This book is derived from the last of three symposia on Europe honouring the memory of a truly distinguished sociologist, Professor Edmund Mokrzycki of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology at the Polish Academy of Sciences (IFiS) and the Centre for Social Studies (CSS) at the Central European University in Warsaw. Edmund's sudden death in 2001 shocked and saddened all who had had the privilege of knowing him and working with him.

In the late 1950s the insufficiencies of Marxism-Leninism were evident enough for (empirical) sociology to be introduced in most of state-socialist Eastern Europe. In Poland alone this amounted more to the recovery of a long tradition of sociological study. Thus, sociologists whose views had been formed in pre-socialist Poland were able to influence the development of sociology after 1956 and secure for it an openness to western sociology unique in Eastern Europe. Arguably the single most important of those sociologists was Stanisław Ossowski, best known abroad for his *Class Structure in the Social Consciousness* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963). Edmund Mokrzycki studied under Ossowski at the University of Warsaw and always acknowledged that he had been greatly influenced by him and also by his wife, Maria, a specialist in the sociology of morals. Edmund developed further his expertise in quantitative sociology during a year spent at Berkeley but it was soon clear to his fellow teachers and students at the University of Warsaw that he was a humanistic critic of much of the positivist tradition, just

as he was of much of the tradition of historical materialism. His (meta)theoretical position was set out for an international readership in his *Philosophy of Science and Sociology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984).

Like the previous two, this third symposium draws together the work of scholars from many countries—something Edmund always liked to do. He relished the years he spent at Chicago (1976-1977), the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences at Wassenaar (1984–1985), and the European University Institute in Fiesole near Florence (1992–1993). He was the key figure in the re-formation of the sociology programme in George Soros's postgraduate foundation, the Central European University, on the transfer of the programme to Warsaw in 1995, serving as the foundation director of the CSS while also teaching at the College of Europe in Bruges. Edmund's collaborative network included sociologists in America, Britain, France, Germany, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, Bulgaria and Russia—and, of course, Poland where he also served a term as director of IFiS. Edmund, the Polish intellectual, cared deeply about his country and sought to serve it by critically examining its institutions and practices. You could say it was his vocation. Comparative study and international collaboration were necessary to that critical engagement. One of his last essays, "Democracy in a Non-Democratic Society" (in R. Dahrendorf et al., eds, The Paradoxes of Unintended Consequences, Budapest: CEU Press, 2000), provides a fine example of his independent thinking. There are many essays written in a similar spirit in this book. He would have been particularly pleased that one, on Polish national memory, is by his former student, Joanna Kurczewska.

The new Europe is complex. What and where it is and what it could and should become are contested intellectually and politically. Contributors to the symposium draw lessons from Kant and Marx onwards. Edmund Mokrzycki's own life and work is just as instructive. He was born in 1937 in the village of Wierzchowce in what is now western Ukraine. Most of the local population was Ukrainian or Jewish. After the Second World War he lived in Silesia in what had formerly been Germany. He knew about borders. This book has much to say about the borders of Europe and issues of permanence and transience, hardening and permeability, core and periphery; and about peoples and cultures and issues of inclusion and exclusion, identity and difference, cohesion and conflict. These are issues that matter to citizens but they are seldom simple. They are also exactly the kinds of issues that Edmund thought social scientists have a responsibility to clarify.

Sven Eliaeson comments that the first symposium on building civil society and democracy in Europe east of the Elbe came close to a celebration

Published by The Bardwell Press, 2010

Foreword

of transitology. Edmund and I never liked the idea of a transition in East-Central Europe insofar as it suggested a movement in all cases to a single clearly defined and guaranteed end-state—liberal democracy and a market economy. We preferred to speak of transformation because it allowed greater variation with respect to democratic and capitalist outcomes (see our The New Great Transformation? London: Routledge, 1994). It is gratifying that in this third symposium talk of transition has largely given way to transformation. When we wrote in the early 1990s, there was also talk of Poland joining the European Union by 1998 which seemed to us utterly unrealistic. Edmund died before Poland's accession in 2004. There is interesting comment on the pros and cons of 'early' accession in Sven Eliaeson's introduction and elsewhere. The very notion of growth to limits is also the kind of challenge Edmund would have welcomed. How far can the European Union be extended geographically? How far, too, can the four freedoms and the single market be developed? What are the limits to multi-level governance? What, beyond liberal democracy and a market economy, does the union stand for? On these and other questions the essays in this symposium offer readers rich food for thought.

The very many social scientists in Poland and other countries who remember Edmund Mokrzycki with great respect and affection are indebted to Sven Eliaeson for his protracted labours in organising the three symposia in Edmund's honour and publishing the proceedings. Of course others made major contributions too, but without Sven the meetings and the books would not have happened.

Christopher G.A. Bryant University of Salford June 2009