

chovnou snahu. Paradox folku jako hudebního mainstreamu totiž netrval dlouho, byť jde sále ještě o vysoce prodejný žánr, což některé jeho představitele vedlo směrem k posluchačsky méně náročné populární hudbě, jiné k diferencovanému náboženskému písničkářství, zatímco většině nezbylo než „vykrádat hroby“ – žít z vlastního odkazu, nebo hrát převzaté věci, jako to dělají (neříkám že špatně) třeba J. Burián, J. Dědeček a R. Křesťan, nebo v případě domácích básníků K. Plíhal, V. Veit či Z. Vřešťál (Nezez/Neřež).

Velkou část uvedených nedostatků a „kompozičních problémů“ recenzované knihy samozřejmě vysvětluje její orientace na běžného čtenáře, nostalgicky vyžadujícího potvrzení vlastních představ a náhledů, stejně jako závislost na původním televizním seriálu, v jehož stínu vznikala. Tak je tomu i v případě „skečovitého“ charakteru výkladu, kdy je populárně pojatý průvodní text, spojující interpretativní stránku s úryvky z rozhovorů a vzpomínek, prokládán delšími citacemi, dílčími úseky písňových textů a velkým množstvím reprodukováných fotografií a dalšího obrazového materiálu. Na této skutečnosti by samo o sobě nebylo nic špatného, zvlášť když žádný jiný „příběh folku, tramské a country písně u nás“ nemáme, v textu by se však neměly objevovat frapantní chyby jako absentující verše nebo nepřesné citace písní (např. s. 355, 413, 427, 449), nehledě k tomu, že v knižním vydání bych uvítal prezentaci celých písňových textů, ne jen jejich částí. Spolu s problematickou koncepcí celé knihy, jejíž autoři nebyli schopni patřičného odstupu a tedy i náležitého (z)hodnocení, nekladli si závažné otázky stran obsahu a sociální recepce sledované části moder-

ní populární hudby, je třeba zdůraznit, že jde o pokus jako celek nevydařený. *Legends of folk & country* mohou posloužit jako nezávazná vzpomínka pamětníkům, i když mnozí se asi s jejich argumentací v řadě ohledů neztotožní, a zejména jako legitimální sebe prezentace „zbylých“ protagonistů v knize obsažených žánrů (případně žánru FTC). Pregnantní dějiny tak výrazných fenoménů, jako bylo české protestní písničkářství, folk obecně, ale i tramská hudba a její přerod do populární country, tedy bude nutné teprve napsat. Nemělo by však jít jen o muzikologickou nebo literárně-historickou studii, byť i na tomto poli jsme unikátním uměleckým formám mnoho dlužni, nýbrž o široce pojatý kulturně-sociologický rozbor jejich obsahu a působení, podobně jako to v případě undergroundu alespoň částečně naplnil kolektiv autorů pod vedením J. Alana (*Alternativní kultura. Příběh české společnosti 1945–1989*. Praha 2001).

*Zdeněk R. Nešpor*

## **THE RISE OF THE CREATIVE CLASS by Richard Florida, Basic Books, New York 2004**

The book by Richard Florida became one of the most important recent reference points in the discussions involving economic perspective heavily marked by sociological approach. His most fundamental thesis looks both very appropriate for the description of newly emerging class in the developed societies and attractive as frame for interpretation of quite a range of phenomena such as prosperity, sustainability and immigration, to name just a few. As

far as Florida's method is concerned, he combines statistics with observations and empirical research, including quoting his private life and male magazine surveys as a source of information.

His fundamental thesis, which became very famous around the world (and also criticized), is: we are witnessing (and some of us also participating in) the process of emergence of a creative class, quite distinct from working, administrative and service classes. In a wider context, he adds that in order to be constantly competitive a country must develop not only technology and talent but also tolerance (for which Florida invented quite a successful statistical measurement method). Therefore, a country, which seriously means to stay in the leading and upwards development position must invest into technology and talent but also into environment, which would attract and keep creative people from all around the world. This has special relevance for European countries in terms of their immigration policies, which rarely take this idea as their guideline. Florida published a study under title *Europe in the Creative Age* (published by Carnegie Mellon Software Industry Center, Feb. 2004), where he applied the same and similar criteria to the selected EU countries.

