

*2009 Presidential
Address at the Congress
of the Croatian
Sociological Association*

*Predsjednički govor na
kongresu Hrvatskoga
sociološkog društva
2009.*

**A View of the Future:
Sociology as a
Multiparadigmatic,
Reflexive and Public
Science**

**Pogled u budućnost:
sociologija kao
multiparadigmatska,
refleksivna i javna
znanost**

Inga TOMIĆ-KOLUDROVIĆ

*Odjel za sociologiju, Sveučilište u Zadru / Department of Sociology, University of Zadar
itomic@unizd.hr*

The text represents the presidential address held at the 2009 congress of the Croatian Sociological Association. It is argued that sociology as a discipline and its research results are insufficiently visible in the transitional Croatian society, because of its previous role of legitimation of the social order, assigned to it during the socialist period. It is in such past of the discipline that the reasons should be sought for its insufficient theoretical and methodological capability to respond to the complex processes Croatian society is faced with in the post-socialist period. In order to fulfil its public role, Croatian sociology should continue its current efforts to methodologically diversify and to adopt multiparadigmatic theoretical approaches. It should also work on its self-reflexivity as a discipline and strive to achieve ever-higher levels of academic excellence.

Key words: Croatian sociology, post-socialist transition, public sociology, sociology as legitimising science, sociology as interpretive science, reflexivity

Tekst predstavlja predsjednički govor na kongresu Hrvatskoga sociološkog društva, održanom 2009. godine. Konstatira se da su sociologija kao disciplina i njezini istraživački rezultati nedovoljno vidljivi u tranzicijskom hrvatskom društvu. Uzroci takvom stanju pronalaze se u ulozi legitimacije društvenog poretka, koja je sociologiji kao disciplini bila namijenjena tijekom socijalističkog razdoblja. U takvoj prošlosti discipline valja tražiti razloge nedovoljne teorijske i metodološke spremnosti hrvatske sociologije da odgovori na kompleksne procese s kojima se hrvatsko društvo suočava u postsocijalističkom razdoblju. Da bi ispunila svoju javnu ulogu, hrvatska bi sociologija trebala nastaviti aktualna nastojanja prema metodološkom uraznoličenju i usvajanju multiparadigmatskih teorijskih pristupa. Također bi, kao disciplina, trebala poraditi na svojoj samorefleksivnosti i nastojati postići što viši stupanj akademske izvrsnosti.

Cljučne riječi: hrvatska sociologija, postsocijalistička tranzicija, javna sociologija, sociologija kao legitimacijska znanost, sociologija kao interpretacijska znanost, refleksivnost

I will begin¹ with words that are not my own – with a statement that everyone knows, made by president Kennedy in his inaugural address, when he said: “Ask not what your country can do for you – ask what you can do for your country”.

However, one eminent intellectual, by profession a philosopher of politics, recently stated in an interview on Croatian television, that the time has come – at least in his personal case – to ask his country what it can do for him, after a lifetime of lecturing at the university and conducting scientific work. And this, certainly, is also a possible perspective. Yet when we are dealing with sociology as a profession, I would nevertheless plead for a more serious understanding of the second part of Kennedy’s quote. Thus I would say again that as a profession we truly must ask ourselves what we can do at this moment, not for our country – let us disregard the patriotic tone of the American Sixties – but for the society in which we live.

We still call it a transitional society, although the notion of “transition” implies that at some moment the shift from one economic, political and overall social condition to another one will happen. Today we can say that such an expected and radical change has not taken place. One could practically say that we have become accustomed to living precisely in a state of expecting things to change: the state of transition in a certain way has become permanent, so that we might also call it a “permanent transition”.

In spite of this, as I wrote in a text in 2007 (Tomić-Koludrović and Petrić, 2007a), it seems that the newly formed social relations have stabilised to the point that we can speak of a configuration that is subject to further change, but in which relations are, even so, already defined and very recognisable.

Such a transitional reality has become our reality, a social context in which we situate both our research ambitions and our civic expectations. At the same time one should not forget that the transitional change, which is generally considered to have followed after the fall of the Berlin Wall, was for many in former East Europe not only a turnabout and a surprise, but also a shock, whereas today it constitutes everyday social life.

The change of the political and economic order, which – according to Beck’s terminology – introduced post-socialist countries to the “turmoil

¹ During the Congress of the Croatian Sociological Association, held in Zagreb on 3rd and 4th April 2009, for the first time in the CSA’s history it was decided that the chair would address the membership in a speech intended to position the current moment and the tasks of sociological science in Croatia. This type of address to the membership came at the initiative of Siniša Zrinščak and Aleksandar Štulhofer, members of the CSA’s Presidency at the time, and was accepted by the Presidency on its session on 5th February 2009. The speech printed here is based on the written script of the oral presentation. Bibliographic sources have been added to the text, more detailed explanations are given in the footnotes, and some minor stylistic corrections have been made.

Započinjem¹ riječima koje nisu moje – citatom koji je svima poznat, a izgovorio ga je američki predsjednik Kennedy. U svom inauguracijskom govoru, on je rekao: »Ne pitaj što tvoja zemlja može učiniti za tebe, nego što ti možeš učiniti za svoju zemlju«.

Doduše, jedan poznati intelektualac, po struci filozof politike, u intervjuu na Hrvatskoj televiziji nedavno je ustvrdio da je – barem u njegovu osobnom slučaju – došlo vrijeme da on upita svoju zemlju što će ona učiniti za njega, nakon što je cijeli život predavao na sveučilištu i bavio se intelektualnim radom. I to je, dakako, moguća perspektiva. No, kad je riječ o sociologiji kao struci, ipak bih pledirala na ozbiljno shvaćanje drugog dijela Kennedyjeva citata. Stoga bih ponovila da se kao struka doista moramo zapitati što u ovom trenutku možemo učiniti ne za svoju zemlju – zanemarimo pritom patriotski ton američkih šezdesetih godina – nego za društvo u kojem živimo.

Svi znamo kakvo je to društvo. Još ga uvijek nazivamo tranzicijskim, iako je zamisao »tranzicije« pretpostavljala da će se u jednom trenutku dogoditi prijelaz iz jednoga gospodarskog, političkog i ukupno društvenog stanja u drugo. Danas možemo reći da do takve, očekivane i radikalne promjene nije došlo. Gotovo bi se moglo reći da smo se naviknuli živjeti upravo u stanju očekivanja da se stvari promijene: stanje tranzicije na neki je način postalo trajnim pa bismo ga možda mogli nazvati i »permanentnom tranzicijom«.

Unatoč tomu, kao što sam ustvrdila u jednom tekstu iz 2007. godine (Tomić-Koludrović i Petrić, 2007a), čini mi se da su se novonastali društveni odnosi stabilizirali do te mjere da govorimo o konfiguraciji koja je možda podložna daljnjoj promjeni, ali u kojoj su odnosi ipak već definirani i vrlo prepoznatljivi.

Takozvana tranzicijska stvarnost postala je naša stvarnost, društveni kontekst u koji smještamo podjednako svoje istraživačke ambicije i svoja građanska očekivanja. Pritom ne valja zaboraviti da je tranzicijska promjena, za koju se općenito uzima da je uslijedila nakon pada Berlinskog zida, za mnoge u nekadašnjoj Istočnoj Europi bila ne samo obrat i iznenađenje, nego čak i šok, a danas je društvena svakodnevnica.

¹ Na kongresu Hrvatskoga sociološkog društva, održanom u Zagrebu 3. i 4. travnja 2009., prvi put u povijesti HSD-a uvedeno je obraćanje predsjednika/ce članstvu s govorom kojemu je namjena pozicionirati aktualni trenutak i zadaće sociološke znanosti u Hrvatskoj. Do uvođenja ovog oblika obraćanja članstvu došlo je na inicijativu članova tadašnjeg Predsjedništva HSD-a, Siniše Zrinščaka i Aleksandra Štulhofera, koju je Predsjedništvo usvojilo na sjednici 5. veljače 2009. godine. Govor se ovdje donosi u obliku pisanog predloška na temelju kojega je usmeno referiran, uz dodane bibliografske izvore, pobliza objašnjenja pojedinih tvrdnji u fusnotama i manje stilske korekcije.

of the world risk society” did not bring about only political and economic gains. Actually, it could be said that in the majority of cases the opposite was true. Instead of optimistic expectations of a rapid and easy abandonment of socialism, Croatian society – and likewise other societies in the area of ex-Yugoslavia and in the former Eastern Block – had to face the process of radical transformation of previous political, economic and socio-cultural structures, and also the increasingly apparent consequences of an aggressive global expansion of neoliberalism. In the region of ex-Yugoslavia, especially in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, society had to face also the reality and the long-term consequences of war.

Despite the basic similarity of processes occurring in transitional countries, precisely this war-time past reminds us that transitional processes differ in their concrete realisations in particular social contexts. These differences are the result of the various political conditions in which transition took place, or is still taking place, and also of the various transitional matrices that we find in individual transitional societies.

To this another element should be added, brought on by the close association between processes of transition in former East Europe and the expected membership of former socialist countries in the supranational European Union. In this regard, Croatia – with the exception of Slovenia and partially Macedonia² – is in a somewhat different position than other countries formed after the break-up of former Yugoslavia. In relation to other post-Yugoslav societies that until recently were not even part of realistic plans for EU expansion, Croatia finds itself facing numerous and profound changes that in the near future will bring about full integration into the supranational European context. This context includes a political, legislative, economic and also social framework, significantly different not only from the previous socialist one, but also from the – in the meantime established – transitional frame of reference.

Accession to the European Union, to a community which – at least in the East European framework – presents itself as exemplary in terms of its political system and market, and which is seen as a signpost indicating the direction that should be followed, will surely greatly change also the “permanent transition” to which we have become accustomed in the past two decades.

Despite this, one should not forget that changes that are yet due are already in a certain way present in the recent past of Croatian transitional society. Specifically, as has already been said, the social situation in Croatia and in other candidate countries has already for some time been described

² Slovenia became a full member of the European Union during the 2004 expansion, whereas Macedonia is the only post-Yugoslav country, apart from Croatia, that has received candidate status for Union membership, although – in difference to Croatia – it has not yet initiated accession negotiations.

Promjena političkog i gospodarskog poretka koja je – Beckovim riječnikom rečeno – uvela postsocijalističke zemlje u »previranja svjetskog društva rizika«, nije urodila samo političkim i gospodarskim dobicima. Štoviše, moglo bi se reći da se, u većini slučajeva, dogodilo upravo suprotno. Umjesto optimističkih očekivanja o brzom i laganom napuštanju socijalizma, hrvatsko se društvo – kao i druga društva na području bivše Jugoslavije i nekadašnjega Istočnog bloka – suočilo s procesom radikalnog preoblikovanja nekadašnjih političkih, gospodarskih i sociokulturnih struktura, kao i sa sve vidljivijim posljedicama agresivnoga globalnog širenja neoliberalizma. Na području bivše Jugoslavije, osobito u Hrvatskoj te Bosni i Hercegovini, društvo se suočilo i sa stvarnošću i dugotrajnim posljedicama rata.

Bez obzira na načelnu sličnost procesa koji se odvijaju u tranzicijskim zemljama, upravo nas ta ratna prošlost podsjeća na to da se i tranzicijski procesi razlikuju u svojim konkretnim realizacijama u pojedinom društvenom kontekstu. Te su razlike posljedica različitih političkih okolnosti u kojima se tranzicija odvijala i još se odvija, ali i različitih tradicijskih matrica na koje nailazimo u pojedinim tranzicijskim društvima.

Tomu valja dodati još jedan element, koji je donijela bliska povezanost tranzicijskih procesa u nekadašnjoj Istočnoj Europi s očekivanim članstvom bivših socijalističkih zemalja u nadnacionalnoj Europskoj uniji. U tom pogledu, Hrvatska je – uz iznimku Slovenije i djelomično Makedonije² – u ponešto drukčijem položaju od ostalih zemalja nastalih nakon raspada bivše Jugoslavije. U odnosu na ona postjugoslavenska društva koja donedavno nisu bila niti dio realističnih planova za proširenje EU, Hrvatska se nalazi pred brojnim i dubokim promjenama koje će u skoroj budućnosti donijeti potpuna integracija u nadnacionalni, europski kontekst. Taj kontekst uključuje politički, pravni, gospodarski, ali i društveni okvir, znatno drukčiji ne samo od nekadašnjega socijalističkog, nego i od – u međuvremenu uspostavljenoga – tranzicijskog referentnog okvira.

Uključivanjem u Europsku uniju, kao zajednicu koja se – barem u istočnoeuropskim okvirima – postavlja kao primjerna u pogledu političkog sustava i tržišta, te koja se vidi kao putokaz prema kojem se treba orijentirati, zacijelo će se umnogome promijeniti i stanje »permanentne tranzicije« na koje smo se naviknuli tijekom proteklih dvaju desetljeća.

Unatoč tomu, ne smije se smetnuti s uma da su promjene koje se tek očekuju na neki način nazočne i u nedavnoj prošlosti tranzicijskoga

² Slovenija je postala punopravnom članicom Europske unije u proširenju 2004. godine, a Makedonija je jedina postjugoslavenska zemlja koja je dosad, uz Hrvatsku, postigla status zemlje kandidatkinje za pristup Uniji, ali – za razliku od Hrvatske – još nije otvorila pristupne pregovore.

and measured in relation to the degree of proximation to conditions, whose fulfilment is expected before accession to the European Union. Depending on the degree of approximating this presumed political, economic and legislative (although not also social) reality,³ there have been and still are references to countries of initial, developed or “mature” transition. By fulfilling conditions for the initiation of negotiations with the EU, Croatia has approached the status of a “mature” transitional country, i.e. the status that neighbouring Slovenia had immediately before accession to the Union countries, or that other former socialist countries had prior to acceding to the Union in the framework of the 2004 and 2007 expansions.⁴

Yet it is questionable with how much justification Croatian society, regardless of the required and realised changes in its political, economic and juridical framework, can be called a “mature” transitional *society*, especially if the aforesaid “maturity” measures the degree of modernisation of the society.

In an attempt to answer this question, I will apply a thesis that I elaborated in several papers on Croatian society, published during the past ten years. Croatian society, as I stated in these papers, is a society in which two processes of modernisation are taking place at the same time. In it we can find characteristic elements of both so-called first (“simple”) modernity and

³ Criteria for the accession of former socialist countries to the European Union were established in a relatively short period after the fall of the Berlin Wall. The so-called Copenhagen criteria were established in 1993, and as a precondition for joining the Union they required the stability of democratic institutions, the existence of a functioning market economy and “the ability to take on the obligations of membership”. During the meeting of the European Council in Madrid in 1995 an imperative was added calling for the harmonisation of administrative and legislative structures with European norms, so that the “Copenhagen criteria” could be successfully implemented. Jacobsen (2005) believes that candidate countries for EU membership quickly realised that in this process more was expected from them than mere democratic and economic reforms. Namely, it was expected that they adopt the entire political and institutional frameworks of the *acquis communautaire*. Conditional accession to the Union based on fulfilling given criteria became a powerful instrument of reform policies. From the sociological viewpoint, however, it should be noted that conditionality did not include the type of social relations that presumably would be compatible with membership in the Union. It could be said that, from the standpoint of the Union, the established criteria constituted a sufficiently general and attainable framework, which did not presume in fact impossible and ethically questionable social engineering. However, today’s social reality of the former post-socialist countries is thus marked by a discrepancy between the established framework and the abilities of individual societies to respond to it. Precisely this discrepancy provides a stimulating topic for sociological research.

