Introduction

Gareth Dale

When Karl Polanyi, in a letter of 1934, gave an account of 'the inner development' of his thought, he divided it into two periods. The first was his early life in Hungary, until 1919, the second was the fifteen years that followed, in Viennese exile. 'Although nearly all my published writing falls into this second period,' he observed, the literary and pedagogical work accomplished 'in the first, the Hungarian period, forms the real background of my life and thought.'[1]

This will come as no surprise to anyone familiar with Polanyi's life. Formed within an extraordinary historical-geographical crucible – *fin-de-siècle* Budapest – during a period of tumultuous change, he became a central figure in its radical counter-culture, the members of which were to exert an influence upon twentieth-century thought out of all proportion to their number. The focus of this volume is upon his writings from this phase, his early life in Hungary. However, he also engaged intensively in émigré politics in three subsequent periods: the early 1920s in Vienna, the mid-1940s in London, and the late 1950s and early 1960s in Canada. Representative samples of his Hungarian writings from these three periods are also included. So too are examples of his correspondence. Polanyi was a prolific correspondent, and the letters included in this volume represent only a tiny fraction of his output. Those selected are clustered in periods during which he was engaged in political and intellectual projects with his Hungarian compatriots.

In this introductory essay I provide a survey of Polanyi's early life, during which he wrote the bulk of the texts that are included in this volume, followed by a summary overview of his engagement in émigré politics during his spells in Austria, Britain and North America.[2]

Born in the Habsburg capital, Vienna, Polanyi was raised in the Empire's second city, Budapest. The late nineteenth century was a time of change, as a semi-feudal absolutism gave way to industrial modernity, with the expansion of capitalist social relations, the systematic deployment of science and technology to the production process, and rapid urbanisation. To use the sociologese of the era, *Gemeinschaft* was dissolving into *Gesellschaft*, and intellectual culture in the Habsburg Empire was arguably more polarised than anywhere else

along the *Gemeinschaft–Gesellschaft* axis. There is a sense in which Karl's own parents, Cecile and Mihály Pollacsek, epitomised the dichotomy – or, perhaps more accurately, that of romantic anti-capitalism and liberal Enlightenment. Cecile inclined to the former. In lifestyle Bohemian and chaotic, her intellectual interests centred upon the philosophical, aesthetic and psychoanalytic. Of Russian descent, she maintained connections to Russian émigré circles, above all through her friend Samuel Klatschko, a socialist and former *narodnik* who, in his youth, had founded a utopian community in the USA and later provided a Viennese base for exiled revolutionaries – including Leon Trotsky and Karl Radek. Klatschko exerted a lasting influence on both Karl Polanyi and his influential cousin Ervin Szabó (on whom more below). Mediated through Cecile and through Klatschko, Polanyi developed a fascination with Russia, as the land of populism, revolutionary spirit and romantic anti-capitalism.

Mihály, by contrast, was a liberal businessman. According to Karl's wife, Ilona Duczynska (hereafter, Ilona), he 'lived by his creed of Puritanism, positivism, progress, the scientific outlook, democracy, and the emancipation of women'.[3] As Polanyi himself recalls, Mihály, 'to whose passionate idealism I owe a great debt, was Hungarian, though deeply imbued with western education and culture'.[4] An engineer, he had studied railway construction in Edinburgh, after which he returned to Budapest 'as what he understood to be a practising Scotsman'.[5] Whatever that phrase might mean, he certainly regarded Britain as an exemplar, synonymous with modernity.[6] For Karl, Britain was the land of his father's stories, of his English-language education, of Kipling (whose *Jungle Book* and *Stalky and Co.* he adored when young), of John Stuart Mill and the Fabians, and of Robert Owen. Altogether, these formed a counterpoint to his 'Russian' inspirations. 'From the outset', as he put it in a letter to his life-long friend Oscar Jaszi of 27 October 1950 (pp. 227–30), 'Russian and then Anglo-Saxon ingredients' were present in his intellectual world: 'on the one hand, Tolstoy and Dostoevsky (but as reflections of the Russian revolution!), and, on the other, my English upbringing, overseen by my deeply Westernised father'.

Cecile and Mihály Pollacsek belonged to a distinct layer of Hungarian society. In their son's words, they were 'liberal-minded Jews belonging to the upper class of Hungarian society'.[7] Jews functioned as the *Staatsvolk* of the Habsburg Empire. As Jaszi put it, they were a highly 'efficacious force' in its 'unification and cohesion'.[8] The Jews of Prague, for example, cleaved loyally to the 'imagined imperial community', as did their counterparts in Budapest, particularly after the 1867 Compromise which promoted the Hungarian elite to joint governor of the realm.[9] The Jewish *Bildungsbürgertum*, in its economic power and dominance within many professions, was a remarkable social group. Jewish economic and professional ascendancy was such that, although comprising scarcely more than a fifth of the capital's population, some two-thirds of all individuals

engaged in commerce and fully 90 per cent of those in finance were of Jewish extraction; and in both categories, Jews were disproportionately situated in the middle and upper brackets of the scale. They were over-represented in the legal profession and in political elites – the percentage of the leaderships of all left or left-liberal parties with Jewish parentage was never below 40 and could reach as high as 60 per cent.[10] An index of the pace of upward mobility is that in ten years from 1885 the Jewish intake at the University of Budapest quadrupled, and from 1895 Jews comprised almost half of the student body.

Cecile and Mihály had come of age during an era in which conditions were becoming steadily more secure for the Jews of Budapest. In the third quarter of the nineteenth century British hegemony at the global level and domestic agricultural prosperity underpinned a pronounced liberal trend in economic policy. In politics, Hungarian liberalism experienced its golden age. Freedoms of press, speech, assembly and religion were granted, and Judaism was put on an equal footing with other religions. Liberals, including Mihály, believed that Hungary was firmly positioned on the highway to modernity headed towards Western Europe, for which the signposts read *laissez-faire* and free trade, tolerance, civil liberties and steady democratisation. For bourgeois Jews of his generation full equality was not yet in their grasp but life was manifestly more tolerable than it had been for their parents and grandparents. They had little but scorn for those who stuck to an ethnic Jewish identity, seeing it as antithetical to modernity, patriotism and liberalism. Their preference was to assimilate.

Typically, Jewish professionals and businesspeople aspired to integrate into the Hungarian nobility, but the conventions were stringent: they demanded the adoption of social styles and mannerisms but also expected, tacitly but firmly, conversion to Christianity.[11] A substantial portion of the Jewish business class sought to enter the nobility, which in most cases involved religious conversion and magyarisation of the family name.[12] (A well-known case, due to his son's later fame, was the banker József Löwinger who purchased a title to become József von Lukacs.) Cecile and Mihály assimilated in most respects – she converted to the Protestant faith – but Mihály formally retained membership of the Jewish community and declined to magyarise his name.

Whether or not they converted, Jews in Hungary tended not to consider themselves a national minority and, even for newcomers, assuming the Hungarian national identity was generally straightforward.[13] Some evidence for this is anecdotal, but the statistics on linguistic change are also suggestive. The language of urban Jews (and of local administration) in mid-nineteenth century Hungary had been German; it was the native language of 60 per cent of the inhabitants of Buda and 33 per cent of Pest – including the Polanyis.[14] By the time Karl entered *Gymnasium*, however, German speakers had been reduced to a rump, even as the city's Hungarian-speaking population soared – to 80

per cent in 1900 and 90 per cent in 1920. An important factor in this was the adoption of Magyar by Jews. In 1880, 59 per cent of Jews gave it as their mother tongue; by 1910 the figure had leapt to 78 per cent.[15]

The existence of popular and institutional anti-Semitism notwithstanding, Jewish assimilation in pre-war Hungary could hardly be described as forced. Jewish immigration and economic advancement was positively welcomed by the bureaucratic state which, in the words of the Hungarian historian Andrew Janos, reached out its arms to the bourgeoisie,

> and was ready to protect it not only as an entrepreneurial class but also as a religious minority. At a time when pogroms raged in Russia and Rumania, and when even in neighboring Austria an irritating anti-Semitism was increasingly accepted as part of political life, in Hungary Jews were extolled by the prime minister as an 'industrious and constructive segment of the population' while anti-Semitism was denounced as 'shameful, barbarous and injurious to the national honor'.[16]

In spite of the absence of major institutional hurdles to upward mobility and integration in pre-war Hungary the relationship of assimilating Jews to their religious-ethnic heritage and to their national identity was far from straightforward. Assimilation to the dominant culture and belief system required conversion, which meant not only the exclusion of devout traditionalist Jews from the mainstream of public culture but the simultaneous raising of a barrier to the social mobility of the unbelieving or the agnostic. These faced a peculiar dilemma: they could 'freely' become members of the liberal or even anti-clerical establishment but only by taking the clerical route, through conversion (and, strictly, baptism).[17] Refuse, and one risked pariah status; accept, and the door to parvenu status was opened but at the risk of an identity troubled by the invidious compromise that had been made. Either way, Hungary's secularised Jewish intelligentsia faced a predicament, which its radical elements sought to resolve by embracing internationalist ideologies such as cosmopolitan liberalism and socialism. They exemplified the oscillation between 'parvenu and pariah' that in Hannah Arendt's terms characterised the Jewish experience in modern Europe. As a result of their critical estrangement from society and insight into the experience of oppression and social exclusion, the characteristic stance of Jewish radicals was that of the 'conscious pariah': they spurned the sycophancy of their conservative fellows, and rejected both Zionist separatism and the chauvinism of aristocratic Hungary in favour of a 'universal humanism'.[18]

Alongside Arendt's, theses on the peculiar experience of Central European Jewish intellectuals have been advanced by a number of authors, notably Isaac Deutscher and Mary Gluck. For Deutscher, their situation promoted a sensitivity to social change and contradiction, which may explain why such a remarkable number of revolutionaries of modern thought were Jewish.

Deutscher had in mind the likes of Baruch Spinoza, Heinrich Heine and Rosa Luxemburg but the point would apply equally to Polanyi or Georg Lukacs. The minds of these individuals matured

> where the most diverse cultural influences crossed and fertilised each other. They lived on the margins or in the nooks and crannies of their respective nations. Each of them was in society and yet not in it, of it and yet not of it. It was this that enabled them to rise in thought above their societies, above their nations, above their times and generations, and to strike out mentally into wide new horizons and far into the future.

Their attention ineluctably drawn to the dynamic elements of reality, they could 'comprehend more clearly the great movement and the great contradictoriness of nature and society'.[19] Likewise, Gluck, in *Georg Lukacs and his Generation, 1900–1918*, has argued that a segment of Budapest's Jewish intelligentsia at the turn of the century was peculiarly alive to the sense of fragmentation that characterises modern and, still more, modernising societies, and this impelled a quest for community. The Budapest Jews she surveys attached themselves to wider groupings, such as communism or social democracy, the avant-garde and Bauhaus, and formed imaginary allegiances to communities elsewhere. Is it coincidence that the social theorists among them turned their attention to experiences of detachment (Karl Mannheim's 'socially unattached intelligentsia') or to the dialectic of alienation and community (Lukacs, Polanyi)?

The radical elements of Budapest's Jewish intelligentsia were not consumed by the desire to ingratiate themselves with Hungary's establishment, by purchasing baronies and the like. Ultimately, their desire was, in the words of György Litván, to 'create an order in which the whole issue of assimilation was irrelevant'.[20] For some, this demanded a political community based on universalist criteria rather than on the tribal particularism of the nation state. Others attempted to navigate a middle course between nationalism and cosmopolitanism. Polanyi was of this type. Until he left Hungary in 1919, he recalled a decade or so later, 'I looked upon myself as an Hungarian, and took part enthusiastically in the intellectual and public life of my country'.[21] When a child, his embrace of the Hungarian national identity was ardent – so much so that he assumed the dominant nation's blindness towards the 'non-historic' national minorities over which it reigned. 'As schoolboys', he recalls, 'we had no interest in the vicissitudes of the 49 per cent of the population who were of non-Magyar extraction; many of us had not so much as heard of their existence.' Upon discovering their existence, his reaction was 'Blimpian', in his words. 'Unable to speak Hungarian?! And yet they claim the right to live in "our" country, to eat "our" bread?'[22] This chauvinism, however, was an eccentricity of childhood, and soon yielded to the perspective that he was to retain throughout his adult life, summarised by his daughter, Kari Polanyi-Levitt, as 'opposition to the chau-

vinist nationalism of the ruling circles and the bourgeoisie, but wholehearted enthusiasm for the Hungarian nation'.[23]

In connection with his desire to assume the Hungarian identity, Polanyi distanced himself from his Jewish heritage: he 'neither considered himself Jewish nor wished to be considered Jewish'.[24] He and his family disdained the commercial ethic of the 'Jewish bourgeoisie',[25] looked down in particular upon 'those Jews who came from the ghetto and retained their culture', and lamented the fact that Jews 'have a divided loyalty, to their tribe and their country'.[26] Anti-Semitism had configured the ghetto as synonymous with cultural nationalism and backwardness – with *Gemeinschaft*, religiosity and tradition. To Polanyi, 'ghetto Jews' appeared as mulishly resisting the course of progress; they ought to slough off their atavistic identity. In short, assimilant Jews such as Polanyi internalised an element of the endemic anti-Semitic prejudice against Jews of the ghetto. Ultimately, this did nothing to help their cause. Despite their best efforts to assimilate, to learn Hungarian and to convert to Christianity, they found themselves excluded from full national membership – and increasingly so, as Jew-hatred grew.