This book is exclusively focused on the situation in the USA and its transformation from industrial to creative era, as Florida sees it. Each person has potential to be creative and economy, which knows how to use this potential, has future in terms of growth; and innovation and economy, which uses people to do the rote, essentially mechanical work is wasting its most precious capital. In a distinct American model, Florida explains his theory of eco-

nomical growth in 3T's, technology (measured by innovation and high-tech industry concentration), talent (measured not as human capital, but according to number of people in creative occupations) and, especially interesting for non-economists, tolerance (measured as combination of a number of indexes, namely the Gay Index, the Bohemian Index, the Melting Pot Index and measure of racial integration). The final Creative Index is combination of these models and gives us rank of the American cities (Austin, San Francisco, Seattle, Boston and Raleigh-Durham are the first five). Not surprisingly, the analysis is more about cities and regions than states and nations.

Basically, Florida wants us to understand that in his view the most important capital in the current economy lies in attracting different sorts of people and nurturing their creativity and that this is more important than flows of goods and services or capital. These are formative conditions for the creative class, which, socially speaking, moves from "traditional" to "secular-rational" values and from "survival" (financial and social stability) to "self-expression" values (Florida, p. XXV). It makes weak ties as opposed to the strong ones, which used to structure our societies. People move more often and live, what Florida calls, quasi-anonymous lives. In forty years (1960–2000) number of Americans living in nuclear families fell from 45 to 23,5 percent (see Florida p. 10). Creativity should be treated as common good, on the same basis as liberty or security, but in addition to that it is the decisive source of competitive advantage. This has interesting influence on diversity managements (terminus technicus, describing

nondiscrimination and equality on the job market): once it was a matter of legal compliance, now it has become a matter of economic survival, because “creativity comes in all colors, genders and personal preferences.” (ibid. p. 5). Creativity is raw material of the modern business the way iron and coal were for the traditional business. And, instead of putting people to social welfare or creating factory or low paid jobs, society should find the way to open channels for flow of creativity and pay these people accordingly.

Whereas he sees the creative age as marked by individuality, self-expression and openness to difference, the previous period, the organizational age was marked by homogeneity and conformity as basic norms. Life of artists, professors or scientists, which represented a marginal model with these professions being able to set their own working-hours and being dressed in an informal and relaxed way with the creative class became the economic mainstream. More and more creative class members work on the principle of soft control, which also means that boundaries of work and “life” become blurred. In that sense, Florida has interesting interpretation of Karl Marx’s forecast that workers will someday control the means of production: namely, Florida thinks that this is happening right now with the creative class, because it *became* the means of production itself. Florida divides the creative class into two components, one being the Creative Core (scientists, engineers, university professors, poets, novelists, artists, entertainers, actors, designers, architects, nonfiction writers, editors, cultural figures, think-tank researchers etc) and creative professionals, which are those em-

ployed in the knowledge-intensive sectors such as high-tech, financial services, legal and health care sectors, including business management. The class is characterized by three basic lines of values: individuality, meritocracy (the best should get ahead regardless of race, creed, sexual preference etc.) and diversity and openness. This, however, does not mean that existence of such a class has erased gender and particularly not race inequalities, creative class environment looks like “United Nations minus the black faces”, as one of Florida’s respondents put it (ibid. p. 80), which is directly related to the digital divide in the USA (fewer black people have access to digital media and this is reflected in their children’s education).

Referring to Inglehart’s World Values Survey, Florida describes member of the Creative Class as situated in the “post-materialist” or “post-scarcity” economies, where time does not have to be devoted to survival but to self-expression, to one’s own genuine lifestyle or in Mokyr’s words, we are witnessing the rise of *homo creativus* (ibid. p. 82). For the Creative Class workers money is not the ultimate motivation (maybe, we could add, because they are very well paid anyway), but, according to Florida, stimulation of the work itself and the place where they live represent the intrinsic award for them.

Members of the Creative Class tend to move horizontally on the job market rather than previously popular vertical way of climbing up the company hierarchy. Partly this is because the companies in which they work do not exist for decades and can vanish as easily as they emerged. This affected many things including the change of the dress code and creation of “no-collar

workplace” as opposed to blue- and white-collar workplaces. The dress code evolves to virtually none and due to electricity, personal computer, mobile phone and Internet, the working schedule became indiscernible from the time off. Also, the working place tends to be organized not anymore in separate rooms in which people quietly work on their own, but as open space, where creativity rises from casual contacts of employees of the same company. In short, new class created a new workplace culture. It looks more like “chaotic interplay of a bazaar, than orchestrated building of a cathedral.” (ibid. p.136).

Old employment contracts were group oriented and emphasized job security; the new ones are tailored to the needs and desires of individuals. This also contributed to levels of stress at work and the time famine (chronic lack of time). As an example, I will quote the following: “Templeton calculated that during 1986 – the year Microsoft went public – a \$5 bill would have been to small a bill for Bill (Gates) to bother with (picking it up). By 1998, a \$10,000 bill wasn’t worth the trouble.” (ibid. 152). Organizational age separated lives of people into work and life, requiring often different personalities for both place, creative age blurred the difference between the two, but also stretched work into life and life into work, which can be as stressful and also produces request to “deepen every moment”, to enjoy it fully, to make it intensive, to speed up activities, to order food instead of cooking, to do the multitasking (doing more things at the same time), to make detailed planning etc.