⁴ In the framework of the 2004 expansion, eight post-socialist countries of Central and Eastern Europe (among them Slovenia, as the only former Yugoslav republic) became members of the European Union. In the framework of the 2007 expansion, Bulgaria and Romania became members of the Union.

hrvatskog društva. Naime, kao što je već rečeno, društveno stanje u Hrvatskoj i drugim zemljama kandidatkinjama već se dulje vrijeme opisuje i mjeri u odnosu na stupanj približavanja uvjetima čije se zadovoljenje očekuje prije uključenja u Europsku uniju. Ovisno o stupnju približavanja toj pretpostavljenoj političkoj, gospodarskoj i pravnoj (ali ne i društvenoj) stvarnosti,³ govorilo se i govori se o zemljama početne, razvijene ili »zrele« tranzicije. Ispunjavajući uvjete za početak pregovora s EU, Hrvatska se približila statusu zemlje »zrele« tranzicije, dakle statusu koji su u vremenu neposredno prije priključenja Uniji imale zemlje poput susjedne Slovenije, odnosno druge bivše socijalističke zemlje koje su pristupile Uniji u okviru proširenja 2004. i 2007. godine.⁴

Pitanje je, međutim, s koliko opravdanja hrvatsko društvo, bez obzira na tražene i ostvarene promjene političkoga, gospodarskog i pravnog okvira, može ponijeti naziv »zreloga« tranzicijskog društva, osobito mjeri li se spomenuta »zrelost« tranzicije stupnjem moderniziranosti društva.

U pokušaju da odgovorim na to pitanje, poslužila bih se tezom koju sam elaborirala u nekoliko tekstova o hrvatskom društvu, objavljenih u posljednjih deset godina. Hrvatsko društvo, ustvrdila sam u tim tekstovima, jest društvo u kojem se istodobno odvijaju dva procesa modernizacije. U njemu nailazimo i na elemente karakteristične za takozvanu prvu (»jedno-

³ Kriteriji za pristupanje bivših socijalističkih zemalja Europskoj uniji utvrđeni su u razmjerno kratkom razdoblju nakon pada Berlinskog zida. Tzv. kopenhaski kriteriji utvrđeni su 1993. godine, a kao preduvjet za pristupanje Uniji tražili su stabilnost demokratskih ustanova, postojanje funkcionalnoga tržišnog gospodarstva i »sposobnost preuzimanja odgovornosti članstva«. Na sastanku Europskog vijeća u Madridu 1995. godine dodan je i imperativ usklađivanja administrativnih i pravosudnih struktura s europskim normama, da bi se »kopenhaski kriteriji« mogli uspješno primjenjivati. Jacobsen (2005) smatra da je zemljama kandidatkinjama za pristup Uniji uskoro postalo jasno da se u procesu pristupanja od njih očekuje više od demokratskog i gospodarskog reformiranja. Od njih se, naime, tražilo da usvoje cjelokupni politički i institucionalni okvir europske stečevine (*acquis communautaire*). Uvjetovanost pristupanja Uniji ispunjavanjem zadanih kriterija postala je snažnim instrumentom politike reformi. Sa sociološkog motrišta, međutim, valja primijetiti da sve uvjetovanosti nisu uključivale tip društvenih odnosa pretpostavljivo kompatibilan s članstvom u Uniji. Moglo bi se reći da su, sa stajališta Unije, postavljeni kriteriji bili dovoljno općenit i dosežan okvir, koji nije pretpostavljao ionako nemoguć i etički upitan društveni inženjering. No, današnja društvena stvarnost bivših postsocijalističkih zemalja odlikuje se stoga diskrepancijom postavljenog okvira i mogućnosti pojedinih društava da na njega odgovore. Upravo je tu diskrepanciju poticajno sociološki proučavati.

⁴ U okviru proširenja 2004. godine, Europskoj uniji pristupilo je osam postsocijalističkih zemalja Srednje i Istočne Europe (među njima je bila i Slovenija, kao jedina bivša jugoslavenska republika). U okviru proširenja 2007. godine, Uniji su pristupile Bugarska i Rumunjska.

of “second” (“reflexive”) modernity. In the papers I am referring to, I borrowed these concepts from Ulrich Beck.⁵

According to Beck, first modernity assured the transition from pre-modern to modern society. It promised the modernisation of everything, yet despite this much in society remained non-modern – especially work, sexual, gender and family roles. In the last decades of the 20th century, these non-modernised, or not-totally-modernised parts of modern society were exposed to processes of individualisation, globalisation, growing unemployment, to revolutions linked to gender roles and to the global production of risk. Second modernity, according to Beck, can be explained as a specific type of modernisation of modernity, or as a further modernisation of industrial society, which, among other things, produces also risk society.

Second modernity is likewise important for the state of Croatian society that we are discussing, since precisely this form of modernity – once more according to Beck – assures the transition from an industrial to a post-industrial modernised society. Beck also calls this second modernity “reflexive”, since he believes that all challenges to which modernity is exposed must be re-thought once more in order to respond to them. In a society that has emerged on the fragments of first modernity there are no ready answers or rules that are not subject to re-examination. The opposition between old (“first”) and new (“second”) modernity, according to Beck, is so strong that it calls for a new invention of politics.⁶

In the latter part of the 1980s, Beck’s concept of reflexive modernity presented a new frame of reference, which helped in providing an understanding of the nature of new capitalism, of world risk society, of the processes of liberation from traditional ties, and also of the necessity to establish new ties and conditionalities that the concept of “individualisation” also includes in itself.

Some of these processes, at that time, could be felt also in the area of former Yugoslavia, which was in many aspects an atypical socialist country.⁷

⁵ Beck’s differentiation of first and second modernity was initially elaborated in: Beck, 1986. In relation to Croatian society I first used these concepts in my unpublished master’s thesis (Tomić-Koludrović, 1992). Later I mentioned them in a series of papers during the 1990s dealing with changes in the type of youth (Tomić-Koludrović, 1993; Leburic and Tomić-Koludrović, 1996; Tomić-Koludrović and Leburic, 1997), and from the end of the 1990s in publications addressing the social position of women and young people (Leburic, Tomić-Koludrović and Radnić, 1999; Tomić-Koludrović and Leburic, 2001, 2002; Leburic and Tomić-Koludrović, 2002a, 2002b). Croatian society as a society in which two modernisation processes are taking place at the same time is especially noted in papers that were written in the 21st century (Tomić-Koludrović and Petrić, 2007a, 2007b; Tomić-Koludrović, 2008, 2009).

⁶ This theme is treated separately and in detail in: Beck, 1993.

⁷ As opposed to the “real-socialist” countries of the Eastern (Soviet) Block, after Tito’s break with Stalin Yugoslavia opened up to cultural and media influences of the capitalist

stavnu») modernost i »drugu« (»refleksivnu«) modernost. U tekstovima na koje se referiram, te sam pojmove preuzela od Ulricha Becka.⁵

Prema Beckovu razlikovanju, prva modernost osigurala je prijelaz iz predmodernoga u moderno društvo. Obećavala je modernizaciju svega postojećega, no unatoč tomu mnogo je toga u društvu ostalo nemodernizirano – pogotovo radne, spolne, rodne i obiteljske uloge. Tijekom posljednjih desetljeća 20. stoljeća, ti su nemodernizirani, ili ne-do-kraja-modernizirani, dijelovi modernog društva bili izloženi procesima individualizacije, globalizacije, rastuće nezaposlenosti, revolucije povezane s rodnim identitetima i s globalnom proizvodnjom rizika. Druga se modernost, prema Becku, može tumačiti kao svojevrsna modernizacija modernosti, odnosno daljnja modernizacija industrijskog društva, koja je između ostaloga proizvela i društvo rizika.

Druga modernost bitna je i za stanje hrvatskog društva o kojem raspravljamo, jer upravo ona – opet prema Becku – osigurava prijelaz iz industrijskog u postindustrijski modernizirano društvo. Drugu modernost Beck naziva i »refleksivnom«, jer smatra da sve izazove kojima je modernost izložena treba još jednom promisliti da bi se na njih moglo odgovoriti. U društvu koje nastaje na krhotinama prve modernosti nema gotovih rješenja ili pravila koja nisu podložna preispitivanju. Suprotstavljenost stare (»prve«) i nove (»druge«) modernosti prema Becku je toliko snažna da traži novi okvir za ponovno pronalaženje politike.⁶

U drugoj polovini osamdesetih godina prošlog stoljeća, Beckov koncept refleksivne modernost predstavljao je nov referentni okvir, koji je pomagao shvatiti prirodu novog kapitalizma, svjetsko društvo rizika, procese oslobađanja od tradicionalnih spona, kao i nužnost novih vezivanja i uvjetovanosti koje pojam »individualizacije« također sadržava u sebi.

Dio ovih procesa mogao se, u tom vremenskom okviru, osjetiti i na području bivše Jugoslavije, kao umnogome atipične socijalističke zemlje.⁷

⁵ Beckovo razlikovanje prve i druge modernosti početno je elaborirano u: Beck, 1986. U relaciji prema hrvatskom društvu prvi put sam se njime koristila u neobjavljenom magistrskom radu (Tomić-Koludrović, 1992). Poslije toga se spominje u nizu tekstova iz devedesetih godina koji su se bavili promjenama tipa mladosti (Tomić-Koludrović, 1993; Leburić i Tomić-Koludrović, 1996; Tomić-Koludrović i Leburić, 1997), a od kraja devedesetih u publikacijama koje su obrađivale društveni položaj žena i mladih (Leburić, Tomić-Koludrović i Radnić, 1999; Tomić-Koludrović i Leburić, 2001, 2002; Leburić i Tomić-Koludrović, 2002a, 2002b). Hrvatsko društvo kao društvo u kojem se istodobno odvijaju dva modernizacijska procesa osobito se eksplicitno nominira u tekstovima nastalim u 21. stoljeću (Tomić-Koludrović i Petrić, 2007a, 2007b; Tomić-Koludrović, 2008, 2009).

⁶ Ta je tema zasebno i detaljno obrađena u: Beck, 1993.

⁷ Za razliku od »realsocijalističkih« zemalja Istočnoga (sovjetskog) bloka, Jugoslavija se nakon Titova raskida sa Staljinom otvorila kulturnim i medijskim utjecajima kapitalistič-

The results of an extensive empirical survey, carried out in 1986 among young people in all the republics and provinces of former Yugoslavia, testify to the fact that in Slovenia and in Croatia – at the time when the study was conducted – one could note certain elements pertaining to so-called “postmaterialist values”, which are characteristic of second (“reflexive”) modernity.⁸ In the mentioned parts of Yugoslavia, as well as in the individual larger cities in its other republics, one could note the change of the traditional youth into the so-called new type of youth, whose agency and values were closer to the “second” than to the “first” modernity.

On account of the re-traditionalisation and homogenisation of Croatian society that occurred in the initial transitional period, or rather under the war conditions that marked the transition in Croatia, there was a gradual recession of the values and ways of behaviour, that had been characteristic of the fragile “reflexively” modernised layers of society. Yet despite this, Croatian society remained – at the least – a society which, in difference to many Eastern European societies, had registered in its history an experience of “second modernity”. This is its *differentia specifica* in regard to Eastern European, and also to other post-Yugoslav societies, with the exception of Slovenia.

The question that must be answered reads as follows: To what degree did Croatian sociology, already in the latter half of the 1980s, manage to respond to social change and to new phenomena in Croatian society? To what degree did it manage to explain them, and how capable to do so is it today, when phenomena characteristic of second modernity have receded to those characteristic of first modernity, or rather in conditions in which the relationship between the two modernities – which I believe are simultaneously present in Croatian society – has been altered to the detriment of trends leading to greater reflexivity?

West, and eventually introduced elements of the market economy. In Yugoslav socialism elements of participative worker’s democracy were also different, and during the 1970s and 1980s they partially converged with or were theoretically stimulating to processes in economically much more developed countries, whose political systems still respected the principles of the welfare state and social democratic ideology.

⁸ The study was conducted in former Yugoslavia in 1986 on a sample of 6,849 young people (Vrcan et al., 1986). We are obliged to Mirjana Ule (1988, 1989) for insight into the existence of significant differences in the value orientations among youth in the former Yugoslav republics. She noticed that youth in Slovenia and Croatia, at the time when the study was conducted, were ideologically, politically and culturally much more open and liberal in comparison to young people in other Yugoslav republics, and that they showed a significantly higher level of tolerance towards cultural, ethnic and religious differences. Claiming that young people in Croatia and Slovenia partially express also postmaterialist values, Ule referred to Beck’s (1986) interpretation of two modernities and to Inglehart’s (1977) thesis about an increasing shift from materialist towards postmaterialist, or post-modern values, in developed industrial countries.

Rezultati velikoga empirijskog istraživanja mladih u svim republikama i pokrajinama ondašnje Jugoslavije, provedenog 1986. godine, svjedoče o tome da su se u Sloveniji i Hrvatskoj – u vremenu kad je istraživanje provedeno – mogli uočiti elementi tzv. »postmaterijalističkih vrijednosti«, karakterističnih za drugu, »refleksivnu« modernost.⁸ U spomenutim dijelovima Jugoslavije, kao i u pojedinim većim gradovima u drugim republikama, bila je nazočna promjena tradicionalnog u tzv. novi tip mladosti, djelovanjem i vrijednostima bliži »drugoj« nego »prvoj« modernosti.

Retradicionalizacijom i homogenizacijom hrvatskog društva, koje su nastupile početkom tranzicije, odnosno u ratnim uvjetima koji su je u Hrvatskoj obilježili, postupno su se povlačile vrijednosti i načini ponašanja karakteristični za krhke »refleksivno« modernizirane slojeve društva. Unatoč tomu, hrvatsko društvo ostaje – u najmanju ruku – društvom koje, za razliku od brojnih istočnoeuropskih društava, u svojoj povijesti ima zabilježeno iskustvo »druge modernosti«. To je njegova *differentia specifica* u odnosu na istočnoeuropska, ali i druga postjugoslavenska društva, s iznimkom Slovenije.

Pitanje na koje valja odgovoriti jest: koliko je hrvatska sociologija, već u drugoj polovini osamdesetih, uspijevala odgovoriti na društvenu promjenu i nove pojave u hrvatskom društvu? Koliko ih je uspjela protumačiti i koliko je sposobna činiti to danas, kad su pojave karakteristične za drugu modernost ustupile više mjesta onima karakterističnima za prvu modernost, odnosno u uvjetima u kojima se odnos dviju modernizacija – za koje smatram da su istodobno nazočne u hrvatskom društvu – promijenio na štetu trendova koji vode prema većoj refleksivnosti?