Free-floating intellectuals

When a child, Karl knew the prosperity that *fin-de-siècle* Habsburg capitalism could offer but also the unsteadiness of the ground upon which it rested. His father, Mihály, was a railway baron. When in Austria, his company had built lines for the Viennese State Railway Company, and his move to Budapest in the early 1890s had been astute. Railway building was a lead sector in Hungary's explosive economic boom, and his company was responsible for over a thousand kilometres of the track laid at this time.[27] The revenues enabled him to acquire a grand flat on a fashionable city-centre boulevard, as well as a summer residence. A team of tutors and governesses was hired to provide private tuition until the age of ten or twelve, when the children were sent to the best *Gymnasium*. But they also received a practical lesson in the instability of the capitalist system when, in 1900, Mihály's business collapsed. Straitened times followed, as the family navigated its descent into the middle class.

The abrupt destabilisation of the Polanyi family's fortunes echoed a wider volatility on the societal level. During the 'Great Depression' of 1873–96 the liberal consensus on the benefits of international trade and investment evaporated. As tariffs, cartels and other protectionist measures proliferated, a new form of 'organised capitalism' arose, centred upon interventionist economic policy and close cooperation between banks and states. Imperial rivalries intensified, with colonial annexations, an arms race and increasing diplomatic tensions. On the European left, a debate arose in respect of these tendencies. Some, such as the

'revisionist' Marxist Eduard Bernstein, held that the increasing regulation of capitalism would stabilise the business cycle.[28] Orthodox Marxists such as Rosa Luxemburg countered that organised capitalism would be far from crisis-free and would tend to intensify class struggle, while the Austrian social democrat Rudolf Hilferding, in his *Finance Capital*, studied the interconnections between business organisation, capital export and geopolitical competition. The emerging phase of capitalism dominated by giant corporations and cartels and orchestrated by banks, he argued, would encourage export offensives abroad, re-scaling capitalist competition to the global level and exacerbating imperial rivalries. Germany, he predicted in 1910, would soon be at war with Britain and France.[29]

In one of his earliest essays, 'The crisis of our ideologies' (1910) (pp. 83–5), Polanyi took Bernstein's side in the debate, and forecast a stable age of regulated capitalism. The collectivist society that was coming into being, the same essay also predicted, would render liberalism antiquated. No longer concentrated in the hands of individual owners, capital was becoming ever less personal, management ever more bureaucratic, and in society at large personality was losing its centrality: in future, people would be valued less for their individuality than for their sociality. 'Liberal individualism', as he later summarised his thesis, was on its way out, 'and in the coming phase of Capitalism the upper classes would exchange their individualistic theories for some form of "Socialist" doctrine' – albeit a socialism of a dogmatic kind, one that, far from serving 'the cause of the workers', would be based on a 'conviction of their natural inferiority'.[30]

If his prediction of capitalist stability was shortly to be refuted by the general conflagration of 1914–18 and the decades of volatility that followed, Polanyi's thesis on the demise of liberalism was seminal. The final quarter of the nineteenth century witnessed the early throes of what one historian, leaning on Dangerfield, has called 'the strange death of Liberal Europe'.[31] In the Habsburg Empire the 'death' of liberalism took an especially dramatic form. In respect of its Western half, the classic account is Carl Schorske's *Fin-de-siècle Vienna*, with its eloquent portrayal of the social blowback that followed upon liberal reforms:

> During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the program which the liberals had devised against the upper classes occasioned the explosion of the lower. The liberals succeeded in releasing the political energies of the masses, but against themselves rather than against their ancient foes. ... A German nationalism articulated against aristocratic cosmopolitans was answered by Slavic patriots clamouring for autonomy. ... Laissez faire, devised to free the economy from the fetters of the past, called forth the Marxist revolutionaries of the future. Catholicism, routed from the school and the courthouse as the handmaiden of aristocratic oppression, returned as the ideology of peasant and artisan, for whom liberalism meant capitalism and capitalism meant

> Jew. ... Far from rallying the masses against the old ruling class above, then, the liberals unwittingly summoned from the social deeps the forces of a general disintegration. Strong enough to dissolve the old political order, liberalism could not master the social forces which that dissolution released and which generated new centrifugal thrust under liberalism's tolerant but inflexible aegis.[32]

The process whereby the old order disintegrated concurrently with the foundering of the accustomed alternative, liberalism, formed the experiential backdrop to Vienna's modernist moment, that cocktail of explosively creative tensions which gave impetus to experimental and iconoclastic movements in the arts and sciences.

The sense of upheaval, of crisis and new beginnings, that characterised *fin-de-siècle* Vienna was strongly felt in Budapest too. Here, the contradictions of 'modernisation' were experienced no less acutely. The late nineteenth century had seen absolutism yield rapidly to liberal capitalism, but in the wake of a Europe-wide agricultural crisis liberal economic policy was reversed and protectionism gained ground. The brunt of a 50 per cent fall in agricultural prices was imposed upon agrarian wage earners with the assistance of a series of labour-repressive measures, including a law of 1878 that imposed humiliating conditions on seasonal labourers by exempting their masters from legal liability for 'minor acts of violence'.[33] This was followed at the end of the century by an Act of Parliament – dubbed by contemporaries the Slave Law – that outlawed industrial action by agricultural labourers, made them criminally liable for breaches of seasonal contracts, and provided that fugitive labourers be returned to their place of work by the gendarmerie. Liberals generally supported these measures, on the grounds that they contributed to the restoration of profit margins. On questions of the political constitution, liberalism was no more progressive. The franchise of the Hungarian parliament was very restricted: for the regions studied by Dániel Szabó the electorate in 1890 represented only 5 per cent of the population, rising to 7 per cent in 1910.[34] In effect, proletariat and peasantry were excluded from representation in parliament, as were the minority nationalities (in some cases partially, in others completely). Given the numerical weight of non-Magyars in the Hungarian half of the Dual Monarchy, questions of nationality and democracy became intimately connected, and conservative patriots were able to successfully silence nationalistically minded Hungarian democrats with the warning that universal suffrage would imperil Magyar dominance.[35] The Liberal Party, its backbone formed by the arch-nationalist gentry, opposed democratic reform.

By the turn of the century, then, classical liberalism was no longer the buoyant creed that it had been when Mihály and Cecile were coming of age. The historical conditions their children encountered were conspicuously different. The brief, golden age of Hungarian liberalism had reached its end. Whereas in 1870 most

citizens of Budapest had welcomed economic liberalisation, by 1900, according to historian John Lukacs, 'more and more people were inclined to think that economic liberalism, capitalism and freedom of enterprise profited some people but not others; that the profits of a minority were accumulating at the expense of a majority'.[36] The liberal faith that social progress would arrive courtesy of capitalist development was evaporating. Commodification and marketisation seemed to breed all manner of disagreeable phenomena: the destruction of rural communities, exploitation, moral regression and philistinism. On the political right, middle-class nationalists agitated against immigration and against the oppressed nations' demands for political equality. Anti-liberal sentiment among peasants alloyed with anti-democratic and anti-socialist reaction among the nobility and petit bourgeoisie, enabling a conservative anti-Semitic coalition to form, fronted from 1895 by the Catholic People's Party. Although not a successful mass organisation in the manner of Karl Lueger's Christian Social movement in Austria, the People's Party did help to rally chauvinist sentiment – to the extent that by 1900 'chauvinism' was in common use as a commendatory term by many a Hungarian politician and journalist – and to refashion anti-Semitism from a religious movement directed specifically at practising, non-assimilated Jews into a socio-political movement whose target was determined by 'ethnicity'.[37] The new conservative anti-Semitism was nowhere more visible than at the University of Budapest's Faculty of Law. Polanyi studied there from 1903 to 1907, and found it to be 'the stronghold of political reaction'.[38] During his student years, polarisation between conservative and radical (predominantly Jewish) students reached fever pitch, and he himself was expelled from university for clashing with members of a rival student organisation.

On the political left, in the same period, resistance coalesced around the trade unions and the Social Democratic Party (SDP). They took heart from union- and socialist-led campaigns and revolts elsewhere in Europe, which had clamoured for a widening of the suffrage, and in several cases had brought left-liberal technocratic governments into office. In Hungary, the labour movement pushed questions of welfare to the fore, and led the struggle for democracy – and in so doing helped to ensure the young Karl Polanyi's life-long identification with labour. The movement, however, did not achieve a democratic breakthrough, as the street protests and industrial action of 1905 in Austria had done. Not only was Hungary's labour movement weaker, and its organisations more rigid, but the threat to the central state's territorial claims posed by democratisation in areas with minority nationalities was greater, and this, as mentioned above, caused the liberal bourgeoisie to cling tightly to the coat-tails of the conservative gentry.

With the Liberal Party taking a conservative stance on democracy, and the SDP rigid, parliamentarist and weak, a layer of the intelligentsia existed, Michael

Löwy has observed, that was to an unusual extent free from attachment to political movements linked to the major socio-economic classes – Mannheim's *freischwebende Intelligenz* (the 'free-floating' or 'socially unattached' intelligentsia).[39] This group formed the spine of the movement of 'bourgeois radicals', which challenged classical liberalism from within the broadly liberal camp. Whereas classical liberals were free traders, Christians and supporters of only a minimal franchise, there emerged across *fin-de-siècle* Europe, as Norman Stone has described, a movement of middle-class liberals who adopted a quite different prospectus.

> They were quite violently anti-aristocratic and they regarded religion as mumbo-jumbo. They advocated divorce, and wholly secular education; sometimes, they supported the emancipation of women ... they wanted the franchise to be extended. They were, on the whole, contemptuous of the past and confident of a progressive future, for which the lumber of past centuries should unhesitatingly be swept aside.[40]

Many of Budapest's young bourgeois radicals, including Polanyi, adopted the previous generation's optimistic faith in liberal social advance, but they were not so confident that progress would be steady and linear. A giddy sense of the challenges and contradictions of progress comes across vividly in Polanyi's writings of the pre-war period, notably 'Credo and credulity' (pp. 49–51), 'On the destructive turn' (pp. 52–4), and 'A lesson learned' (pp. 60–3). In contrast to their parents' generation, his encountered darkening trends, not least of anti-Semitism and chauvinism, that bore a warning: the progressive promise of *Gesellschaft*, of Enlightenment values, could not be taken for granted. Some, notably Lukacs, reacted with revulsion against the materialistic, utilitarian civilisation of their era, convinced as they were that 'the dubious material gains of progress have been made at the price of stupendous spiritual loss'.[41] He and his circle shared with conservatives an intense and melancholic awareness of 'life as it was, and is not, and should be'.[42] Unlike conservatives, however, they made no attempt to recapture the traditions of bygone ages. They seemed to possess a deeper, more tragic sense of separation from the past, and sensed that its forms and conventions were irretrievable and probably inappropriate for modern society. To borrow a phrase from Robert Sayre and Michael Löwy, they may be classified alongside Tönnies as 'resigned Romantics'. (The German sociologist's influence was potent, on the young Lukacs and, more enduringly, on Polanyi).[43] For Lukacs especially, but Polanyi too, the past became an instrument of criticism against the present, as well as a model of integrity and synthesis for the future. Like the Romantics, they searched in the past – notably Ancient Greece and medieval Europe – for an imaginary of non-alienated cultures 'when individuals supposedly still felt that their inner selves were adequately reflected by the cultural world around them'.[44] And like their modernist counterparts

elsewhere, they were captivated by primitivism and folk cultures. In cultural forms such as folk music and peasant culture they thought to have discovered the sense of personal wholeness and communal rootedness that they felt to be distressingly absent in industrialising modernity.

