

# IDEA OF REPUBLIC

Book of Abstracts



Novi Sad  
2023

University of Novi Sad  
Faculty of Philosophy  
Department of Philosophy  
Center for the Studies of Idealism

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

# IDEA OF REPUBLIC

Book of Abstracts

Novi Sad,  
18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> November 2023.



Novi Sad  
2023.

UNIVERSITY OF NOVI SAD  
FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY

21000 Novi Sad,  
Dr Zorana Đinđića br. 2  
www.ff.uns.ac.rs

*Publisher*

Prof. dr Ivana Živančević Sekeruš

*Editing and Manuscript Redaction*

Lazar Atanasković

*The Picture on the Cover*

*Rome: Ruins of the Forum, Looking Towards the Capitol (1742) by  
Canaletto*

*Cover Design and Printing Preparation*

Igor Lekić

ISBN

978-86-6065-803-8



Novi Sad

2023

*Conference is organized with the support of the Ministry for Science and  
Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia*

### *Program Committee*

prof. dr Günter Zöller (University of Munich)  
prof. dr Ugo Vlasisavljević (University of Sarajevo)  
prof. dr Lino Veljak (University of Zagreb)  
prof. dr Ivan Jordović (University of Novi Sad)  
doc. dr Saša Hrnjez (University of Padua)  
doc. dr Tomasz Rafał Wiśniewski (University of Warsaw)  
doc. dr Lazar Atanasković (University of Novi Sad)

### *Organizing Committee*

prof. dr Stanko Vlaški (University of Novi Sad)  
doc. dr Lazar Atanasković (University of Novi Sad)  
doc. dr Nevena Jevtić (University of Novi Sad)  
dr Gorge Hristov (IFDT, Belgrade)  
doc. dr Mina Đikanović (University of Novi Sad)  
doc. dr Marica Rajković (University of Novi Sad)  
doc. dr Goran Rujević (University of Novi Sad)  
doc. dr Nemanja Mičić (University of Novi Sad)  
asist. msr Miloš Miladinov (University of Novi Sad)  
asist. msr Tanja Todorović (University of Novi Sad)



## ***Editor's note:***

*From Plato's Politeia, through Aristotle's and Polibius' ideas on the nature of different political constitutions, to Augustine's Civitate Dei, More's Utopia, Bodin's Six books of the Republic, Hobbes Leviathan and Kant's text on Perpetual peace, up to the Hegel's philosophy of modern state and Marx's critique of it, and then to the big ideologies of XX century and their critique and downfall – the idea of political community has occupied a prominent place in the philosophical, historical, judicial, economical and social thought. Today, when the very existence of the political community as a public and common thing (res publica) is frequently called into question and when the fears of refeudalisation of the public sphere arise, when debates about “stakeholder” capitalism suggest a newly emergent clientelistic relationship between contemporary state and big corporations, when the so-called populist and hybrid regimes erode the very foundations of modern democratic societies – accordingly, today, in our contemporary situation in which idea of the republic undoubtedly lingers in crisis, pondering in the history of that idea as well as pinpointing of its relevance constitutes a necessary task. In that regard conference “Idea of Republic” gathers researchers from the field of humanities and social sciences and it aims to contribute to the reactualisation of republican tradition understood in the broadest sense, as well as to contemporary debates on the role and status of state and position of politics in our contemporary societies.*

## ABSTRACTS

**Plenary Lecture: Ivan Jordović (University of Novi Sad)**

*Politeia and the Problem of Human Nature in Late Fifth and Early  
Fourth Century BC*

[ivan.jordovic@ff.uns.ac.rs](mailto:ivan.jordovic@ff.uns.ac.rs)

A striking idiosyncrasy of Plato's political thought is that he did not care much about the specific structures of any political system. His attention focused on the effect of political order and the influence of its predominant values on the moral and psychological conditions in the state. This is most evident in Plato's most famous work. Though it bears the title *Politeia*, it essentially ignores the role of legislation, institutions, and constitutional arrangements. Instead, a correlation between types of constitutions and states of the human *psychē* is introduced, and the city-soul analogy becomes Plato's principal tool of political analysis. This analogy represents one of the oldest and most intractable problems of his political thought. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that there is a long-lasting discussion on its meaning and purpose and the related tripartite soul theory. The proposed solutions vary substantially, yet the starting point of most of them is, as a rule, the same: Plato's depiction of this analogy in *The Republic*. In other words, it has become standard practice to attempt to decipher the city-soul analogy by analyzing its characteristics. The present paper deliberately opts for a different approach: it attempts to shed new light on the rationale behind it by revealing the reasons for its introduction. Thus, the focus is on

systematically exploring how the political and intellectual climate of the late fifth and early fourth centuries instigated Plato to formulate the city-soul analogy. The main thesis of this paper is that the civil wars of the late fifth and early fourth century BCE affected Greek socio-political life and thought to such a degree that the contemporaries started to view politics primarily through the lenses of power and self-interest. This development which placed human motivation at the center of political reflection as a harmonious interplay between it and moral virtue is not only a characteristic of a well-functioning political order but an absolute precondition for it. This is because human beings are those who make political decisions, who exercise authority, who form institutions, and who enact, interpret, and enforce laws. Consequently, the moral corruption of those who wield political power and control can lead to the decline of any political system.

## REPUBLIC, POLITICAL AND HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ugo Vlaisavljević (University of Sarajevo)

*The Republicanism of the Small Nations of Central and Eastern Europe*

[ugo.vlaisavljevic@ff.unsa.ba](mailto:ugo.vlaisavljevic@ff.unsa.ba)

In analyzing the recent history of Central and Eastern Europe it is important to operate with the notion of 'small nation' or 'small state'. According to the classical insights of Tomáš Masaryk and István Bibó, the smallness of small nations/states is not an accidental feature, as it substantially determines their socio-ontological nature, cultural-political profile, and historical destiny. These nations have survived through centuries of foreign rule and resisted threats of cultural assimilation and physical extermination, but the moment they reemerged as liberated nations they were confronted with immense difficulties: they had to rebuild themselves, which was a task of nation-building, and renegotiate their mutual relations, which implied rebuilding national and state frameworks. Neither a nation nor a national state was inherited from the past. The recent political history of the small nations, deeply marked by national liberation wars, is a history of republicanism. We aim to explain the specificity of the small nations' republicanism, which we primarily see in their war and post-war struggle for the unity of one political people and a national common good beyond all ethnocultural and religious divisions. However, what the republican discourse presents as a community of citizens or a unity of people is, in fact, a 'struggling community' (Kampfsgemeinschaft), because the current brotherhood of citizens is forged in the last liberation war as a brotherhood in arms. The thesis is advanced that the small states are republics of soldiers.