O tome koliko je sociologija sposobna i spremna tumačiti suvremene društvene pojave, naime, ovisi i njezina budućnost kao znanstvene discipli-

kog Zapada, a postupno počela uvoditi i elemente tržišnog gospodarstva. U jugoslavenskom socijalizmu drukčiji su bili i elementi participativne radničke demokracije, koji su sedamdesetih i osamdesetih godina djelomično konvergirali ili bili teorijski poticajni i u gospodarski znatno razvijenijim zemljama čiji je politički poredak još uvijek uvažavao zasade države blagostanja i socijaldemokratske ideologije.

⁸ Istraživanje je provedeno 1986. godine u bivšoj Jugoslaviji, na uzorku od 6840 mladih (Vrcan i dr., 1986). Spoznaju da postoje znatne razlike u vrijednosnim orijentacijama mladih među bivšim jugoslavenskim republikama dugujemo Mirjani Ule (1988, 1989), koja je uočila da su mladi u Sloveniji i Hrvatskoj u doba kad je provedeno istraživanje bili ideološki, politički i kulturno znatno otvoreniji i liberalniji u odnosu na mlade u drugim republikama bivše Jugoslavije te da su pokazivali znatno veću toleranciju prema kulturnoj, etničkoj i religijskoj različitosti. Tvrdi da mladi u Hrvatskoj i Sloveniji dijelom iskazuju i postmaterijalističke vrijednosti, Ule se referirala na Beckovu (1986) interpretaciju dviju modernosti i Inglehartovu (1977) tezu o sve većem zaokretu od materijalističkih prema postmaterijalističkim, odnosno postmodernim vrijednostima, u razvijenim industrijskim društvima.

Sociology's future as a scientific discipline and as a socially useful activity depends on the degree to which it is capable and willing to explain contemporary social phenomena. When we speak in this context of the future of sociology, I think that we must begin exactly from this point. In other words, I think that we must examine sociology's contribution to society as well as its role in explaining processes that are vital to society, and not only proceed from what have most often been called "intradisciplinary questions". By saying this I do not wish to refute the importance of these issues, but rather I believe that sociology at this moment needs to be reassessed primarily in relation to its usefulness to society.

Yet it should also be stressed that this does not mean that the mentioned "intradisciplinary questions", and ultimately the issue of greater or lesser academic excellence, do not come to the forefront in such a context. Even to be able to speak of the future we must necessarily in both mentioned aspects analyse the present state of affairs. We must ask questions about the general social usefulness of sociology in Croatia and about the level of development of our discipline. In every examination of the present state and of the tasks of sociology it is thus necessary to take into consideration also its relationship to the society in which it acts as well as its specificities as a scientific discipline.

Within the sociological community in Croatia there is a quite widely-held conviction that the contributions and the visibility of sociology in society are minimal, that sociology is poorly appreciated, and that there is a lack of more extensive empirical surveys, especially longitudinal studies. All this is true, but at the same time it should be said that sociology in recent years has gradually diversified, that new chairs and departments have been established, and that new approaches to studying society have appeared.⁹

Therefore I do not doubt that Croatian sociologists will be surprised to learn the fact that their discipline, by the number of papers referred to in the *Social Sciences Citation Index*, in the period from 1990 to this day, assumed the third position, per capita, in Europe, after Great Britain and Ireland, and in front of countries such as Sweden, France and Germany, i.e. countries

⁹ Apart from the Department of Sociology at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb, established in 1963, and the Department of Sociology at the University of Zadar (established in 1977 within the previous Faculty of Philosophy), in 1996 the previous specialisation "Society" in the framework of Croatian Studies at the University of Zagreb, developed into a sociology programme, and in 2005 a Department of Sociology was created in the newly established Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Split. Within these institutions, as well as at other faculties and departments in which sociology is scientifically studied and taught (for a full review see: Krebec and Lažnjak, 2008), a gradual diversification of approaches and orientations occurred during the transitional period.

ne i kao društveno korisne djelatnosti. Kad u ovom kontekstu govorimo o budućnosti sociologije, mislim da trebamo početi upravo na ovom mjestu. Drugim riječima, mislim da trebamo razmotriti doprinos sociologije društvu i njezinu ulogu u tumačenju procesa koji su bitni za društvo, a ne polaziti samo od onoga što se najčešće naziva »unutardisciplinarnim pitanjima«. Pritom ne želim reći da ta pitanja nisu bitna, nego mislim da sociologiju u ovom trenutku treba promišljati ponajprije s obzirom na njezinu korisnost za društvo.

No, također treba naglasiti da to ne znači da spomenuta »unutardisciplinarna pitanja«, kao uostalom i pitanje veće ili manje akademske izvrsnosti, i u takvom kontekstu ne izbijaju u prvi plan. Da bismo uopće mogli govoriti o budućnosti, moramo nužno u obama spomenutim aspektima dijagnosticirati sadašnje stanje. Moramo se zapitati o općoj društvenoj korisnosti sociologije u Hrvatskoj i stupnju razvijenosti naše discipline. Pri svakom razmatranju današnjeg stanja i zadaća sociologije treba, dakle, uzeti u obzir i njezin odnos prema društvu u kojem djeluje i njezine osobitosti kao znanstvene discipline.

Unutar sociološke zajednice u Hrvatskoj postoji dosta prošireno uvjerenje da su doprinos i vidljivost sociologije u društvu minimalni, da se sociologija slabo uvažava, da nema većih empirijskih, pogotovo longitudinalnih istraživanja. Sve je to točno, ali istodobno valja reći da se sociologija u posljednje vrijeme polako uraznoličuje, da su osnovane nove katedre i odsjeci, da se pojavljuju novi pristupi istraživanju društva.⁹

Stoga ne sumnjam u to da će hrvatske sociologe i sociologinje začuditi podatak da njihova disciplina, po broju objavljenih članaka referiranih u *Social Sciences Citation Index*, po glavi stanovnika, u razdoblju od 1990. do danas, zauzima treće mjesto u Europi, iza Velike Britanije i Irske, a ispred – primjerice – Švedske, Francuske i Njemačke, dakle zemalja koje imaju znatnu sociološku tradiciju i čije vlade znatno više ulažu u razvoj sociologije od hrvatske Vlade.¹⁰

⁹ Uz Odsjek za sociologiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu, osnovan 1963., te Odjel za sociologiju Sveučilišta u Zadru (osnovan 1977. na ondašnjem Filozofskom fakultetu), godine 1996. prethodni smjer »Društvo« pri Hrvatskim studijima Sveučilišta u Zagrebu prerastao je u studij sociologije, a 2005. godine osnovan je Odsjek za sociologiju pri novoutemeljenom Filozofskom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Splitu. Unutar tih ustanova, kao i drugih fakulteta i odsjeka na kojima se znanstveno istražuje i podučava sociologija (potpun pregled donosi se u: Krbec i Lažnjak, 2008), u tranzicijskom je razdoblju došlo do postupne diverzifikacije pristupa i usmjerenja.

¹⁰ Podatak je iznesen u priopćenju Christiana Flecka (2009), na konferenciji nacionalnih organizacija Međunarodnoga sociološkog udruženja (ISA) »Challenges for Sociology in an Unequal World«, koja je održana u Taipeiju (23–25. ožujka 2009.).

with significant sociological traditions and whose governments invest much more in the development of sociology than the Croatian government.¹⁰

The situation in this regard, as well as in regard to many other questions, is contradictory and confusing. In order to examine in a more balanced way the question where Croatian sociology stands today and what it can do in the near future, we must briefly review the past of both Croatian society and our discipline.

The society in which we live is such as it is as a result of many events that had occurred in the past. The same holds true for the discipline of sociology. In order to diagnose its present position, we must glance into the past, and not just to the pre-transitional period, that is the period immediately preceding the changes that brought us to the present moment – but further into the past, to the very beginnings of our discipline.

Fortunately, thanks to the work of several of our colleagues, carried out precisely during the transitional period, we know more about the history of our discipline in Croatia than was known before.¹¹ Here we cannot go into details, but it should be said that today, in this profession, it is generally known that, for example, the beginnings of sociology in Croatia date back to 1906, when a Department of Criminology and Sociology was set up at the Faculty of Law in Zagreb, which was the first sociology department in former Austria-Hungary. Today even sociologists of the youngest generation are familiar with the influence that the Chicago School had on sociology in Croatia in the period between the two world wars, as well as with Tomašić's contribution to Croatian sociology and to the study of Croatian society.¹²

Today we are much better informed and objectively distanced than before when discussing also the two cataclysms which Croatian sociology had to face in the period from 1941 through to the end of the 1950s. Both were motivated by totalitarian ideologies and were part of the great destabilisations that occurred in that time frame on the European continent. Sociology

¹⁰ This information was presented in Christian Fleck's report (2009) at the International Sociological Association's conference of national organisations, "Challenges for Sociology in an Unequal World", held in Taipei (23rd–25th March 2009).

¹¹ Here I have in mind the writings by Batina (2006, 2008) and Ravlić (2008), and I would also note the "Timeline of main events in Croatian sociology, with an emphasis on the historical development of the Croatian Sociological Association" (http://www.hsd.hr/portal/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1&Itemid=4&lang=english). In regard to special sociologies, I would like to draw attention likewise to the writings of Štulhofer and Matić (1992) and Zrinščak (1999).

¹² The broader sociological public in Croatia became better acquainted with Tomašić's work only at the beginning of the 1990s, after the journal *Društvena istraživanja* (1993, 2 /6/) published a special issue entitled "The Sociology of Dinko Tomašić". Afterwards Tomašić's books were also republished, after their original publications in 1937 and 1938 (Tomašić, 1997a, 1997b).

Stanje je i u tom pogledu, kao i u još nizu drugih, proturječno i zbu-
njujuće. Da bismo mogli uravnoteženo razmotriti pitanje o tome gdje hrvat-
ska sociologija danas jest i što može učiniti u bližoj budućnosti, moramo
se osvrnuti i pogledati u prošlost, podjednako hrvatskog društva kao i naše
discipline.

Društvo u kojem danas živimo takvo je kakvo jest zbog mnogih doga-
đaja koji su se odvijali u prošlosti. Isto vrijedi i za sociološku znanost. Da
bismo dijagnosticirali njezin sadašnji položaj, moramo pogled usmjeriti pre-
ma prošlosti, i to ne samo do predtranzicijskog razdoblja, odnosno razdo-
blja koje je neposredno prethodilo promjenama koje su nas uvele u sadašnji
trenutak, nego dalje unatrag, sve do samih početaka naše discipline.

Na sreću, zahvaljujući radu nekolicine naših kolega, i to upravo u
tranzicijskom razdoblju, o povijesti naše discipline u Hrvatskoj sada zna-
mo više nego nekad.¹¹ Na ovom mjestu ne možemo ići u pojedinosti, ali
valja ustvrditi da je danas u struci opće poznato da, primjerice, počeci
sociologije u Hrvatskoj sežu u 1906. godinu, kad je na Pravnom fakultetu
u Zagrebu osnovana katedra za kriminalne znanosti i sociologiju koja je
bila prva katedra za sociologiju u tadašnjoj Austro-Ugarskoj. Danas je,
također, sociolozima i sociologinjama najmlađe generacije poznat utjecaj
Čikaške škole na sociologiju u Hrvatskoj između dva svjetska rata, kao
i Tomašićev doprinos hrvatskoj sociologiji i proučavanju hrvatskog druš-
tva.¹²

Danas smo, znatno informiranije i distanciranije nego prije, u prilici
raspravljati i o dvjema kataklizmama s kojima je hrvatska sociologija bila
suočena u razdoblju od 1941. godine pa sve do kraja pedesetih godina
prošlog stoljeća. Obje su bile motivirane totalitarnim ideologijama i bile su
dio velikih destabilizacija koje su se u tom vremenskom okviru događale
na europskom kontinentu. Sociologija je kao znanost u tom kontekstu stra-
dala i u dodiru s kolaboracionističkom, fašističkom ideologijom, a poslije
toga i s boljševičkom ideologijom na kojoj je bila utemeljena poslijeratna
društvena stvarnost.

¹¹ Mislim pritom na radove Batine (2006, 2008) i Ravlića (2008), a skrećem pozornost i na
»Kronološki pregled hrvatske sociologije s naglaskom na povijesni razvoj Hrvatskog socio-
loškog društva« (http://www.hsd.hr/portal/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1&Itemid=4). Kad je riječ o posebnim sociologijama, skrećem pozornost i na: Štulhofer i
Matić, 1992; Zrinščak, 1999.

¹² S Tomašićevim se djelom šira sociološka javnost u Hrvatskoj detaljnije upoznala tek
početkom devedesetih godina 20. stoljeća, nakon što je u časopisu *Društvena istraživa-
nja* (1993, 2 /6/) objavljen temat »Sociologija Dinka Tomašića«. Nakon toga su ponovo
objavljene i Tomašićeve knjige izvorno objavljene 1937. i 1938. godine (Tomašić, 1997a,
1997b).

as a science in that context suffered in contact with both the collaborationist fascist ideology, and afterwards the Bolshevist ideology on which the post-war social reality had been based.

The suspension of independent critical thinking, and especially of thinking that would reflect on society, both in the war-time period of NDH (Independent State of Croatia) and in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat that began after the defeat of the fascist ideology, contributed to creating a social context in which sociology could not express itself in a way that would be expected of it in civil society. Most briefly said, in Croatia in the mid-20th century great ideologies were the most vocal. We cannot enter into their details at this time, but it must be said that these had totally clear implications for the development of sociology. Common to both the mentioned ideologies was a disdain for the civil aspect and for a vision of society centred on a notion of social improvement, instead of on radical social change in the way that the revolutionary projects wanted, and which led to totalitarian regimes.

However, after this relatively long hiatus, the revival of sociology began, culminating in the establishment of the Department of Sociology at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb in 1963. The founder of this first sociological department in Croatia, Rudi Supek, was associated with the journal *Praxis*, and was its editor from 1967 to 1973. Supek's work contributed to making a non-dogmatic, so-called creative Marxism the basis of the sociological approach in this period after the establishment of the Department of Sociology.

During the entire socialist period, sociology was marked by a Marxist perspective of social philosophy and critical social theory. The university curriculum in this period included classics, while modern approaches were limited to authors with affinities towards Marxism and to Marxist interpretations of what was by that time already historical structural functionalism.¹³ It is justified to say that sociology at the time was based on only one principle, i.e. the aforesaid "creative Marxism". As to the possibilities of social interventions of the discipline – as I tried to explain in a paper in the mid-1990s (Tomić-Koludrović, 1996) – these stopped at the line of "permitted criticism".¹⁴ The limits to problematising social reality and social problems

¹³ Sociology in Croatia in the period after World War II has yet to be set into a historical context. For the beginning, an analysis could be made of the curricula in higher education institutions in Croatia in which sociology was taught. Such an undertaking, in regard to the Department of Sociology of the former Faculty of Philosophy in Zadar, has already been initiated by Marčelić and Krolo (2008).