Faces of the counter-culture

Budapest's counter-culture was a milieu united in antagonism to absolutism and its liberal props. Its various currents converged around a set of overlapping nodes, of which the most notable were the literary review *Nyugat* ('West'), Jaszi's Sociological Society with its journal *Huszadik Század* ('Twentieth century'), and Polanyi's Galilei Circle with its periodical *Szabadgondolat* ('Free thought'). Within this milieu, the Polanyi family played a central role – so much so that one scholar has remarked that, when perusing the names on the Polanyi family tree, one can easily conclude that, 'with only a little exaggeration, and counting friends, acquaintances and love interests, the entire progressive counter-culture of turn-of-the-century Hungary could be attributed to the Polanyi family'.[45] Karl's elder sister Laura was a pioneering socialist feminist, became one of the first women to graduate with a doctorate from the University of Budapest and founded an experimental kindergarten (later immortalised in the memoirs of one child who attended, Arthur Koestler). One of Karl's brothers, Adolf, was to gain an official position in the 1919 'Councils' Republic' (on which more below), while another, Michael, would achieve fame as a chemist, philosopher and liberal economist. Karl's school friends included Leo Popper, son of the cellist and composer David Popper, whose untimely death he describes and mourns in letters to Maria and Georg Lukacs, 1911–12 (pp. 216–18), and among his cousins was Ervin Szabó, the country's leading Marxist theoretician – whose closest friend, Jaszi, was a former schoolmate of the scholar of jurisprudence and pioneer of economic anthropology, Bódog Somló, who supervised Polanyi's postgraduate study. Another of Polanyi's cousins was the artist Irma Seidler, whose brother, Ernö, was a founder member of the Hungarian Communist Party (CP) and a minister during the Councils' Republic, and whose sister married Emil Lederer, a professor of economics at Heidelberg, referee to Karl Polanyi, mentor to Mannheim and doyen to German academic socialists.[46] Irma herself was the early flame of Lukacs, who was a neighbour and close friend of Cecile and Karl, and was – together with members of his Sunday Circle such as Karl Mannheim – a regular at Cecile's salon. Lukacs' intellectual relationship with Karl was particularly intense from their teenage years until the Great War. A sense of it is conveyed in Karl's letters to him from 1908 and 1912 (pp. 213–19).

Lukacs represents one of the three poles of attraction within the counter-culture to which Polanyi belonged in his teens and twenties. A metaphysical

idealist, he found in romantic philosophy pointers towards a cultural renaissance, and was fiercely critical of what he saw as the insipid, toxic staples of nineteenth-century liberal philosophy: utilitarianism, materialism and determinism. He drank deeply from vitalist and neo-Kantian philosophy which, in various ways, emphasised the distinction between the methods of the natural and the social sciences, between the objective world studied by science and the subjective reality of individual consciousness and social existence. At a 1910 meeting of the Galilei Circle, Lukacs inveighed against positivism, determinism and liberal individualism, those caustic beliefs that acted to dissolve social bonds and attenuate the intellectual basis for conscious human action. In his perspective, as explicated by Mary Gluck,

> it was ultimately positivistic science which was responsible for the fragmented, relativistic world view bequeathed by the nineteenth century to the twentieth. Positivism, he felt, approached nature from a position of passive observation rather than active involvement, and encouraged a view of the world geared to register the reality of atomized individuals and dispersed, disconnected movements.[47]

Lukacs' enthusiasms, alongside Dostoevsky and the Hungarian poet Endre Ady, were chiefly German and French philosophers and sociologists: Nietzsche, Bergson, Dilthey, Simmel and Weber. But there was also a home-grown theorist, Ervin Szabó, to whom he was deeply indebted.[48]

Szabó was the second pole of attraction for Polanyi – indeed, Ilona hails him as 'our spiritual father'.[49] A revolutionary syndicalist, he espoused an ascetic, heroic morality, 'radically opposed to capitalist hedonism and the crude materialism of the bourgeoisie'.[50] He was, according to Jaszi, intimately attached to the peasantry and 'instinctively aware of the morbid and corrupt nature of the big city'.[51] Of the programme and practice of the Social Democratic Party he was a savage critic. It was, he snorted, wedded to a stultifying parliamentarism and controlled by union bureaucrats. The theory that sanctioned its behaviour was not Marxist but Lassallean: a determinism that denies the role in history of human ideas and psychology.[52] Against such 'objective sociology', he would insist – for example, in an address to the Galilei Circle – on the role of conscious human activity, not least in the realm of the 'soul and feelings'.[53] In *Syndicalism and Social Democracy* (1908), he proposed that the labour movement establish its categorical independence from the bourgeoisie. Freedom, passion and the flourishing of the worker's human potential are of greater consequence than the construction of mere institutions – even including those of a future socialist state.

Arguably, Polanyi was closer to Szabó than to Lukacs, and he was effusive in his praise of Szabó's writings: they have 'the power of awakening visions', they will 'educate generations', they demonstrate 'the revolutionary power of ideas' and, in particular, the role of popular traditions as a seedbed of revolution.[54]

More generally, he kept abreast of the progress of the syndicalist phenomenon around Europe. Another of his cousins, Ödön Pór, was active in syndicalist movements in Italy and published, in *New Age*, an enthusiastic piece on the 'national guilds' – cooperatives – of Emilio Romana and Ravenna. Polanyi also followed the course of the Great Unrest (sometimes called the Syndicalist Revolt) in Britain. That country, he remarked in 'The constitution of socialist Britain' (pp. 108–10), had become 'the home of pragmatic radicalism'. He was familiar with the work of G. K. Chesterton and took approving note of his radical proposals for the redistribution of productive property and land. Chesterton was the editor of *Eye-Witness* and a contributor to *New Age*, the principal journals of cultural rebellion in Britain at the time. The crux of Chesterton's interpretation of the Great Unrest was that it was directed against collectivism – including the encroaching 'servile state' and statist forms of socialism.[55] He was, however, close friends with a prominent statist socialist, and one of Polanyi's life-long passions and the subject of one of his earliest published essays, the dramatist George Bernard Shaw.

Alongside romantic anti-capitalism and dissident Marxism, Fabian socialism (or 'positivist reformism') formed the third pole of attraction within the Budapest counter-culture. It was the creed of Shaw, of Polanyi's other teenage idol, H. G. Wells, and of Jaszi.[56] Jaszi, of whom Polanyi was the truest disciple, was very much the 'anti-aristocratic' radical in the sense described by Norman Stone above. Radicalism's mission, he held, was to breathe new life into a liberalism that had become discredited through its association with 'Manchesterism' – the advocacy of free trade as a means of entrenching the dominance of the strong, cynically disguised by the vocabulary of liberty.[57] In sharp contrast to Szabó, he exhorted radicals to pledge themselves to 'industrial capital' in its battle against 'agrarian feudalism',[58] and to rescue 'the part of classical liberalism that is still viable today' – by which he meant tolerance, civil liberties, parliamentary democracy and free trade, but not *laissez-faire* or even, necessarily, private property in the means of production.[59] As sociological inspiration, Jaszi looked above all to the positivism of Herbert Spencer.[60] Positivist sociology, he held, would provide the compass for political reform, enabling a passage to be opened towards a 'new morality, founded on science and human solidarity'.[61] Jaszi believed 'in the power of ideas ... in the invincible strength of truth; in the weakness of the debauched "ancien regime"' and above all 'in the importance of spreading our noble, simple, and clear principles among our fellow men'.[62]

Jaszi also found support from his friend Bernstein, who had broken from the mainstream of the German SPD, refusing its philosophy of history and denouncing its economic determinism, lack of separate ethical agenda and theory of crisis, to become a 'bourgeois radical' of the Fabian stripe.[63] Capitalism, in Bernstein's optic, was not moving towards collapse, and if the

position of workers was becoming intolerable this was due to the uncertainty of their existence in a volatile habitat and not to any sustained tendency to depress their living standards.[64] The enemy was not capitalism or the capitalist state but 'the small group of private interests which stubbornly refused to see the light of reason and social justice'.[65] Accordingly, the method by which to expand working-class influence within society was not class struggle and certainly not revolutionary upheaval but the broadening of the franchise. Together with the Fabians, Achille Loria, Franz Oppenheimer and Eugen Dühring, he inspired the Central European current of liberal socialism, a movement of which Jaszi was Hungary's most prominent exponent, ably assisted by Polanyi.[66] As Polanyi saw it, the 'central pillar' of liberal socialism was the proposition that capitalist exploitation results from the monopoly of land ownership by the capitalist class.[67] When shorn of monopoly excrescences, free market competition would reduce income inequality; its intrinsic logic is egalitarian.[68] As such, it represented the continuation of a current that could be traced back through John Stuart Mill to Adam Smith, centred upon the axiom that the conditions of market exchange cannot be unjust except to the extent that they have been influenced by violence or fraud.

Radical kindling

The moral, cultural and political-economic transformations in which Polanyi, Jaszi, Lukacs and company invested their hopes raised the prospect of a Hungary that would be at ease with itself and in which they would feel at home. No longer would society be fractured along lines of education. The franchise would be extended to all, the oppression of the minority nations would be brought to an end, and the gulf between classes would be reduced or eliminated. In a radical or revolutionary Hungary the counter-culture would become the mainstream, and anti-Semitism would melt away. But how were these goals to be realised? How might the intellectual resources of the counter-culture be put to practical effect? In the young Polanyi's case, his practical activities initially focused upon the Galilei Circle, a freemason-funded organisation of students and young intellectuals.

The Galilei Circle, according to Polanyi, was formed in response to rising chauvinism among students. It attracted youth of a particular social stratum, the 'predominantly Jewish intellectual proletariat'. Its social background 'was one-sided: the children of wealthy families were completely absent'.[69] Its mission was to overcome Hungary's backwardness and inspire national moral regeneration. Its enemies were clericalism, corruption, bureaucracy and the privileged elites who resisted its aims: the establishment of an open liberal (or socialist) society with a modern education system and generously defined and robustly defended

academic and scientific freedoms.[70] Although it aimed to kindle radical flames, and stood for 'universal suffrage, land reform and equal cultural rights for all racial minorities', its emphasis was upon 'the cultural and moral field. It was the first effort, in modern Hungary, to see political activity in ethical terms'.[71] Principally a scholarly and pedagogical enterprise (its motto was 'To learn and to teach'), it kept a distance from politics, narrowly defined. Indeed, its watchword was 'opposition to politics', a slogan through which it demarcated itself sharply from 'the established student movement'.[72]

Within this remit a number of specific agendas were identified. Polanyi saw research in rural sociology as an important task. The Galileists should follow the Russian student movement that had gone 'out to the villages' to meet the people.[73] A higher priority was in the pedagogical field: between its foundation in 1908 and its prohibition in 1917 the Circle organised adult education classes that were attended by tens of thousands of working people.[74] But if it possessed a single defining task it was to introduce and disseminate cutting-edge scientific, cultural and social-scientific thought to the Budapest intelligentsia. At one of its first meetings a debate was held on the topic 'What is scientific truth' – as Polanyi mentions in his letter to Lukacs of 9 December 1908 (pp. 214–15). At another, Polanyi lectured on Ernst Mach's theory of knowledge. ('I remember it distinctly', he describes in a wry, self-deprecating recollection, 'expecting some spectacular result, a manifestation of a change in the audience, perhaps exaltation, or [some] form of transfiguration. But nothing happened ...'[75]) For Polanyi, Mach exemplified *fin-de-siècle* philosophy's abandonment of its tiresome preoccupation with metaphysics, as well as the contemporary shift towards philosophical relativism, and he publicised the Bohemian philosopher's ideas in a number of essays, including 'Culture – pseudo-culture' (pp. 41–4) and 'Preface to Ernst Mach's *The Analysis of Sensations*' (pp. 45–8). Alongside Mach and Richard Avenarius, and Marxist and other socialist theorists, the Galileists engaged with the ideas of thinkers such as Spencer, Albert Einstein and Sigmund Freud.[76] The keynote speakers were often home grown (e.g. Polanyi and Lukacs) or Austrian (Max Adler), but an imposing assortment of foreigners came too, including Bernstein, Roberto Michels, Wilhelm Ostwald and Werner Sombart. The greatest inspiration and support came from the poet Endre Ady, to whom Polanyi wrote a Letter in 1909 (p. 215) and at whose funeral he delivered an 'Oration to the youth of the Galilei Circle' (pp. 74–8). Ady identified with the Galilei students as fellow 'outcasts' and as the 'concrete incarnation in Hungary of that which he discovered, prophesied and loved'. The Bohemian poet, Polanyi was later to reflect, 'was the only renowned leader of "bourgeois radicalism" to regularly connect with the Galilei Circle, which he would visit each year, solemnly, as if it were a spiritual necessity'.[77]

