

Summaries

Who Is the “Other”?

GÁBOR BICZÓ

The critical turn is an important conceptual development in contemporary cultural anthropology that began at the end of the sixties. This article analyzes and reviews key aspects of the critical turn, particularly those associated with the representation of the “Other”. The first part of the paper investigates the epistemological background of the controversy about representation in the famous Writing Culture debate among James Clifford, Paul Rabinow, Mary Louise Pratt, George Marcus and Michael Fischer. The second subchapter reveals how the epistemological critique of representation in the critical anthropology works. Here I reflect on Bernhard Waldenfels’ concept of the representational paradox in ethnology that is entwined with the basic idea of the discipline. The third part of the paper concludes by acknowledging the difficulties of anthropological understanding which researchers face as an unbridgeable epistemological gap between the representation and the represented “Other”.

Prejudice: The Ideology of Desire

FERENC ERŐS

The article examines the social psychological concept of prejudice, based on Elisabeth Young-Bruhl’s *The Anatomy of Prejudices* (1996). In her book the American philosopher and psychotherapist criticizes the traditional, mainstream approach to prejudices, as represented in Gordon W. Allport’s *Prejudice* (1954) and in *The Authoritarian Personality*, by Theodor W. Adorno and his associates (1950). While the mainstream theories assume that the prejudice or ethnocentrism is one single attitude based on the cognitive mechanisms of overgeneralisation and stereotyping, she argues that it is necessary to distinguish between different types of prejudices, the people who hold them, the social and political settings that promote them, and the human needs they fulfil. According to her, prejudices, like racism, anti-Semitism, sexism, and homophobia in modern times are “ideologies of desire”, since they “institutionalise at deeper... individual and social and political level the differences between ‘us’ and ‘them’”. She proposes a classification of prejudice types on the basis of distinguishing between obsessive, hysterical and narcissistic characters. Young-Bruhl’s approach is challenged by the Norwegian philosopher Lene Auestad who in her book *Respect, Plurality, and Prejudice* (2015) suggests that the „silent social consensus” around prejudices should be interpreted in terms of modern psychoanalytic trauma theory.

Prejudices As Conditions of Understanding

ISTVÁN M. FEHÉR

In a highly provocative chapter of his main work, *Truth and Method*, Hans-Georg Gadamer has undertaken what he called a rehabilitation, not only of authority and tradition, but of prejudice as well. The title of the chapter, “Prejudices as Conditions of Understanding,” is, in fact, a challenge in itself. In a succinct form, it formulates the highly controversial – indeed rather shocking and seemingly outrageous – thesis according to which prejudices are not to be regarded – as is commonly thought – as an obstacle, hindrance, or impediment for understanding. On the contrary, in actual fact, they are the very conditions that make understanding possible at all.

In my paper I propose to reconstruct and make sense of Gadamer’s above claim as well as his position with regard to the concept of prejudice in its relation to several neighboring, that is, related concepts, such as, first of all, pre-understanding, with an eye also to his view of authority and tradition (the first two sections of this paper). In the final step (the third section), I wish to show how Gadamer’s treatment of the issue was anticipated and indeed delineated by Heidegger. In an Appendix, finally, I attempt to show that something such as pre-understanding and prejudice was not completely unknown to a thinker commonly thought to be a bitter enemy of prejudices by virtue of being *the* philosopher of the Enlightenment – Immanuel Kant.

The Conception-Forming Role of the Human Intellect in Dante’s Society Concept

MÁRTON KAPOSÍ

According to Dante, man, naturally in accord with God’s intention and providence, developing his intellectual abilities exclusive to his *genus*, and organising co-operation throughout the whole of mankind, is able to establish a worldwide monarchy, the emperor of which, who is independent of the pope, could prevent the prevalence of *cupiditas*, and the conflicts arising from it. Thus it could create peaceful conditions, ensuring that the human race could live its life in this world according to their real calling; they could fulfill their intellectual and moral values unthwarted, which – though only indirectly – could help them gain happiness in the afterlife.

Dante is mainly relying on Aristotle’s complex soul concept and teleologic ontology when he takes Augustine’s historical philosophy further in a more secular sense and broadens the Thomist monarchy concept, because he develops the more dynamic and conscious image of man of the Averroes commentary, who, by linking the universality of *intellectus possibilis* and the form shaping of *intellectus actívus* (hence *intellectus adeptus*) gains knowledge, which is continually being enriched by human beings, or can be made the theoretical driving force of their activities on various levels and in various forms.

