

Tema četverbroja »Kako živi narod na hrvatskim otocima?«

Antun Petak

Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu, Zagreb, Hrvatska

Tematski broj časopisa »Sociologija sela« *Kako živi narod na hrvatskim otocima na Jadranu?* priprema se od 1999. godine temeljem zahtjevnog projekta.

Iako su hrvatski otoci dijelovi ruralnog prostora čije su društvene zajednice bile jedinice tradicionalnog (seljačkog) društva, na kojima se od šezdesetih godina 20. stoljeća pod utjecajem industrijalizacije, razvitka turizma, deagrarizacije i urbanizacije (nakon demografskog i agrarnog) zbio slom ruralnih zajednica, otočane i otočne zajednice sociolozi, socijalni antropolozi i socijalni psiholozi vrlo rijetko istražuju. Za razliku od kontinentalne Hrvatske na otocima uopće nisu istraživane kućne zajednice, bratovštine i (sub)kultura. Dramatične posljedice tektonskih ekonomskih, društvenih i kulturnih promjena u socijalnoj strukturi, načinu života, svjetonazoru i vrijednosnoj orijentaciji otočana zadnjih pola stoljeća jedva su literarno opisane. Štoviše, propuštena je jedinstvena eksperimentalna socijalna situacija: nisu praćeni učinci depopulacije, utjecaj prekida turizma tijekom Domovinskog rata, efekti načina privatizacije društvene imovine s privrednom stagnacijom na način života, na obiteljsku poljoprivredu, pojavu sloja bogatih otočana i siromašnih otočnih zajednica, involuciju socijalnosti otočana koja plodi teškim osobnim i socijalnim traumama, na funkcioniranje otočne samouprave itd. Ukratkog, dok su istraživanja otočana u svijetu sve brojnija (Malmberg, 1992.) u Hrvatskoj ih nema zbog malobrojnosti sociologa i trajne podfinanciranosti njihovih istraživanja, jer kreatori javne politike rijetko zasnivaju odluke na rezultatima društvenih istraživanja, te zbog »kontinentskog« pristupa razvoju otoka.

Ovu turobnu bilancu sociologijskih istraživanja hrvatskih otoka unekoliko mijenja par projekata kao što su »Društveni i kulturološki položaj žena u Hrvatskoj« (uzorkom su obuhvaćene i žene u Splitsko-dalmatinskoj županiji) i »Problemi adolescenata u Primorsko-goranskoj županiji«. Poduzeto je i nekoliko akcijskih, »policy research«, u svrhu izrade i vrednovanja strategija ili programa razvitka (primjerice, »Stanje i razvojni potencijali Vrbnika na otoku Krku«), čije ciljeve određuju i čija su publika, u pravilu, izvanakademski čimbenici. Za razliku od toga provedena su ili su u tijeku respektabilna demografska, etnografska, arheološka, lingvistička i povijesna, a do neke mjere i ekonomska istraživanja otoka.

Koliko kreatori javne politike u Hrvatskoj u donošenju odluka ne vode računa o rezultatima društvenih istraživanja svjedoči i izrada »Nacionalnog programa razvitka otoka«, kojega je Hrvatski sabor donio 1997. godine. U ekspertskom timu pri Ministarstvu razvitka i obnove nije bilo sociologa (a program se radi zbog ljudi i provedba ovisi o ljudima!), stručnjaka za socijalnu politiku i socijalni rad (unatoč sve većeg bremena socijalnih problema i neprimjerenosti instrumentarija socijalne politike). U ortačkom (rodijačkom) kapitalizmu, na kojega slični model instaliran procesom postsocijalističke tranzicije u Hrvatskoj, uske grupe zanemaruju interes društvene zajednice i instrumentaliziraju pravo artikulacije tog interesa.

