

suasion. And therefore I believe that it is necessary to 'open one's mouth' and try to restore utopia (...)” (*Pierre Bourdieu et Günter Grass - la tradition „d'ouvrir sa queue”, 1999*).

Radka Radimská

*Carried out with support from the Centre français de recherche en sciences sociales (CEFRES) in Prague.*

## References

- Bourdieu P. 1980. *Le sens pratique*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- Bourdieu P. 1994. *Raisons pratiques. Sur la théorie de l'action*. Paris: Seuil.
- Bourdieu P. 1998. *La domination masculine*. Paris: Seuil.
- Bourdieu P. 2000. *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*. Paris: Seuil.
- De Singly F. 1993. *Sociologie de la famille contemporaine*. Paris: Nathan.
- Pierre Bourdieu et Günter Grass - la tradition 'd'ouvrir sa queue'*, a transcript of an interview of Pierre Bourdieu with Günter Grass, broadcast on December 5, 1999 on Arte. *Le Monde.fr*, 02/12/1999. ([www.lemonde.fr](http://www.lemonde.fr)).
- Ferenczi T. *Pierre Bourdieu, le sociologue de tous les combats*. *Le Monde.fr*, 24/01/2002. ([www.lemonde.fr](http://www.lemonde.fr)).
- Mink G. and Szurek J.-Ch. 1999. *La grande conversion*. Paris: Seuil.
- Možný I. 1991. *Proč tak snadno...* [Why So Easy...]. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství.
- Šubrt J. 2000. 'Sociologie jako věda, která zbavuje iluzí (Pierre Bourdieu)' [Sociology as a Science that Overcomes Illusions (Pierre Bourdieu)]. In: *Jedinec a společnost*. Praha: Katedra sociologie FFUK.

## From Economic Planning to 'Historical Social Science': Professor Jaroslav Krejčí at 85

Jaroslav Krejčí, professor emeritus at Lancaster University, Great Britain, and director of the Centre for Research into Socio-Cultural Pluralism of the Academy of Sciences in Prague, has recently - in full health, vitality and scientific activitiveness - reached the age of 85. He studied law and economics in Prague and was one among those who prepared the first plans of economic development of the Czechoslovak Repub-

lic after World War II. His orientation toward the modern schools in economy was the most important grounds for his imprisonment by the communist régime in the 1950s. After his release at the beginning of the 1960s he quite unexpectedly wrote two interesting studies devoted to the sociological theory of revolutions, which were published in the Czech Sociological Journal. After the defeat of the Prague Spring through Soviet intervention, he withdrew into exile and spent decades in research and teaching at Lancaster University. During this time and over the course of the 1990s, when he worked by turns in Great Britain and the Czech Lands, he continued along with other activities in sociological research and publishing. In the early 1960s he wrote a book on social stratification in Czechoslovakia, in the early 1970s he wrote another analysing social structure in divided Germany. He was also the author of a paper on sociology and the future (in which he invokes the spirit of the complexity and synthesisism of the work of J. M. Keynes), and another on Czech elites. He also co-operated on several projects with Czech sociologists, and on a book about Czechoslovakia 1919-1992 as a laboratory of social change. This is the reason why this jubilee year is being commemorated not only by Czech economists but also by the sociological community.

During the past decade of his scientific work, professor Krejčí wrote a series of books and papers devoted to the topics of great revolutions compared, societies in global perspective, Asian civilisations, the human predicament, human rights and responsibilities, economic developments and ethno-politics in the Czech lands and Slovakia, and some studies devoted to the methodology of the social and human sciences.

An as yet incomplete overview of Krejčí's writings characterises him first as an efficient scholar, determined under any circumstances to continue work begun with only one end in sight: to enrich the available knowledge concerning human society, with special regard to his country of origin. It is also clear that he is a bright thinker, capable of transferring theoretical and methodological knowledge and skills from one scientific branch and specialisation to others. Partly compelled by the hard conditions of his life, but mainly owing to his inclination towards polyhistorism and to the abilities mentioned

here, he became one of the rare scholars to aim at and really formulate senseful syntheses of knowledge accumulated in a series of scientific branches, such as the economy, statistics, demography, ethnology and ethno-politics, historiography, cultural anthropology, religionistics, structural and historical sociology, ethics and law, political science and analyses, and social philosophy. In his works he refuses all kinds of on-sided determinisms without abandoning the strenuous endeavour to learn the essential characteristics of social orders and the regularities of the historical dynamics of individual societies, as well those of human evolution as a whole. He belongs to the not too large group of economists, sociologists, historians and social philosophers who are at least able to address and understand one another and to assist in the enrichment of common knowledge in the social sciences and humanities as a whole. Krejčí's syntheses - mainly the sociological and historical ones - are still being developed, their author coming up with continuously new incentives, aiming recently at the ideal of 'historical social science'. His work certainly cannot be avoided by the emerging generations of scientists, though the individual results of this endeavour can of course become a subject of discussion and lead to possible criticism of individual hypotheses.