¹⁴ In the first issue of the journal of the Sociological Association of Croatia (*Revija za sociologiju*), in 1971, the "Editorial" on page 4, stated that "[s]ociologists, just as other scientists, in their attempt to arrive at valid insights into social reality, necessarily apply

Suspenzija nezavisne kritičke misli, a pogotovo misli koja bi bila društveno reflektivna, u ratnom razdoblju postojanja NDH, kao i u razdoblju diktature proletarijata koje je nastupilo nakon poraza fašističke ideologije, pridonijelo je stvaranju društvenog konteksta u kojem sociologija nije mogla govoriti na način koji bi se od nje očekivao u građanskom društvu. Najkraće rečeno, u Hrvatskoj su sredinom 20. stoljeća najglasnije bile velike ideologije, u čije pojedinosti ovom prigodom nije moguće ulaziti, ali koje su – to je potrebno ustvrditi – imale posve jasne posljedice na razvoj sociologije. Zajedničko je objema spomenutim ideologijama bilo to što su prezirale građanski aspekt i viziju društva koja je u središtu imala ideju njegova poboljšavanja, ali ne i radikalne promjene društva na način na koji su to revolucionarni projekti htjeli, a koji su kao posljedicu imali totalitarne režime.

Nakon razmjerno dugotrajnog hijata, započinje ipak obnova sociologije, koja kulminira osnivanjem Odsjeka za sociologiju na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zagrebu 1963. godine. Osnivač tog prvoga sociološkog odsjeka u Hrvatskoj, Rudi Supek, bio je povezan s časopisom *Praxis*, čiji je urednik bio od 1967. do 1973. godine. Supekova djelatnost pridonijela je tome da nedogmatski, tzv. stvaralački marksizam postane temeljem sociološkog pristupa u razdoblju nakon osnivanja Odsjeka za sociologiju.

Tijekom cijeloga socijalističkog razdoblja sociologiju su obilježavale marksistička perspektiva socijalne filozofije i kritičke društvene teorije. Sveučilišni kurikulum u tom je razdoblju uključivao klasike, ali suvremeni pristupi bili su se ograničili na autore sklone marksizmu i na marksističke interpretacije tada već povijesnog strukturalfunkcionalizma.¹³ Opravdano se može reći da je sociologija tada počivala na samo jednom pristupu, to jest na spomenutom »stvaralačkom marksizmu«. U smislu mogućnosti društvene intervencije discipline, ona se – kao što sam to pokušala obrazložiti u jednom tekstu iz sredine devedesetih (Tomić-Koludrović, 1996) – zastavljala na »dopuštenoj kritičnosti«.¹⁴ Granice problematiziranja društvene

¹³ Sociologiju u Hrvatskoj u razdoblju nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata tek očekuje povijesna kontekstualizacija. Njezin početak mogla bi biti analiza nastavnih programa visokoškolskih ustanova u Hrvatskoj na kojima se predavala sociologija. Takav su posao, kad je riječ o Odsjeku za sociologiju nekadašnjega Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru započeli Marčelić i Krolo (2008).

¹⁴ U prvom broju časopisa Sociološkog društva Hrvatske (*Revija za sociologiju*) iz 1971. godine, u »Riječi uredništva« na stranici 4, kaže se da »[s]ociolozi, poput ostalih znanstvenika, u svom nastojanju da dopru do valjane spoznaje o društvenoj stvarnosti, nužno upotrebljavaju različite metode i pristupaju ispitivanju s različitih aspekata, pa je logično da postoji raznolikost stilova mišljenja i zaključaka. Imajući to na umu, časopis će otvoriti svoje stranice svim teorijskim i empirijskim djelima, makar oni bili različito intonirani

were set by incorporating theoretical and empirical approaches to topics into the framework of Marxist theory.¹⁵

Despite this, in the given context, it should be emphasised that the dominant, or more precisely – the only ideologically confirmed approach to studying society, coincided at the time with a prevailing trend towards the neo-Marxist approach in sociology throughout the world. This convergence helped create the impression of the modernness of sociology in that period, and enabled sociological reflections worthy of the demands of those times. Yet such a situation, simultaneously, also burdened the subsequent development of sociol-

different methods and approach their studies from different aspects, so it is logical that differences exist in styles of thinking and conclusions. Bearing this in mind, the journal will open its pages to all theoretical and empirical works, even if they are differently intoned and – *in the framework of the designated orientation* – even clearly opposed” (italics added, I.T.K.). What kind of orientation is involved becomes clear in the explicit statement, given on page 3, according to which “‘Revija za sociologiju’ is a scientific and professional journal for Marxist oriented sociologists”. One can, therefore, conclude that the proclaimed “openness of the journal necessary for the development of sociology” (page 4) applied only if the basic orientation of the scientific or professional paper was Marxist.

¹⁵ Sesardić dedicated an extensive analytical paper (1983) to the theme of remaining within the limits of what is permissible. He continued to elaborate this theme in later polemical papers (Sesardić, 1987, 1988, 1989), which were finally published together in the form of a book (Sesardić, 1991). These papers demonstrated that limits were set not only in terms of remaining within the framework of Marxist theory, but also by concrete political practices based on Marxist ideology, the postulates of which were expressed in the programme documents of the only permitted political party (the League of Communists). As Sesardić states (1991: 229–230): “At the end of the Sixties and the beginning of the Seventies, when the philosophy of practice was at its apex, it was impossible for anyone to publish a text in which official policies would be criticised from a declared non-Marxist position, and if by some miracle someone managed to do so, it would certainly be his last appearance on the public scene. Therefore also the fact that philosophers of practice were at one time indeed the most frequent targets of political attacks should be explained not by [the fact] that their criticism best hit the target, but simply because it was the only one that was at least tolerated, and that any more radical type of criticism was absolutely impermissible”. Sesardić (1991: 228) also claimed that the “[d]eclination of the philosophy of practice from the views of official politics at times has to be measured not in degrees but in seconds of an angle”. Through quotes he demonstrated that individual leading Marxists argued, for example in their “criticism of bureaucracy”, that there were no essential differences between what they wrote in philosophical and sociological journals and what had already for years been the content of speeches made by the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia; that their political opinions coincide with those presented in Party documents, and also that they interpreted their disputes and conflicts as conflicts with bureaucratic-Stalinist forces in the Party, and never as conflicts with the Party as a whole. Sesardić (1991: 228) likewise says to those who in the philosophy of practice saw a principled adjudication and radical criticism of the political situation, that they should ponder over the claim made by one of the creators of this philosophy, according to which “a ruthless criticism of everything in existence” and “thinking the revolution” were clearly formulated “nowhere else but in the opening report of Josip Broz at the 8th Congress of the LCY!”.

zbilje i društvenih problema bile su određene uklapanjem teorijskog i empirijskog pristupa temi u okvire marksističke teorije.¹⁵

Unatoč tomu, u ovom kontekstu valja naglasiti da se dominantni, ili – točnije rečeno – jedini ideološki ovjereni pristup proučavanju društva, u to vrijeme poklapao s trendom dominacije neomarksističkih pristupa u svjetskoj sociologiji. Ta je konvergencija pridonosila dojmu suvremenosti ondašnje sociologije i ostavljala prostor za sociološku refleksiju dostojnu zahtjeva tadašnje suvremenosti. No, takva je situacija, istodobno, također otežala kasniji razvoj sociologije u postmarksističkom vremenu: cijeli niz teorijskih pristupa i metoda ostao je, naime, izvan domašaja ondašnje hrvatske sociologije.

Primjerice, u knjigama Rudija Supeka, utemeljitelja suvremene hrvatske sociologije, obrađivane su i kvalitativne metode, ali o njima se samo

i – u okviru naznačene orijentacije – čak jasno suprotstavljeni« (kurziv I.T.K.). O kakvoj je, pak, orijentaciji riječ, jasno je iz izričite tvrdnje, iznesene na stranici 3, prema kojoj je »Revija za sociologiju' [...] znanstveni i stručni časopis marksistički orijentiranih sociologa«. Može se, dakle, zaključiti da je proklamirana »otvorenost časopisa neophodna za razvoj sociologije« (str. 4) vrijedila ako je temeljna orijentacija znanstvenog ili stručnog rada bila marksistička.

¹⁵ Temi ostajanja u okvirima dopuštenoga, u području filozofije, opsežan analitički članak posvetio je Sesardić (1983), a istu temu nastavio je razrađivati u kasnijim polemičkim člancima (Sesardić, 1987, 1988, 1989) koji su naposljetku zajednički objavljeni u knjizi (Sesardić, 1991). Ti članci pokazuju da se granice nisu određivale samo ostajanjem u okviru marksističke teorije, nego i konkretne političke prakse utemeljene na marksističkoj ideologiji, čije su postavke bile izražene u programskim dokumentima jedine dopuštene političke stranke (Savez komunista). Kao što kaže Sesardić (1991: 229–230): »Krajem šezdesetih i početkom sedamdesetih godina, kada je filozofija prakse bila na svom vrhuncu, bilo je nemoguće da netko objavi tekst u kojem bi s deklarirano nemarksističkih pozicija kritizirao službenu politiku, a da je kojim čudom netko u tome ipak uspio, bio bi to sigurno njegov zadnji nastup na javnoj sceni. Stoga i činjenicu da su filozofi prakse jedno vrijeme doista bili najčešća meta političkih napada treba objašnjavati ne time da je njihova kritika najbolje pogađala cilj, nego naprosto time da je jedino ona mogla bar donekle biti tolerirana, a da je svaki radikalniji tip kritike bio apsolutno nedopustiv«. Sesardić (1991: 228) ustvrdio je također da »[d]jeklinaciju filozofije prakse od stavova službene politike katkad treba mjeriti ne stupnjevima, već lučnim sekundama«. Na citatima je pokazao da su pojedini vodeći marksisti iznosili da, primjerice, u »kritici birokracije« nema nikakve bitne razlike između onoga što piše u filozofskim i sociološkim časopisima i onoga što su već godinama sadržavali govori rukovodilaca Saveza komunista Jugoslavije, da se njihovi politički stavovi podudaraju s onima iznošenima u partijskim dokumentima, kao i to da su svoje sporove i sukobe shvaćali kao sukobe s birokratsko-staljinističkim snagama u Partiji, a nikad kao sukobe s Partijom kao cjelinom. Sesardić (1991: 228) također poručuje onima koji su u filozofiji prakse vidjeli principijelno osporavanje i radikalnu kritiku političkog stanja, da bi se trebali zamisliti nad tvrdnjom jednog od tvoraca te filozofije prema kojoj su »bespoštedna kritika svega postojećeg« i »mišljenje revolucije« jasno formulirani »nigdje drugdje nego u uvodnom referatu Josipa Broza na 8. kongresu SKJ!«.

ogy in the post-Marxist period: specifically, an entire range of approaches and methods remained outside the scope of Croatian sociology in those days.

For example, in the books written by Rudi Supek, the founder of modern Croatian sociology, qualitative methods are also treated, but they were only studied, and not practised (neither in students' practical work, nor in sociological research practices). In the same way in which "creative Marxism" – or macro-theory and conflict theory – was the dominant theoretical perspective in Croatian sociology, in the field of empirical research there was an absolute dominance of the positivist approach and quantitative methodology. In part this dominance certainly had roots in the proclaimed "scientific" approach within Marxist theory.¹⁶ Its other side, due to which interpretative approaches were also absent, resulted from discomfort with the possibility of interpretations, which – despite partly proclaimed "pluralism" – in a fundamental sense still did not match the dominant approach.

Such a situation greatly limited the later development of sociology in Croatia. Due to a variety of reasons, in Croatia in the 1980s the process of surpassing the framework of "permitted criticism" – that had marked the entire history of sociology in the socialist period – never happened.¹⁷ One

¹⁶ The Slovenian theoretician Rastko Močnik (1988) explained in an essay his theory that science in socialism was reduced to scholasticism, or rather that precisely the ideology that referred to historical materialism experienced science and knowledge as uncomfortable. The reasons why non-positivistic and qualitative approaches were excluded from empirical studies conducted in the socialist period have not yet been addressed either in essay form, or as a scientific theme. Following Močnik's postulates from the 1980s, it could be said, however, that a specific post-bourgeois type of censorship was at work here, which – in the media – functioned as a "complex dispersion of various elements, from legal prohibitions of 'enemy propaganda' and disseminating 'disturbing news', through ideological threats, decisions of informal power groups in the media, to the psychological blackmail of journalists and public speakers, etc." (Močnik, 1984: 15). This situation prevented the free circulation of ideas (Mastnak, 1987), which was evident in the terminology of social and humanistic sciences, which only minimally diverged from the terminology of the ideology of socialist self-management, and which discussed the social order using the same language of the latter (Močnik, 1988: ix).

¹⁷ This is a theme that awaits more extensive scientific treatment. When dealing with Croatian sociology and other social sciences in Croatia, in principle it can be said that the reasons for not surpassing "permitted criticism" – which was surpassed in neighbouring Slovenia – had a two-pronged nature. On the one hand, there were intradisciplinary reasons (the type of dominant theoretical approach, or confinement to the Marxist paradigm), and on the other hand there were reasons associated with the social context in which public life took place. As is known, in regard to the reformist movement that had developed in Croatia with strong national traits ("the mass movement") – and which culminated in the events of 1971 – the former socialist regime in Yugoslavia, as well as in Croatia itself, responded in part by increasing repression, and in part by giving certain concessions, ranging from decentralisation of the country as stipulated in the Constitution of 1974 to increasing the material standard (based on increasing foreign loans), and to an even greater opening up to Western culture than had been the case previously. Increased repression, especially at the beginning of the period after 1971, led to the phenomenon known as the

učilo, a nisu se prakticirale (ni u studentskoj ni u sociološkoj istraživačkoj praksi). Na isti način na koji je »stvaralački marksizam« – odnosno makroteorija i konfliktna teorija – u hrvatskoj sociologiji bio dominantna teorijska perspektiva, u domeni empirijskih istraživanja apsolutnu su prevlast imali pozitivistički pristup i kvantitativna metodologija. Jednim je dijelom ova prevlast sigurno imala korijene u proklamiranom »znanstvenom« pristupu marksističke teorije.¹⁶ Druga je njezina strana, zbog koje su vjerojatno također izostali interpretativni pristupi, bila nelagoda od mogućnosti interpretacija koje – unatoč donekle proklamiranom »pluralizmu« – ipak nisu u temeljnom smislu odgovarale dominantom pristupu.

Takva je situacija umnogome ograničila kasniji razvoj sociologije u Hrvatskoj. U Hrvatskoj se, zbog niza razloga, osamdesetih godina, nije dogodio proces nadilaženja okvira »dopuštene kritičnosti«, koja je obilježila ukupnu povijest sociologije u socijalističkom razdoblju.¹⁷ Moglo bi se čak

¹⁶ Slovenski teoretičar Rastko Močnik (1988) esejistički je obrazložio svoju tezu da je znanost u socijalizmu bila svedena na skolastiku, odnosno da je upravo ideologija koja se pozivala na historijski materijalizam doživljavala znanost i znanje kao neugodan moment. Razlozi isključivanja nepozitivističkih i kvalitativnih pristupa iz empirijskih istraživanja provedenih u socijalističkom razdoblju hrvatske sociologije nisu još obrađeni ni kao esejistička ni kao znanstvena tema. Na tragu Močnikovih postavki iz osamdesetih godina prošlog stoljeća, moglo bi se, međutim, ustvrditi da je i ovdje na djelu bila specifična, postburžoaska cenzura koja je – u medijskom komuniciranju – djelovala kao »zapleten dispozitiv najrazličnijih prvina, od zakonskih prepovedi 'sovradne propagande' in širjenja 'vznemirljivih vesti', prek ideoloških groženj, odlučitev neformalnih oblastnih skupin v občilih, do psihološkega izsiljevanja novinarjev in javnih besednikov itn.« (Močnik, 1984: 15). To je stanje sprječavalo slobodnu konkurenciju ideja (Mastnak, 1987), što je bilo vidljivo i iz terminologije društveno-humanističkih znanosti, koja je minimalno odstupala od terminologije ideologije samoupravnog socijalizma koja je o društvenom poretku govorila jezikom njega samog (Močnik, 1988: ix).