**Michael Antolović (University of Novi Sad)**

*Conservative Revolution and Weimarer Republik*

[mihael.antolovic@pef.uns.ac.rs](mailto:mihael.antolovic@pef.uns.ac.rs)

Although it may sound like an oxymoron, the term 'conservative revolution' has taken root as a label for an influential intellectual movement in the Weimar Republic. Despite its heterogeneity, it is possible to see several common, essential motives in it: in addition to strong anti-capitalism and anti-Marxism, it is primarily about the rejection of liberalism and democracy as an ideology 'foreign' to the German 'conservative' spirit, and hence the strong aversion to the Republic as a form of government contrary to the German 'being'. 'Conservative revolutionaries' (above all Ernst Jünger, Gottfried Benn, Carl Schmitt, Hans Freyer, Oswald Spengler, Thomas Mann until the beginning of the 1920s) accepted modern science and technology while, on the other hand, they glorified the pre-modern political order and demanded the establishment of strong authorities, in the domain of social organization they emphasized the ideal of an allegedly harmonious organic 'community' as an antithesis to a modern, class-divided society, advocating, instead of capitalism, the establishment of a planned economy under state supervision. The fact that in their views they combined a strong longing for the institutions of the pre-industrial world with respect for technical-technological development (which they considered an integral part of German culture), gives the right to the thesis that their ideas can be considered as a form of the so-called revolutionary modernism. Ultimately, with their comprehensive criticism, the

conservative revolutionaries were in close contact with the radical right, contributing to the collapse of the fragile liberal-democratic order of the first German Republic.

**Tomáš Halamka (Charles University of Prague)**

*Republicanism: A Morphological Analysis*

[tomas.halamka@fsv.cuni.cz](mailto:tomas.halamka@fsv.cuni.cz)

This contribution will introduce a conceptual analysis of republicanism as an ideology following a conceptual approach to ideologies developed by Michael Freeden. I conceive republicanism through a syncretization of neo-Roman and neo-Athenian republican discourses as 1) a dynamic ideology inspired by both Greek and Roman antiquity, 2) unified by an interconnected cluster of overlapping and intersecting concepts, and 3) displaying a distinctive conceptual morphology. This understanding offers an alternative to a common depiction of republicanism as a story of a single master-concept, which narrows our understanding of republicanism and its ideological complexity and versatility. Instead, I will present a morphological model of republicanism consisting of nearly two dozen concepts grouped around the interdependent core values of freedom, self-rule, and mixed constitution. Such an approach emphasizes sustaining links within a larger cluster of republican concepts and offers a new perspective on how the often-disentangled discourses of neo-Roman and neo-Athenian republicanism could be brought together. Next, I will suggest how this unified account of republicanism constitutes a unique position within a broader ideological spectrum. I will demonstrate this by presenting my second diagram exploring republicanism's relations with other ideologies, particularly liberalism, conservatism, socialism, and populism. I argue that republicanism has appeared as a standalone ideology in some contexts, but in others, it appeared as a subset of some of the „neighboring “ ideologies

in the guise of ideological fusions such as labor republicanism, feminist republicanism, etc. I suggest that while the traditional republican interpretations of the individual concepts often survived in these ideological mutations, a general republican morphology disintegrated in the 19th century and ceased to be a standalone ideology up until the recent neo-republican revival. Arguably, neo-republicanism could meet the same fate if the gap between neo-Athenian and neo-Roman republicanism becomes too great and both disappear in respective neighboring ideologies. However, if we rethink their relation and approach them as two strands of the same ideological family (i.e., displaying different emphases but still utilizing similar conceptual apparatus), we might better appreciate the synergies between the two major republican discourses. That, in turn, might provide a larger employable toolbox at the disposal of neo-republican theorists useful in their ideological polemics with liberalism and populism. I end by arguing why, from a morphological perspective, neo-republican self-localization between liberalism and populism indeed has a case and how republicanism constitutes a middle position between them.

**Predrag Krstić (IFDT, Belgrade), Aleksandar Ostojić (University of Novi Sad)**

*Which Public, Whose Affair: The Aporia of Republic(anism)*

[predrag.krstic@ifdt.ac.rs](mailto:predrag.krstic@ifdt.ac.rs), [ostojic.alexandar@gmail.com](mailto:ostojic.alexandar@gmail.com)

The Republic always represented a certain emancipatory idea, a password, or a flag, which stood up against imperial tyranny (Rome) or hereditary monarchy (France). But that performance was neither unison nor monochrome. Perhaps the purest, ideal-type representation of the republic, with all the paradoxes and/or contradictions of its discourse, is offered by a republic that in the political sense could not be called by that name, or perhaps it was just a crypto-political republic, a so-called metaphor of the republic that, all the more, reveals its constitutive fragility. *Respublica literaria* is not a „real" republic, but it is not a complete chimera either: it had its members, but no citizenship that guarantees anything. It did not have its territorial boundaries, but it also knew how to limit the conditions of belonging to it – by proving a standard that we could maybe call intellectualistic, but a standard that was engaged inside communication. This is the contradiction we would like to expose in this paper. The fact that *Respublica literaria* consistently, to the point of paroxysm, followed the principle that it is not a private but a public matter and that this occurred alongside the fact that the public space, or the space of that public, was very limited, and more transparently indicated than usual. The characteristic not only of that republic but something like perhaps the fate of each: the first act of the French republic was the closing of the borders, similar to the Soviet one. The question is therefore whether the republic can exist in a

universal way or whether it implies exclusion. And vice versa, is the act of demarcation inevitable when establishing a republic that otherwise aspires to universality?

## EARLY MODERNITY, CIVIL SOCIETY AND REPUBLIC

Olga Nikolić (IFDT, Belgrade)

### *Education for Man and Citizen in Rousseau*

[olga.nikolic@ifdt.bg.ac.rs](mailto:olga.nikolic@ifdt.bg.ac.rs)

This talk will begin by exploring Rousseau's distinction between education for man and citizen, based on *Emile* and *The Social Contract*. Crucial in this respect are the distinctions between self-sufficiency and dependence, existing for oneself and others, as well as between two forms of self-love: *amour de soi-même* and *amour propre*. The question will be can these two educational models be reconciled in Rousseau's philosophy, and how, as well as what can that tell us about the relation between individual and society. The key issue to be explored concerning this is what it means to educate for freedom and whether such an education breeds a lack of societal responsibility. Next, implications will be drawn for the idea of republican education. Rousseau's preference for domestic education over public education will be critically compared with the argument in favor of public education as providing a necessary common ground in a pluralist society. Finally, the talk will analyze challenges faced by contemporary republics related to the role of the state in education and the ensuing conflicts over the educational content imparted in schools. Rousseau's rich insights can serve as a springboard for exploring the republican educational ideal, offering valuable reflections on the intricate interplay between individual freedom and societal obligations in contemporary republics.

**Igor Cvejić (IFDT, Belgrade)**

*Feeling of Respect and Civil Society*

[igor.cvejic@ff.uns.ac.rs](mailto:igor.cvejic@ff.uns.ac.rs)

In this presentation, I aim to underscore the significance of the feeling of respect in the context of the (republican) understanding of the civil community. In the first part, I will delve into Kant's concept of the feeling of respect. Kant associates this feeling with our connection to moral law and the inherent dignity of each individual. Furthermore, Kant attributes a pivotal role to this feeling in the elucidation of civil society, as discussed in his work *Metaphysics of Morals*. In the second part, I will explore the interpretation of respect as presented in Bennet Helm's book *Communities of Respect*. Helm interrelates respect with communal norms and a distinctive form of commitment to these. I will conclude by examining the complex interplay of respect for individual persons on one side and collective, moral law in the case of Kant or communal norms in Helm, on the other.