Subsequent to his work for the Galilei Circle, Polanyi moved into the explicitly political realm. He did not see this as his natural habitat. He had no 'talent' or 'interest' in politics, he once wrote – not without a soupçon of hyperbole – and had 'never been a politician'.[78] Yet in the early 1910s he engaged intensively in the political sphere, producing strategic discussion papers for, and participating in the creation of, a political party. Variously translated as 'National Citizens Radical Party' and 'Radical Bourgeois Party', for Polanyi the operative term was 'radical'. In the meaning he gives it, for example in 'Believing and unbelieving politics' (pp. 99–107), radicalism expresses a politics of 'belief', of following one's ideals to their conclusion, in contrast to Marxism (which in Polanyi's interpretation posits reality as a merely objective process) and to traditional liberalism, a current that had forsaken its idealistic past. He was dismayed that Hungarian liberals, in shameful contrast to their rebellious forebears of 1848, were pusillanimous in the face of clerical conservatism. Why had liberalism lost its vitality, he wondered; why had it foresworn all revolutionary initiative and become a reactionary movement? The answer lay not in material developments – such as the ascendancy of liberalism's chosen economic system, capitalism, or the threat to private property in the means of production posed by the rise of organised labour – but, he spelled out in his 'Speech on the meaning of conviction' (pp. 55–9), in a 'disastrous idea' that had gripped the social sciences and radical politics alike. This novel view, he elaborated in 'A lesson learned' (pp. 60–3), was 'political fatalism', the blind belief in continuous progress, with the relegation of political action to a mere hand servant. Infected with this spirit, liberalism had abandoned any serious fight against the rule of the large landowners and the Church, and although social democracy had at least taken up the campaign to extend the franchise, it too found itself weighed down by immobilising, fatalistic doctrines, suffered from 'anti-intellectualism', and had 'isolated itself from the instinctive revolutionary spirit of the intellectual proletariat'.[79]

By what means could radical Hungary be shaken from its torpor? What was required in order to re-kindle the spirit of 1848? On the intellectual stage the task was clear: to combat fatalism. But what of politics? Here, matters were more complex, and to grasp Polanyi's views and strategic proposals it is necessary to first comprehend his class analysis of the contemporary Hungarian scene. In his assessment, the Hungarian state, even though it had presided over rapid industrialisation and a burgeoning and confident bourgeoisie, remained dominated by landowning interests and the Church and was therefore fundamentally a feudal institution. The upper bourgeoisie was represented by the powerful Liberal Party, and the rapidly expanding manual-industrial working class by the Social Democratic Party, but in the intervening space, he argued in 'The programme and goals of radicalism' (pp. 181–90), 'Radical Party and bourgeois

party' (pp. 191–6) and 'Manual and intellectual labour' (pp. 197–203), a 'new middle class' had come into being, encompassing white collar workers, private and public officials and the intelligentsia (including, *inter alia*, priests, actors and academics). In this, Polanyi was adopting a theory that had been elaborated in the 1890s by the German Historical Schoolmen Gustav Schmoller, Gerhard von Schultze-Gävernitz and Sombart, and popularised by Bernstein. Polanyi's analysis, grouping as it does blue- and white-collar workers together with the upper-middle-class practitioners of 'mental labour' as a single stratum, is obfuscatory, and no less confusing is his use of diverse, even contradictory, labels to refer to it, including 'intelligentsia', 'intellectual class', 'intellectual workers' and 'bourgeois'. Be that as it may, the inferences he drew were clear: that the two 'classes', although inextricably united in their destiny, were innately different in nature, the manual worker being 'necessarily materialist' and concerned above all with economic matters 'while the intellectual worker is necessarily idealist'. This difference in character and outlook necessitated their separate organisation into bourgeois radical and social democratic parties.

In a raft of articles and speeches in the run-up to the Great War, Polanyi advocated a loose but meaningful association between social democracy and bourgeois radicalism, based upon a division of labour with regard to constituency – on one hand, the working class; on the other, radical elements of the bourgeoisie and intelligentsia, together with minority nationalities and the peasantry – and with regard to long-term goals. 'Bourgeois politics and the struggle against feudalism,' he asserted in 'Bourgeois radicals, socialists and the established opposition' (pp. 174–80), would be carried out by the radicals, 'while the socialists will represent the labour movement and the struggle against capitalism'. The area of common ground would consist of the immediate goals towards which the practical activities of the two parties would be oriented: the overthrow of feudalism and clericalism and the expansion of the franchise. In conclusion, he asserted, the radical intelligentsia should assume hegemony over the progressive camp, including the working class.

This strategy, Polanyi believed, held out tremendous promise for a progressive Hungary. The formation of an intellectual middle-class party that was prepared to 'besiege the fortress of feudalism out of bourgeois interests and with bourgeois forces' would arouse the latter from their stupor and hoist the bourgeoisie back on to its emancipatory track. It would at last create a platform within parliament that would be able to provide serious and genuine opposition to the rule of the landowners and the Church, in the process ensuring that the axis of public life would swivel such that 'the struggle between forces of progress and reaction' would henceforth take centre stage. For the labour movement organisations, too, the creation of a Radical Party could not but be beneficial, for in place of well-meaning intellectual advisors they would gain a strong middle-

class ally – to the support of which they should, Polanyi advised in 'Radical bourgeois politics' (pp. 169–70), pledge their unconditional allegiance.

Polanyi's strategic thinking was developed in close conference with Jaszi, who appointed him deputy leader of the Radical Bourgeois Party in 1914.[80] The core points of its programme were the extension of the franchise, land redistribution, free trade, education reform and federalisation. The last of these, aimed at assuaging the demands for autonomy of the minority nationalities while maintaining the borders of Greater Hungary, was seen by conservatives and anti-Semites as a cosmopolitan plot to undermine 'Magyardom', yet if the radicals' nationalities policy deserves criticism it is, on the contrary, for being insufficiently appreciative of the oppressions inflicted upon the minority nations. Of the two chief arguments that Polanyi deployed in justification of the case for federalism, one was that in its absence the nationalities would be tempted to ally themselves with absolutism against democracy in order to block the formation of a Magyar-dominated state, but the other, although avowedly democratic in inspiration, was brazenly, even arrogantly, nationalistic: an argument from Magyar cultural supremacy, as laid out in 'Magyar hegemony and the nationalities' (pp. 171–3). This was an outlook typical of the bourgeois Jewish milieu of the pre-war Habsburg Empire. Although in many respects oppressed and excluded, their trajectory appeared to be towards rapid and successful integration into Hungarian civil society. As such, they found it difficult to comprehend the discrepancy between their aspirations and those of newly mobilising national minorities.

The Radical Bourgeois Party did not live up to Polanyi's hopes. Clearly, the date of its foundation – June 1914 – was inauspicious. But there were deeper reasons too. Although programmatically committed to an alliance with the peasantry and minority nationalities, in practice it was unable to reach beyond its core constituency in the left-liberal intelligentsia. Quite simply, according to Jaszi, it 'was of too intellectual a type' to gain mass support.[81] In Gluck's harsher judgement, Jaszi, Polanyi and their colleagues were the epitome of 'a fastidious intellectual elite who were, on occasion, glad to give lectures for the edification of working-class audiences; were more than ready to theorise about the 'proletariat' as an abstraction' while remaining essentially ignorant of, and indifferent towards, the concrete, individual manifestations of working-class and peasant life.[82]

The moment for the radicals to attempt to break out of their niche did arrive, in autumn 1918, in an uprising known as the Chrysanthemum Revolution. Its genesis can be traced to December 1917, when workers' councils were established in factories and a network of them swiftly spread – with vigorous support from a new generation of Galileists.[83] The first half of 1918 witnessed a general strike, scores of wildcat strikes and revolts in the barracks.[84] Amid worsening

social conditions and with defeat in war looming, the political mood, as elsewhere in Central and Eastern Europe, swung abruptly towards republicanism, social democracy and communism. Jaszi's memoirs captured the *Zeitgeist* vividly:

> The spirit of revolution had penetrated into every sphere of human relations in the course of September and October. Men lost all interest in everyday affairs and were looking fixedly into the future. … An electrician's apprentice, come to repair the wires, prophesied that we were on the threshold of revolution and appalling events. The maid bringing in the soup told us that she had it from her relatives in the country that the old world would last very little longer now. The young men [*sic*!] of the Galileo Club pursued their anti-militarist propaganda almost openly, and the imprisonment of a few of them only increased their revolutionary enthusiasm. Soldiers and even officers spoke aloud in public of the collapse of the front. In the tram one heard passionate outbursts against the war, the authorities and the propertied classes.[85]

In the early autumn, the social democrats joined forces with the Radical Bourgeois Party and Count Michael Károlyi to form the Hungarian National Council (HNC). In October, Károlyi, whose aim was a peaceful and orderly transition to liberal democracy, warned the parliament in Budapest and the Emperor in Vienna that Hungary faced the choice between an HNC-led government and Bolshevism. When neither legislators nor monarch responded to the threat, the social democrats, by far the strongest component of the HNC, sought to entrench their bargaining position by appealing to the workers and soldiers to act. The response exceeded their expectations, and took them utterly by surprise: a wave of street demonstrations, strikes and mutinies hoisted them into power.[86]

In its initial phase the Chrysanthemum Revolution was characterised by the spirit of unity that typifies the first stages of revolutions in which the working and middling layers of society band together against an autocratic regime. Jaszi's memoirs record his elation at the concord between classes and between nationalities that prevailed during those spirited days.[87] I have little doubt that Polanyi felt the same, and he, like Jaszi, also drew attention to the critical role played by Galileists. He awards the plaudits for the revolt's success first and foremost to 'the leaders whose foresight and courage made it possible for a new democratic Hungary to rally round their persons' and, secondly, to 'the revolutionary discipline of the Hungarian masses'.[88] In 'The Galilei Circle: a balance sheet' (pp. 204–8), he credits the 'fervour and the integrity of the revolution' and its 'unblemished brilliance' to the 'students' movement "Galilei"', which had raised a generation selflessly devoted to 'the rights and the truth of others'. Nevertheless, the Chrysanthemum episode did not fulfil Polanyi's expectations, let alone his hopes.

If the HNC government experienced a honeymoon period it was not to last for more than a few weeks and its demise was predictable, with Károlyi widely seen as playing Kerensky's role in Hungary's faltering recapitulation of

the Russian revolution.[89] Its first step was to autonomously sign an armistice with the Allies, breaking from Vienna in the process, but it immediately found itself in troubled waters. Although committed to gradual reforms within a liberal framework, it had been hoisted to power by mass movements that were pressing for wholesale changes that pointed beyond the limits of parliamentary-democratic capitalism. In Budapest a potential rival power had arisen in the form of the soldiers' and workers' councils. In the countryside, peasants agitated for land redistribution. On the perimeter, national minorities were moving to secede.

The initial euphoria notwithstanding, the unity for which Polanyi yearned was hardly to be realised under Károlyi's provisional government. Instead, social polarisation ensued. On one side, the old ruling classes mobilised against the incoming government. ('As there had been scarcely any social welfare in the past', Károlyi's wife, Catherine, recalls in her memoirs, even the mildest measures 'could irritate and alarm the ruling classes'.)[90] On the other, movements of workers and peasants, their political confidence raised by their central part in the Chrysanthemum Revolution, pressed for further demands: land redistribution, improvements to pay and conditions and socialist economic policies. According to Károlyi, his government did its level best to dampen the demands of the 'popular classes' while displaying the utmost magnanimity to the bishops, counts, princes and bank directors. 'We were', he reflected with the benefit of hindsight, 'bitterly to regret this generous attitude'.[91]

On the whole, Polanyi regarded the HNC government as his own, but he lamented its lack of a 'clear and feasible political programme' (a fault for which, as explained in 'The Galilei Circle: a balance sheet' (pp. 204–8), he blamed himself, for having neglected to use the Circle to cultivate a revolutionary intelligentsia skilled in the arts of political campaigning and administration). Of the government he demanded 'more determination ... against every breath of the counter-revolution', the acceleration 'of the economic construction of socialism', a retreat from its protectionist economic policies, and an end to its 'chauvinist attitude in the nationalities question'.[92] He supported the HNC in its rivalry with the communists, but in December he initiated a debate on Bolshevism in his journal *Szabadgondolat* and, at his request, the first to air their views, alongside Jaszi, were the communist Eugene Varga, and Georg Lukacs, who was at the time moving rapidly into the communist camp. His own contributions to the unfolding debate, including 'The test of socialism' (pp. 86–91), were astringently critical of Bolshevism, and yet did credit it with being 'the only serious representative of socialism'.