Florida also refers to Joseph Pine and James Gilmore book *The Experience Economy*, showing successfully that experi-

ences became a market product distinct from services and goods. Goods were limited to services now services became limited to experiences. Now we are being sold and we are buying experiences, sometimes even just anticipation of the experience to come, which is sometimes called “imaginative hedonism”.

His interpretation of the role of our bodies is interesting, but shows some weak points I will get back to later in the text: body became an art form, members of the Creative Class are obsessed with fitness of their bodies and riding a mountain bike became the activity, as horseback riding was in the previous century among the rich. One of the reasons for that is that people grow old as singles or get divorced more often, so they spend more time on the mating market (Florida’s expression). The sculptured body is simply more marketable on the mating market.

What Creative Class cares most about is a vibrant city, open to difference and tolerant, with hefty cultural life. But, as we learn from Florida, culture for the Creative Class has to be the street-level culture not the boring and predictable high culture, but the one in which the creator and the crated are exposed. That’s why also high culture must look for the way to sell itself in a more attractive way. As shown on the example of appliances and cookware in the kitchen, the Creative Class members have them because they provide experience and not to cook every day, to satisfy the need. The same goes for other things, the thins provide experience, they show status and they are used exclusively. The street level culture is also very eclectic, which precisely reflects the way the Creative Class sees its openness.

The community of the new class is similar: instead of strong ties and long-term commitments its members prefer more flexible, quasi-anonymous community, where they can quickly plug in and build a wide range of relationships. They want to be somewhat like tourists in the cities they live in, to be always excited by new experience and connect quickly, because two other sources of stability, family and workplace, became less secure. People tend to live alone and frequently change jobs and living spaces. In the USA that is obvious also geographically, where we find traditional working class, we don't find the creative class, but we do find a flourishing service class, which satisfies the demands of the creative.

Finally we arrive at statistics, the so-called Creativity Index, which comprises four factors:

1. Creative Class share of the workforce
2. Innovation, measured as patents per capita
3. High-tech industry
4. Diversity index

The diversity index is based on the Melting pot index, which measures openness to immigration as the corner stone of innovation and economic growth. Pascal Zachary is quoted as writing that America's economic success is directly related to its ability to attract and keep (in Europe we would say integrate) innovative and energetic people from around the world and the lack of this strategy is reason for decline of say Japan or Germany. As illustration, we can refer to numbers related to immigrant population in New York City, where between 1990 and 2000 some 1 million immigrants moved to the city, which added to the foreign-born population's rise to

40% (in Prague, it's less than 10%, including Slovaks). In Silicon Valley, nearly 25% of the population and 30% of high-tech scientists are foreign-born (ibid. p.253). But it does not mean that all immigration centers are also the creative centers, on the contrary, the statistical relationship is insignificant. Nevertheless, it is clear that "quality" migrants are essential for economic growth and creation of innovative environment.

The second component of the diversity index is much-commented Gay index. Openness to gay population is a significant sign of a tolerant setting for heterosexual individuals, too because tolerance to it signals even more tolerance to other differences. In Florida's opinion homosexuality represents "the last frontier of diversity in our societies" (ibid. p.256), which in my opinion can be strongly disputed. One is more likely not to be tolerated as a Muslim than as a gay in the western world nowadays.

The third component is the Bohemian index, which measures the number of writers, designers, musicians, actors, directors, painters, sculptors, photographers, dancers etc.

Now, let's see how the diversity index affects some important social parameters:

Parameter	Predictor
Population growth	Bohemian index, Melting Pot index, Diversity index
Employment growth	Bohemian index
Large regions	Bohemian index, Diversity index
Small and medium-size regions	Melting Pot index

**Table 1.** *Correlation of selected parameters and the Diversity Index*

Florida makes an important difference of his theory of creative communities as opposed to Putnam's and Bourdieu's theories saying that creative communities are centers of diversity, innovation and economic growths and that social capital communities are not (ibid. p. 273), referring to the exclusionary side of the social capital as such, to its strong preference for social isolation and security and stability, basic reciprocity of friendship usage and the "close the gate" mentality to those who do not own the social capital. Therefore Florida refers to Cushing who differentiates social, human and creative capital, with distinct impact on economic growth. The effect of social capital on economic growth was negative, whereas human capital had a considerable but not straightforward impact, but the most important correlation was established regarding creative capital. In Florida's view, this is because the social capital prefers strong ties, whereas the creative capital favors the weak ties. Weak ties consume less time and we can manage more of them.