Professor Krejčí's first specialisation was that of an economist and statistician, engaged in economic planning. For me as a sociologist, the mystery of his relatively sudden turn to sociology was always of great interest, and it obviously opened the way for his subsequent work in other specialisations, as well as his later work on an elaborated interdisciplinary orientation. This mystery was revealed by one of his former students, now professor emeritus of economy, Jiří Vysušíl, at a seminar devoted to the jubilee of Jaroslav Krejčí in April 2001 in Prague. Professor Vysušíl saved his teacher's notes, recorded in prison in the form of his own manual transcription (a copy of Krejčí's manuscript). One of the main parts of these notes represents the fruits of Krejčí's scrutinising and critical study of international sociology. From the piece of writing titled 'Introduction to the Sociological Study of Social Change', one learns that the list of authors studied at that time by the political prisoner, mainly in the 1950s, includes the following

names: Comte, Condorcet, Durkheim, Espinas, Ginsberg, Gurvitch, Hegel, Kaplan, Laswel, Le Bon, Mannheim, Marx, Merton, Ogburn, Pareto, Parsons, Riesman, Sorokin, Spencer, Schumpeter, Tönnies, Toynbee, M. Weber, von Wiese, and others. This is a remarkable selection of sociological and social philosophical works amidst the conditions of that time in Czechoslovakia, and many of them were clearly studied from publications in the original languages! All this means that the first factor which assisted in turning an economist toward sociology was serious erudition in sociological, socio-philosophical and historical literature on social change.

However, his strong interest in neighbouring fields, which is far from common among specialists in economy, necessarily had a powerful subjective motivation. In Vysušíl's copy one can find in between the manuscript mentioned above ('Introduction ...') and the other, preceding, original manuscript, called 'The Frame of Macrosociology' (incidentally full of historical comments and amendements, including also the first outlines of historical schemes of the Great French and the Czech Hussite revolutions), dated 1954-1960, three pages with the inscription 'The Formalisation of the Main Economic Relations'.

This short text represents an original analysis of the general concepts of gross national product and its increase over time, national wealth, the productivity of labour, and all factors influencing their developments. In this analysis one can find coefficients such as the 'non-effective part of national wealth', 'the advance of price changes over wage changes', and the 'increase of the concentration of capital'. At that time these could have been considered immeasurable. Another group of coefficients represent those considered as being not only immeasurable, but at the same time as exceeding the purely economic horizon of thought. These include 'fertility and access to natural resources', 'conjunctural expectations', and 'autonomous decisions of the public hand'. Though now, after more than forty years of experience with both a state-socialist and a modern market economy, the list of items belonging particularly to the second group could be easily multiplied and some new ways of measuring certain variables have been found, the conclusion made then by the author of the

manuscript is still quite clear and persuasive. Professor Krejčí added to his formalisation es- quise the following words:

*'The presence of the immeasurable (partly meta- economic) coefficients shows the limits of quanti- tative (and, eventually, pure economic) analysis as such.'*

Professor Vysuřil quite correctly deduced from this remark that the existence of meta- or extra- economic factors influencing what seem to be merely pure economic variables was one of the most persuasive reasons for the shift of a rationally thinking economist and statistician, with experience in practical planning, in the direction of sociological factors and, finally, to sociologi- cal and other societal phenomena in general. Jaroslav Krejčí, who was present at the seminar convened in his honour by the Faculty of Social Sciences of Charles University and Hlávka Foundation in Prague was at first slightly sur- prised by Vysuřil's conclusion. However, after only short hesitation, he agreed with the interpreta- tion of the shift in his thought - at least partially resulting from his economic analyses - which had occurred several decades before his anniversary.

Both factors mentioned here - the study of kindred disciplines together with the statement of the lack of information resulting from the lim- ited possibilities of the economy - lay behind Professor Krejčí's decision to enter the field of sociology and, further on, to continue on the way to some kind of inter-disciplinarity. These kinds of developments occur of course at times among other scholars, both in the natural sci- ences and in the social sciences and humanities. This was the case of Krejčí's favourites, Keynes and Toynbee, or of my own favorite, Max Weber. However, in Czech scientific tradition this kind of trespassing the 'forbidden' boundaries that

separate academic branches does not happen too often. Moreover, it seems to be of great sig- nificance for the present study of the problems of the social transformation and the modernisa- tion of post-socialist societies. The example of Jaroslav Krejčí could therefore represent a use- ful challenge to those middle-aged scientists who are already attaining the peak of their ca- reers in their specialisations and are ready to broaden their horizons, and in this way reach a more complex and consequently more profound knowledge of contemporary life in society.

Pavel Machonin

### **Selected bibliography of the most important writings of Jaroslav Krejčí**

- Income Distribution* (Habilitation Thesis). Praha 1947, in Czech.
- Social Change and Stratification in Postwar Czechoslovakia*. London, New York 1972.
- Social Structure in Divided Germany*. London, New York 1976.
- Economic and Political Nations in Europe*. London, New York 1981, with V. Velimský.
- National Income in Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia*. London, New York 1982.
- Great Revolutions Compared, the Search of a Theory*. Brighton 1983.
- Czechoslovakia at the Crossroad of European History*. London, New York 1990.
- The Human Predicament: its Changing Image*. London, New York 1993.
- Great Revolutions Compared, the Outline of a Theory*. Brighton 1994.
- Czechoslovakia 1918-1992, a Laboratory for Social Change*. London, New York 1996, with P. Machonin.
- Civilizations of Asia and the Middle East before the European Challenge*. London, New York 1999.