION 6: Communication and the Transfer of Knowledge I

09.30-09.50 **Languages of International Scientific Communication in Central Eastern Europe after World War I**
Roswitha Reinbothe (University of Duisburg-Essen, DE)

09.50-10.10 **Copy-paste in Technologies? Soviet Advisers in the Hungarian Military Industry in the 1950s**
Pál Germuska (Institute for the History of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, Budapest, HU)

10.10-10.30 **People's Cars and People's Technologies: Škoda and Fiat Experts face the American Challenge (1918-1948)**
Valentina Fava (European University Institute Florence, IT)

10.30-11.00 *Coffee break*

11.00-11.30 **Comment:** **Christoph Mick** (University of Warwick, UK)

11.30-12.30 **Discussion**

12.30-14.00 *Lunch*

SESSION 7: Communication and the Transfer of Knowledge II

14.30-14.50 **The Life and Thinking of Ludwik Fleck in and outside Poland (1896-1961)**
Justyna Górný (Independent Scholar Berlin, DE)

14.50-15.10 **Political Geography Travels East: Stepan Rudnytsky and the Emergence of an Ukrainian Political Geography, 1914-1926**
Guido Hausmann (University of Dublin, IE)

15.10-15.30 **Engineers without Borders? Scientific Management in Interwar East Central Europe**
Elisabeth van Meer (College of Charleston, US)

15.30-16.00 *Coffee break*

16.00-16.30 **Discussion**

16.30-18:30 **Final Discussion and Discussion of Further Activities**

18.30 **End of the Conference**

19.30-21.30 *Dinner*

Sunday 14 September 2008

morning *Breakfast and departure*

5. Final list of participants

Sari Autio-Sarasma	University of Helsinki, FI
Kenneth Bertrams	University of Brussels, BE
Valentina Fava	European University Institute, IT
Marcus Funck	York-University of Toronto, CA
Pál Germuska	Institute for the History of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, Budapest, HU
Justyna Górny	Independent Scholar, Berlin, DE
Catherine Gousseff	Centre Marc Bloch, Berlin, DE
Karl Hall	Central European University, Budapest, HU
Guido Hausmann	University of Dublin, IE
Eva Horn	University of Basel, CH
Erik Ingebrigtsen	Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, NO
Dagmara Jajeśniak-Quast	University of Erfurt, DE
Martin Kohlrausch	GHI Warsaw, PL
Ingo Loose	HU Berlin, DE
Małgorzata Mazurek	Center for Research on Contemporary History Potsdam, DE
Elisabeth van Meer	College of Charleston, US
Christoph Mick	University of Warwick, UK
Johannes Paulmann	University of Mannheim, DE
Ronald J. Pohoryles	ICCR Vienna, AT
Albert Presas i Puig	Max Planck Institute for the History of Science Berlin, DE
Michal Pullmann	University of Prague, CZ
Roswitha Reinbothe	University of Duisburg-Essen, DE
Stefan Rohdewald	University of Passau, DE
Katrin Steffen	University of Halle-Wittenberg, DE
Georg Wagner-Kyora	University of Hannover, DE
Paul Weindling	Oxford Brookes University, UK
Stefan Wiederkehr	GHI Warsaw, PL

6. Statistical information on participants

Young scientists

young scientists	19
no young scientists	8
total participants	27

Gender

female	10
male	17
total participants	27

Age

average year of birth	1967
born before 1957	3
born in 1958-1962	6
born in 1963-1967	5
born in 1968-1972	7
born after 1972	6
total participants	27

Countries of origin

Austria	1
Belgium	1
Canada	1
Czech Republic	1
Finland	1
Germany	11
Hungary	2
Ireland	1
Italy	1
Norway	1
Poland	2
Switzerland	1
United Kingdom	2
United States	1
total participants	27