Especially interesting correlation for the academics is relation of places, which score high on Creativity Index to major research universities, which represent creative hubs, but not necessarily in a linear pathway from university research centers to commercial innovation. It is more about contribution to creation of friendly climate to innovation and bringing people together. The cities, which fail to have such centers, often suffer from what Florida calls "institutional sclerosis."

Finally, Florida calls for self-organization of the Creative Class, because creativity is essential source of economic growth and a part of everyone's humanity that

needs to be cultivated. Therefore, public and private funds should shift away from investment in the physical capital and toward investment in the creative capital. The strong social capital communities, envisaged by Putnam do not fit into modern and changed economy and in Florida's opinion there is no point in trying to bring them back.

Let's focus now on a few points that deserve criticism in my opinion:

First of all, Florida's theory is based on extrapolation of a certain limited but powerful group of people. It is not incidental that, although he often mentions various artists, he almost exclusively draws his conclusion on the basis of analysis of high-tech workers. Therefore, his theory is elitist and is based on the fact that elite has power and therefore it is important. It ignores problems coming from non-elite, which tends to be less powerful but numerous. That is obvious in the case of failure in race relations; he points to the fact that music as creative activity mostly comes from disadvantaged groups but fails to notice that the branches accessible to the groups are severely restricted and that creativity area, the way he defines it, is one of them. He also levels the differences between the groups he labels as creative, equalizing success in engaging in a creative activity and its value (which does not necessarily correspond in art, for example).

Secondly, he overestimates the role of creativity in the economic process, again precisely because he generalizes what he found to be true about high-tech and IT workers.

Thirdly, he seems to be unaware of depth of problems stemming from social consequences of the creative elite in terms

of communities. The fact that its members change a lot of parameters in their lives (place where they live, where they work, friends and relationships) can be seen not only as a sign of creativity but as a sign of resignation to building important and responsible private universe of relations to other people. When he contemplates about the changes at work place and says that women were not interested so much in a company providing day care for the children, he does not see that it is a consequence of the lack of children as such. This is in accord with what he found, namely that top creative cities are not very children friendly. He mentions some of the deeply negative aspects of techno-libertarian culture, such as selfishness and lack of interest in civic engagement, but he fails to see the underlying connection – lack of stability leads to lack of responsibility other than to one's work and one's own benefit. This is because Florida sees economic growth as an ultimate social value, creativity as an uncontroversial vehicle to reach it and lack of stable community as collateral damage of the two. This is why he sees bodies as goods to be marketed, accepting as necessary the fact that people increasingly grow old without important relations as persons to persons. The fact that something is wrong deserves not only explanation that it was necessary to go wrong but also criticism.

This book is a huge source of inspiration for socio-economic analysis both with its provocative, precise and controversial matters.

*Selma Muhič-Dizdarevič*

## **TŘIKRÁT MARTIN HEIDEGGER – korespondence**

**Martin Heidegger: BRIEFE  
AN MAX MÜLLER UND  
ANDERE DOKUMENTE,**  
Hrsg. von Holger Zaborowski  
und Anton Bösl, Freiburg/  
München 2003

Nakladatelství *Verlag Karl Alber* sídlící v Mnichově a ve Freiburgu in Breisgau se profiluje jako ryze filosofické s důrazem na fenomenologické bádání. Dává však i prostor zcela novým a neznámým autorům. V případě publikování korespondence mezi Martinem Heideggerem a Maxem Müllerem (1906–1994) nakladatelství vsadilo na jistotu a prokázalo tím Heideggerovi velkou službu ve věci postupné korekce jeho působení v období rektorátu 1933/34. Svazek 16 Heideggerovy *Gesamtausgabe* (GA I. Abt., Bd. 16 *Reden und andere Zeugnisse eines Lebensweges 1910–1976*, k vydání připravil Hermann Heidegger, Frankfurt a.M. 2000, 842 str.) celou řadu dokumentů upřesňující situaci z inkriminované doby, která slouží jako alibi pro nezabývání se Heideggerovým myšlením. Max Müller coby Heideggerův žák se nikoli zanedbatelnou měrou přičinil o to, aby Heidegger nepřišel o svou knihovnu, kterou chtěli francouzští úředníci zabavit a vystrojit jí knihovnu nově založené univerzity v Mainzu. Ba co více: přimlouval se o to, aby mohl opět přednášet na univerzitě ve Freiburgu a aby nebyl připraven o plnohodnotnou profesorskou penzi. Za to mu byl Heidegger po celou dobu nesmírně zavázán. Heidegger „na