**Guido Frilli (University of Florence)**

*Equality, Diffidence, and Glory. Hobbes and Machiavelli on Republican  
Passions*

[guido.frilli@unifi.it](mailto:guido.frilli@unifi.it)

As remarked by James Harrington in *The Commonwealth of Oceana* [1656], Hobbes's *Leviathan* has a largely implicit yet pivotal interlocutor: Machiavelli's republicanism. According to Harrington, this confrontation is inherently ambivalent, as Hobbes would reject Machiavelli's republican idea of liberty, while at the same time embracing some of its core claims. The polemical purpose is obvious: Hobbes aims at subverting the basis of Machiavelli's «ancient prudence», and at replacing it with «modern prudence». When, in ch. XXI of *Leviathan*, Hobbes condemns the advocates of the «popular governments» of antiquity, who have «the habit (under a false shew of Liberty), of favoring tumults, and of licentious controlling the actions of their Sovereigns», he is thinking first of all of Machiavelli's impact on English Republican authors before and during the civil war. The «imitation of the Greeks and Romans», notoriously promoted by Machiavelli in the Proem of the *Discourses on Livy*, spread the seditious opinion that the subjects of a monarchy «are all Slaves» and that the alleged «popular liberty» must be defended through rebellion and even «tyrannicide» [ch. XXIX]. Where, on the other hand, can one find the thread of a positive dialogue with Machiavelli's republicanism, and how does this affect Hobbes's thought? Reading the *Leviathan* with the lens suggested by Harrington, the focus falls primarily on ch. XIII, where Hobbes, illustrates the causes of contention intrinsic to human nature,

illustrates three key passions: equality, diffidence, and glory. Scholars have only rarely addressed the circumstance that all three of these causes draw directly, and quite literally, on central topics in Machiavelli's Discourses. Equality is primarily shown, according to Hobbes, by the equally widespread reluctance to «be governed by others» [ch. XIV], a passion that Machiavelli identifies with the universal «desire for liberty» [Discourses I.V, I.XVI]. Diffidence leads to conflict because of the division between those who desire liberty in order to dominate others, and those who, however, inclined «to be at ease within modest bounds», must accumulate power in order to defend themselves against the former [Lev. XIII]: an explicit restatement of Machiavelli's theory of the «two humors» of the city and their structural struggle, the *popolo* and the *grandi*. Finally, it is Machiavelli's specific claim [Discourses, I.XVI, I.XXIV, III.XXV] that the competition for glory, in the broad sense of ambition, pride, and political or military honors, is the cause as much of the great disunity within popular governments as of their superior vitality, strength, and virtue. The paper tackles this paradox and places it in its proper context: Hobbes assimilates the core of Machiavelli's anthropology of republican passions (liberty as self-government, the conflict between humors, and the pursuit of glory) in order to drastically reverse its original political outcome. The possible success of this reversal depends much on the credibility of the «modern prudence» of Hobbes's state, as opposed to the «ancient prudence» of Machiavelli's republicanism.

Ágoston Nagy (NUPS, Budapest)

*The Republican Festival Culture as Political Otherness: The Experiences  
of a Hungarian*

*Noble Officer in Occupied Northern Italy and the Directory-era French  
Republic*

[nagy.agoston@uni-nke.hu](mailto:nagy.agoston@uni-nke.hu)

The cultivated Hungarian nobleman, and future popular poet, Sándor Kisfaludy as a promising young officer of the Viennese Hungarian Royal Noble Bodyguard was detailed to a garrison regiment of low prestige as a penalty for his rebellious conduct. His unit was sent to the Sforza fortress of Milan during the Italian campaign of the French Republic in 1796. He made a long journey through the lands of Habsburgs, lived through the siege of the city, and became captured and transported to a small, scenic Provençal town, Draguignan. Later that year he could safely get back to Austria, in a no less adventurous way. This forced journey was the greatest adventure of his life and provided fertile ground for his later poetry. Kisfaludy took notes and kept a diary during his journey. These were worked together into an ego-document (Diary), which was written to a high literary standard in the manner of the so-called contemporary "Sensationalist" *belles-lettres*. This work presents the experiences of war and captivity as subsequently formed perceptions, therefore it should be read rather as non-referential, as a self-perception and representation of a certain historical subject. Therefore, what we can learn from, it is Kisfaludy's perspective of history. *The Diary* shaped the experiences of several militarized cultural encounters, as well as of the facing forms of political and cultural otherness. My presentation will

show how *The Diary* represented an evaluative view of the Directory-era French republican festival culture at home and abroad from a distinctively Hungarian perspective. First, I will show, how Kisfaludy developed a mainly negative notion about the efforts of the French to introduce forcefully republican rites and symbols in occupied Northern Italy. Second, the *Diary's* narrative will discuss the practice of two freshly introduced republican festivals in Draguignan, which were assessed by the author more positively. These festive practices were interpreted in a comparative framework, which emphasized in a moderate Josephinist manner the priority of public good over denominational conflicts and Catholic bigotry, and reason over outdated religious practices of devoutness. Moreover, Kisfaludy presented the selected set of French republican institutions and practices (civil religion as a form of religious tolerance, national festivals, and competitions) as an up-to-date model for the Kingdom of Hungary, theoretically flashing the idea of reception.

## **Keynote Lecture: Günter Zöller (University of Munich)**

### *Res Publica Duplex. Civil Society and the Political State in Hegel's*

#### *Philosophy of Right*

[zoeller@lmu.de](mailto:zoeller@lmu.de)

While Hegel was no republican in the ancient Roman or the early modern neo-Roman sense of the term, the constitution of the modern polity he outlined in *Elements of the Philosophy of Right* (1820) is only inadequately characterized as a constitutional monarchy. In addition to the monarchical "moment" (Moment) of a largely symbolic head of state, Hegel's *Philosophy of Right* recognizes the aristocratico-republican moment of a civil service executive and the democratico-republican moment of a bicameral legislative body. Most importantly, in addition to the constitutional set-up of the "political state" (politischer Staat) governing the polity from above, Hegel's *Philosophy of Right* recognizes the public sphere of "civil society" (bürgerliche Gesellschaft) structuring and staffing the polity from below. The presentation tracks the emergence and the functioning of Hegel's innovative civico-political distinction in its historical and systematic context. Historically, Hegel's crypto-republican philosophy of the political state and civil society is situated on the distinction, to be found in Montesquieu and B. Constant, between political liberty and civil liberty. Systematically, Hegel's modern polity is presented as the combined differentiation and unification of the two public spheres of the self-organization of civil life and the governmental structuring of political life. The first section presents the historically and geographically extended horizon of Hegel's politico-philosophical thinking. The second section

presents Hegel's outwardly monarchical state as a latter-day alternative to ancient (Roman) and early modern (neo-Roman) republicanism on the one side and post-monarchical late modern democratism on the other side. The third section features the development and articulation of Hegel's civic-political distinction between civil society and the state. The fourth section tracks the transformation of the socio-economically defined divisions of civil society into the executive and legislative powers of government in Hegel's modern polity.