With a certain indirectness, Dante demonstrates that man has the essential forces, generic abilities (intellect, temperance, interactivity and so on) that allow the forging of a more just society, since apart from the sovereign’s elevated position and philosophical culture, the special consciousness of citizens as individuals is a secure source and guarantee of the institutions and smoothly running mechanism of a more advanced society that can shape a more favourable human existence.

Diderot's Political Thought between 1770 and 1784

ESZTER KOVÁCS

In the present paper, I examine Diderot's political philosophy during the last decade of his life. I intend to present this study as marginal notes to the new translation in Hungarian of his selected works, published in 2013. I argue that Diderot expresses more radically certain ideas in political texts after than during his editorship of the *Encyclopédie*. The key notions from 1770 are *nature, liberty, property*. We can observe a more determined criticism of absolute power, as well as anti-colonial convictions. Diderot emphasizes the respect of so-called natural laws and urges a national legislation. I focus on two of his works related to his journey in Russia and on his contribution to the *History of the two Indies* published under the name of Raynal.

Prejudice, Presupposition and Tradition from a Hermeneutic Point of View

CSABA OLAY

At the very beginning of philosophy the idea was formulated that all thought rely on presuppositions. Therefore philosophical thinking sought to clarify her relationship to presuppositions and prejudices from early on. The paper examines the problem of presuppositions in the light of Hans-Georg Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics which discussed the question in the framework of the "rehabilitation of prejudices". Prejudices need to be rehabilitated on the basis of their peculiar "productivity", since they constitute conditions of understanding. Following a sketch of how the question of prejudices arises in philosophy, also with an eye to social psychology, the bigger part of the paper will treat the specific hermeneutic conception of prejudices. In connection with this, I discuss Gadamer's view on tradition and authority, and contrast it with Odo Marquard's sceptic philosophy of compensation.

Implicit Bias and the Limits of Individual Responsibility

ANNA RÉZ

The paper explores the aims and perplexities of explaining individual moral responsibility for actions influenced by implicit biases toward members of minority groups. First it presents the notorious difficulties of justifying responsibility for such instances of human agency, which apparently lacks either consciousness or direct control or identification with one's value judgments. The author argues that although indirect and attributionist accounts of moral responsibility adequately explain and justify most of the cases where people are held responsible for their implicit biases, in order to explain "alienated" cases (where someone is influenced by implicit biases in spite of their sincere egalitarian commitments) we would have to accept normatively untenable and counterintuitive variant proposals. The second part of the paper situates the problem in the contemporary political context and raises some general complaints about the political project which aims to erase structural injustice by diminishing individual biases. The author argues that (i)

blaming individuals for being influenced by implicit biases is not an effective method of eliminating discriminatory behavior and that (ii) at least in certain contexts 'weeding out' individual biases is insufficient to end structural inequalities. Thus, the paper concludes, there is no (practical) need to extend the scope of individual responsibility for biased behavior to those cases, where this extension requires substantial theoretical sacrifices.

Prejudice in Late Modernity

DOMONKOS SIK

Prejudice appears on the horizon of philosophy as a twofold problem: from an epistemological point of view it is considered as a necessary element of interpreting reality (Gadamer), from a moral philosophical point of view it is considered as a threat of objectifying the other (Habermas). From a historical perspective we may argue that prejudice is inseparable from modernity, as it became the key element of relating to the other in the functionally differentiated societies (Gesellschaft). Accordingly the question concerning the preconditions and functioning of prejudice needs to be posed over and over as modernity changes. This indicates the aim of the article that is reinterpreting the notion of prejudice based on critical theories of late modernity (including Bourdieu, Giddens, Habermas, Honneth and Lash). For this task a previously elaborated network theoretical framework is used (based on the works of White and Latour), which helps us to analyse in parallel those various forms of prejudice, which appear in action situations coordinated by different logics such as value accumulation, reflectivity, communication, recognition or technics. The network concept of prejudice attempts to move forward not only from the approach of the philosophy of consciousness (e.g. Allport, Gadamer), but also from philosophy of language (suggested by Habermas). After elaborating these differences and the idealtypical network constellations characterized by dogmatic or idealizing prejudices, finally an attempt is made to describe the network dynamics of prejudice.