¹⁷ Riječ je o još jednoj temi koja očekuje opsežniju znanstvenu obradu. Kad je o hrvatskoj sociologiji i drugim društvenim znanostima riječ, načelno se može reći da su razlozi nadilaženja »dopuštene kritičnosti« – do kojega je bilo došlo u susjednoj Sloveniji – dvojake naravi. S jedne strane, riječ je o unutardisciplinarnim razlozima (tipu dominantnoga teorijskog pristupa, odnosno neizlaženju iz marksističke paradigme), a s druge strane o razlozima povezanim s društvenim kontekstom u kojemu se odvijao javni život. Kao što je poznato, tadašnja socijalistička vlast u Jugoslaviji i u Hrvatskoj samoj, na reformistički pokret naglašeno nacionalnog predznaka (»masovni pokret«) u Hrvatskoj, koji je kulminirao u događajima 1971. godine, odgovorila je s jedne strane pojačanom represijom, a s druge stanovitim koncesijama, u rasponu od decentralizacije zemlje zacrtane u Ustavu iz 1974. do povećanja materijalnog standarda (na temelju povećanog zaduživanja u inozemstvu), kao i još znatnijeg otvaranja prema zapadnoj kulturi nego što je prije bilo slučaj. Izražena represija, pogotovo na početku razdoblja koje je nastupilo poslije 1971., dovela je do pojave poznate pod nazivom »hrvatska šutnja«. Događaj koji je dodatno učvrstio stanje »hrvatske šutnje« u vremenu kad su u susjednoj Sloveniji na teorijskoj sceni bili u tijeku procesi upravo suprotnog predznaka, bila je izrada i objavljivanje tzv. *Bijele knjige*. Taj

could say that precisely this “permitted criticism”, just as the overall project of “soft” Yugoslav socialism “with a human face”, made it impossible to clearly diverge from, or deconstruct Marxist ideology. This process of moving away from Marxist ideology occurred among dissident theoreticians in the countries of real-socialism,¹⁸ and – on different foundations – also in the Yugoslav republic of Slovenia.¹⁹ In these cases – according to a comment

“Croatian silence”. An event that additionally fortified the condition of “Croatian silence”, at a time when in neighbouring Slovenia processes under an opposite sign were on the scene, was the preparation and publication of the so-called *White Book*. This document, whose full title was “On certain ideological and political tendencies in artistic creativity, literary, theatre and film criticism and in public statements by some creators, which contain politically unacceptable messages” was prepared in 1984 by the Information Service of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Croatia, as ordered by Stipe Šušvar, the member of the Presidency of the CC of the LCC responsible for the “ideological sector”. This material, which dealt with “abuses in culture and creativity”, listed the names and surnames of intellectuals from all over former Yugoslavia, whom it reprimanded for “ideological deviations” in their texts or public statements. By proscribing many intellectuals in Croatia, this document, for the second time after the increased repressions following the “Croatian Spring” at the beginning of the 1970s, contributed to intensifying the “Croatian silence”. Specifically, despite turbulent political ferment in former Yugoslavia in the second part of the 1980s, during which there were debates on changes of the Constitution and on the status of the autonomous provinces of Kosovo and Vojvodina, the Croatian political leadership, headed by Mika Špiljak and Stanko Stojčević, sought to limit its public responses to a minimum. In the same way, social and humanistic scientists limited their responses, and this was the case especially among the small number of intellectuals who were still publically active after suffering repressions in the early 1970s, or who that had been proscribed in the *White Book*.

¹⁸ In Croatia a process never took hold in which Marxists, proceeding in their analysis from the positions of Marxist ideology, gradually deconstructed Marxism “from the inside”, and thus generated a paradigm of neo-Marxism, at the very end of which stood the concept of civil society. At the end of the 1980s it was precisely the debate on civil society which played a major role in overturning authoritative and totalitarian regimes in individual countries of the former Soviet Block (e.g. by the anti-regime, dissident movements in Hungary and Czechoslovakia). According to Mastnak, “Rakovski brought Marxism to its immanent limits, and [...] Szelényi exceeded these limits – or at least indicated exceeding them – by introducing the notion of civil society” (Mastnak, 1987: 113). In another context, a similar process occurred in Slovenia, but not also in Croatia. Some reasons for the absence of this process were mentioned in the previous footnote, yet in their entirety they still await comprehensive scientific analysis.

¹⁹ The debate on civil society developed among Slovenian theoreticians in the second part of the 1980s. According to Mirjana Ule “in Slovenia, practically within the grasp of the authorities [...] some young theoreticians advanced the concept of civil society” (Ule, 1989: 22). Although the debate began just as another attempt to solve the “crisis of socialism” and legitimise the socialist social order (Mastnak, 1987: 113), it actually contributed to deconstructing the Marxist theoretical paradigm. Specifically, advocating the institutions of civil society clearly revealed the entire non-democratic nature of “democratic socialism” and made it possible to begin talking about democracy, without having to talk also about socialism (Mastnak, 1987: 125). While dealing with the possibilities and/or impossibilities

reći da je upravo ta »dopuštena kritičnost«, kao uostalom i sveukupni projekt »mekoga« jugoslavenskog socijalizma »s ljudskim licem«, onemogućio proces jasnog odmicanja od marksističke ideologije ili njezine dekonstrukcije. Taj se proces odmicanja dogodio kod disidentskih teoretičara iz real-socijalističkih zemalja,¹⁸ a – na drugim osnovama – također i u jugoslavenskoj republici Sloveniji.¹⁹ U spomenutim je slučajevima razvoj sociološke

dokument, čiji je potpuni naziv bio »O nekim idejnim i političkim tendencijama u umjetničkom stvaralaštvu, književnoj, kazališnoj i filmskoj kritici te u javnim istupima jednog broja stvaralaca u kojima su sadržane politički neprihvatljive poruke«, 1984. godine izradila je informativna služba Centralnog komiteta Saveza komunista Hrvatske, na narudžbu Stipe Šuvara, člana Predsjedništva CK SKH zaduženog za »ideološki sektor«. U tom materijalu, koji se bavio »zloupotrebama u kulturi i stvaralaštvu« bila su navedena imena i prezimena intelektualaca iz cijele tadašnje Jugoslavije koji su, prozivani zbog »ideoloških skretanja« u svojim tekstovima ili javnim istupima. Taj dokument, koji je proskribirao brojne intelektualce, u Hrvatskoj je, po drugi put nakon pojačane represije u doba gušenja »Hrvatskoga proljeća« početkom sedamdesetih, pridonio intenziviranju »hrvatske šutnje«. Naime, unatoč burnim političkim previranjima u tadašnjoj Jugoslaviji u drugoj polovini osamdesetih, tijekom kojih se raspravljalo i o promjenama Ustava i položaja autonomnih pokrajina Kosova i Vojvodine, hrvatski politički vrh na čijem su čelu najprije bili Mika Špiljak i Stanko Stojčević, nastojao se što manje javno očitovati. Na isti način nisu se očitovali ni društveno-humanistički znanstvenici, a posebno ne malobrojni intelektualci koji su još uvijek javno djelovali nakon represije s početka sedamdesetih ili proskribiranja u *Bijeloj knjizi*.

¹⁸ U Hrvatskoj se nije dogodio proces u kojem su marksisti, polazeći u analizu s pozicija te ideologije, postupno »iznutra« dekonstruirali marksizam, generirajući paradigmu neomarksizma, na čijem je samom kraju stajao pojam civilnog društva. Koncem osamdesetih, upravo je diskurs civilnog društva odigrao veliku ulogu u rušenju autoritarnih i totalitarnih režima u pojedinim državama nekadašnjega Sovjetskog bloka (antirežimski, disidentski pokreti u Mađarskoj i Čehoslovačkoj). Prema Mastnaku, »Rakovski [je] doveo marksizam do njegove imanentne granice, a [...] Selenji prekoračio tu granicu – ili barem naznačio to prekoračenje – uvođenjem pojma civilnog društva« (Mastnak, 1987: 113). U drukčijem kontekstu, sličan se proces dogodio i u Sloveniji, ali ne i u Hrvatskoj. Neki od razloga izostanku tog procesa spomenuti su u prethodnoj fusnoti, no i oni u svojoj ukupnosti tek očekuju iscrpnu znanstvenu obradu.

¹⁹ Rasprava o civilnom društvu razvila se među slovenskim teoretičarima u drugoj polovini osamdesetih godina prošlog stoljeća. Prema Mirjani Ule »v Sloveniji takorekoč med prsti oblasti [...] nekateri mladi teoretiki so se oprijeli ideji o civilni družbi« (Ule, 1989: 22). Iako je rasprava započela kao još jedan pokušaj rješavanja »krize socijalizma« i legitimiranja socijalističkoga društvenog poretka (Mastnak, 1987: 113), zapravo je pridonijela dekonstrukciji marksističke teorijske paradigme. Naime, zagovaranje civilnodruštvenih institucija pokazalo je zorno svu nedemokračičnost »demokračkog socijalizma« i otvorilo mogućnost da se počne govoriti o demokračiji, a da se pritom ne mora govoriti o socijalizmu (Mastnak, 1987: 125). Baveći se mogućnostima i/ili nemogućnostima pojave novih društvenih pokreta u društvu samoupravnog socijalizma, zaključila sam (Tomić-Koludrović, 1992), da bi se teorijska rasprava o civilnom društvu u Sloveniji, koja se oslanjala ne samo na neomarksističke, nego i na lacanovske i druge poststrukturalističke teorijske pristupe, na načelnoj razini mogla uspoređivati s djelovanjem novih društvenih

made in the late 1980s by the Slovenian theoretician Tomaž Mastnak – the development of sociological theory and theory in general brought about as the consequence that “[t]hose that were seeking a critical Marxist theory, became [...] critics of Marxism” and “Marxist criticism of Marxism [...] ended in post-Marxism” (Mastnak, 1987: 112).

In Croatia, as has already been said, there is no record of such a deconstruction of the Marxist paradigm, nor of any divergence from the field of Marxist discourse. Thus – as Željka Šporer (2006) stated – sociology in Croatia, in the post-socialist period just as in the socialist period, continued to exist as “an extended hand of politics”, and from a theoretical-epistemological position as “a younger, immature sister of philosophy”. In other words, it could be said – as I stated in the mid 1990s – that during the socialist period, sociology in Croatia had the status of a “legitimising science” (Tomić-Koludrović, 1996).²⁰

for the appearance of new social movements in the society of socialist self-management, I came to the conclusion (Tomić-Koludrović, 1992) that the theoretical discussion on civil society in Slovenia, which was based not only on neo-Marxist, but also on Lacanian and other poststructuralist theoretical approaches, could be compared in principle to the actions of new social movements in the West. To be more precise, I claimed that one could say that this debate served as a substitute for new social movements. This thesis was based on the fact that theoreticians in Slovenia, through the concept of civil society, managed also to inaugurate theoretical and political and civil pluralism. The self-managing paradigm of the one-party system later became dubious not only for advocates of civil society and party pluralism on the Slovenian alternative political scene, but also for the Slovenian political elite. The latter took over the notion of political pluralism from the theoreticians and utilised their view on the need for changing the existing paradigm: “pluralism of self-managing interests”, to a new one: “pluralism of political interests” in order to position itself in relation to the political elites of the other republics in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. In contrast to Slovenia, in which the described transformation of the political elite’s ideology contributed to the fact that representatives of the still existing one-party regime began to advocate pluralism – the same did not happen in Croatia. Thus, despite the fact that within alternative initiatives such as Woman and Society, Women’s Group Trešnjevka, Svarun and Green Action themes were discussed similar to those that concerned new social movements in the West, these did not result in a deconstruction of Marxism, nor did they initiate a change in the political system in the way that non-conformist Slovenian intellectuals managed to change their political system in the second part of the 1980s. Finally, it may be interesting to offer the thought that – despite all the differences in regard to the situation in other parts of the SFRY that should be taken into consideration and that are often expressed by the phrase “greater openness” – Slovenia in the 1980s may have used to its advantage also the delayed theoretical modernisation of the paradigm that prevailed in socialism. In comparison to the previous reform attempts in Croatia and Serbia (where “liberals” encountered opposition from the authorities), in Slovenia reform ideas had greater chances of succeeding also due to their relatively late “awakening”.

²⁰ Political sciences are another discipline within the social sciences which, just as Croatian sociology, needs to distance itself from the role of being a legitimising science. The Faculty of Political Sciences of the University of Zagreb was established in 1962 and was the first higher education institution of that type in the former socialist world. However, as emphasised by Kasapović (2007: 73), it should not be forgotten that this institutionalisation

teorije i teorije općenito za posljedicu imao da su – prema riječima slovenskog teoretičara Tomaža Mastnaka s kraja osamdesetih – »[o]ni koji su tražili kritičku marksističku teoriju postali [...] kritičari marksizma« i da je »marksistička kritika marksizma [...] završila u postmarksizmu« (Mastnak, 1987: 112).

U Hrvatskoj, kao što je već rečeno, nije zabilježena takva dekonstrukcija marksističke paradigme niti iskorak iz polja marksističkog diskursa. Stoga je – kao što je to ustvrdila Željka Šporer (2006) – sociologija u Hrvatskoj i u postsocijalizmu, upravo kao i u socijalističkom razdoblju, nastavila postojati kao »produžena ruka politike«, a s teorijsko-epistemološke pozicije kao »mlađa, nedorasla sestra filozofije«. Drugim riječima, moglo bi se reći – kao što sam ustvrdila sredinom devedesetih godina – da je u socijalističkom razdoblju sociologija u Hrvatskoj imala status »legitimacijske znanosti« (Tomić-Koludrović, 1996).²⁰

pokreta na Zapadu. Točnije, ustvrdila sam da se može reći da je ta rasprava poslužila kao zamjena za nove društvene pokrete. Ta se teza temeljila na činjenici da su teoretičari u Sloveniji preko koncepta civilnog društva uspjeli inauguirati i teorijski i politički i građanski pluralizam. Samoupravna paradigma jednostranačkog sustava nakon toga postala je upitnom ne samo zagovornicima civilnog društva i partijskog pluralizma unutar slovenske alternativne političke javnosti, nego i slovenskoj političkoj eliti. Ona je ideju političkog pluralizma preuzela od teoretičara te iskoristila stav o potrebi promjene paradigme »pluralizma samoupravnih interesa« u paradigmu »pluralizma političkih interesa« za vlastito pozicioniranje u odnosu na političke elite ostalih republika u Socijalističkoj Federativnoj Republici Jugoslaviji. Za razliku od Slovenije, u kojoj je opisana transformacija ideologije političke elite pridonijela tomu da predstavnici još uvijek jednostranačke vlasti počnu zastupati pluralizam, u Hrvatskoj se to nije dogodilo. Stoga, unatoč činjenici da su se unutar alternativnih inicijativa Žena i društvo, Ženska grupa Trešnjevka, Svarun i Zelena akcija raspravljale teme slične temama novih društvenih pokreta na Zapadu, one nisu rezultirale dekonstrukcijom marksizma, niti su inicirale promjenu političkog sustava onako kako su ga uspjeli promijeniti nekonformistički slovenski intelektualci u drugoj polovini osamdesetih godina. Konačno, možda je zanimljivo iznijeti mišljenje da je, uza sve razlike prema stanju u drugim dijelovima SFRJ, koje valja uzeti u obzir i koje se često opisuju frazom »veća otvorenost«, Slovenija osamdesetih možda stanovitu korist izvukla i iz zakašnjele teorijske modernizacije paradigme koja je u socijalizmu bila dominantna. U odnosu na prethodne reformističke pokušaje u Hrvatskoj i Srbiji (gdje su na otpor vlasti naišle pozicije »liberala«), u Sloveniji su reformističke ideje imale veće izgleda na uspjeh već i zbog njihova razmjerno kasnog »buđenja«.