## **Plenary Lecture: Darko Suvin (University McGill)**

### *Hypotheses on Politics, Freedom, Democracy and Violence (The Republic)*

[d.suvin@gmail.com](mailto:d.suvin@gmail.com)

This paper examines historical and hypothetical models of managing collective affairs in the political communities, proposing a split of central cognitive notions into class and alienating versus utopian and disalienating ones. Among them is “politics”, a set of activities that concern making decisions in groups or other collectives and that involve power and the distribution of resources among human classes or other groups. It is an intervention of what is possible within relationships among groups of people into what is now. This definition of politics questions any vision of dismissing politics as a peculiarity of a class society founded on exploitation, as Marx thought. Instead, a brief glance at Marx, Lenin, and Gramsci proposes the necessity of politics in any present or future emancipatory movements and societies. Traditional notions of freedom and democracy can also be varied, including a freedom for imagining a society radically different from our present. Parliamentary democracy should be confronted with “direct” and “associational” democracy. In a final section opposing the present paradigm of violence to one of care, the author concludes that there are slim chances for a society in which radical alterity is dismissed as superfluous day-dreaming instead of being the basis for freedom.

## REPUBLIC, FUTURE AND PAST: UTOPIAN CONSIDERATIONS

**Tomasz Wiśniewski (University of Warsaw)**

*Republic/State – some Remarks on the Notion from the Standpoint of  
Transcendental Materialism*

[tomasz.wisniewski@uw.edu.pl](mailto:tomasz.wisniewski@uw.edu.pl)

The presentation aims to demonstrate how the socio-philosophical standpoint which I call "transcendental materialism" deals with some historical cases of the use of the notion of "state". In the beginning, I will try to define my understanding of the very idea of "transcendental materialism" developed independently of the use of this term you can find in writings of Žižek, Deleuze, or Adrian Johnston, even though you can probably find some similarities between these stances. Next, I will focus on the idea of the state (or the critique of it) developed by Plato, Hegel, Marx, and Bakunin. I will try to show how the notion of state/republic played a different role under different socio-historical conditions, and how certain authors used the term to achieve very different goals. In my opinion, from the point of view of transcendental materialism, there is no abstract or "objective" meaning of the idea of the state, but at any given historical moment, certain authors or even social movements used (and still use) the notion (in an affirmative or critical context) and this use should always be a goal of critical analysis from the point of view of transcendental materialism.

**Zorica Đergović-Joksimović (University of Novi Sad)**

*Ideal Governments in Literature or Who Rules in Utopia?*

[zorica.djergovic.joksimovic@ff.uns.ac.rs](mailto:zorica.djergovic.joksimovic@ff.uns.ac.rs)

Although the historical roots of utopia stem from various mythological, religious, and philosophical concepts, in the modern era it has become predominantly a literary phenomenon. Yet, since an ideal form of government has always been one of utopia's primary concerns, it brings it ever closer to political fiction and politics in general. The question of who rules in utopia is thus a point where literary, philosophical, and political issues intersect and intertwine. From the readers' perspective, this is possibly one of utopias strongest points. On the other hand, from the perspective of the ruling class, this makes utopia a dangerous liberating tool. Can utopian literature help us envision and embrace new and different political horizons now? What could be the epistemic value of such insights given the fact that ideal governments in utopia vary from (rare) monarchies to (prevalent) republics – be it capitalist, socialist, or communist – and (not so negligible) anarchist communities? Can utopia help disenchant the people from the macabre hold of the system based on perpetuating the fear of radical societal change and the condescending assumption that the government not only knows best but is the best? The goal of this paper is to show that it is not the political solutions offered by literary utopias themselves that could save us, but rather questions they teach us to raise at this pivotal moment in history.

**Lazar Atanasković (University of Novi Sad)**

*Effect of Utopian Illusion in Walter Benjamin's Passagen-Werk*

[lazaratanaskovic@ff.uns.ac.rs](mailto:lazaratanaskovic@ff.uns.ac.rs)

In his *Passagen-Werk*, specifically in his papers on Paris as capital of the XIX-century Europe, Walter Benjamin explored how ideal space became commodified in the bourgeois society of the Second French Empire. Utopian dreams of the masses and individuals became inextricably dependent on the dynamics of the market and inventions of the new commodities and ways to market and sell them. Arcades, trade fairs, streets with shops, and lightning became the presence of the dreams of the distant future of community provided with the abundance and security of every sort – new structures of steel and glass were material products of the present reality but they also represented window to the brighter future. While Benjamin does not insist on the theoretical analysis of the republic or republicanism, very society that he analyzes is built on the throes of the defeated revolutionary republic and on the piles and rubbles of the dreams of 1848. In the Second Empire, *res publica* is preserved only as a collectivist vector, as a utopian dream that is nevertheless thwarted by the emergence of the world of commodities, producing only the effect of utopian illusion. Voices of the past revolutionaries, of those advocating public action and collective goals are now muted in the clamor of the show marketed on the streets of the big cities, in their shiny appearance old republican dreams are sunken and exchanged for the realities of everyday desolation and poverty – here, Blanqui's tragedy and bizarre fantasies of defeated man are represented as the paradigm of the destiny of the age

whose essence is described as *Phantasmagoria*. Benjamin was sure that ideological phantasmagoria of the 19th century persisted throughout the nineteenth century leading to the 20th-century crisis, and to the rise of fascism and lack of subjective and political agency – today we could argue that dynamic between utopian expectation and commodity, between politics and consumerism, is at the very core of contemporary disdain for utopian thinking as well as very broad political crisis reflected in the steep disappearance and dysfunction of traditional political institutions as well as established modes of political action.

# REPUBLICANISM TODAY: CHALLENGES AND NORMATIVE QUESTIONS OF POLITICAL THEORY

**Szilárd János Tóth (Corvinus University, Budapest)**

*Why Republicanism Remains Statist Theory*

[toth.szilard.janos@gmail.com](mailto:toth.szilard.janos@gmail.com)

Republicans heavily rely on the idea that maintaining a democratic government demands a great degree of civic virtue from citizens and that the cultivation of such virtue is strongly facilitated by identification with the polity. In this paper, I argue that this aspect of republican theory puts serious constraints on attempts to reconcile it with the more ambitious models for cosmopolitanism which propose dismantling the state system as we know it. On the one hand, as long as people identify with states more than they do with cosmopolitan ties, there will be tension between said plans for institution-building and the theory regarding what is demanded for the stability of such institutions. On the other hand, its above-mentioned aspect makes republicanism a poor theory for cosmopolitan transition. Whichever way such transition is commenced, there will be distinctly republican reasons to moderate it significantly.

**Szolt Kapeler (University of Oslo)**

*Democracy and the Republic*

[kapelner.zsolt@gmail.com](mailto:kapelner.zsolt@gmail.com)

Almost all republicans in political philosophy agree that core republican commitments, most importantly to non-domination, imply a strong commitment to democracy as a form of government. Pettit goes as far as to claim that non-domination, a core republican commitment, requires democracy on the state level. In this paper, I argue that this is false. I offer three scenarios where non-domination seems to be satisfied without democracy. In a recent discussion, Niko Kolodny suggests that similar arguments imply that core republican commitments are better understood in terms of claims against inferiority, rather than claims against domination, and non-inferiority, unlike non-domination, requires democracy. However, I show that the same scenarios also satisfy non-inferiority without democracy. Thus, this reinterpretation does not help the republican case for democracy. I conclude that there is no obvious way to derive a strong commitment to democracy from core republican commitments. If one is to be a democrat, it is not enough to be a republican.