Osim zbornika otoka i priobalnih gradova, otočnom je stanovništvu, privredi i kulturi dosad posvećeno nekoliko zbornika i knjiga. Tematske brojeve objavili su zagrebački časopis »Društvena istraživanja« (12-13/1994.) i zadarsko »Glasje« (7-8/1997.), a blokove zagrebački časopisi »Financijska praksa« i »Migracijske teme«. Daleko premano. Poglavitito jer su tiskani radovi iz drugih zadaća. Naslova o strukturi transformiranih otočnih malih seoskih društava, o društvenosti i načinu života, vrijednosnim obrascima otočana nema. Reproductivna pak je sposobnost otočnih zajednica više esejistički potencirana nego znanstveno raščlanjena.

Differentia specifica »Sociologije sela« spram drugih časopisa u pristupu otocima je *disciplinarna, problemska* i dijelom *metodologijska*. Prvo, hrvatski otoci kao ruralni prostor i seoske zajednice, predmet su *sociologije sela* i srodnih disciplina te zadaća ovog časopisa. Drugo, ruralna se sociologija bavi društvenim, gospodarskim i kulturnim životom i razvojem otoka, tj. sposobnošću produkcije i reprodukcije društva, a u izradi državnih poticajnih mjera referentni joj je okvir plodan spoj vrijednosti baštine i suvremenosti, te vitalne potrebe i interesi otočana. Treće, *Sociologija sela* ustraje na priložima iz *empirijskih* znanstvenih istraživanja izvedenih *lege artis* (strukturalna sociologijska analiza, integracija kvantitativnih i kvalitativnih metoda itd.) respektirajući potrebu posebnog pristupa. Otočne su populacije male i zbog vrlo jakih eksternih utjecaja na istraživanu pojavu točno izračunati statistički parametri često su neuporabljivi i sociologa nagone na socioantropologijski pristup i primjenu kvalitativnih metoda. S druge strane, otočno gospodarstvo spada u red »ekonomija malih razmjera« (djelatnosti i subjekti koji pojedinačno koriste male kapacitete, mali broj zaposlenih, male prostore, troše malo energije, imaju količinski malu proizvodnju, pa su pojedinačni efekti u apsolutnom iznosu također mali) i njegova je prava snaga u rasprostranjenosti, brojnosti i raznovrsnosti. Zato i ekonomski analitičar ima ozbiljne poteškoće: uobičajene ekonomske metode pregrube su za uopćavanje otočnih razvojnih oscilacija, preosjetljive za raščlambu jednostavne otočne gospodarske strukture, preuske za otočni sustav, isuviše oslonjene »na neposrednu atipičnu otočnu gospodarsku prošlost – da bi išta prognozirale, a i suviše okrenute pukom gospodarskom rastu – da bi se mogle baviti otočkim razvojem« (Starc, 1992.: 121-122).

Zato je projekt tematskog broja »Kako živi narod na hrvatskim otocima?« *suradnjom* sociologa, socijalnih psihologa, socijalnih antropologa, demografa, ekonomista i svih ostalih koji u tome mogu pomoći, imao osigurati prikaz spoznaja i

vrednovati provedena, a time i potaknuti buduća sociološkijska i interdisciplinarna istraživanja uvjeta i načina života hrvatskih otočana. Ambicija pri tome nije bila »riješiti pitanje hrvatskih otoka« jer to znanost ne može, nego izbjeći zamke zabluda o znanosti kao svemoćnom sredstvu koje pruža neupitna rješenja svih životnih problema i pomaže u rješavanju političkih prijepora zasićenih znanstvenim konotacijama. Časopis, međutim, zdušno podupire poduzimanje društvenih znanstvenih istraživanja i primjenu njihovih rezultata, jer su oni uvjet racionalnog zasnivanja razvoja i rješavanja problema koje identificiraju akteri donošenja odluka. Dakako bez partikularističkih interesnih instrumentalizacija i simplifikacija.