Despite the widespread goodwill that Károlyi's government had earned by signing the armistice and extending the franchise, few constituencies felt that their demands were being met. Land reform proceeded in dilatory fashion:

the government divided up a mere handful of large estates, including Károlyi's own, as compared to scores that were occupied 'from below'. Citing 'the general lack of energy of the government and its indifference to the progress of the revolution', Jaszi resigned his cabinet position in January.[93] In February, liberal values were thrown overboard when, following an unsuccessful attempt to expel communists from the trade unions and workers' councils, the cabinet authorised the rounding up and imprisonment of leaders and cadre of the fledgling CP and banned its newspaper. Polanyi had little sympathy for communism, and spelt out his objections in numerous articles, such as 'Law and violence' (pp. 92–4), but the incarceration of the CP's leading members, he observed in a companion article, 'Civil war' (pp. 95–8), was causing people who were otherwise unsympathetic to its cause to suspect that there may be truth and justice in its views.

By March 1919, Károlyi's government found itself under attack from Czech-Slovak, Serb and Romanian armies, and was ordered by the French government to withdraw its forces to the borders drawn up by the victorious powers at Versailles. Although Károlyi had supported the Wilsonian peace, the Allies confronted his government with punitive demands, to which it could not realistically accede without first crushing domestic opposition: an impossible task. Mass movements were gaining in strength, with peasants seizing land, workers taking industrial action in support of the imprisoned communists, and a soviet assuming control of the southern provincial capital of Szeged. As Bernstein observed, the government faced a choice between instigating a bloodbath against the 'tempestuous unrest' of the left-turning masses or relinquishing power.[94] Furthermore, 'the hold of Bolshevism was greatly strengthened', reported Jaszi, 'by the growth throughout the country of counter-revolutionary movements', a development for which he held the Károlyi government responsible, for it had permitted the chief conspirators among the whites 'to continue their work undisturbed'.[95] In view of the palpable reality of counter-revolutionary movements, which the HNC government failed to confront, 'revolutionary Hungary stood in fear and trembling; it was generally felt that [the Károlyi] government was no longer able to save the October Revolution; and if a choice had to be made between White and Red ... the Red was preferred'.[96]

With his authority crumbling, Károlyi resigned and handed the reins to the social democrats. Yet they too were in disarray, their support leaching rapidly to the communists, especially among what Jaszi referred to as 'the great masses of the rag, tag and bobtail' – peasants, soldiers and workers.[97] According to Bernstein, 'the sympathies not only of the mass of the proletariat but also of substantial segments of the bourgeoisie, including the bourgeois intelligentsia, veered temporarily to the communists'.[98] Whole sections of the Social Democratic Party, including its Youth League, went over, and of those that remained,

an important segment sought rapprochement with – or, more accurately, co-optation of – the CP. In this manoeuvre, international considerations played a decisive role, given the belief in the SDP's leading ranks that before long the Russian Red Army would break through Romanian lines and reach Hungary's eastern borders. 'We must take … from the East what has been denied to us by the West', declared one SDP leader, in explanation of his party's 'left' turn.

> The army of the Russian proletariat is approaching rapidly. A bourgeois government … will not be able to cope with these new developments. … the Communist comrades immediately must be released from prison and tomorrow … we shall announce to the entire world that the proletariat of this country has taken the guidance of Hungary and at the same time offered its fraternal alliance to the Soviet Russian government.[99]

This was an act of desperation, and its effectiveness would depend upon 'the stupidity, inexperience, and gullibility of the Communist Party leadership'. Yet these were, as John Rees remarks, 'qualities that Béla Kun and his comrades possessed in abundance'.[100] By agreeing to the fusion, and against advice from Moscow, the communists entered government. Although both the new government and Communist Party were led by Kun, his comrades took a minority of the senior positions in both institutions.

Kun's Councils' Republic implemented innovative policies, especially in the cultural and educational fields.[101] It planted in the minds of the mass of the population, according to Jaszi, 'perhaps the first seeds of faith and hope of liberation', and 'shook out of their age-long apathy the unhappy helots of Hungarian society, the agricultural workers'. It was thanks to the Republic, he added, that

> there lives in the hearts of millions the sense of the rights of the workers and of their superiority to the drones and idlers. … No less important was the service of the Soviet Republic to the idea of internationalism, made vivid and real in the minds of the people by the memory of hard and bloody conflicts.[102]

A portion of its popularity, in addition, related to the Entente's intention of reducing Hungary's territory, with nationalists of all political colours praying that the new regime would imbibe something of Soviet Russia's spirit in rejecting the impositions of the Great Powers.

However, the conditions that the Councils' Republic faced, including economic collapse, food shortages and ongoing military attacks, were as inclement as those endured by the Bolshevik-led government in Russia, and Hungary's communists were far less experienced than their Muscovite mentors. In agricultural policy, as Jaszi describes, whereas 'Lenin recognised, with statesmanlike intuition', that in a predominantly agricultural country 'it is out of the question to make a revolution against the will of the peasantry', such that wholesale land redistribution is unavoidable, his Hungarian comrades sought to press ahead full throttle with collectivisation.[103] Equally problematic was their

policy of rapid industrial nationalisation. Already in mid-April, one Councils' Republic functionary could crow that 'we have succeeded within four weeks in socialising more than 1,000 concerns, while the Russians socialised no more than 513 in a whole year'.[104] Revolutionary bravado was inversely related to revolutionary legitimacy. Whereas the Bolsheviks had existed since 1903 and had gained a clear majority in the workers' and soldiers' councils in 1917, Hungary's CP had not yet celebrated its first birthday and, although undoubtedly popular in the councils, it had come to power by sleight of hand: a baroque, bureaucratic manoeuvre, a choreographed wedding to a governing party. It was a marriage that Polanyi viewed with ambivalence. Although sharply critical of the new government, and also of the left social democrats for having abandoned Károlyi in favour of an alliance with Bolsheviks, he recognised that no alternative regime could have been installed, and accepted a minor official position.[105]

The Councils' Republic was not to survive long. Domestically opposition grew, and support among the peasantry in particular evaporated.[106] But the blows that brought it down were delivered by foreign hands. Even before it could celebrate its first month, it was invaded by Western-backed armies from Romania and Czechoslovakia. They pushed Hungary's Red Army back almost as far as Budapest, where, in a remarkable turnaround, it was reorganised, received an infusion of energy from the working-class neighbourhoods, and marched out once again, recapturing lost ground and pushing deep into Slovakia, where a 'soviet republic' was proclaimed.[107] In July, Hungarian forces began an offensive into Romania across the Tisza River, hoping to connect with Soviet forces in Ukraine. But, under pressure from Paris to comply with the terms of Versailles, and facing counter-attacks from Romanian forces, they retreated and, after only nineteen weeks in office, Kun's government resigned.[108] Power passed to the social democrats, only to be swiftly usurped by Romanian generals. They, and their French-backed successor, the dictatorship of Miklós Horthy, instituted a reign of terror in which thousands lost their lives – above all communists, socialists and Jews. Fortunately for the Jewish socialist Karl Polanyi, he had by then reached the safety of Vienna.

From exile to exile

Budapest's radical counter-culture appeared close to achieving its dreams during the revolutionary tumult of 1918–19, but as it subsided, the counter-culture was rapidly dispersed. Some of its adherents remained in Horthy's Hungary while others, including Jaszi, Lukacs and Polanyi, departed. In exile, Jaszi's political outlook solidified into an orthodox, and zealously anti-Marxist, liberalism. Lukacs, having committed to Bolshevism in 1918, produced ground-breaking political philosophy in Vienna, and later sidled towards a reformist variant of

orthodox communism. Polanyi, his worldview shaped by the broadly congruent dichotomies of 'father and mother', 'Britain and Russia', populist socialism and rationalist liberalism, resisted identifying himself with either communism, liberalism or mainstream social democracy but groped instead for a 'third way' – a social arrangement in which democracy could be extended into the workplace without necessitating the complete abolition of markets. Whether or not that project was feasible, it provided the core *problematique* and the impetus behind those creative inquiries into economic history and anthropology that were to establish his reputation in the latter half of the twentieth century. It was in Vienna that this research programme began to assume its recognisable contours.

Polanyi lived in Vienna from 1919 to 1933, and for the first few years in particular he retained close connections with the Hungarian exile community. From 1921 to 1923 he worked for the *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (BMÚ), the foremost publishing organ of Hungarian émigrés and exiles, edited by Jaszi. Its scope was global but its most dedicated task was to monitor Horthy's reign of terror in Hungary – a regime that it described, already in 1922, as 'Magyar fascizmus'.[109] A sample of Polanyi's BMÚ pieces are compiled in this volume. In previous years he had published sporadically on matters of international political economy and international relations, e.g. 'The clowns of world peace' (pp. 129–37), but as a professional journalist these now became his staple topics, as for example his BMÚ essays 'The question of war and peace in Geneva' (pp. 143–5) and 'Uncle Polly' (pp. 146–8). But his brief for the BMÚ was broader than political economy. He reported on an imposing range of subject areas, from the Irish civil war to Iraq's oil industry, from Gandhi to the rise of multinational corporations, and from prison reform to the historical meaning of Christianity, 'The resurrection of Jesus' (pp. 78–80).[110] In addition, he filed regular reports on the political affairs of an array of European countries, particularly Germany, Britain and its empire, e.g. 'Whites, blacks and browns' (pp. 161–2), and Russia, e.g. 'The historical background of the social revolutionaries (pp. 123–6), as well as numerous book reviews, typically on either economic affairs or socialist goals and strategy, e.g. 'Karl Kautsky and democracy' (pp. 114–17). However, probably of greatest interest to readers today is his series of reviews and articles – among which 'New era' (pp. 138–40), 'Titanic journalism' (pp. 151–4) and 'The rebirth of democracy' (pp. 149–50) stand out – in which he sketched his diagnosis of the spiritual-political crisis of the post-war conjuncture.

In this enterprise Polanyi was particularly influenced by the thought of H. G. Wells. He had long venerated the Fabian novelist, as can be seen in 'H. G. Wells, the socialist' (pp. 111–13),[111] and was acutely impressed by his *The Salvaging of Civilization*, which he reviewed for the BMÚ. Modern civilisation, Wells argued, had produced a plenitude of scientific knowledge and this had

immensely expanded 'the physical range of human activities', yet there had been no commensurate 'adjustment of men's political ideas to the new conditions'.[112] In consequence, society lacked cohesion and resilience.[113] In 'H. G. Wells on salvaging civilisation' (pp. 155–8), Polanyi highlighted Wells' anxiety over the challenges that faced his generation, and his proposition that humanity's technological powers were outpacing the progress of its moral faculties. But in explaining the root cause of the crisis he placed greater emphasis than his Fabian hero upon the rise of market society. Market prices, he argued in 'Titanic journalism' (pp. 151–4), had come to 'rule everything, but nobody ruled them'. In essays such as this, one can witness the first threads of Polanyi's masterwork, *The Great Transformation*, being spun.

In his BMÚ journalism, Polanyi not only elaborated his diagnosis of the post-war civilisational crisis – which he had first adumbrated in 'The calling of our generation' (pp. 64–73) – but also sketched out his prescription. For some years he had identified with guild socialism, and he now introduced it to the Hungarian émigré community by way of BMÚ articles, notably 'Guild socialism' (pp. 118–20) and 'Guild and state' (pp. 121–2). Guild socialism was the product of an unlikely coalescence of a Fabian faith in parliamentary democracy, syndicalist workers' self-government and romantic anti-capitalism – a trinity which, if transposed on to the Hungarian counter-culture, maps precisely to Jaszi, Szabó and Lukacs. Initiated during the Great Unrest, it was sometimes referred to as 'English syndicalism', where 'English' connoted an opposition to abrupt change and a saturation in the culture of liberalism. As its most eminent adherent, Bertrand Russell, put it, whereas the syndicalists accept, from Marx, the doctrine of class struggle and, from anarchism, the immediate abolition of political power, 'the Guild Socialists, though some persons in this country regard them as extremists, really represent the English love of compromise'.[114] For Polanyi, one may speculate, it represented a happy junction between 'England' and 'Russia', father and mother.

