

good and evil, law and injury, value and worthlessness.

On the other hand I think that we find instrumental accesses not only in the human race's relation to nature, but also in interpersonal relations. Moreover, it would be possible to hypothesise that an escalation of the manorial relationship to nature is accompanied by an escalation in manorial interhuman relationships. In every case, there is a close bond between the cultivation of the human race's relationship to nature and the cultivation of interpersonal relationships.

From here, it seems to me that the question of deep ecology should not stand as an advancement in „-centrism“, but as the consequential consideration of humanity's unsouvereignity and limits, as a redefinition of humanity (even paradigms of science, scientificity, rationality, technicity etc.). Otherwise, the impression might arise that the „human“ attitude is only similar to one spiritually civilisational attitude, with the certain continual generic disease, treatable only by underclassing humanity within an extrahuman order; in reality, how-

ever, it treats one of the possible (deformed) forms of humanity. Possible steps towards a remedy to the human-nature relationship are signs of another concept of humanity (e.g. contemporary voluntary modesty, compassion for every living thing, the cultivation of the Me-You relationship); such attitudes are purely human, nature being incapable of them.

Consequently: whoever puts natural integrity out of order must correct it (by correcting themselves first, this constituting a further „anthropocentrism“). Things may already be advanced so far that nature cannot save itself without our responsible engagement. If we have to alleviate the damage caused to nature, we have to begin by amending human things.

I am persuaded that in this I do not disagree with Hana Librová's work, the publication also appealing format. That a consideration of one of the open problems lead me to this short text, may serve to endorse the inspiration in this thought-provoking, culturally written, well-considered and very necessary book.

Lubomír Nový

Vladimíra Dvořáková, Jiří Kunc:

Opřechodech demokracii

[On Transitions to Democracy]

Praha, SLON (Sociologické nakladatelství)
1994, 150 p.

The work constitutes a survey of knowledge of transitology – a nascent discipline within comparative politics (in particular Linz: *Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Crisis, Breakdown and Re-equilibration* and O'Donell, Schmitter, Whiteland: *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule*). This survey is introduced by more general reflections on democracy and its origin. There is also a reflection on the application of Luhmann's systematic theory – which deals with the problem of anomie's emergence during the transition. A further initial reflection of the problems of dealing with the totalitarian past and an outline of utilisation of presented evaluation theories for the Czechoslovakian transition to democracy are included. A survey of the organisation of transitology is not only the main emphasis of the work, but its most

valuable part. The authors sought to avoid writing a classical survey paper with its inevitable insufficient explanatory component. Indeed, the text is basically divided and compiled in a way allowing the particular parts to carry a rather low number of selected, relatively elaborately developed ideas from several key works. Although including many additional quotations from other works, the book maintains the systematic ordering of the original papers by their authors. The range of complementary literature is wide, due, among other reasons, to the authors' language skills allowing them to study Spanish, French and Italian literature (the history of South Europe and America often being compared). However, the stressed explanatory character of the book necessarily reduces its critical dimension, as is common to survey studies. This may not disturb the reader, but does the reviewer, who is uncertain whether to address the authors of the survey or the authors of the original papers.

The introductory chapter „How Democracy is being Born“ serves two purposes: (1) it

legitimises the chosen attitude within comparative politics and (2) presents a historical reconstruction of the evolution of the relevant political literature, the term „transition“ as well as the book's essential topics. As a topic, the transition to democracy becomes interesting when we stop concentrating on what makes democracy possible and take into consideration those procedures which are successful in its establishment and defence (Rustow). Such an approach turns its attention to political actors and „gives importance and dignity back to the realm of politics without stopping to examine relations to other spheres in the human course of events“ (Rustow, Poulantzas, Furet).

The first important focus in the dynamic concept of change based on a method of comparative politics was Chile in 1973. As a pioneering study in this field, a work by Linz *Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Crisis, Breakdown and Re-equilibration* – is considered, which also provides a probabilistic paradigm of the theory of strategic games to studies on transitology: „Certain types of individuals and institutional actors, placed in similar situations, react with high probability such that, they contribute to the breakdown of regimes“.

The work *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Outlooks for Democracy* is a collection of twenty monographic studies of various kinds of „transitions to democracy“ and a whole range of synthesising articles this time motivated by success of emerging democracies in Southern Europe (especially in Spain) and extended to the whole world, particularly South America. As such, it lays down some of the foundations to theories of transition to democracy.

Przeworski provides the most important summary of the problem, his interpretation being presented as follows: „Transition is defined as a form of change from an authoritarian regime to another, indefinite one. This aspect of indefiniteness may mean a real political democracy or still only an even more authoritarian regime or simply a chaos, violent confrontation or a revolution. The related terms liberalisation and democratisation are analytically distinguishable within the transition. Liberalisation lies in the opening of authoritarian system on the basis of the present rulers' initiative

and leads to a form of *limited authoritarianism and a moderate dictatorship* (dictablanca), democratisation on the other hand may also involve moments up to which considerable restrictions concerning the free conduct of actors are enforced and which may end in (*strict*) *limited democracy* (demokradura). The statement that the best way possible and desirable of achieving democracy is without the dramatic interruption of continuity and without any violence is common to the majority of the authors and possibly stands even as their normative postulate“.