To u *Sociologiji sela* nije novina. Prvo, ona je već objavila više radova o demografskim kretanjima, strategiji razvoja i ekonomiji otoka i kreatorima politike posredovala znanstvene osnove za upravljanje otočnim razvitkom. Drugo, svih pet bibliografija tiskanih u *Sociologiji sela* zadnjih devet godina (115–116/1992., 117–118/1992., 125–126/1994., 135–138/1997. i 147–148/2000.) sadrže i bibliografske jedinice relevantne za ruralnosociološki pristup otocima. Naposljetku, *Sociologija sela* sudjeluje u pomacima istraživačke fronte, a sada u pomaku ka »teritorijalizaciji društvenosti« odnosno teritorijalnosti ponašanja (*behavioural territoriality*) na otoku (Moles, 1982.; Malmberg, 1992.; Meistersheim, 1994.; Biggi, 2000.).

Autori su pozvani da ponude izvorne tekstove, a sociolozi i da poklone pozornost »malim otočnim društvima«, tradicionalnim ruralnim zajednicama i *inzularnosti* (*insularity*) kao determinanti *otočnosti* (*islandity*), varijetetu društvenosti otočana. Naime, u raščlambi otočnog svijeta danas se rabe tri koncepta, koji omogućuju promišljanje teritorija, odvojenosti, samodostatnosti, autonomije, periferije, održivog razvitka i upravljanja otocima: *inzularnost* – pristup geografa i ekonomista, *inzularizam* – pristup političara i geopolitičara, te *otočnost* – pristup psihologa i sociologa (Meistersheim, 1994.). Abraham Moles (1982.) drži otoke rijetko dobrom ilustracijom esencijalne povezanosti između ponašanja živih bića i okoliša, te ističe da geografski oblici u kojima pojedinci žive nužno podrazumijevaju posebnu sliku svijeta i da je to predmet nove discipline »nisologije« (*nissology*; grčki *nissos* = otok), znanosti o otočnom prostoru.

Otoci se geografski i ekonomski razlikuju po stupnju inzularnosti (ovisno o udaljenosti od najbližeg otoka ili kontinentalnog kopna), a ekonomski po gospodarskoj ranjivosti (zavisno o vlastitim resursima i prednostima). Inzularnost označuje izolaciju otočana od ostalih dijelova svijeta, jer je otok istodobno i ograničeno područje i apsolut unutar posebnog prostorno-vremenskog okvira. Zbog zatvorenosti u sebe otok je od početaka autonomna ekonomija utemeljena na vlastitim proizvodima, a u društvenom smislu otok je spacijalni sistem u kojem operira društveni sustav.

O okviru proučavanja ljudskog teritorijaliziranog ponašanja ne postoji suglasnost. Obilježja inzularnosti i otočnosti posljedica su *ekstremnih životnih uvjeta* i prostorne udaljenosti odnosno *prostorne, gospodarske, socijalne i kulturne izolirano-*

»*sti manjih, u pravilu seoskih, zajednica* od naselja sa specijaliziranim funkcijama zbog čega je bitno osiromašena komunikacija i razmjena s drugim zajednicama i globalnim društvom. Čak i u suvremenosti. Otočnost je dokazana istraživanjima otočana, žitelja norveških fjordova, planinskih naselja na velikoj nadmorskoj visini i na visoravnima i žitelja pustinjaških oaza. Značajke otočnosti (neke su kompenzatorne naravi) jesu: višestrukost socijalnih uloga pojedinca, posebna upućenost i otvorenost spram drugih sličnih zajednica, naročiti tip otočne socijalne solidarnosti i kontrole, te osebnost tradicijske kulture, svjetonazora i sustava vrednota. U užem smislu otočnost je poseban varijetet socijalne distance, izolacije, kontrole i kontakata (komunikacija) između pojedinaca i između različitih grupa. Taj se način života na hrvatskim malim otocima mijenjao (već i etapnim prijevom svježe krvi s kopna nakon svake veće socijalne ili prirodne katastrofe), a najdalekosežnije promjene izazvali su: povezivanje redovitim parobrodskim linijama (što je omogućilo promet roba, ljudi i ideja, razmjenu s kopnom i globalnim društvom) i uvođenje obvezne osnovne škole pod austrijskim carem Franjom Josipom, a osobito peronospora i filoksera krajem 19. stoljeća, te industrijalizacija, deagrarizacija, urbanizacija i razvoj masovnog industrijskog turizma u drugoj polovici 20. stoljeća.