Socialism, during Polanyi's first years in Vienna, seemed to be on the march, and his political thought entered a period of change. In economics, he remained committed to the doctrine and policy of free trade. For example, in the BMÚ he published paeans to the tradition of Smith, Cobden and Bright ('all that is good and valuable in British politics today is inherited from the free traders') and impassioned pleas for pan-European tariff reductions – the means by which the continent's 'natural division of labour' could and should be restored.[115] At the same time, as noted above, his thoughts on the market economy were becoming more critical.[116] He reappraised his commitments of the previous decades, developing a critique of the Galilei Circle for its apolitical intellectualism and of the Radical Bourgeois Party for its failure to reach out to the masses. He tirelessly propagated the guild socialist case, and in his social thought he warmed to soci-

ology, and even to Marxism. His arrival in Vienna had seen his antipathy to Marxism reach its acme, but he had simultaneously become impatient with the individualistic moralism that had captivated him for some years, the voluntaristic, Tolstoyan advocacy of a moral path through the strait gate to salvation. This outlook, he now argued, failed to properly appreciate the interdependence of individual and society – in his phrase, 'the reality of society'.[117] In the course of this intellectual transformation he attempted to reconcile an 'idealist' commitment to action with a recognition of the determining function of social structures – but with little success, either at the level of practical activity or theoretical reflection. He would periodically reiterate his lifelong commitment to 'energetic intervention' in the political process, but, unlike Ilona, he remained largely aloof from social movement activity, and when events in the mid-1920s afforded Austria's Social Democratic Workers' Party the opportunity of 'energetic intervention' he did not join his Marxist wife in agitating for it so to do.

After the radical upsurge of the early 1920s had begun to subside, Polanyi paid greater critical attention to movements of the political right. In 'The defenders of race in Berlin' (pp. 159–60) he scrutinised the early stirrings of European fascism, and in 1927, at the beginning of the authoritarian episode that was shortly to consume Austria, his letter to the editor of *A Láthatár* (pp. 219–20) conveys a tremor of anxiety at the 'concrete reality' of fascism. As the decade reached its close, public life came to be punctuated by paroxysms of anti-Semitism. In 1931 the fascist *Heimwehr* attempted a 'march on Vienna', and a year later Austria's Nazi Party achieved its electoral breakthrough. For Polanyi, as a socialist working for a left-leaning newspaper, the pressure to leave Austria grew intense. In early 1933 he departed for his next station of exile: London.

'Re-conquered for Hungary'

During his stay in Britain, Polanyi's engagement with the Hungarian exile community was limited, but in the latter years of the war, after returning from a spell of research in the USA during which he completed *The Great Transformation*, he renewed his connections to Hungary's anti-fascist opposition in London, in particular to Károlyi's New Democratic Hungary Movement. Its goals were to promote the war effort, to support the fight for Hungary's liberation from fascist rule and to prepare for its post-war democratic future, with Károlyi as presumptive president.

The Hungarian exile community in Britain was far from homogeneous. This was the case within the anti-fascist camp, broadly defined, but also within the smaller bounds of Károlyi's movement. There were political variances, particularly over attitudes to Soviet communism, divisions along class lines and differences in outlook between 'old' immigrants and more recent arrivals. In the US,

similar cleavages were found. Károlyi's organisation stateside, the American Federation of Democratic Hungarians (AFDH), was led by some of his earliest US-based supporters – including Jaszi. But in 1943 it split, with the formation of a pro-communist breakaway, the Hungarian-American Democratic Council (HADC). Polanyi did not involve himself in the fracas, but he did make it clear, in a letter to Károlyi of 6 December 1944 (p. 220), that his sympathies essentially lay with Jaszi.

In Britain, provisional unity among the various anti-Horthy movements was achieved in the form of a Hungarian Council headed by Károlyi, yet beneath the surface, fractures parallel to those in the US were pervasive. Polanyi maintained, for example in his letter to Jaszi of 15 May 1946 (pp. 224–5), that the Council should take care not to become an 'appendage of the communists', and yet, unlike his former mentor, he had become broadly sympathetic to communism. The Council's internal politics were complicated additionally by the communist movement's nationalist lurch, which saw communists allying informally with conservative nationalists who were profoundly suspicious of Károlyi's project in general and of his social democrat supporters in particular – the very constituency that Polanyi was keen to encourage. This, he recalled in the same letter, threatened to make 'left-wing cooperation impossible'.

The most constructive role for his own person, Polanyi believed, would be to provide Károlyi's movement with in-depth political analysis aimed at facilitating rapprochement among communists, social democrats and anti-Horthy liberals. Given that the latter two constituencies' suspicions of communism represented an egregious sticking point, the thrust of his written output was oriented to rehabilitating Soviet Russia. In 1945, he held out hope for a worldwide socialist transformation that would include Hungary, under Soviet aegis, and Britain, as indicated in his 'The emergence of the Crossman opposition' (pp. 163–6). It was at this moment in the relationship between Károlyi and Polanyi that the Soviet question began seriously to itch. The background was the Soviet Army's advance towards Hungary and the formation in the Soviet-occupied East of a provisional government – *sans* Károlyi. In response to the snub, the Count's attitude to the Soviets cooled, as did his determination to take an active part in Hungarian politics. In discussions at Károlyi's Hampstead residence, Polanyi, as he recounted in his letter to Károlyi of 15 April 1946 (pp. 220–4), charged his friend with vacillation and a political abstentionism which, although the consequence of a 'passionate, unbreakable fidelity to his principles' that may have been admirable in the abstract, prevented effective intervention in the real world. He urged Károlyi that if he were to demonstrate clear support for the Soviet-backed administration in Budapest, this would in the medium term facilitate the formation of a popular left-wing regime, helping to consolidate progressive politics throughout the region.

Through 1945 and 1946, Polanyi followed Károlyi's trajectory with concern. This was not, he thought, an appropriate moment to confront the Soviet military administration and the Communist Party. The Russians had liberated Hungary, and the communists' publications, he was pleased to relate to his friend Endre Havas in a letter of 25 October 1946 (pp. 226–7), revealed 'greater progress with regard to the reception of healthy ideas from the West' than Westerners managed 'towards an understanding and fruitful application of the healthy ideas of Marxism'. He attempted to convince Károlyi to defend the regime, but in vain. Before long, Károlyi's fears concerning Soviet rule in Hungary were confirmed, and the Count retired from the fray.

For the next decade, Polanyi had relatively little to do with Hungary, but that changed with the 1956 revolution – which he hailed, in a letter to Istvan Meszaros of 24 April 1961 (pp. 237–8), as one of the 'most pure' in world history. He took a very close interest in it, and penned a number of essays, notably 'Concealed foreign rule and socialist economics' (pp. 209–10), that sought to explain its origins. Essentially, the problem lay in Moscow's suzerainty over Hungary, for independence, in Polanyi's understanding, is indispensable to a functioning socialist society, and where it was lacking, the 'strains' within the socialist system would only multiply.[118] However, he was careful to distinguish his interpretation from that which held the rising to have been liberal-nationalist, fought under the colours of 1848. What that perspective missed was that at the heart of the movement lay an alliance between, even a fusion of, anti-Stalinist revisionists and Hungarian populists.

The 1956 revolt was cruelly crushed. Yet it had, Polanyi believed, illuminated the constituency from which a progressive Hungary would arise, namely, 'the Populists' linkage with the now persecuted Party-reformers'.[119] Moreover, he hoped, the thousands of intellectuals who fled to the West in its aftermath would bring populist-revisionist ideas with them, to the benefit of the exile community. In this, he was to be sorely disappointed. Hungarian expatriate journals, he complained in a letter to the editors of one of them, Új Látóhatár, 24 April 1961 (pp. 236–7), came to act exclusively on behalf of 'American interests and ends'. However, in Hungary itself, the uprising had indeed excited revisionist thinking, about which Polanyi was always eager to hear more – as for example in his letters to György Heltai of 1960 (pp. 231–2) and to Lukacs of 25 January 1964 (p. 239). He set out to amplify the voice of Hungarian revisionism and populism in the West, by editing, jointly with Ilona, an anthology of Hungarian poetry, *The Plough and the Pen*. For purposes of political enlightenment, poetry seemed a peculiarly appropriate medium. A poet, Sándor Petőfi, had been the torch-bearer of Hungary's liberal revolution in the nineteenth century – and it was one of his poems that Polanyi had read forth at his school-leaving celebration decades earlier. For his own 'reform generation', Ady had played a similar role.

Contemporaneously with the preparation of *The Plough and the Pen*, Polanyi devoted himself to a new project, the journal *Co-Existence*. It was a venture that required considerable application and diplomacy, as can be seen in Polanyi's letters to Meszaros of 1961 (pp. 232–8) and to Lukacs of 27 May 1963 (pp. 238–9). He and Ilona contacted friends and acquaintances, seeking help with the journal. Alongside Polanyi himself, the active core of the editorial board was envisaged as Joan Robinson, Thomas Hodgkin and Rudolf Schlesinger. Robinson was an economist of the Kalecki-Keynesian stripe; Hodgkin and Schlesinger were former communists. Schlesinger was close to Ilona but not to her husband,[120] and his appointment to the position of editor-in-chief owed much to her. Other thinkers who were slated to write for the journal included the socialist sinologist Joseph Needham, and the dissident Marxist Ernst Bloch.[121] The goals of *Co-Existence* were threefold: to challenge cold-war propaganda, give a voice to neutralist and socialist values, and work towards the reconciliation of the Western and Soviet spheres. Given the fusion of influences – from paternal West and maternal Russia – that had formed Karl Polanyi's intellectual and political psyche, it was an appropriate valedictory project.

Notes

1 SPSL-536-1, Karl Polanyi (1934) to Walter Adams, 31 March.
2 Part of this introductory essay draws upon Gareth Dale, 'Karl Polanyi in Budapest: on his political and intellectual formation', *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, 50.1 (2009).
3 Ilona Duczynska, 'I first met Karl Polanyi in 1920...', in Kenneth McRobbie and Kari Polanyi-Levitt (eds), *Karl Polanyi in Vienna: The Contemporary Significance of the Great Transformation* (Black Rose Books, 2000), 303–7.
4 SPSL-536-1, Karl Polanyi to Zoe Fairfield (24 March 1934).
5 Duczynska, 'I first met Karl Polanyi', 303; Judith Szapor, *The Hungarian Pocahontas: The Life and Times of Laura Polanyi Stricker, 1882–1959* (East European Monographs, 2005), 15.
6 Kari Polanyi-Levitt, telephone interview, 8 November 2007.
7 SPSL-536-1, Karl Polanyi to Zoe Fairfield (24 March 1934).
8 Quoted in David Rechter, *The Jews of Vienna and the First World War* (The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2001), 26.
9 Derek Sayer, *Prague, Capital of the Twentieth Century: A Surrealist History* (Princeton University Press, 2013), 123.
10 Andrew Janos, 'The decline of the oligarchy: bureaucratic and mass politics in the Age of Dualism, 1867–1918', in Andrew Janos and William Slottman (eds), *Revolution in Perspective: Essays on the Hungarian Soviet Republic of 1919* (University of California Press, 1971), 35; Andrew Janos, *The Politics of Backwardness in Hungary, 1825–1945* (Princeton University Press, 1982), 176.
11 Janos, *Politics of Backwardness*, 180–1.
12 Szapor, *Hungarian Pocahontas*, 17.

13 Endre Nagy, 'After brotherhood's Golden Age: Karl and Michael Polanyi', in Kenneth McRobbie (ed.), *Humanity, Society and Commitment: On Karl Polanyi* (Black Rose Books, 1994), 39.
14 György Enyedi and Viktória Szirmai, *Budapest: A Central European Capital* (Belhaven Press, 1992), 67.
15 Janos, 'Decline of the oligarchy', 36–8.
16 *Ibid*., 36.
17 Janos, *Politics of Backwardness*, 181.
18 Gabriel Piterberg, *The Returns of Zionism: Myths, Politics and Scholarship in Israel* (Verso, 2008).
19 Isaac Deutscher, *The Non-Jewish Jew and Other Essays* (Oxford University Press, 1968), 27.
20 Quoted in Janos, *Politics of Backwardness*, 181.
21 SPSL-536-1, Karl Polanyi to Zoe Fairfield (24 March 1934).
22 KPA-18-29, Karl Polanyi, 'Count Michael Károlyi', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 24.63 (1946): 94.
23 Kari Polanyi-Levitt, telephone interview, November 2007.
24 Kari Polanyi-Levitt, telephone interview, December 2008.
25 To those who were insensitive to nuance, this could appear to 'stretch almost to anti-Semitism'. Kari Polanyi-Levitt, telephone interview, November 2008.
26 Even his dislike of garlic 'was linked to his rejection of Jewish culture'. Kari Polanyi-Levitt, interview July 2006, and telephone interviews, November 2007 and December 2008.
27 Judith Szapor, 'An outsider twice over: Cecile Wohl Pollacsek, salonist of fin-de-siècle Budapest', in A. Pető Szapor, M. Hametz and M. Calloni (eds), *Jewish Intellectual Women in Central Europe, 1860–2000: Twelve Biographical Essays* (Edwin Mellon, 2012), 37.
28 Helen Callaghan and Martin Höpner, 'Changing ideas: organized capitalism and the German Left', *West European Politics*, 35.3 (2012).
29 Rudolf Hilferding, *Finance Capital: A Study of the Latest Phase of Capitalist Development* (Routledge, 1981 [1910]).
30 SPSL-536-1, Karl Polanyi to Zoe Fairfield (24 March 1934). In this, his thesis resembles Jan Machajski's *The Intellectual Worker* (1905), in which socialism is understood to be a movement of the intelligentsia as a class, one that will supervise a transition to state capitalism.
31 Norman Stone, *Europe Transformed, 1878–1919* (Fontana, 1983).
32 Carl Schorske, *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1980 [1961]), 117.
33 Janos, *Politics of Backwardness*, 129–31.
34 As a percentage of the workforce the equivalent figures were 14.8 and 16.7 per cent. See Dániel Szabó, 'Wahlsystem und Gesellschaftsstruktur in den letzten beiden Jahrzehnten des Dualismus, 1896–1910', *Acta Historica*, 35 (1989): 181–204.
35 KPA-18-29, Polanyi, 'Count Michael Károlyi', 96.
36 John Lukacs, *Budapest 1900: A Historical Portrait of a City and its Culture* (Weidenfeld, 1993), 183.
37 Lukacs, *Budapest 1900*, 128.
38 KPA-1-43, Karl Polanyi, 'The autonomy of science and the autonomy of the university' ['A tudomány autonomiája és az egyetem autonomiája'], *Szabadgondolat*, 9.4 (1919).