**Milán Pap (NUPS, Budapest)**

*Leadership in Republicanism: Divergences in Classical and Neo-republican Theories*

[Pap.Milan@uni-nke.hu](mailto:Pap.Milan@uni-nke.hu)

The issue of political leadership is essential to the republican theoretical tradition. The possibilities and constraints of leadership, as well as the nature of the leader and his connection to the citizen, have presented problems for thinkers of the republican canon ever since Aristotle. Two of the most powerful versions of republican leadership can be found in Machiavelli's Discourses and Rousseau's Social Contract: the myth of the republic's founding, the existential dilemma of the political community, the question of decadence, and the spread of morality are all themes that belong to political leadership. The first section of my paper will cover these issues, while the second section will consider why the problem of leadership has not received enough attention in modern neo-republican philosophy. In contrast to classical ideas, neo-republican theories presume democratic control and a spontaneous spread of civility.

**Zoltán Balázs (Corvinus University, Budapest)**

*Can we Make Sense of (Republican) Virtues in Democracies?*

[zoltan.balazs@uni-corvinus.hu](mailto:zoltan.balazs@uni-corvinus.hu)

Republicanism stands out as an ideology that requires political virtue to be cherished and nourished among citizens. However, as Benjamin Constant pointed out long ago, such an approach is impracticable, even pernicious, in modern polities, especially in democracies. Most people can and should enjoy privacy and political virtue, with the best intentions, which tends to make them intolerant. His compatriot, A. de Tocqueville has a slightly different view, as he thought that democratic values will, like it or not, shape private life, and have a bearing on what look like the most intimate virtues such as love, faith, and hope. He implicitly advised us to be alert to the influence of political virtue. In my paper, I intend to look at some contemporary republicans, such as M. Viroli, R. Bellamy, and Ph. Pettit, and virtually ask them how they can cope with Constant's and Tocqueville's objections and qualms about political virtue to be applied in a genuine democratic polity.

**Marjan Ivković (IFDT, Belgrade)**

*From Complex Domination to Complex Non-Domination: Requirements  
of Real Political Agency*

[marjan.ivkovic@ifdt.bg.ac.rs](mailto:marjan.ivkovic@ifdt.bg.ac.rs)

In this paper, I aim to contribute to the elaboration of one central normative concept of the republican tradition – freedom as non-domination – through an analysis of forms of domination that exist in contemporary capitalism, and a consideration of what is required to counteract (and possibly overcome) them. I borrow the term 'complex domination' from Luc Boltanski, but I expand it: for Boltanski, complex domination essentially means the post-Fordist technique of government of 'simulated social change', which nominally invites people to 'get engaged' in solving societal problems, while it neutralizes their capacity for real engagement, i.e. their real political agency. I argue that, in order to grasp the complexity of domination in present-day capitalism, Boltanski's concept needs to be expanded to include the dimension of structural domination as theorized by some currents of contemporary Marxism: the domination of all social actors by the basic forms of social structure in capitalism – value, commodity, and capital. This deep 'layer' of domination is not specific to post-Fordism but exists throughout capitalism; however, it does become more pronounced in the current formation and stands in a relation of mutual reinforcement with the layer of domination which could be termed the 'hegemonic project', and which is treated by authors such as Boltanski, Wendy Brown or Nancy Fraser. I address the combined effects of structural domination and the post-Fordist hegemonic project to arrive at a preliminary understanding –

normative-theoretic and political-strategic – of what is required to counteract this synergy. Drawing on some elements of Axel Honneth's perspective, I argue that, in addition to the claims of distributive justice, adequate recognition, and participation in decision-making processes, the ideal of non-domination (i.e. the struggle to attain non-domination) requires a form of 'respect' of social actors' moral accountability – what I call 'politics of respect'.

**Željko Radinković (IFDT, Belgrade)**

*Modern State and Myth*

[zeljko.radinkovic@ifdt.ac.rs](mailto:zeljko.radinkovic@ifdt.ac.rs)

The lecture deals with the theories of the modern state and politics that emerged in the middle of the twentieth century and can be seen as a reaction to the rise of political totalitarianism of that time. On the one hand, it points to the theses of Horkheimer and Adorno about the threat to political and social modernity caused by the mixing of Enlightenment principles with mythical thinking. In this context, Cassirer's theory is also of interest, in which the relationship between the mythical symbolic figure and modern political thought is reflected on the level of a philosophy of culture. But it also examines another way of thinking about political modernity, which starts from the continuities between the pre-modern and the modern and identifies the critically highlighted part of the pre-modern myth as part of a historical, all-encompassing life that also includes the Enlightenment and modern political tendencies.

**Keynote Lecture: Zdravko Kobe (University of Ljubljana)**

*The Problem of Representations in Hegel's State*

[zdravko.kube@guest.arnes.si](mailto:zdravko.kube@guest.arnes.si)

While it is no longer common to accuse Hegel of being a court philosopher of the Prussian police state, his denunciation of liberal democracy remains a well-documented fact. Indeed, Hegel vehemently rejected the system of people's sovereignty and general elections that has become the accepted standard in the 'free world', and he even saw in this abstract liberalism the key historical problem to be solved in the future. In my contribution, I will first try to review the reasons that led Hegel to reject the model of liberal democracy. We will see that he accurately identified some of its key weaknesses, which we are confronted with today. I will then present Hegel's own conception of the political constitution, conceived as a system of continuous self-mediation, in which the formation of the political will is firmly grounded in real social structures and their interests, and individuals are given the opportunity to lead a universal life. Given the present crisis of liberal democracy, it will be argued, both Hegel's diagnosis and his proposal must be taken seriously. Indeed, his concept of political representation in which interests are not represented but are actually present in the political assembly, together with some other Hegelian features, such as the extension of democracy to the economic sphere, could well prove fundamental to the restoration of democracy in our time.

# GERMAN CLASSICAL PHILOSOPHY, IDEALISM AND MODERN STATE

Marica Rajković (University of Novi Sad)

## *Schiller's Idea of Aesthetic State*

[marica.rajkovic@ff.uns.ac.rs](mailto:marica.rajkovic@ff.uns.ac.rs)

The author examines Schiller's concept of the aesthetic state as the kingdom with the fundamental law that freedom is bestowed using freedom. Man is forced to live in society under the natural compulsion of needs and the binding force of laws, but his social character does not come from them, but from a third source - from the realm of beauty and play. Relying on moral character is not enough - one must develop a social character, which is enabled by the beautiful and the sublime. The idea of aesthetic state is not something foreign to reason - it was precisely the reason overcoming the natural state that made it possible to establish a moral man, who is no longer a finite being, but a possible one, so the new ideal of society is just one of the possible consequences of a rational act. The difference that Schiller makes between the dynamic, ethical, and aesthetic state lies in the overcoming of forced limitations, and the final victory of freedom, because in the aesthetic state man no longer appears to another man as a wolf, but as a figure - and can only be seen as an object of free play. According to Schiller, the spirit can not be satisfied with merely being free - it must also liberate everything around it: the constitution of the aesthetic law using play is also a constitution of freedom for others. Schiller, therefore, opens a new

possibility: not that the aesthetic field is practically conditioned, but that practical principles can be adequately presented only through art. If it is understood that the ultimate purpose of art is the sensory presentation of the spiritual idea, it should be understood that in this way it presents moral and political laws as a sensory recognizable form.