Mada su iznimna nacionalna vrijednost i prvorazredan razvojni resurs, hrvatski su otoci izloženi jakim i kontinuiranim procesima devastacije krajobraza, demografske degradacije, gašenja obiteljskih gospodarstava kao proizvodnih jedinica, podzaposlenosti, produbljivanja socijalne nesigurnosti i bezperspektivnosti, te involuciji socijalnosti. Onaj tko rješenje vidi u svemoćnoj državi sučelit će se s nepremostivom barijerom domašaja državnih intervencija i proći će najskuplju školu. Na kraju, ne samo što produktivne transplantacije rješenja iz jednog u drugi sociokulturni sustav nisu moguće, jer su ona funkcionalna u sustavu čijim su dijelom, već su i komparacije moguće sa zemljama sličnih obilježja (primjerice, po broju stanovnika, modelu gospodarskog i političkog sustava i kulturnom krugu) i sličnog otočja – po mnoštvu manjih i malih naseljenih tzv. kontinentskih otoka koji tvore određene skupine odnosno arhipelage referentnim se mogu držati Finska, Grčka i Norveška (Hache, 2000.).

Odazvali su se gotovo svi pozvani autori i pružili izuzetno vrijedan prinos. Čitatelj se na jednom mjestu može informirati o najvećem dijelu korpusu znanja, ali i otvorenim pitanjima, posebice adresiranim nositeljima javne politike. *Nenad Starc* izložio je cjelovit pregled i prosudbu modela upravljanja otočnim razvojem u Hrvatskoj od kraja Drugoga svjetskog rata, *Mladen Ante Friganović* (jedinu živući hrvatski demograf koji je osobno bio na svakom nastanjenom otoku i otočiću hrvatskog dijela Jadrana) pružio je jedinstvenu izvornu sintezu demografskih istraživanja prožetu vlastitim stavom i znakovitim poukama, *Dragutin Babić* i *Ivan Lajić* iznijeli su rezultate istraživanja predmigracijskog mnijenja osnovnoškolaca i srednjoškolaca sa šibenskih otoka s »crnim prognozama«, agrarni ekonomisti *Josip Defilippis* i *Stipe Radinović* (prvi u radu o otočnom gospodarstvu uopće a drugi raščlanjujući nalaze svojevrstnog longitudinalnog istraživanja obiteljskih gospodarstava na srednjodalmatinskim otocima) suočavaju nas sa čitavim breme-

nom problema ali i s mogućim razvojnim iskorakom, *Eduard Kušen* upoznaje nas s procjenom štetnog utjecaja turizma na krajobraz, prostor, razvoj i sustav vrijednosti hrvatskih otoka, *Josip Županov* (vodeći istraživač modernizacije) predstavlja se u ulozi minucioznog i vrsnog analitičara tradicionalnog društva i njegove (sub)kulture, *Anči Leburic* se zalaže za integraciju kvalitativnih i kvantitativnih pristupa u budućim empirijskim istraživanjima otoka, *Petar Bezinović* i *Antun Petak* po prvi put u Hrvatskoj posvjedočuju plodnost otočnosti kao interpretativnog okvira u tumačenju rezultata jednog empirijskog istraživanja mladih otočana, *Inga Tomić-Koludrović* i *Anči Leburic* iznijele su indikativne rezultate istraživanja svakidašnjice otočanki krajem 20. stoljeća, *Željka Mrkić* reinterpretila svoje nalaze istraživanja razvojnih potencijala Vrbnika na otoku Krku (prve sociološke studije ove vrste u nas), *Josip Sarić* i *A. Petak* suočili su se s insuficijentošću sustava zaštite socijalno ugroženih kategorija pučanstva hrvatskih otoka, *Vladimir Skračić* je načeo temu zaštite interesa privatnih vlasnika u zaštićenom prostoru Nacionalnog parka Kornati, a *Mirjana Randić* cjelovito prezentirala sintezu dosadašnjih istraživanja prehrane stanovništva hrvatskih otoka. Prva selektivna hrvatska bibliografija socioloških i srodnih radova o otočanima (528 bibliografske jedinice) *A. Petaka*, objavljena na kraju, potvrđuje uvodne konstatacije o razvijenosti istraživanja.