²⁰ Političke su znanosti još jedna disciplina društvenih znanosti s kojom hrvatska sociologija dijeli potrebu distanciranja od uloge legitimacijske znanosti. Fakultet političkih znanosti Sveučilišta u Zagrebu osnovan je 1962. godine i bio je prva visokoškolska ustanova te vrste u tadašnjem socijalističkom svijetu. Unatoč tomu, kao što ističe Kasapović (2007: 73), ne bi trebalo zaboraviti da je do te institucionalizacije političkih znanosti došlo u kontekstu autokratskog režima, što je presudno utjecalo na prirodu i kasniji razvoj discipline u socijalističkom razdoblju. Iako Kasapović tvrdi da je to u istom razdoblju vrijedilo i za druge društvene znanosti, valja reći da je javna slika političkih znanosti kao legitimacijske disci-

Such a status of the discipline resulted in the absence of diverse theoretical approaches already in the late socialist period. After the mentioned period in which neo-Marxist approaches had prevailed in world sociology, and with which the approaches of Yugoslav socialist social sciences had converged, mainstream sociological events were left without approaches that in the meantime had appeared and developed on the global sociological scene.

Thus Croatian sociology in the 1980s lacked – and in many respects still lacks today – various theories, methodologies and studies, that would be based on methodological individualism, interpretative theory, poststructuralist and post-colonial theories. In mainstream sociological thinking in Croatia there is also an absence of studies of the media, of representation and of individual cultural identities.²¹

of political sciences was achieved in the context of an autocratic regime, and this fact had a critical impact on the discipline's nature and subsequent development during the socialist period. Even though Kasapović claims that this was true in the same period likewise for other social sciences, it should be said that the public image of political science as a legitimising discipline was at the time nevertheless more emphasised than was the case in regard to sociology or philosophy. Yet this difference in the public perception, as well as in the degree of conformity to the dominant political agenda that provided a basis for this public perception, does not change the basic similarity of the social roles of these two disciplines during the socialist period. Rotar (1988: 148) claims that during the socialist period in Yugoslavia social and humanistic sciences functioned less as reflexive processes and more as separate sectors of the socially and culturally symbolic [level]. In other words, even their legitimising role was not always based on analysis, but rather on an *a priori* defined position within the order, with clearly marked limits to possible ideological transgressions of the basic postulates (Tomić-Koludrović, 1996). Thus it is not surprising that Kasapović (2007: 65) claims that it was only in the post-socialist period, during the process of democratisation of the 1990s, and despite war-time conditions, that a generation of political scientists appeared who for the first time in the history of the discipline developed a full range of possible approaches to their subject matter.

²¹ During the 1970s and 1980s, in a context in which collective culture was dominant, some attention was given to collective, although not to individual cultural identities (Tomić-Koludrović, 1992, 1993). During the 1980s the symbolic representation of identity affiliation was analysed down to the level of sub-cultural groups (Tomić-Koludrović and Leburic, 2001). Individual cultural identities did not come to the forefront either during the 1990s, due to prevalence at the time of themes associated with ethnic and national identities. In the first decade of the 21st century, one can say that there has been gradual compensation in the field of sociology for what had been previously missed in the area of symbolic representation, articulation and representation of cultural identities. This is especially evident in university courses conducted from 2006 within the framework of the national Ph.D. programme in sociology. As Petrić noted (2008), the rise of academic disciplines dealing with cultural studies in Croatia in the post-socialist period can be linked to the above-mentioned deficiency of modern sociological theories and practices. According to Petrić, cultural studies served also as a substitute for the insufficient willingness of Croatian sociology to engage in interdisciplinary collaboration. In this, the unopeness of sociology as a discipline was attributed to its self-perception, which corresponds to the context of “first”, and not to the context of “second modernity”.

Takav status discipline imao je za posljedicu manjak različitih teorijskih pristupa već u kasnom socijalističkom razdoblju. Nakon spomenutog razdoblja dominacije neomarksističkih pristupa u svjetskoj sociologiji, s kojima je konvergirao pristup jugoslavenske socijalističke društvene znanosti, iz matice socioloških događaja izostali su pristupi koji su se u međuvremenu pojavili i razvili na svjetskoj sociološkoj sceni.

U hrvatskoj sociologiji osamdesetih godina prošlog stoljeća izostale su tako – a umnogome izostaju i do danas – teorije, metodologije i studije koje bi se oslanjale na metodološki individualizam, interpretativne teorije, poststrukturalističke i postkolonijalne teorije. Iz matice sociološke misli u Hrvatskoj izostaju i studije medija, reprezentacije i individualnih kulturnih identiteta.²¹

Stanje sociologije u kasnom socijalizmu imalo je, dakle, dugoročne posljedice i na sposobnost discipline za interpretaciju suvremenih društvenih pojava u postsocijalističkom razdoblju. To se osobito odnosi na društvene

pline u to vrijeme ipak bila znatno naglašenija nego kad je riječ o sociologiji ili filozofiji. Ta razlika u javnoj percepciji, kao i u stupnju konformnosti dominantnoj političkoj agendi, koja je toj javnoj percepciji stvarala podlogu, međutim, ne mijenja temeljnu sličnost društvene uloge dviju disciplina u socijalističkom razdoblju. Rotar (1988: 148) tvrdi da su u socijalističkom razdoblju u Jugoslaviji društvene i humanističke znanosti funkcionirale manje kao reflektivni proces nego kao zaseban sektor društvenog i kulturnog simboličkoga. Drugim riječima, čak ni njihova legitimacijska uloga nije uvijek bila zasnovana na analizi, nego prije na unaprijed definiranom položaju unutar poretka, s jasno naznačenim granicama mogućih ideoloških transgresija temeljnih postavki (Tomić-Koludrović, 1996). Ne čudi stoga što Kasapović (2007: 65) tvrdi da se tek u postsocijalističkom razdoblju, u procesu demokratizacije devedesetih godina, unatoč ratnim uvjetima, pojavila generacija političkih znanstvenika koja je prvi put u povijesti discipline razvila pun raspon mogućih pristupa njezinu predmetu.

²¹ Sedamdesetih i osamdesetih godina prošlog stoljeća, u kontekstu dominacije kolektivne kulture stanovita se pozornost pridavala kolektivnim, a ne individualnim kulturnim identitetima (Tomić-Koludrović, 1992, 1993). Tijekom osamdesetih godina, simbolička reprezentacija identitetskih pripadnosti analizirala se do razine subkulturnih skupina (Tomić-Koludrović i Leburić, 2001). Individualni kulturni identiteti nisu izbili u prvi plan niti tijekom devedesetih, zbog tadašnje dominacije tematike povezane s etničkim i nacionalnim identitetima. U prvom desetljeću 21. stoljeća, može se ustvrditi da se u području sociologije postupno nastoji nadoknaditi dotad propušteno u području simboličke reprezentacije, artikulacije i reprezentacije kulturnih identiteta. To je osobito vidljivo u kolegijima koji se, od 2006., izvode u okviru nacionalnoga doktorskog studija sociologije. Kao što je ustvrdio Petrić (2008), uspon akademske discipline kulturnih studija u Hrvatskoj u postsocijalističkom razdoblju može se povezati i s ovdje spomenutim manjkavostima suvremene sociološke teorije i prakse. Prema Petriću, kulturni su studiji poslužili i kao zamjena za nedovoljnu spremnost hrvatske sociologije za ulazak u interdisciplinarnu suradnju. Disciplinarna zatvorenost sociologije pritom se pripisuje njezinoj samopercepciji koja odgovara kontekstu »prve«, a ne kontekstu »druge modernosti«.

The situation in regard to sociology in late socialism, therefore, had long-term repercussions also on the ability of the discipline to interpret contemporary social phenomena in the post-socialist period. This especially pertains to certain social phenomena, or their aspects, which during socialism – due to the unwillingness of sociological theories to treat them – remained totally invisible.

One of the particularly painful paradoxes of the late socialist period is that the non-dogmatic profile of Yugoslav socialism made possible the development of social phenomenon similar to those that appeared in Western societies from the 1970s onwards. Yet Croatian sociology – as opposed to Slovenian sociology, which deconstructed Marxism from within – did not have, and on the whole still does not have, a theoretical vocabulary and the necessary reflexivity to explain processes of individualisation and other elements of “second modernity”, which were at work likewise in Croatian society. Despite shortcomings also in other areas, this deficiency in theory in contemporary Croatian sociology is perhaps most apparent precisely in the insufficient treatment of the problem of identity, especially if it is observed against the background of global processes.

Croatian sociology thus entered into the turbulent transitional period, which in the Croatian case included war events as well, with very limited theoretical possibilities to help it even understand the newly formed reality.

This was certainly one of the reasons why sociology in the first transitional period remained – to say the least – quiet. There is also no doubt that ideological repression in the war-time conditions silenced sociology. Nevertheless, I believe that the invisibility of sociology during that period was mostly due to the impossibility of theoretically interpreting reality in a way different from the one that the profession had adopted in socialism.

On the other hand, it should also be said that sociology in Croatia today gained much from the fact that it even managed to survive as a profession in the first period of transition. Specifically, in the first part of the 1990s it was extremely marginalised due to its Marxist past and reputation. We owe the survival of sociology in Croatia to the wisdom and tactfulness of its eminent representatives in their contacts with representatives of the academic nomenclature of that period and with the political authorities.²²

²² This phase in the recent past of the discipline of sociology in Croatia is still awaiting systematic academic analysis. Based on what can be learned from informal contacts with various protagonists, the teaching of sociology at the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb remained more or less unchanged in relation to the previous situation due to the fact that eminent representatives of sociology suggested to representatives of the transitional nomenclature of that period that at the Department, from the start of its work, not only Marxist sociology was taught, but likewise bourgeois/civil sociology. It was perhaps that suggestion that, at least partly, resulted in

pojave ili njihove aspekte koji su u socijalizmu – zahvaljujući nespremnosti sociološke teorije da se njima pozabavi – bili posve nevidljivi.

Jedan od osobito bolnih paradoksa kasnoga socijalističkog razdoblja jest da je nedogmatski profil jugoslavenskog socijalizma otvorio mogućnost razvoju društvenih pojava sličnih onima koje se javljaju u zapadnim društvima od sedamdesetih godina prošlog stoljeća nadalje. No, hrvatska sociologija – za razliku od slovenske, koja je iznutra dekonstruirala marksizam – nije imala i najčešće do danas nema teorijski vokabular i refleksivnost potrebnu da bi se objasnili procesi individualizacije i ostali elementi »druge modernosti«, koji su bili na djelu i u hrvatskom društvu. Unatoč nedostacima i u drugim područjima, teorijski deficit suvremene hrvatske sociologije možda je najrazvidniji upravo u neadekvatnom bavljenju problemom identiteta, pogotovo promatra li se on na pozadini globalizacijskih procesa.

U turbulentna tranzicijska vremena, koja su u hrvatskom slučaju uključivala i ratne događaje, hrvatska je sociologija dakle ušla s vrlo ograničenim teorijskim mogućnostima s pomoću kojih bi uopće mogla shvatiti novonastalu zbilju.

To je, svakako, jedan od razloga zbog kojih je sociologija u prvom razdoblju tranzicije bila u najmanju ruku tiha. Nema sumnje u to da je i ideološka represija u ratnim uvjetima ušutkala sociologiju. No, smatram da je nevidljivosti sociologije u tom razdoblju najviše pridonijela nemogućnost da se zbilja teorijski tumači na način drukčiji od onoga koji je struka prihvatila u socijalizmu.

S druge strane, treba također reći da je veliki dobitak za sociologiju u Hrvatskoj danas što se sociologija u prvom razdoblju tranzicije uopće održala kao struka. U prvoj polovini devedesetih, ona je, naime, bila izrazito marginalizirana zbog marksističke prošlosti i reputacije. Opstanak sociologije na ovim prostorima u tom razdoblju dugujemo mudrosti i taktičnosti njezinih istaknutih predstavnika u kontaktima s predstavnicima ondašnje akademske nomenklature i političke vlasti.²²

²² Ovaj dio nedavne povijesti discipline sociologije u Hrvatskoj tek očekuje sustavnu akademsku obradu. Prema onome što se može doznati iz neformalnih kontakata s akterima, poduka sociologije na Odsjeku za sociologiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu održala se u više-manje nepromijenjenom obliku u odnosu na prethodno stanje stoga što su istaknuti predstavnici sociologije sugerirali predstavnicima ondašnje tranzicijske nomenklature da se na Odsjeku od početka njegova djelovanja poučavala ne samo marksistička nego i građanska sociologija. Ta je sugestija možda, barem djelomično, rezultirala nešto manjim pritiskom vlasti na disciplinu i odsjek sociologije nego na disciplinu filozofije kakva se predavala na odsjeku Filozofskog fakulteta posvećenom izučavanju te discipline. No, o nezadovoljstvu postojećim stanjem i planovima vlasti svjedoči paralelno formiranje, unutar istog sveučilišta, usmjerenja filozofije i sociologije u okviru programa Hrvatskih studija

The importance of this gain – not only for the academic scene, but also for society as a whole – cannot be sufficiently stressed. It would be difficult to imagine how we all would fare today if sociology had not survived as a profession in that environment, and if in the new conditions it would have been necessary to reinitiate it as an academic discipline.

Since the period that we are now discussing, sociology has faced a duality in its institutional organisation, which it has only recently begun to overcome. Namely, all until recently a rather pronounced division was felt on the Croatian sociological scene between those academic and research institutions that the political authorities in the first half of the 1990s wanted to eliminate, and whose influence they wished to minimise, and those institutions that the newly established order wished to nominate and institutionalise as being best suited for its ideological needs and preferences.²³

The rift that began to form at that time has fortunately lessened, and today we can view previous divisions also as a contribution to enriching the Croatian sociological scene.²⁴ Despite previous turbulence and unease, with time the aforesaid duality in the standpoint towards sociology initiated a theoretical and methodological diversification of the discipline, which was painfully absent in the past.