**Gorge Hristov (IFDT, Belgrade), Mark Losoncz (IFDT, Belgrade)**

*Rousseau and Hegel: the Many Sides of Republican Freedom*

[george.hristov@ifdt.bg.ac.rs](mailto:george.hristov@ifdt.bg.ac.rs), [mark.losonc@ifdt.bg.ac.rs](mailto:mark.losonc@ifdt.bg.ac.rs)

Our presentation will consist of two parts. The first part will focus on the ambivalence of Rousseau's republican freedom and critique the interpretation of Rousseau offered by Isaiah Berlin. Berlin's interpretation ignores essential aspects, including the fact that the social contract itself, as the preservation of citizens, does not simply manifest positive freedom. Similarly, the more obviously republican thought, that freedom is not being subjected to the arbitrary will of other agents, embodies a complex concept of freedom. The complexity of the Rousseauian republican concept of freedom, with its multiplex combination of positive and negative aspects, is revealed when we take into consideration the various layers of Rousseau's quadrotomy of freedom (natural freedom, civil freedom, democratic freedom, moral freedom), without resorting to reductionist interpretative strategies. Rousseau will also be analyzed as an advocate of freedom as non-domination and in the role of watching over and critiquing the government. Based on this analysis and in light of the discussion about the positive and negative aspects of Rousseau's conception of republican freedom, the second part will examine Hegel's critique of Rousseau. It will be demonstrated that while Hegel does indeed resolve some of the paradoxes of republican freedom, which he implicitly identified through his criticism of Rousseau, he introduces new ones within his political philosophy. At the same time, it will be shown that when the negative aspect of Rousseau's conception of republican freedom is taken into account

some of Hegel's criticisms directed at Rousseau's 'general will' have merit and cannot be reduced to a mere misreading as is often done.

**Nevena Jevtić (University of Novi Sad)**

*State's Inner Enemy, Hegel's view on Women's Status from a Political Perspective*

[nevena.jevtic@ff.uns.ac.rs](mailto:nevena.jevtic@ff.uns.ac.rs)

In his work *Outlines of Philosophy of Right* Hegel presents a critique of gender relations within the bourgeois nuclear family, marked by conflict. He highlights an "ethical collision" that arises from the power asymmetry between the husband and other family members, particularly concerning property rights. While love may be the principle of familial relationships, Hegel argues that conflict has been its historical social reality. Far from concealing societal oppression of women with misogynistic platitudes about their supposed inferior nature, Hegel exposes the patriarchal system's social conditioning of women as a politically dangerous mechanism. This article reviews the main evidence that Hegel drew from contemporary political struggles for women's emancipation in the European intellectual realm. Also, his analysis of family and its relationship to civil society and the state was influenced by Hippel's interventions. The notions of marriage proposed by Kant, which uphold the naturally superior arbitrariness of the male head of the family, and Fichte's glorification of self-exclusion of the female counterpart, provided Hegel with a blueprint for the bourgeois construction of gender roles. This construction builds up certain pressure within the sphere of politics, which will be further explored in this article.

**Mina Đikanović (University of Novi Sad)**

*Concept of the Sovereign in Hegel's Philosophy*

[mina.djikanovic@ff.uns.ac.rs](mailto:mina.djikanovic@ff.uns.ac.rs)

If Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* is the true birthplace and secret of Hegel's philosophy, as Marx said, then his *Philosophy of Right*, and especially the role of the sovereign, can be defined as its dying place. The whole of the magnificent system of spirit is shattered down to ash in one simple move: on the top of spiritual reign comes natural principles. The author examines Hegel's motivation for this paradox and tries to shed light on an even bigger question: is it even possible for Hegel to make a different conception? Taking into account Marx's critique of Hegel's philosophy of state, it is necessary to reexamine the key stations of Hegel's conception of state.

## CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

**Ivan Jordović** (1974) is a Full Professor teaching Ancient History, particularly the history of Ancient Greece and its political institutions at the Department of History of the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Novi Sad. He studied history at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade, where he graduated in 1999. Thanks to DAAD scholarships, he completed his doctoral studies at the Ruhr University of Bochum. After returning to Serbia in 2004, he worked at the Balkanology Institute, SANU. He was elected assistant professor at the History Department of the Faculty of Philosophy in Novi Sad in 2006, associate professor in 2011, and full professor in 2016. He was on postdoctoral training at the University of Dresden (2006/2007), as a scholarship holder of the Hart Foundation he conducted several months of research in Geneva (2008/2009), while the Humboldt Foundation enabled him three longer stays at the University of Bielefeld (2015–2017). He gave numerous guest lectures by invitation in the Republic of Serbia and abroad (Faculty of Law in Belgrade, University of Heidelberg, University of Zhangzhong, University of Utrecht, University of Bern, University of Münster, University of Erfurt, University of Aachen, University of Duisburg-Essen, University of Bielefeld). He collaborated on several domestic and foreign projects. For the book *Old Greeks. Portrait of a People* he received the Milan Budimir Award for Classical Sciences in 2012.

**Ugo Vlaisavljević** (1957) is a full professor of philosophy at the University of Sarajevo, where he teaches the epistemology of social sciences and theories of identity construction. Editor-in-chief of the journal of

philosophy and social sciences *Dialogue*, Sarajevo (2006-2013), member of the editorial board of the international journal *Transeuropéennes*, Paris (2000-2011), president of PEN Centre B&H (2006-2009), member of International advisory board of the journal of phenomenology and hermeneutics *Phainomena*, Ljubljana (2015-present). He has written widely on phenomenology, poststructuralism, semiotics, and political philosophy (particularly on ethnicity and nationalism, gender equality, the rebirth of religion, peace and reconciliation issues). He has published numerous articles in English, French, German, Italian, and Hungarian journals and book collections. Among the twelve books published in his country are: *The Phenomenological Constitution of the European Community* (1996), *The Origin of Geometry and the Transcendental Phenomenology of History* (2003), *Lepoglava and University. Essays in Political Epistemology* (2003), *Merleau-Ponty's semiotics of perception. The Phenomenological Way into Deconstruction* (2004). *Ethnopolitics and Citizenship* (2006), *War – the Greatest Cultural Event. A Contribution to Semiotics of Ethnonationalism* (2007), *A Ghostly Reality of the Narrative Politics* (2012), and *The Aporias of Coexistence* (2018).

**Michael Antolović** (1975) is a Professor of Modern European History at the University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Education, Republic of Serbia. His research interests include the history of modern historiography, historical theory, and intellectual history. He has published widely on the history of Serbian and Yugoslav historiography. His most recent books are *Istoriografija i politika. Intelektualna biografija Friedricha Meineckea* (*Historiography and Politics. Intellectual Biography of Friedrich Meinecke*,

2017) and *Čedomir Popov. Intelektualna biografija Čedomira Popova*. (*Čedomir Popov. Intellectual Biography of Čedomir Popov*, 2021).