Time *Sociologija sela* nastavlja svoju misiju. Broj je pripremljen bez posebne potpore – državno tijelo nadležno za otoke na zahtjev podnijet temeljem javnog natječaja čak nije ni odgovorilo. Ukoliko broj skrene pozornost barem dijela javnosti na hrvatske otoke, potakne rasprave i zanimanje hrvatskih sociologa i javnosti, on je ispunio svoju ulogu. Znanstvene prosudbe rezultata *Nacionalnog programa razvitka otoka* nalažu dulju vremensku distancu.

Literatura

1. Biggi, Michel M. (2000.): Représentations statistiques et économiques de l'insularité. – In: Jean-Didier Hache (ed.): **Quel statut pour les îles d'Europe? / What Status for Europe's Island's?**, – Paris ; Montréal : Éditions L'Harmattan, pp. 128–148.
2. Malmberg, Torsten (1992.): Island Territoriality : Insular Environment as Stress on Territorial Lifestyles. – In: Maj-Lis Follér (ed.): **Environment, Lifestyle, and Health : A Report from the European Workshop on Environment, Lifestyle, and Health, Strömstad in September 1991**. – Stockholm : Forskningsrådsnämnden, pp. 19–25.
3. Meistersheim, Anne (1994.): Territoire et insularité : le cas de la Corse. – Paris : Éditions Publisud, 262 p.
4. Moles, Abraham A. (1982.): Nissologie ou science des îles. – **L'espace géographique**, Paris, 11 (1982): 281–289.
5. Starc, Nenad (1992.): Otoci, regije i razvojna politika (*Islands, regions and developmental policy*). – **Društvena istraživanja**, Zagreb, 1 (1992) 1: 115–126.

The topic of the quadruple issue »How live the people on the Croatian Adriatic islands«?

Antun Petak

Institute for Social Researches of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

The preparations for thematic issue of the »Rural Sociology« quarterly entitled *How live the people on the Croatian Adriatic islands?* began already in 1999 and the whole work was founded on a demanding project.

Although the Croatian islands in the Adriatic have traditionally made part of the rural space, whose social communities were specific units of tradition-determined society or relatively isolated small peasant societies, where since the beginning of the 1960s (after demographic and agrarian destruction) a breakdown of rural communities has occurred as the result of industrialization, tourist development, deagrarianization and urbanization impact, the islanders and island communities have seldom been subject to systematically sociological, social-anthropological and social-psychological researches. Unlike in continental Croatia, the family co-operatives, fraternities and (sub)culture on the islands haven't been researched at all. Yet, an exceptional experimental social situation was neglected: the effects and impact that depopulation, break of tourism during the Homeland War, the way the former common property had been privatized along with economic stagnation have had on the life-style, the household-type agriculture, the appearance of the rich individual islanders and poor island communities, involution of islanders' sociability resulting in heavy personal and social traumas, the functioning of local authorities, etc. have never been monitored and researched. In short, while in global range sociological researches of islanders (Malmberg, 1992), in Croatia there aren't any because of the small number of sociologists and constant not sufficient financial support for their researches, since the creators of public policy rarely found their decisions upon the results of social scientific researches; and because of the »mainland« approach to the island development.

This gloomy balance of sociological researches of the Croatian islands has somewhat been changed by a few projects, like »The social and cultural position of women in Croatia« (the sample included the women in Splitsko-dalmatinska county as well) and »The problems of adolescents in Primorsko-goranska county«. A few »policy researches« have also been carried out aiming at creating and evaluating the development strategies or programmes (like for instance »The situation and developmental potentials of Vrbnik on the island of Krk«), whose objectives are defined by the factors not belonging to academic community. Unlike the mentioned, respectable demographic, ethnographic, archaeological, linguistic and historical, and to some extent also economic researches of the islands either were or are actually being carried out.