39 Michael Löwy, *Georg Lukacs: From Romanticism to Bolshevism* (New Left Books, 1979), 73.
40 Stone, *Europe Transformed*, 43.
41 Stephen Spender, quoted in Mary Gluck, *Georg Lukacs and his Generation, 1900–1918* (Harvard University Press, 1985), 7.
42 Gluck, *Georg Lukacs*, 7.
43 Robert Sayre and Michael Löwy, *Romanticism Against the Tide of Modernity* (Duke University Press, 2001), 70–1.
44 Gluck, *Georg Lukacs*, 7.
45 Szapor, *Hungarian Pocahontas*, 2.
46 Joseph Schumpeter, *History of Economic Analysis* (Allen & Unwin, 1986), 884; Judith Szapor, 'Laura Polanyi 1882–1957: narratives of a life' (n.d.), www.kfki.hu/chemonet/polanyi/9702/szapor.html (last accessed 2 November 2015).
47 Gluck, *Georg Lukacs*, 140.
48 Georg Lukacs, *Record of a Life: An Autobiographical Sketch* (Verso, 1983), 39–40.
49 Erzsébet Vezér, 'An anniversary tribute', in Kenneth McRobbie and Kari Polanyi-Levitt (eds), *Karl Polanyi in Vienna: The Contemporary Significance of the Great Transformation* (Black Rose Books, 2000), 283.
50 Löwy, *Georg Lukacs*, 82.
51 *Ibid*., 81
52 Ervin Szabó, *Socialism and Social Science*, edited by György Litván and János Bak (Routledge, 1982), 109.
53 Zoltán Horváth, *Die Jahrhundertwende in Ungarn: Geschichte der zweiten Reformgeneration, 1896–1914* (Corvina Verlag, 1966), 498.
54 Karl Polanyi, 'Revolution and ideology: notes on Ervin Szabó's posthumous work' ['Forradalom és ideológia. Jegyzetek Szabó Ervin hátrahagyott müvéhez'], *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (18 September 1921); KPA-1-52, Karl Polanyi, 'The possibilities of Russia's new politics' [Az új orosz politika esélyei'], *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (12 August 1921).
55 Tom Villis, *Reaction and the Avant-Garde: The Revolt Against Liberal Democracy in Early Twentieth-Century Britain* (Tauris, 2006), 42.
56 Kari Polanyi-Levitt, telephone interview, 6 October 2007.
57 Lee Congdon, 'The moralist as social thinker: Oszkár Jaszi in Hungary, 1900–1919', in Walter Laqueur and George Mosse (eds), *Historians in Politics* (Sage, 1974), 304–5.
58 Horváth, *Jahrhundertwende*, 293.
59 György Litván, *A Twentieth-Century Prophet: Oscar Jaszi, 1875-1957* (Central European University Press, 2006), 164.
60 Cecile Polanyi would chide him, he himself recalled, for his 'narrow, Spencerian, English positivism', recommending that he 'balance it with Nietzsche's brilliance'. Arpad Kadarkay, *Georg Lukacs: Life, Thought and Politics* (Blackwell, 1991), 89.
61 David Kettler, Volker Meja and Nico Stehr, *Karl Mannheim* (Tavistock Publications, 1984), 20; Horváth, *Jahrhundertwende*, 135.
62 Gluck, *Georg Lukacs*, 104.
63 Schumpeter, *Economic Analysis*, 883.
64 The resemblance of the latter claim to arguments in Polanyi's *Great Transformation* may not be accidental.
65 Bernstein, as explicated by Carl Schorske, *German Social Democracy, 1905–1917: The*

Development of the Great Schism (Harvard University Press, 1983 [1955]), 18.

66 Litván, *Oscar Jászi*, 72. Polanyi was not personally acquainted with Loria or Dühring, but he did write – from his hospital bed in 1917 – to Oppenheimer, with questions concerning his book on 'cooperative settlements' [*Siedlungsgenossenschaften*]. MPP-17-2, Karl Polanyi to Misi (19 January 1920).

67 KPA-4-9, Karl Polanyi, Notes on readings (early 1920s).

68 KPA-2-9, Karl Polanyi, 'Worauf es heute ankommt. Eine Erwiderung' (1919). See also Franz Oppenheimer, *Theorie der reinen und politischen Ökonomie; Ein Lehr- und Lesebuch für Studierende und Gebildete* (Georg Reimer, 1910), 99.

69 KPA-37-8, Karl Polanyi, 'The Galilei Circle fifty years on' ['A Galilei Kör otven év távlatából'] (1958).

70 KPA-29-12, Ilona Duczynska, 'Karl Polanyi (1886–1964): a family chronicle and a short account of his life' (n.d.).

71 SPSL-536-1, Karl Polanyi to Zoe Fairfield (24 March 1934).

72 KPA-37-8, Polanyi, 'The Galilei Circle fifty years on'.

73 Ferenc Múcsi, 'The start of Karl Polanyi's career', in Kari Polanyi-Levitt (ed.), *The Life and Work of Karl Polanyi* (Black Rose Books, 1990), 27.

74 KPA-30-1, Karl Polanyi, Unpublished notes and biographical information (1940–84).

75 MPP-17-12, Karl Polanyi to Misi (4 March 1961).

76 KPA-29-12, Duczynska, 'Karl Polanyi'; KPA-30-1, Polanyi, Unpublished notes; KPA-46-6, Ilona Duczynska, Interview with Ilona Duczynska by Dr Isabella Ackerl (1970s).

77 KPA-30-1, Karl Polanyi, quoted by Ilona Duczynska and Zoltán Horváth, 'Unknown documents relating to the Galilei Circle' ['A Galilei Körre vonatkozó ismeretlen dokumentumok'] (n.d.).

78 *Ibid*.

79 *Ibid*.

80 *Ibid*. See also Múcsi, 'Karl Polanyi's career', 29.

81 Oscar Jaszi, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Hungary* (P. S. King & Son, 1924), 75.

82 Gluck, *Georg Lukacs*, 102.

83 KPA-37-9, Karl Polanyi, 'Fifty years' ['Ötven év'], *Irodalmi Újság* (1 May 1959); Rudolf Tökés, *Béla Kun and the Hungarian Soviet Republic: The Origins and Role of the Communist Party of Hungary in the Revolutions of 1918–1919* (Praeger, 1967), 39.

84 István Deák, 'The decline and fall of Habsburg Hungary, 1914–1918', in Iván Völgyes (ed.), *Hungary in Revolution, 1918–19* (University of Nebraska Press, 1971), 28.

85 Jaszi, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, 29.

86 Michael Károlyi, *Fighting the World: The Struggle for Peace* (Kegan Paul, 1924), 443.

87 Jaszi, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, 34.

88 KPA-18-29, Polanyi, 'Count Michael Károlyi', 97.

89 Congdon, 'Moralist as social thinker', 310.

90 Catherine Károlyi, *A Life Together: The Memoirs of Catherine Károlyi* (George Allen & Unwin, 1966), 195.

91 Michael Károlyi, *Memoirs of Michael Károlyi: Faith Without Illusion* (Jonathan Cape, 1956), 127.

92 KPA-1-45, Karl Polanyi, 'Our parties and the peace' ['Pártjaink és a béke'], *Szabadgondolat*, 8.8 (1918b); György Litván, 'Karl Polanyi in Hungarian politics', in Kari Polanyi-Levitt (ed.), *The Life and Work of Karl Polanyi* (Black Rose Books, 1990), 33.

93 Jaszi, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, 84.
94 Eduard Bernstein, 'Geleitwort', in Oskar Jaszi, *Magyariens Schuld, Ungarns Sühne: Revolution und Gegenrevolution in Ungarn* (Verlag für Kulturpolitik, 1923), xi.
95 Jaszi, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, 88.
96 *Ibid*., 88.
97 *Ibid.*, 119.
98 Bernstein, 'Geleitwort', xi.
99 John Rees, *The Algebra of Revolution* (Routledge, 1998), 254–5.
100 *Ibid*., 254–5.
101 Frank Eckelt, 'The internal policies of the Hungarian Soviet Republic', in Iván Völgyes (ed.), *Hungary in Revolution, 1918–19* (University of Nebraska Press, 1971).
102 Jaszi, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, 151.
103 *Ibid.*, 126.
104 *Ibid.*, 126.
105 Lee Congdon, *Exile and Social Thought: Hungarian Intellectuals in Germany and Austria, 1919–1933* (Princeton University Press, 1991), 218. Jaszi's view was similar. In order 'to avoid isolation', he argued, the social-democrat leadership had no choice but 'to follow its radical masses and, after much soul-searching, they 'chose Lenin' in preference to reformist socialism'. Quoted in Tökés, *Béla Kun*, 135.
106 Polanyi criticised both the social democrats (under Károlyi and Kun alike) and the communists for neglecting 'the necessity for a radical redistribution of the land', a mistake for which they paid 'with the easy victory of the counter-revolution, which could count on a peasantry indifferent to the cause of the workers'. KPA-18-26, Karl Polanyi, 'Towards a New October Revolution in Hungary' (1944).
107 KPA-29-12, Duczynska, 'Karl Polanyi'.
108 Adam Tooze, *The Deluge: The Great War and the Remaking of Global Order, 1916–1931* (Allen Lane, 2014), 410.
109 Front-page headline, *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (16 September 1922). See for example the editorial of 19 March 1922, 'To the democratic and anti-militaristic public opinion of the world', authored by Károlyi and Jaszi, *et al*. Describing Hungary's recent experience: 'Terror brigades were formed for the persecution of innocent people. The system of torture was introduced, and even the raping of women was resorted to as a method of obtaining obedience. Mass murders and pogroms were organised. Hundreds of people were exterminated, without any judicial procedure. Democratic and republican politicians were drowned in the Danube. Journalists known for their outspokenness, incorruptibility and honesty have been kept in prison for years. In internment camps thousands of innocent people have been condemned to slow death. ... Police brutality has annulled all freedom of assembly, press and strike'.
110 On multinational corporations, see Karl Polanyi, 'The captains of German industry: towards global trusts' ['A német iparbárók kivándorlása: világtrösztök felé'], *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (30 November 1923).
111 See also KPA-1-52, Karl Polanyi, 'The new Machiavelli, Kipps and Tono-Bungay' ['Az Uj Machiavelli, Kipps es Tono-Bungay'] (n.d.).
112 H. G. Wells, *The Salvaging of Civilization* (Cassell, 1921).
113 *Ibid.*, 102.
114 Bertrand Russell, *Roads to Freedom*: *Socialism, Anarchism and Syndicalism* (Cornwall Press, 1918), 124.

115 Karl Polanyi, 'Free trade!' ['Szabadkereskedelmet!'], *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (2 November 1922).
116 Karl Polanyi, 'Does Europe have enough bread?' ['Van-e elég kenyere Európának?'], *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (11 May 1923).
117 Duczynska, 'I first met Karl Polanyi', 310.
118 KPA-50-1, Karl Polanyi to Carter Goodrich (12 February 1957); KPA-37-1, Karl Polanyi, 'A Hungarian lesson' (1957).
119 KPA-51-1, Ilona and Karl Polanyi to Harry Campbell (29 October 1959).
120 Perhaps Schlesinger's political temper was coarser than Polanyi felt comfortable with. Moreover, his personal habits, Kari Polanyi-Levitt recalls, 'would turn my stomach. He would slurp his soup as he drank it from the bowl!' His etiquette, or lack of it, she adds, must have violated her father's sense of decorum, for Polanyi, in keeping with his bourgeois upbringing, was 'fanatical about manners.' Kari Polanyi-Levitt, interview, 13 December 2008 and by telephone, 6 April 2009.
121 KPA-51-5, Karl Polanyi to Meszaros (5 January 1961).