To my mind, the chapter named „The Nature of a Regime in Displacement“ exhausts itself somewhat in an end itself sorting of various classifications of nondemocratic regimes. The basic information the reader may get from it (except that he/she may accept or reject the vocabulary employed) is the fact that what is characteristic of nondemocratic systems is a limited pluralism in the field of government and all other forms of social life control, and that the term „totality“ is related to a myth diabolising the completeness and the violent character of its mastery over people's thought and behaviour. Therefore it deserves to be rejected in favour of a more realistic term – authoritarian regime. In terms of the theory of transition to democracy it is, in my opinion, more important to speculate over formal and informal sources and the internal conditions of relative stability of such authoritarian regimes, since they themselves subsequently become essential factors affecting transitions.

The chapters „End of the Old Regime“ and „Stages of Transition to Democracy“ consist mainly of a recapitulation of the outcome of the four-part-book „Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Outlooks for Democracy“ and works drawing upon them (e.g. Przeworsky's monograph). They have taken the main notions about transitions to democracy from the workshop of comparative politics:

- Stepan's typology of redemocratisation and its various openings;
- Przeworsky's defence of analysis of strategies and signals;
- Linz's and Schmitter's typology of transitions (by making a pact, by thrusting upon, by reform and revolution) combining leading

actors (elite and masses) and chief strategies (compromise, force) and their apology for arranged transitions;

- Przeworsky's classification of initial positions in terms of conflict structure and decision-making branches of liberalisation;
- the conception of the origin or re-establishment of democracy as an outcome of an authoritarian regime (a broad antiauthoritarian front) and the building of democracy (differentiating between moderate and radical members of both political camps).

The chapter „What to do with the Past“ also seems a bit heterogeneous to me. As long as the authors stick to the transitological paradigm of comparative politics (speculations about the personification of the past in form of persons or its identification with nondemocratic institutions in connection with the typology of the end of authoritarian regimes caused by the revolutionary overthrow of the sultanic type, by a collapse or arranged transition) they tend to be subject to their own priority of consociate democracy and appeasement strategy: they ask for pardon, which would not challenge the whole political community in which everybody is willing to live together with others, i.e. not even to deduce normative conclusions for the present and for the future from the past. However, the problem is that such generosity poses a threat when power is taken over by a new elite. For many supporters and opponents of democracy it represents proof of the weak will to win the fight which, in a certain sense, recurs: the matter is whether the regeneration anomie will or will not be coped with. Apart from other things, this fight is fought on the level of description of the old regime and the history of the overthrow. Incidentally, the authors themselves mention that „the problem of dealing with the past is actually the same thing as pushing through one's own account and one's own story as generally applicable and consequently binding the present and the future, only with different words.“

The last chapter, „Question Mark instead of a Full Stop (Czecho-Slovakian)“, is itself a big question mark for me. It represents a rough reconstruction sketch of a Czecho-Slovakian transition, in places involving statements which seem to me quite unrelated. Each transi-

tion is, however, described in more than one way in a spirit of narrative attitude to which I am well disposed and which the authors applied to the end of the chapter on dealing with the past. The mistake probably was that their reconstruction is only superficially treated. Despite this fact, it seems to reveal one thing very convincingly, that being that in our case, it was not only a transition to democracy; the single focus on the political dimension, without respect to other spheres (in particular economics), leads to doubtful conclusions. This takes us back to the introductory postulates of the work, which will be discussed. Dvořáková and Kunc's book has to be welcomed as an introductory contribution to commencing such professional discussion.

As well as transitology, the key postulate of this work is that all studied transformations form part of a field of study of „transitions to democracy“; hence the essential and sufficient thing in studying them is the political actors' behaviour. Instead of this conception, which is founded on the presumption that these changes are primarily occurring in the political sphere and should therefore be studied only as political processes, I prefer an alternative, confronting the political „transformation“ with changes in other spheres of life in the society and distinguishing whether at the same time it is also a transformation of the society which then encroaches not only on politics but on all other spheres of social life, law, economics, ethics and the like. Since socialism originated as a result of nationalisation, the denial of economic subjectivity, the problem of its re-establishment and the aversion of an economic collapse may be a key to understanding the transformations in East European countries, i.e. even to the contents of political negotiations. It is not entirely possible to view the transformations which took place in Czechoslovak society after November 1989 merely as a transition to democracy in the sense upheld by the discussed work.

The second problem, closely connected with the former, is the question of the transition's direction. The authors of the initial study found, as the title of their work shows, a smart solution to the problem: „Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Outlooks for Democracy“.

They were more careful than the authors of the reviewed work. Nevertheless, in the same surreptitious way they actually build their conclusions on a normative idea of the transition to democracy, as we can see in the differentiation of each stage of these transitions: liberalisation and democratisation. I myself would prefer a more neutral indication of a regime's (system) erosion and the origin of the new regime (system). At the same time, an essential part of the „game“ is, of course, the question of direction – post hoc acknowledged by the authors themselves in a chapter named „What to do with the past“.

The third problem is the justification for constituting a probabilistic model on the basis of comparison of various transitions.

With Luhmann (the problem of anomie in transition) and Furet (symbolic dimension of politics and narrative approach) drawn upon for support, it shows that the authors themselves are aware of the limitations of this approach. I personally think that these models

emerge mainly thanks to the retrospective determinism of the quoted Benedix: in principally narrative reconstructions of transitions, mutual determinations are consequently being found and may be generalised according to the described regularity. The important thing here is not the statistical probability but the mimetic representation of probability, its general features to be found in Propp's analysis of fairy-tales about witches. A story line appears here, which starts with power's disruption of a stable situation. This causes an imbalanced state which must be returned to stability by another power with opposite potential during the performance of tasks. Indeed, to talk about the probabilistic model of dragon extinction in fairy-tales would seem to us somewhat ridiculous, despite the fact that on a statistical basis, the comparative ethnography could easily show that, globally, dragons' outlook for survival are bad.

Jiří Kabele