The practice of the making of the »National island development programme«, that was passed by the Croatian Parliament in 1997, evidences to what extent have the creators of

public policy taken into consideration the need of establishing the decision making process founded upon the results of social scientific researches. The expert team of the Ministry of Reconstruction and Development did not include sociologists (and the programme is being made for the people and its implementation depends on the people!), experts in the field of social policy (despite the ever growing burden of social problems and the inappropriateness of the available instruments of social policy). In companionship/partnership (kinship) capitalism, to which the model of capitalism inaugurated in Croatia in the process of post-socialist transition resembles, the narrow groups of people neglect the interest of social community and usurp the right of articulating it.

Besides the miscellanies on individual islands and coastal towns, several miscellanies and books have until now been dedicated to the island population, economy and culture. Thematic numbers were issued by the following periodicals: »Društvena istraživanja« (*Social Researches*) of Zagreb (12–13/1994) and »Glasje« (*Tidings*) of Zadar (7–8/1997), and the block issues were published by Zagreb periodical »Financijska praksa« (*Financial Practice*) and »Migracijske teme« (*Migration Topics*). *Far too little*. And this particularly because the papers published resulted from other tasks. There are no titles dealing with the structure of transformed peasant societies, with the sociability and the traditional life-style, the islanders' value patterns. And the reproduction ability of the island communities has rather been emphasized in essayist way than scientifically analysed.

Differentia specifica of *Rural Sociology* quarterly's approach towards the islands is *disciplinary, problematic* and partly *methodological*. In the first place, being rural space and rural communities, Croatian islands are the subject matter of *rural sociology* and related disciplines and thus the task of this periodical. Second, rural sociology deals with the islands social, economy and cultural life and development, i.e. with the ability of social production and reproduction, and its framework in the making of the government stimulating instruments is the fruitful combination of the heritage values and the contemporaneity as well as the islanders' vital needs and interests. Third, *Rural Sociology* quarterly persists in accepting the papers resulting from the *empirical* scientific researches performed *lege artis* (structural sociological analysis, integration of quantitative and qualitative methods, etc.) and respecting the need of implementing an appropriate approach. Island societies are small in number and because the phenomenon researched is under strong external influences, accurately calculated statistic parameters are often useless and make sociologist to apply social-anthropological approach and to implement quantitative methods. On the other hand, island economy belongs to the »narrow scope economies« (which include activities and subjects that use small capacities, small number of employees, small production facilities, spend little energy, have a small production in terms of quantity, so their individual effects within the absolute amount are also small) and its true power is in diffusion, number and variety. For that reason an economy analyst meets serious difficulties: usual economic methods are too rough to be implemented in island developmental oscillations generalization, too delicate to be implemented in the analysis of the island simple economy structure, too narrow for island's system, they rely too much »on the immediate atypical island economy past – to be able to give any prognoses, and too orientated towards the mere economy growth – to be able to deal with the island development« (Starc, 1992: 121–122).

For that reason, this thematic issue »How live the people on the Croatian islands?« created *through collaboration* of sociologists, social psychologists, social anthropologists, demographers, economists and all the other specialists whose expertise could help, was meant to provide the account of findings and to evaluate the researches that were carried out, but also to inspire future sociological and interdisciplinary researches of the living conditions

and the life-style of the population of Croatian islands. The intention wasn't to «solve the problem of Croatian islands» as the science can't do that, but to evade the traps of the mistaken thought that the science is an omnipotent instrument that offers indisputable solutions to all life problems and helps solving political disputes saturated with scientific connotations. Nevertheless, the periodical fiercely supports performing of scientific social researches and implementation of their results, as they are condition for reasonable establishment of development and for the solution of problems that have been identified by the decision-makers. Of course, without making them a particularist interest instrument and without any simplification.