Afterwards, in the 21st century, a new department of sociology was established (at the University of Split), and new approaches were introduced in a department that had existed already for over thirty years, but which was

somewhat lessened pressure of the authorities on the discipline and the department of sociology, in comparison with the discipline of philosophy as taught at the department of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences devoted to research in that discipline. Yet the authorities' discontent with the existing situation and their plans were revealed by the parallel creation, within the same university, of a philosophy and sociology curriculum within the framework of the Croatian Studies programme (as has been said, the specialisation "Society" within Croatian Studies developed in 1996 into an independent programme of sociology).

²³ The part of the recent history of the discipline that concerns the work of institutes also awaits systematic analysis. However, and once more based on informal contacts with protagonists, it could be said that – regarding this form of institutional organisation of scientific work in the discipline – there was an analogy to the above-mentioned establishment of a parallel sociology programme within the same university in the favouritism shown to the new Institute for Applied Social Research (later the Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar) *vis-à-vis* the Institute for Social Research (of the University of Zagreb) (IDIS), together with the intent of possibly eliminating the latter.

²⁴ Today researchers from the Institute for Social Research in Zagreb teach within the programme of Croatian Studies and individual researchers from the Institute Ivo Pilar hold lectures within the national Ph.D. programme in sociology, co-ordinated by the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb, and in which the Institute Ivo Pilar – in contrast to other scientific institutions in which sociology is studied or taught – is not included as an institution.

Ne može se dovoljno naglasiti koliki je to dobitak, ne samo za akademsku scenu nego i za društvo u cjelini. Teško bi bilo zamisliti kako bi nam svima danas bilo da se sociologija u takvom okruženju nije održala kao struka i da ju je u novim uvjetima trebalo od samog početka ponovo pokretati kao akademsku disciplinu.

Iz vremena o kojem je sada riječ sociologiju prati i stanovita dvojnost institucionalne organizacije, koju je ona kao struka počela prevladavati tek u posljednje vrijeme. Naime, sve donedavna se na hrvatskoj sociološkoj sceni osjećala prilično izražena podjela na one akademske i istraživačke institucije koje je politička vlast u prvoj polovini devedesetih htjela ukinuti i čiji je utjecaj željela minimizirati te onih ustanova koje je novouspostavljeni poredak želio nominirati i institucionalizirati kao prikladnije njegovim ideološkim potrebama i preferencijama.²³

Jaz koji se tada bio počeo uspostavljati, na sreću je postupno smanjen, a nekadašnje podjele danas možemo vidjeti i kao doprinos obogaćenju hrvatske sociološke scene.²⁴ Unatoč svojedobnim turbulencijama i neugodama, u vremenu spomenute dvojnosti pristupa sociologiji započelo je teorijsko i metodološko uraznoličivanje discipline, koje joj je u prošlosti bolno nedostajalo.

U 21. stoljeću došlo je, potom, do osnivanja novog odsjeka za sociologiju (na Sveučilištu u Splitu), odnosno uvođenja novih pristupa na odsjeku koji postoji već više od trideset godina ali koji je znatno kadrovski ojačao i uraznoličio područja svog djelovanja u drugoj polovini prvog desetljeća 21. stoljeća (pritom mislim na Odjel za sociologiju Sveučilišta u Zadru). Oba ta odsjeka svoj identitet grade na pristupima i tematikama koji dosad nisu bili uobičajeni, a sigurno nisu bili dominantni u hrvatskoj sociologiji.

(kako je već rečeno, smjer »Društvo« u okviru Hrvatskih studija 1996. prerasta u samostalni studij sociologije).

²³ Dio nedavne povijesti discipline koji se odnosi na rad instituta također tek očekuje sustavnu obradu. No, ponovo iz neformalnih kontakata s akterima, može se reći da je – kad je riječ o tom obliku institucionalne organizacije znanstvenog rada u disciplini – paralela spomenutoj uspostavi paralelnog studija sociologije u okviru istog sveučilišta bilo favoriziranje novog Instituta za primijenjena društvena istraživanja (kasnije Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar) u odnosu na Institut za društvena istraživanja (Sveučilišta u Zagrebu) (IDIS), s namjerom mogućeg ukidanja potonjega.

²⁴ Danas istraživači/ce iz Instituta za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu predaju na Hrvatskim studijima a pojedini istraživači/ce iz Instituta Ivo Pilar predaju u okviru nacionalnoga doktorskog studija sociologije, koji koordinira Odsjek za sociologiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu, a u koji se Institut Ivo Pilar – za razliku od drugih znanstvenih ustanova na kojima se proučava ili podučava sociologija – nije uključio kao ustanova.

significantly strengthened in staff and diversified in its area of activity in the second half of the first decade of the 21st century (here I have in mind the Department of Sociology at the University of Zadar). Both these departments are building their identities on approaches and themes that have so far not been typical, and certainly were not dominant in Croatian sociology. Since the beginning of the transition, new approaches and themes have been noticeable also in the Department of Sociology at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb.²⁵

Therefore, we can say that the professional situation in which we now live – regardless of divisions and turbulence in the relatively recent past – is characterised by a certain pluralisation of the scene, which I think is positive and should be supported. I believe that only advantages can be gained from this pluralisation within the profession, and from the specialisation of individual sociological academic centres.

In this sense I also consider as a favourable circumstance the possibility of academic mobility both of students and of lecturers that has been enabled by the new system of higher education, organised in accordance with the “Bologna” principle. This possibility of mobility, unfortunately, is still poorly utilised within Croatia. The university department, in which I am employed, to mention just an example that I know well, thus has so far had a higher level of student and also lecturer mobility with universities abroad than with universities in Croatia, even though the existing system in theory enables easy and practically non-procedural exchanges within the country. Neverthe-

²⁵ The study of sociology in Split, in the words of its founder, has been primarily a study of “methodological orientations” (Leburčić, 2006), which has included also qualitative methods and mixed methodology. In Zadar the emphasis was on a full range of modern sociological theories, as well as on covering areas that were previously in this text identified as deficient (identity, the media, cultural, post-colonial, feminist and gender theories, postmodernism, consumerism, the sociology of emotions and spatial mobility, visual analysis and discourse analysis and other qualitative methods) (Petrić, 2006). The Department of Sociology at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb has continued to offer a large number of special sociologies, and recently has also introduced qualitative methods. The Department of Economics and Tourism at the Juraj Dobrila University of Pula offers sociological content from the otherwise insufficiently represented field of economic sociology, and the programme of social work at the Faculty of Law in Zagreb offers the possibility of training in the theory and methodology of this field. In addition to the aforementioned institutions, it should not be forgotten that the study programme in sociology at the Croatian Studies also offers specific content unrepresented at the other departments and chairs in which sociology is being taught. In the framework of the Bologna reform, such a diversity of approaches theoretically opens the possibility of interuniversity student and staff mobility. This has practically already been realised in the framework of the national Ph.D. programme in sociology, coordinated by the Department of Sociology at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb. For a full review of the study programmes and the institutions that teach sociology as a general subject, or for the adapted specific needs of their main studies, see: Krbec and Lažnjak, 2008.

Od početka tranzicije, novi pristupi i teme primjetni su i na Odsjeku za sociologiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu.²⁵

Za strukovnu situaciju koju danas živimo, možemo dakle reći da je – unatoč podjelama i turbulencijama u razmjerno nedavnoj prošlosti – odlikuje svojevrsna pluralizacija scene, za koju mislim da je pozitivna i da ju valja poduprijeti. Od te unutarstrukovne pluralizacije i specijalizacije pojedinih akademskih središta sociologija, smatram, može samo profitirati.

Povoljnom okolnošću u ovom smislu smatram i mogućnost akademske mobilnosti, podjednako studentske i nastavničke, koju omogućuje novi sustav visokog školstva, organiziran na »bolonjskom« principu. Ta se mogućnost mobilnosti, nažalost, unutar Hrvatske još uvijek slabo koristi. Sveučilišni odjel na kojem sam zaposlena, da navedem samo primjer koji dobro poznam, ima tako veću studentsku, a isto tako i nastavničku, mobilnost s inozemnim sveučilištima nego sa sveučilištima u Hrvatskoj, kojima postojeći sustav u teoriji omogućuje laku i gotovo neproceduralnu razmjenu. Ipak, do mogućnosti slušanja predavanja nastavnika i nastavnica s drugih sveučilišta, te rada sa studentima i studenticama s takvih sveučilišta, došlo je unutar nacionalnoga doktorskog studija sociologije, koji trenutačno obrazuje drugu generaciju polaznika i polaznica.

Do uraznoličenja i veće međuinstitucionalne protočnosti, dakle, ipak dolazi, htio to netko ili ne, a kontakti i s njima povezana daljnja pluralizacija scene u budućnosti će se zacijelo intenzivirati. Ono na čemu će, međutim, trebati ozbiljno poraditi, poduzimajući i sustavna djelovanja, jest

²⁵ Studij sociologije u Splitu je, prema riječima njegove utemeljiteljice, studij ponajprije »metodološke orijentacije« (Leburić, 2006), koji uključuje i kvalitativne metode i mješovitu metodologiju. U Zadru, naglasak je na punom rasponu suvremenih socioloških teorija, kao i pokrivanju područja koja su prije u ovom tekstu dijagnosticirana kao deficitarna (identitet, mediji, kulturne, postkolonijalne, feminističke i rodne teorije, postmodernizam, konzumerizam, sociologija emocija i prostorne mobilnosti, vizualna analiza i analiza diskursa, te druge kvalitativne metode) (Petrić, 2006). Odsjek za sociologiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu nastavlja nuditi kolegije u velikom broju posebnih sociologija, a u posljednje se vrijeme također otvorio kvalitativnim metodama. Odjel za ekonomiju i turizam Sveučilišta Jurja Dobrile u Puli nudi sociološke sadržaje iz drugdje nedovoljno zastupljene ekonomske sociologije, a studij socijalnog rada pri Pravnom fakultetu u Zagrebu nudi mogućnost znanstvenog usavršavanja iz teorije i metodologije te grane. Uz ovdje spomenute ustanove, ne smije se zaboraviti da studij sociologije pri Hrvatskim studijima također nudi specifične sadržaje nezastupljene na drugim odsjecima i katedrama na kojima se podučava sociologija. U okviru Bolonjske reforme, ovakva raznolikost pristupa teoretski otvara mogućnost međusveučilišne studentske i nastavničke mobilnosti. Ona se praktički već ostvarila u okviru nacionalnoga doktorskog studija sociologije, koji koordinira Odsjek za sociologiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu. Za potpun pregled studijskih programa i ustanova na kojima se predaje sociologija kao opći predmet ili prilagođena specifičnim potrebama matičnog studija, vidi: Krbec i Lažnjak, 2008.

less, the possibility of attending lectures by teachers from other universities, and of working with students from such universities, has been incorporated into the national Ph.D. programme in sociology, which is at this moment educating the second generation of students.

Thus diversity and greater interinstitutional fluidity is nonetheless occurring, whether one wants it or not, and contacts – and with them the further pluralisation of the scene in the future – will surely intensify. However, the area that must be seriously treated, applying systematic action, pertains to the public role of sociology, which should correspond to its potential importance and its role in this sense.

Today we live in a social context congested by sudden social changes, and society on a broader scale is simply crying out for explanations and contextual elaborations that a developed sociology can or should be able to offer. It is not known how things will develop further and how the profession will respond to future challenges, while carrying out its social role, both in contact with official government institutions, which – subsequent to European integration – will also have more need of scientific insights into society, and in contact with civil society, to which the discipline should be significantly more open.

How then can Croatian sociology fulfil both its public role and its role of opening up towards civil society? In order to designate this theme, we have to be aware of the broader context, or rather compare our own situation with similar attempts in other settings. As is known, in 2004 Michael Burawoy, in his presidential address to members of the American Sociological Association (ASA) advocated public sociology.²⁶ On that occasion he

²⁶ Burawoy (2005: 4) believes that public sociology should try to involve multiple publics in equally multiple ways. Namely, according to him, if the division of labour in the field of sociology is outlined, the existence of an antagonistic interdependence is revealed between four types of knowledge: professional, critical, policy oriented and finally public. In the growing rift between the sociological ethos and the world which sociologists study, public sociologies should not be left on the margins, but should be integrated into the framework of the discipline. Thus, claims Burawoy, public sociology would be strengthened and would gain legitimacy and finally the entire discipline would profit. On the other hand, this focus of action should also be seen as sociology's investment into civil society, which is threatened by market and state intrusions. Burawoy, *inter alia*, has called for research into the relations existing between the four mentioned types of knowledge in particular historical and national contexts, since these relations indicate the reasons for divergences in individual careers and approaches. I am of the opinion that Croatian sociology should certainly accept Burawoy's invitation, because it would thus learn more about itself as a discipline, which is especially important in its present moment. Also, such an examination would contribute to the inauguration of the very concept of "public sociology", which in Croatia does not have a tradition, which in this sense already exists in the US (the concept was introduced in that country in Herbert Gans's presidential address to the ASA membership in 1988, yet the tradition of addressing the public in the sociological profession is much older and represents one of the foundations of the discipline in the US).

rad na ispunjenju javne uloge sociologije u mjeri koja bi odgovarala njezi-
nu potencijalnom značaju i ulozi u ovom smislu.

Danas živimo u društvenom kontekstu prepunom naglih društvenih
promjena, šire društvo naprosto vapi za objašnjenjima i kontekstualizaci-
jama koje mu razvijena sociološka znanost može ili bi barem trebala moći
pružiti. Pitanje je kako će se stvari odvijati dalje i kako će struka odgovoriti
na izazove budućnosti, obavljajući svoju društvenu ulogu i u kontaktu sa
službenim vladinim ustanovama, koje će – slijedom europskih integracija
– također imati sve više potrebe za znanstvenim spoznajama o društvu,
ali i u kontaktu s civilnim društvom, prema kojemu bi se trebala znatnije
otvoriti.

Kako, dakle, hrvatska sociologija može ispuniti svoju javnu ulogu i
ulogu otvaranja prema civilnom društvu? Da bismo mogli nominirati tu
temu, moramo biti svjesni šireg konteksta, odnosno vlastitu situaciju us-
porediti sa sličnim nastojanjima u drugim sredinama. Kao što je poznato,
Michael Burawoy se 2004. godine, u predsjedničkom obraćanju članstvu
Američkoga sociološkog društva (ASA), založio za javnu sociologiju.²⁶
Tom prigodom pozvao se na američku tradiciju u sociologiji i naznačio
razliku između sociologije shvaćene kao akademske discipline, u kojoj se
profesionalni sociolozi/ginje obraćaju ponajprije svojim kolegama/icama, te
javne sociologije, koja potiče raspravu i angažman pri formuliranju javnih
politika, dijalog s institucijama civilnog društva, pa i eksplicitni politički
aktivizam.