References

Archival collections

Society for the Protection of Science and Learning Archive, Bodleian Library, Oxford University (SPSL)
536-1, Karl Polanyi file, Letter from Karl Polanyi to Zoe Fairfield (24 March 1934).
536-1, Karl Polanyi file, Letter from Karl Polanyi to Walter Adams (31 March 1934).

Michael Polanyi Papers, Regenstein Library, University of Chicago (MPP)
17-12, Letter from Karl to Misi (4 March 1961).
17-2, Letter from Karl Polanyi to Misi (19 January 1920).

Karl Polanyi Papers, Karl Polanyi Institute, Concordia University, Montréal (KPA)
1-43, Karl Polanyi, 'A tudomány autonomiája és az egyetem autonomiája' [The autonomy of science and the autonomy of the university], *Szabadgondolat*, 9.4 (1919).
1-45, Karl Polanyi, 'Pártjaink és a béke' [Our parties and the peace], *Szabadgondolat*, 8.8 (1919).
1-52, Karl Polanyi, 'Az Uj Machiavelli, Kipps es Tono-Bungay' [The new Machiavelli, Kipps and Tono-Bungay], *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (n.d.).
1-52, Karl Polanyi, 'Az új orosz politika esélyei' [The possibilities of Russia's new politics], *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (12 August, 1921).
2-9, Karl Polanyi, Draft article, 'Worauf es heute ankommt. Eine Erwiderung' [The crucial issue today: a response] (1919).
4-9, Karl Polanyi, Notes on readings (early 1920s).
18-26, Karl Polanyi, 'Towards a New October Revolution in Hungary' (1944).
18-29, Karl Polanyi, 'Count Michael Károlyi,' *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 24.63 (1946)
29-12, Ilona Duczynska, 'Karl Polanyi, 1886–1964: a family chronicle and a short account of his life' (n.d.).

30-1, Karl Polanyi, Unpublished notes and biographical information (1940–84) (including CV, and interviews).
30-1, Ilona Duczynska and Zoltán Horváth, 'Unknown documents relating to the Galilei Circle' [A Galilei Körre vonatkozó ismeretlen dokumentumok] (n.d.).
37-1, Karl Polanyi, 'A Hungarian lesson' (1957).
37-8, Karl Polanyi, 'A Galilei Kör otven év távlatából' [The Galilei Circle fifty years on] (1958).
37-9, Karl Polanyi, 'Ötven év' [Fifty years], *Irodalmi Újság* (1 May 1959).
46-6, Ilona Duczynska, Interview with Ilona Duczynska by Dr Isabella Ackerl (1970s).
50-1, Karl Polanyi, Letter to Carter Goodrich (12 February 1957).
51-1, Ilona and Karl Polanyi, Letter to Harry Campbell (29 October 1959).
51-5, Karl Polanyi to Meszaros (5 January 1961).

Published literature

Arendt, Hannah, *The Jew as Pariah: Jewish Identity and Politics in the Modern Age* (Grove Press, 1978).
Bernstein, Eduard, 'Geleitwort', in Oskar Jaszi, *Magyariens Schuld, Ungarns Sühne: Revolution und Gegenrevolution in Ungarn* [Magyar guilt, Hungary's atonement: revolution and counter-revolution in Hungary] (Verlag für Kulturpolitik, 1923).
Callaghan, Helen and Martin Höpner, 'Changing ideas: organized capitalism and the German Left', *West European Politics*, 35.3 (2012).
Congdon, Lee, 'The moralist as social thinker: Oszkár Jaszi in Hungary, 1900–1919', in Walter Laqueur and George Mosse (eds), *Historians in Politics* (Sage, 1974).
Congdon, Lee, *Exile and Social Thought: Hungarian Intellectuals in Germany and Austria, 1919–1933* (Princeton University Press, 1991).
Gareth Dale, 'Karl Polanyi in Budapest: on his political and intellectual formation', *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, 50.1 (2009).
Deák, István, 'The decline and fall of Habsburg Hungary, 1914–1918', in Iván Völgyes (ed.), *Hungary in Revolution, 1918–19* (University of Nebraska Press, 1971).
Deutscher, Isaac, *The Non-Jewish Jew and Other Essays* (Oxford University Press, 1968).
Drucker, Peter, *Adventures of a Bystander* (Transaction, 1999).
Duczynska, Ilona, '"I first met Karl Polanyi in 1920..."', in Kenneth McRobbie and Kari Polanyi-Levitt (eds), *Karl Polanyi in Vienna: The Contemporary Significance of the Great Transformation* (Black Rose Books, 2000).
Eckelt, Frank, 'The internal policies of the Hungarian Soviet Republic', in Iván Völgyes (ed.), *Hungary in Revolution, 1918–19* (University of Nebraska Press, 1971).
Enyedi, György and Viktória Szirmai, *Budapest: A Central European Capital* (Belhaven Press, 1992).
Gluck, Mary, *Georg Lukacs and his Generation, 1900–1918* (Harvard University Press, 1985).
Hilferding, Rudolf, *Finance Capital: A Study of the Latest Phase of Capitalist Development* (Routledge, 1981 [1910]).
Horváth, Zoltán, *Die Jahrhundertwende in Ungarn: Geschichte der zweiten Reformgeneration, 1896–1914* [Hungary's turn of the century: history of the second reform generation, 1896–1914] (Corvina Verlag, 1966).
Janos, Andrew, 'The decline of the oligarchy: bureaucratic and mass politics in the Age

of Dualism, 1867–1918', in Andrew Janos and William Slottman (eds), *Revolution in Perspective: Essays on the Hungarian Soviet Republic of 1919* (University of California Press, 1971).

Janos, Andrew, *The Politics of Backwardness in Hungary, 1825–1945* (Princeton University Press, 1982).

Jaszi, Oscar, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Hungary* (P. S. King & Son, 1924).

Kadarkay, Arpad, *Georg Lukacs: Life, Thought and Politics* (Blackwell, 1991).

Károlyi, Catherine, *A Life Together: The Memoirs of Catherine Károlyi* (George Allen & Unwin, 1966).

Károlyi, Michael, *Fighting the World: The Struggle for Peace* (Kegan Paul, 1924).

Károlyi, Michael, *Memoirs of Michael Károlyi: Faith Without Illusion* (Jonathan Cape, 1956).

Kettler, David, Meja, Volker and Stehr, Nico, *Karl Mannheim* (Tavistock Publications, 1984).

Litván, György, 'Karl Polanyi in Hungarian politics', in Kari Polanyi-Levitt (ed.), *The Life and Work of Karl Polanyi* (Black Rose Books, 1990).

Litván, György, *A Twentieth-Century Prophet: Oscar Jaszi, 1875–1957* (Central European University Press, 2006).

Löwy, Michael, *Georg Lukacs: From Romanticism to Bolshevism* (New Left Books, 1979).

Lukacs, Georg, *Record of a Life: An Autobiographical Sketch* (Verso, 1983).

Lukacs, John, *Budapest 1900: A Historical Portrait of a City and its Culture* (Weidenfeld, 1993).

Miller, Tyrus (ed.), *The Culture of People's Democracy* (Brill, 2013).

Múcsi, Ferenc, 'The start of Karl Polanyi's career', in Kari Polanyi-Levitt (ed.), *The Life and Work of Karl Polanyi* (Black Rose Books, 1990).

Nagy, Endre, 'After brotherhood's Golden Age: Karl and Michael Polanyi', in Kenneth McRobbie (ed.), *Humanity, Society and Commitment: On Karl Polanyi* (Black Rose Books, 1994).

Oppenheimer, Franz, *Theorie der reinen und politischen Ökonomie; Ein Lehr- und Lesebuch für Studierende und Gebildete* [Theory of pure and political economy: a textbook and reader for students and scholars] (Georg Reimer, 1910), 99.

Piterberg, Gabriel, *The Returns of Zionism: Myths, Politics and Scholarship in Israel* (Verso, 2008).

Polanyi, Karl, 'Radikális polgári politika' [Radical bourgeois politics], *Szabadgondolat*, 3.11 (1913).

Polanyi, Karl, 'A magyar hegemonia és a nemzetiségek' [Hungarian hegemony and the nationalities], *Szabadgondolat*, 4.3 (1914).

Polanyi, Karl, 'Polgári radikálisok, szocialisták és történelmi ellenzék' [Radical bourgeois, socialists and historic opposition]', *Szabadgondolat*, 4.5 (1914).

Polanyi, Karl, 'A szocializmus próbája' [The test of socialism], *Szabadgondolat*, 8.10 (1918).

Polanyi, Karl, 'Radikális párt és Polgári párt' [Radical Party and bourgeois party], *Szabadgondolat*, 8.9 (1918).

Polanyi, Karl, 'Polgárháború' [Civil war], *Szabadgondolat*, 9.6 (1919).

Polanyi, Karl, 'Forradalom és ideológia. Jegyzetek Szabó Ervin hátrahagyott müvéhez' [Revolution and ideology: notes on Ervin Szabó's posthumous work], *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (18 September 1921).

Polanyi, Karl, 'Szabadkereskedelmet!' [Free trade!], *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (2 November 1922).

Polanyi, Karl, 'Van-e elég kenyere Európának?' [Does Europe have enough bread?'], *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (11 May 1923).
Polanyi, Karl, 'A német iparbárók kivándorlása: világtrösztök felé' [The captains of German industry: towards global trusts], *Bécsi Magyar Újság* (30 November 1923).
Polanyi, Karl, *Fasizmus, demokrácia, ipari társadalom* (Gondolat Kiadó, 1986).
Rees, John, *The Algebra of Revolution* (Routledge, 1998).
Rechter, David, *The Jews of Vienna and the First World War* (The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2001).
Russell, Bertrand, *Roads to Freedom*: *Socialism, Anarchism and Syndicalism* (Cornwall Press, 1918).
Sayer, Derek, *Prague, Capital of the Twentieth Century: A Surrealist History* (Princeton University Press, 2013)
Sayre, Robert and Michael Löwy, *Romanticism Against the Tide of Modernity* (Duke University Press, 2001).
Schorske, Carl, *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1980 [1961]).
Schorske, Carl, *German Social Democracy, 1905–1917: The Development of the Great Schism* (Harvard University Press, 1983 [1955]).
Schumpeter, Joseph, *History of Economic Analysis* (Allen & Unwin, 1986).
Stone, Norman, *Europe Transformed, 1878–1919* (Fontana, 1983) .
Szabó, Dániel, 'Wahlsystem und Gesellschaftsstruktur in den letzten beiden Jahrzehnten des Dualismus, 1896–1910' [Electoral system and social structure in the final two decades of dualism, 1896–1910], *Acta Historica*, 35 (1989).
Szabó, Evin, *Syndicalism and Social Democracy* (Deutsch, 1908).
Szabó, Ervin, *Socialism and Social Science*, edited by György Litván and János Bak (Routledge, 1982).
Szapor, Judit, 'Laura Polanyi 1882–1957: narratives of a life' (n.d.), www.kfki.hu/chemonet/polanyi/9702/szapor.html (last accessed 2 November 2015).
Szapor, Judith, *The Hungarian Pocahontas: The Life and Times of Laura Polanyi Stricker, 1882–1959* (East European Monographs, 2005).
Szapor, Judith, 'An outsider twice over: Cecile Wohl Pollacsek, salonist of fin-de- siècle Budapest', in A. Pető Szapor, M. Hametz and M. Calloni (eds), *Jewish Intellectual Women in Central Europe, 1860–2000: Twelve Biographical Essays* (Edwin Mellon, 2012).
Tökés, Rudolf, *Béla Kun and the Hungarian Soviet Republic: The Origins and Role of the Communist Party of Hungary in the Revolutions of 1918–1919* (Praeger, 1967).
Tooze, Adam, *The Deluge: The Great War and the Remaking of Global Order, 1916–1931* (Allen Lane, 2014).
Vezér, Erzsébet, 'An anniversary tribute', in Kenneth McRobbie and Kari Polanyi-Levitt (eds), *Karl Polanyi in Vienna: The Contemporary Significance of the Great Transformation* (Black Rose Books, 2000).
Villis, Tom, *Reaction and the Avant-Garde: The Revolt Against Liberal Democracy in Early Twentieth-Century Britain* (Tauris, 2006).
Wells, H. G., *The Salvaging of Civilization* (Cassell, 1921).