This is not a novelty in *Rural sociology*. In the first place, this periodical has already published several articles on demographic movements, development strategy and island economy, mediating this way the policy creators scientific foundations for the island development management. Second, all five bibliographies that have been published in *Rural sociology* in the last nine years (115-116/1992, 117-118/1992, 125-126/1994, 135-138/1997 and 147-148/2000) include also the rural-sociological approach to the island issue relevant bibliographical units. And finally, *Rural sociology* is a scientific periodical that takes part in the shifts of the research front, and now this occurs through the shift towards the «sociality territoriality» phenomenon, and towards the behavioural territoriality on the example of islands (Moles, 1982; Malmberg, 1992; Meistersheim, 1994; Biggi, 2000).

The authors were invited to present original texts, and sociologists were asked also to pay attention to «small island societies» as the traditional rural communities and to *insularity* as the determinant of *islandity*, the variety of the islanders' sociability. Analysing the island world, today three concepts which enable the questioning of the islands' territory, isolation, self-sufficiency, autonomy, periphery, sustainable development and management are being implemented: *insularity* – geographers' and economists' approach, *insularism* – politicians' and geo-politicians' approach, and *islandity* – psychologists' and sociologists' approach (Meistersheim, 1994). Considering the islands an extremely good illustration of the essential connection between the living beings and their environment, Abraham Moles (1982) points out that geographical forms the individuals live in necessarily comprehend a specific picture of the world and that this should be the subject matter of a new discipline that he named «nissology» (Greek *nissos* = the island), the science of the island space.

Geographically and economically the islands differ from each other by the insularity degree (depending on the distance to the next island or to the nearest mainland), and economically they differ by the economic vulnerability (depending on their own resources and advantages). Insularity indicates the islanders' isolation from the rest of the universe, since the island is at the same time both a limited area and an absolute, functioning within a specific space-time framework. For its quality of being closed, the island has since the beginnings been an autonomous economy founded upon its own products, and socially speaking the island is a spatial system where the social system operates.

Within the studies of behaviour territoriality there is no consent. Characteristics of insularity and islandity are consequences of the *extreme working and living conditions* and of the remoteness, i.e. of *spatial, economic, social and cultural isolation of small, usually rural communities* from the settlements having specialized functions and for that reason their communication and exchange with other communities and with global society is significantly poorer. Islandity has been proved in studies of the islanders, the inhabitants of Norwegian fjords, high altitudes mountain regions and plateaux, and the inhabitants of oases. The characteristics of islandity are the following: multiple social functions of an individual, a particular openness to other similar communities, a special type of island social solidarity

and control, and distinctive traditional culture, attitude towards the world and set of values. In its narrow meaning, islandity is a particular variety of social distance, isolation, control and contacts (communication) between the individuals and between the different groups. This life-style has changed on Croatian small islands (already with inflows of »fresh blood« from the dry land after every greater social or natural disaster), but the farthest-reaching changes were caused by: the regular steamboat lines (which enabled goods, passenger and ideas traffic, as well as the exchange with the nearest dry land and with global society) and the introduction of obligatory elementary schooling under the Austrian emperor Francis Joseph, but above all the plague of phylloxera and peronospora at the end of the 19th century as well as the process of industrialization, deagrarianization, urbanization and the industrial mass tourism development since the 1960s.

Although being an extreme national value and a first class developmental resource, Croatian islands have been exposed to continuous strong processes of landscape devastation, demographic degradation, extinguishing of family households as the production units, sub-employment, ever-deeper social uncertainty and lack of prospect, as well as to sociability involution. Anyone who thinks the omnipotent government can provide the solution will face the unbridgeable barrier of the range of governmental interventions and will learn his lesson the heaviest way. Finally, not only that the solution transplantation from one social-cultural system to the other one is impossible, as these solutions function in the system whose intrinsic part they make, but also comparisons are possible to make only with countries having similar characteristics (for instance, by the number of population, social and economic and political system and cultural circle) and similar archipelago – by a number of smaller and small inhabited, so-called continental islands forming particular archipelagos, for instance Finland, Greece and Norway can be considered reference countries (Hache, 2000).