**Tomáš Halamka** (1991) works as an Assistant Professor at the Institute of Political Studies, at Charles University of Prague. He specializes in political theory and the history of political thought and his main research interests are republicanism, ideology studies, and methodology in political thought.

**Predrag Krstić** (1964) is a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade, and PhD Professor at the Faculty of Media and Communications, Singidunum University, Belgrade. Fields of his proficiency include critical theory, modern theory of the subject, philosophical anthropology, philosophy of Enlightenment, and philosophy of education. In addition to fifteen theoretical books and numerous articles, monographic studies, and editorial contributions in academic publications, he is also the author of one novel and two books of poetry.

**Aleksandar Ostojić** (1988) works as a teaching assistant at the Faculty of Economics, University of Novi, and is currently finishing his PhD thesis at the Faculty of Philosophy in Novi Sad. His areas of interest are philosophy of the Renaissance and Modern philosophy, philosophy of science, philosophy of education, but also post-modern approaches, especially the philosophies of Michel Serres and Gilles Deleuze. For the paper "Clavis universalis as a evoking of meaning: Bruno and Leibniz on infinite possibilities toward knowledge", he received the award "dr Zoran Djindjic"

for the best master thesis in philosophical and sociological sciences, in 2019.

**Olga Nikolić** (1990) is a Research Fellow at the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory (University of Belgrade), where she coordinates Edulab: Laboratory of Educational Theories. Her research interests include phenomenology, philosophy of education, philosophy of science, and social and political philosophy.

**Igor Cvejić** (1986) is a senior research associate employed at the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory (University of Belgrade). He received his doctorate in philosophy from the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Belgrade on the topic "Kant's Theory of Sensation". His areas of interest include philosophy of emotions, engagement studies, problems of collective intentionality, classical German philosophy, and aesthetics, with a focus on Kant. He has published a large number of works on these topics in domestic and foreign magazines and anthologies, including the monograph *The Irreducibility of Feelings* (2018). He was the editor-in-chief of *Kritika: A Journal of Social Philosophy and Theory*. He is currently the president of the Ethics Committee of the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory.

**Guido Frilli** (1987) is a tenure-track Assistant Professor in the History of Philosophy at the University of Florence. He graduated from Pisa's Scuola Normale Superiore (2011), and after PhD (2015, in Florence and Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne) has been a postdoc researcher in Florence (2017-2022). His research areas are Classical German Philosophy (especially Hegel and Jacobi) and Early Modern Philosophy (Machiavelli, Hobbes,

Rousseau); He has published many articles, contributions, and translations (from English, French, and German) on these topics, as well as three monographs. He recently published a book on Hobbes's and Machiavelli's moral and political anthropologies, devoted to the emergence of a new concept of "poietic" or constructive rationality in the early modern age. He is generally interested in the connections between reason and moral-political passions, both in historical and systematic terms.

**Ágoston Nagy** (1986) is research fellow at National University of Public Service, Eötvös József Research Centre research fellow. His main fields of interest are Hungarian literature and political thought in the age of French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, and cultural history of the Hungarian estates polity.

**Günter Zöller** (1954) is Professor of Philosophy (Emeritus) at the University of Munich. He studied at the University of Bonn, Germany, the École normale supérieure, Paris and Brown University, U.S.A. He has been a Visiting Professor at Princeton University, Seoul National University, Emory University, McGill University, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, the University of Bologna and Huanzhong University of Science and Technology (Wuhan, P. R. China). His main areas of research are Kant, German idealism, and political philosophy. Recent book publications include *Philosophy of the 19th Century. From Kant to Nietzsche* (2018), *Hegel's Philosophy. An Introduction* (2020) and *History of Political Philosophy. From Antiquity to the Present* (2024).

**Darko R. Suvin** (1930) is scholar, critic and poet, born in Zagreb, Yugoslavia. He is Professor Emeritus of McGill University and Fellow of The Royal Society of Canada. Was co-editor of *Science-Fiction Studies*, editor *Literary Research/Recherche littéraire*, visiting professor at 10 universities, has won various awards for scholarship and prizes for poetry. Has published 35 book titles, which include *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction*, 1979; *To Brecht and Beyond*, 1984; *Disputing the Deluge: 21st Century Writings on Utopia, Narration, Horizons of Survival*, 2022; etc. He has edited 14 volumes and written hundreds of articles on literature and dramaturgy, culture, utopian and science fiction, political epistemology and communism; also three volumes of poetry, latest *Bijasmonečija budućnost*, 2022. Vita and essays are accessible at [www.darkosuvn.com](http://www.darkosuvn.com); papers to read and download at <https://independent.academia.edu/DarkoSuvn/Papers>

**Tomasz Rafał Wiśniewski** (1965) studied journalism, philosophy, political sciences, and religious studies at the University of Warsaw. He earned his habilitation with the thesis *Podmiot i wolność. Dziedzictwo heglowskie i jego wrogowie, Książka i Prasa*, Warszawa 2013. His work concentrates on the area of modern and contemporary social philosophy, especially the Hegel-Marx tradition. He is assistant professor at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Warsaw.

**Zorica Đergović-Joksimović** (1968) is a full professor in the Department of English Studies, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad, Serbia, where, among other courses, she teaches Science Fiction, Utopia in English

Literature and Dystopia in Literature and Film. Đergović-Joksimović is the author of *Utopija: alternativna istorija (Utopia: An Alternative History)* (Belgrade, 2009). She has published numerous articles, including “Serbia Between Utopia and Dystopia“ (2000) and “The Poetry of Estrangement or Utopia Suviniana“ (2017), both in *Utopian Studies*, and “Teachers and Students of Utopia: Lessons from Serbia” in Liam Benison, ed., *Utopian Possibilities: Models, Theories, Critiques* (forthcoming from U. Porto Press in 2023). She edited *Embracing Utopian Horizons* (2014), a collection of her MA students’ utopian stories, and was a guest editor of the thematic issue „Konteksti: Utopija“ („Contexts: Utopia“) (2019) in the journal *Književna istorija* (Literary History). Zorica Đergović-Joksimović is a member of the advisory board of *Utopian Studies*.

**Lazar Atanasković** (1988) is Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Novi Sad, teaching courses in the Philosophy of History and Contemporary Philosophy. At the same University, he defended his Ph.D. thesis *Hegel and the Problem of Historical Writing* (2021.) - part of the research for the dissertation he conducted at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ljubljana (2014/15). He is a founding member and current coordinator of the Center for the Studies of Idealism (Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad) and a member of the editorial board for the *Journal of Philosophy: Arhe*. His main areas of interest are Classical German Philosophy, 20th-century critical theory (particularly Frankfurt School), and Walter Benjamin’s thought.

**Szilárd János Tóth** (1991) is a junior research fellow at the Institute of Political Science of the Centre of Social Sciences (CSS) at the Budapest Corvinus University. His main field of interest is political theory, more specifically the republican-liberal debate, theories of community, nationalism, cosmopolitanism, and multiculturalism. His secondary fields of research are the political history of South Slavic peoples and the political history and the history of ideas of Vojvodina Hungarians.