Almost all authors responded to our call for collaboration giving thus exceptionally worthy contribution. So, at this one place the reader can get the information on the greatest fond of knowledge, but also on open questions, especially those addressed to protagonists of public politics. *Nenad Starc* gave an integrated account and the evaluation of the island development management in Croatia since the Second World War. *Mladen Ante Friganović* (the only living Croatian demographer who had personally visited every populated island and islet in Croatia's part of the Adriatic Sea) gave a single original synthesis of demographic researches permeated with his attitude and far-reaching social morals. *Dragutin Babić* and *Ivan Lajić* presented the results of a research on pre-migration opinions of primary schools pupils and secondary schools students from Šibenik region islands giving »black prognoses«. Agrarian economists *Josip Defilippis* and *Stipe Radinović* (the former in his paper on island economy in general and the latter analysing the findings of a particular longitudinal study of family households on Middle Dalmatian islands) face us with the whole burden of problems but also with the possible approach in solving them. In his work, *Eduard Kušen* introduces an evaluation of the influence of tourism on landscape, space, value system and Croatian islands development. *Josip Županov* (the prominent researcher of modernization) presents a minute masterly made analysis of the traditional society and its (sub)culture. *Anči Leburic* pleads for qualitative and quantitative approaches to be integrated in future empirical researches of islands. *Petar Bezinović* and *Antun Petak*, for the first time in Croatia, interpret the results of one research of young islanders taking the islandity as an interpretation framework. *Inga Tomić-Koludrović* and *Anči Leburic* presented indicative results of the research on everyday life of the island women at the end of 20th century. *Željka Mrkić* presents re-interpreted findings of the research on developmental potentials of Vrbnik on the island of Krk (the first sociological study of this kind in Croatia), *Josip Sarić* and *A. Petak* faced the insufficient protection sys-

tem for socially endangered categories of Croatian islands population. *Vladimir Skračić* has broached the theme of the protection of private proprietors interests in the protected area of Kornati National Park. *Mirjana Randić* presented an integrated synthesis of the researches of nutrition of the Croatian Adriatic islands population carried out until now. At the end, the first Croatian selective bibliography of sociological and related works on islanders (528 bibliographical units) by *A. Petak* arguments the introductory conclusions on the development of researches.

The *Rural Sociology* quarterly continues its mission. This issue was prepared without any special support – the government body in charge of the islands hasn't even answered to the request that was submitted upon the public call for projects. Should this issue direct at least partial public attention towards Croatian islands, should it initiate discussions and should it raise the Croatian sociologists and public interest, it has accomplished its role. Scientifically justified judgement of the »National island development programme« results require a longer time distance.

References

1. Biggi, Michel M. (2000): Représentations statistiques et économiques de l'insularité. – In: Jean-Didier Hache (ed.): **Quel statut pour les îles d'Europe? / What Status for Europe's Island's?**. – Paris ; Montréal : Éditions L'Harmattan, pp. 128–148.
2. Malmberg, Torsten (1992): Island Territoriality : Insular Environment as Stress on Territorial Lifestyles. – In: Maj-Lis Follér (ed.): **Environment, Lifestyle, and Health : A Report from the European Workshop on Environment, Lifestyle, and Health, Strömstad in September 1991**. – Stockholm : Forskningsrådsnämnden, pp. 19–25.
3. Meistersheim, Anne (1994): Territoire et insularité : le cas de la Corse. – Paris : Éditions Publisud, 262 p.
4. Moles, Abraham A. (1982): Nissologie ou science des îles. – **L'espace géographique**, Paris, 11 (1982): 281–289.
5. Starc, Nenad (1992): Otoci, regije i razvojna politika (*Islands, regions and developmental policy*). – **Društvena istraživanja**, Zagreb, 1 (1992) 1: 115–126.