**Szolt Kapelner** (1991) is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the University of Oslo within the Good Attention Research project, where he works on attention norms in deliberative democracy. He is also Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the University of Tromsø – The Arctic University of Norway where he works on democratic theory, social cohesion, and the philosophy of immigration within the GOODINT Research Project. He received my PhD from Central European University (Vienna, Austria) in 2022.

**Milán Pap** (1983) is a political scientist and research fellow at the Thomas Molnar Institute of Advanced Studies, National University of Public Service. in Budapest. He is a lecturer at the Pázmány Péter Catholic University. He graduated from Eötvös Loránd University and the University of Sheffield and received his PhD from Eötvös Loránd University. His research interests include the ideology and political leadership of post-World War II Hungarian state socialism, theories of political leadership, and republican ideas. He has published two monographs on the ideology and political mobilization of the Kádár regime: *Kádár demokráciája. Politikai ideológia és társadalmi utópia a Kádár-korszakban* [Kádár's Democracy: Political ideology and social utopia

in the Kádár era] (2015) and A párttal, a néppel... Eszmék és politikai mozgósítás a Kádár-korszakban [With the party, with the people... Ideas and political mobilization in the Kádár regime] (2021).

**Zoltán Balázs** (1966) is Professor of Political Science (Corvinus University Budapest) and Research Professor of the Institute for Political Science (Hungarian Research Network). His research interests include analytical political theory, literature and political theory, political theology, moral axiology, and the theories of power and government. His latest publications: „Constraining Government“. Lexington Books. Lanham; New York; London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2021 - „The Sovereign’s Beatitude“. *Political Theory* 3 (2022): 428-48. - „Does the Sovereign exist? Robert Musil’s Political Theology“. *International Journal of Philosophy and Theology*. 1-3 (2022): 163-79. - „Phenomenology of Conversion: John H. Newman and Aurel Kolnai“. *Religions*, 8 (14) 2023: 1-17. - *Creation, Fall, and Political Theology. Perspectives on Political Science*, 2023 (online first).

**Željko Radinković** (1969) is a senior research fellow at the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory. He completed his studies in philosophy and history at the University of Stuttgart, and at the same university he received his doctorate in the field of philosophy on the subject of the narrativist interpretation of Heidegger’s philosophy (*Hermeneutik der Zukunft*). At the same university, he was involved in various projects in the field of philosophy of technology (*Nexus*). Since 2011, he has been employed at the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory. He was engaged in establishing cooperation with German universities. He has been a member of the

Institute's Scientific Council since 2013, and is currently a member of the Institute's Governing Board and Ethics Committee. Since 2020, he is the editor-in-chief of the scientific journal *Philosophy and Society*. He mainly deals with hermeneutics, phenomenology, philosophy of technique, Heidegger and Husserl. Translations from German to Serbian.

**Marjan Ivković** (1985) obtained his BA and MA in sociology at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade, and in February 2014. he defended his PhD thesis in sociology at Cambridge University, United Kingdom. He is the author of *Kritička teorija Aksela Honeta: ka prevazilaženju metafizike* (*The Critical Theory of Axel Honneth: Toward the Overcoming of Metaphysics*, 2017), and numerous articles in international and Serbian academic journals. He has taken part in a number of international projects, conferences and seminars. In his research, Marjan Ivković focuses on problems of contemporary sociological theory and social philosophy. The primary area of his interest is critical theory as an interdisciplinary approach that synthesizes social- and political-philosophical reflection with empirical social research. Marjan's work centres around the analysis of the potential of different varieties of contemporary critical theory for conceptualizing and diagnosing complex forms of social domination in the era of neoliberal revolution.

**Zdravko Kobe** (1966) is Professor of Classical German Philosophy at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. He has published the trilogy *Automaton transcendentale*, which presents a novel interpretation of Kant's theoretical philosophy, and *Three Studies in Kant's Practical*

*Philosophy*, as well as a number of articles, especially on Kant and Hegel, but also on contemporary philosophy. He has also translated several classical philosophical works into Slovenian, including Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* and Hegel's *Science of Logic* and *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*.

**Marica Rajković** (1984) is an Assistant Professor of Aesthetics, Philosophy of Art, Philosophy of Culture, and Philosophy of Technics (Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad). She is the author of the book *The Problem of Aesthetics in the Philosophy of German Idealism* (2021), and numerous scientific articles on German Idealism.

**Gorge Hristov** (1985) is a research fellow at the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory in Belgrade. He received his PhD from the Department for Political Theory and History of Ideas at the University of Regensburg in 2017 for his thesis *Politics and Immanence: State and History in Hegel and Deleuze*. Main fields of interest include ancient political thought, modern contract theories, German idealism, political theory of the 20th century as well as French political thought of the 20th century. His main interests include political violence and war, archaism in modernity, fascism, and totalitarianism, and the phenomenon of mutual recognition and imitation in the context of the politicization of human relations.

**Mark Losoncz** (1987) defended his PhD thesis at the University of Novi Sad with the title *The Concept of Time in Bergson's and Husserl's Philosophy*. He accomplished part of his doctoral research at École des hautes études en sciences sociales (EHESS) in Paris. As a postdoctoral

researcher, he was the guest of the Institute of Ethics at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich. He has been a researcher at the University of Belgrade (Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory) since 2011. His research interests include consciousness studies, theories of sense of reality, philosophy of love, philosophy of death, philosophy & spirituality, philosophy & psychiatry. He has published several works on the Hungarian minority community in Serbia. He is the author and/or editor of thirteen books. His works are published in English, French, German, Serbian/Croatian, Romanian, Slovenian and Hungarian.

**Nevena Jevtić** (1982) is Assistant Professor teaching courses in transcendental and speculative philosophy as well as philosophy of politics at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Novi Sad. Her main fields of research are classical german philosophy and philosophy of politics. She published numerous scientific articles, particularly on philosophy of Immanuel Kant and G.W.F. Hegel.

**Mina Đikanović** (1984) is an Assistant Professor of Ethics and Philosophy of Right at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad. Her fields of research are Ethics, Philosophy of Right, and Philosophy of Economics. She wrote and published numerous scientific articles.

UNIVERSITY OF NOVI SAD  
FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY  
21000 Novi Sad  
Dr Zorana Đinđića br. 2  
www.ff.uns.ac.rs

*Print*  
Sajnos  
Novi Sad

*Print run*  
100

---

CIP - Каталогизacija у публикацији  
Библиотеке Матице српске, Нови Сад

321.728

321.01

**INTERNATIONAL Conference "Idea of Republic" (2023 ; Novi Sad)**

Book of abstracts / International Conference "Idea of Republic", Novi Sad, 18th and 19th November 2023. ; [manuscript redaction Lazar Atanasković]. - Novi Sad : Faculty of Philosophy, 2023 (Novi Sad : Sajnos). - 55 str. ; 24 cm

Tiraž 100.

ISBN 978-86-6065-803-8

a) Републиканизам б) Политичка филозофија

COBISS.SR-ID 129892361

---