²⁶ Burawoy (2005: 4) smatra da bi javna sociologija trebala pokušati angažirati mnogo-
struke publike na isto tako različite načine. Prema njemu se, naime, očta li se podjela
rada u području sociologije, otkriva antagonistička međuzavisnost četiriju tipova znanja:
strukovnog, kritičkog, onoga usmjerenoga na javne politike te, na koncu, javnoga. U sve
većem procjepu između sociološkog etosa i svijeta koji sociolozi/ginje proučavaju, javne
sociologije ne bi trebale biti ostavljene na margini, nego uključene u okvir discipline.
Tako bi se, tvrdi Burawoy, javna sociologija osnažila i dobila legitimnost, od čega bi u
konačnici profitirala cijela disciplina. S druge strane, taj fokus djelovanja valja shvatiti i
kao ulaganje sociologije u civilno društvo, koje je ugroženo presežanjem tržišta i država.
Burawoy, između ostaloga, pozvao je i na istraživanje odnosa koji između spomenutih
četiriju tipova znanja postoje u pojedinim povijesnim i nacionalnim kontekstima, stoga što
ti odnosi upućuju na uzroke divergencija u pojedinačnim karijerama i pristupima. Smatram
da bi taj Burawoyev poziv hrvatska sociologija svakako trebala prihvatiti, jer bi tako
više doznala o sebi kao o disciplini, što je osobito bitno u njezinom današnjem trenutku.
Također, to bi razmatranje pridonijelo inauguraciji samog pojma »javne sociologije«, koji
u nas nema tradiciju kakva u ovom pogledu već postoji u SAD-u (pojam je ondje uveden
predsjedničkim govorom Herberta Gansa članstvu ASA-a 1988. godine, a tradicija obraća-
nja javnosti u sociološkoj struci još je znatno dulja i povijesno predstavlja jedan od temelja
discipline u SAD-u).

referred to the American tradition in sociology and indicated the difference between sociology understood as an academic discipline, in which professional sociologists primarily turn to their colleagues, and public sociology, which encourages discussion and involvement in formulating public policies, as well as dialogue with the institutions of civil society and also explicit political activism.

Certainly such an approach could be and should be stimulative likewise in Croatia, in which – especially during the particularly turbulent and war-marked initial periods of transition – civil society designated themes that the sociological profession failed to designate. Yet seen from the distance of the today, it turns out that this laudable activism, which played a role in the conditions of the time, in the long-run is not sufficient. It represented a vitally important intervention and corrective factor in the context of the time in which it appeared on the scene. However, in order to achieve results in present-day conditions it needs intense collaboration with methodologies and insights that examine society and culture on a level of complexity that surpasses activism.

In this context sociology must become involved, but in a such a way as to be able, at the same time, to gain further and deeper insights from its professional horizon, and to combine such insights – to the public advantage – with those that are coming from civil society. And most importantly, it should present thought-out answers in a way that has an academic basis, but that is also recognisable and understandable to broader society. In other words, the work of sociologists should be conducted on an enviable professional level, but their results should be explained in a way that the public can understand.

Perhaps, after this explanation, it may sound less paradoxical and contradictory, when I say that Croatian sociology can fulfil its public role precisely by turning to itself, or to that what – when seen from the outside – may appear to be narrow “intradisciplinary” questions. Namely, by no means do these questions have only intraprofessional consequences. Only when sociology in Croatia – in terms of its theories and methodology – comes close to having the complexity that phenomena in modern society demand, will it be able to adequately carry out its public role. Therefore I believe that in order to achieve its full public role, it is most important for Croatian sociology to develop its theories and diversify its methodologies, and also to be more academically recognisable on the domestic and international scene.

I have already noted my belief that Croatian sociology can fulfil its public role by becoming international, that is by starting to measure itself in professional terms on the basis of global criteria. It seems to me that this is the only way to adequately reflect on Croatian society and the discipline itself. Furthermore, even though the sociological community in general today gives priority mainly to scientific analysis and research, and not to advocating social reforms, I think that the ideal that inspired the emergence of

Sigurno je da taj pristup može biti i da bi trebao biti poticajan i u Hrvatskoj, u kojoj je – pogotovo u osobito turbulentnim i ratom obilježenim početnim razdobljima tranzicije – civilno društvo umnogome nominiralo teme koje je propustila nominirati sociološka struka. Gledano s današnje distance, pokazuje se, međutim, da taj hvalevrijedni aktivizam, koji je odigrao svoju ulogu u ondašnjim prilikama, dugoročno nije dovoljan. On je predstavljao presudno značajnu intervenciju i korektiv u kontekstu vremena u kojem se pojavio na javnoj sceni. Za postizanje rezultata u današnjim prilikama potrebna mu je, međutim, intenzivna suradnja s metodologijama i spoznajama koje društvo i kulturu proučavaju na razini kompleksnosti koja nadilazi aktivističku.

U ovom kontekstu, sociologija treba biti angažirana, ali na način da je istodobno sposobna iz obzora svoje struke vidjeti dalje i dublje, a pritom te svoje spoznaje – na javnu korist – ujediniti s onima što dolaze iz civilnog društva. Što je najvažnije, trebala bi duboko promišljene odgovore prezentirati na način koji ima akademsku utemeljenost, ali je također prepoznatljiv i razumljiv širem društvu. Drugim riječima, djelovanje sociologa/inja trebalo bi se odvijati na zavidnoj strukovnoj razini, ali bi njegovi rezultati trebali biti objašnjeni i na način na koji to javnost može razumjeti.

Možda će, nakon ovog objašnjenja, manje paradoksalno i nekontradiktorno zvučiti kad kažem da svoju javnu ulogu hrvatska sociologija može ispuniti upravo okrećući se sebi, odnosno onomu što se – gledajući izvana – može učiniti uskim, »unutardisciplinarnim« pitanjima. Ta pitanja, naime, u ovom slučaju nipošto nemaju samo unutarstrukovne posljedice. Tek kad se sociologija u Hrvatskoj u teorijskom i metodološkom smislu približi kompleksnostima koje pojave suvremenog društva jednostavno zahtijevaju da bi se mogle adekvatno objasniti, moći će primjereno obaviti svoju javnu ulogu. Smatram stoga da je za mogućnost postizanja njezine pune javne funkcije, za hrvatsku sociologiju najvažniji njezin teorijski rast i metodološko uraznoličenje, kao i njezina veća akademska prepoznatljivost i na domaćoj i na međunarodnoj sceni.

Već sam napomenula da mislim da hrvatska sociologija može svoju javnu ulogu ispuniti tako da se internacionalizira, odnosno da se u strukovnom smislu počne odmjeravati sa svjetskim kriterijima. Čini mi se da je samo tako moguće adekvatno reflektirati i hrvatsko društvo i samu disciplinu. Nadalje, iako sociološka zajednica općenito danas uglavnom daje prioritet znanstvenoj analizi i istraživanju, a ne zagovaranju društvene reforme, mislim da ideal koji je nadahnuo nastanak sociologije – kao znanosti koja može pomoći razumijevanju društvenog svijeta – još nije potro-

sociology – as a science that can help to provide an understanding of the social world – has not yet been exhausted. This ideal also includes the desire to comprehend that problems faced by people today surpass national borders, and that they are caused by the ways in which individual societies are structured. It is important to realise, finally, that such a desire does not exist in a theoretical vacuum, but that further entry into supranational integration processes – which are already intensely under way – will confront us with the need to understand others.

In addition to upholding the public role of sociology and the need to internationalise it, at this moment it seems to me that it is crucial for the future of Croatian sociology to adopt modern, multiparadigmatic theoretical approaches, and also to continuously work on developing the discipline's reflexivity. The latter, namely, could help sociology not only to better understand phenomena generated by "reflexive modernity", but also help it to interpret and understand itself, before it can assist others in orienting themselves among all the complexities of modern social reality.²⁷

In accordance with Bauman's classification of intellectuals and with his view of the tasks of sociological reflection,²⁸ it could be said that Croatian sociology must try to change its previous role of legitimising the social order, and become an interpretative science, primarily helping others to understand the rapid changes in current social processes. In such a context, the role of sociology is of special significance, and the role of public sociology becomes crucial. I invite you, therefore, to work together in the forthcoming period on the realisation of such goals of action. The path towards their realisation will not be easy, and surely we shall not be able to traverse it in a brief period. However, we should remember that even the longest journey begins with the first step, and – as it seems – we have already taken that step.²⁹

²⁷ Here it is important to call to mind the concept of "double hermeneutic", which one of today's leading sociologists treated in his works from the mid 1970s (Giddens, 1976). In this context, I feel that Croatian sociology should be able first to interpret itself, before it can help others interpret the complexities of contemporary social reality. I believe that by thus developing its own reflexivity it will become more capable of including itself into the context of so-called reflexive modernity.

²⁸ These themes were presented in several of Bauman's writings, but they are most extensively treated in: Bauman, 1987, 1990.

²⁹ Finally, I should say – and I think that this holds also for other members of our sociological community – that I am personally aware of the difficulties previous generations faced in their work, and also of their efforts and the value of their contributions to the development of the discipline. The invitation made here to the discipline to work on becoming in a true sense a reflexive, multiparadigmatic and public science, should in no way be seen as a belittlement of previous accomplishments, but rather as an attempt to place sociology within a context in which I believe it can fulfil its role as is best suited for the present social conditions.

šen. On uključuje i želju da se shvati da problemi s kojima se ljudi danas suočavaju sežu izvan nacionalnih granica te da su generirani načinima na koji su strukturirana pojedina društva. Valja, na koncu, shvatiti i to da ta spomenuta želja ne postoji u teorijskom vakuumu, nego da će nas s potrebom razumijevanja drugih suočiti i sve dublje stupanje u nadnacionalne integracije, koje se već intenzivno odvija.

Osim zagovaranja javne uloge sociologije i potrebe njezine internacionalizacije, čini mi se da je u ovom trenutku za budućnost hrvatske sociologije presudno usvajanje suvremenih, multiparadigmatskih teorijskih pristupa, kao i stalan rad na razvijanju njezine refleksivnosti. Potonja joj, naime, može pomoći ne samo u boljem razumijevanju pojava što ih generira »refleksivna modernost«, nego i u interpretiranju i razumijevanju sebe same, prije nego što drugima pomogne pri snalaženju u svim kompleksnostima suvremene društvene stvarnosti.²⁷

Slijedeći Baumanovu klasifikaciju intelektualaca i njegov pogled na zadaće sociološkog promišljanja,²⁸ može se reći da bi hrvatska sociologija trebala pokušati promijeniti svoju prijašnju ulogu legitimacije društvenog poretka, i postati interpretativnom znanošću, pomažući ponajprije ostalima da razumiju brze promjene u postojećim društvenim procesima. U tom kontekstu, uloga sociologije i inače je osobita, a uloga javne sociologije postaje presudnom. Pozivam vas stoga da u sljedećem razdoblju zajednički poradimo na ostvarenju ovakvih ciljeva djelovanja. Put prema njihovu ostvarenju neće biti jednostavan i zacijelo ga nećemo moći ostvariti u kratkom razdoblju. Valja se, međutim podsjetiti na to da i najdulje putovanje počinje prvim korakom, a mi smo – čini mi se – taj korak već učinili.²⁹

²⁷ Pritom se valja prisjetiti pojma »dvostruke hermeneutike« koji jedan od najvažnijih sociologa današnjice obrađuje u svojim radovima još od sredine sedamdesetih godina prošlog stoljeća (Giddens, 1976). U tom kontekstu, smatram da bi hrvatska sociologija trebala moći najprije interpretirati sebe, prije nego što pomogne drugima u interpretaciji kompleksnosti suvremene društvene stvarnosti. Smatram da bi, na taj način razvijajući vlastitu refleksivnost, postala sposobnijom uključiti se u kontekst tzv. refleksivne modernosti.

²⁸ Ove teme izložene su u više radova tog autora, a najopsežnije ih obrađuje u: Bauman, 1987, 1990.

²⁹ Na koncu valja reći da sam osobno, a smatram da to vrijedi i za ostale članove/ice naše sociološke zajednice, svjesna poteškoća u djelovanju prethodnih generacija, kao i truda i vrijednosti njihova doprinosa razvoju discipline. Ovdje izrečen poziv disciplini da poradi na tome da postane u pravom smislu riječi refleksivnom, multiparadigmatskom i javnom znanošću nikako ne bi valjalo shvatiti kao umanjivanje dosadašnjih postignuća, nego smještanje suvremene sociologije u kontekst za koji mislim da na najbolji način može odigrati ulogu primjerenu današnjim društvenim okolnostima.

LITERATURA / REFERENCES

- Batina, Goran (2006). *Počeci sociologije u Hrvatskoj: društveni uvjeti, institucionaliziranje i kronologija do 1945. godine*. Zagreb: Kultura i društvo.
- Batina, Goran (2008). »Hrvatska sociološka tradicija prije 2. svjetskog rata – ružno pače poslijeratne hrvatske sociologije«, in: Denisa Krbec (ed.). *Hrvatska sociologija: razvoj i perspektive*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko sociološko društvo, 39–58.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (1987). *Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Postmodernity and Intellectuals*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (1990). *Thinking Sociologically: An Introduction for Everyone*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Burawoy, Michael (2005). »2004 Presidential Address: For Public Sociology«, *American Sociological Review*, 70 (1): 4–28.
- Beck, Ulrich (1986). *Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Beck, Ulrich (1993). *Die Erfindung des Politischen. Zu einer Theorie reflexiver Modernisierung*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Fleck, Christian (2009). »Diversity or Fragmentation in Europe's Sociology: Lessons to be Learned?«, Conference of the ISA Council of National Sociological Associations *Challenges for Sociology in an Unequal World*, Taipei, 23-25 March 2009, http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/cna/download/6a_Fleck_3.pdf
- Gans, Herbert (1989). »Sociology in America: The Discipline and the Public. American Sociological Association, 1988 Presidential Address«, *American Sociological Review*, 54 (1): 1–16, <http://www2.asanet.org/governance/PresidentialAddress1988.pdf>
- Giddens, Anthony (1976). *New Rules of Sociological Method: A Positive Critique of Interpretative Sociologies*. London: Hutchinson.
- Inglehart, Ronald (1977). *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles among Western Publics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jacobsen, Hanns D. (2005). *Economic Security and the Stability Pact for South East Europe*. http://www.studienforumberlin.de/Economic%20Security_2005.pdf
- Kasapović, Mirjana (2007). »Izlazak iz množine? Kraj unutarnje institucionalne kolonizacije hrvatske političke znanosti?«, in: Mirjana Kasapović (ed.). *Izlazak iz množine? Stanje hrvatske političke znanosti*. Zagreb: Fakultet političkih znanosti, 7–95.
- Krbec, Denisa & Lažnjak, Jasminka (2008). »Programska diverzifikacija sociologije kao akademske discipline i status posebne sociologije«, in: Denisa Krbec (ed.). *Hrvatska sociologija: razvoj i perspektive*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko sociološko društvo, 71–83.
- Leburić, Anči (2006). »Model splitskog studija sociologije: perspektive i mogućnosti realizacije«, Okrugli stol *Hrvatska sociologija – prvih sto godina u povodu 100. obljetnice osnivanja Katedre za kriminalne znanosti i sociologiju na Pravnom fakultetu u Zagrebu*, Zagreb, 3. studenoga 2006.
- Leburić, Anči & Tomić-Koludrović, Inga (1996). »Mladi danas: drukčiji, ali isti«, *Društvena istraživanja*, 5 (5-6): 963–975.

- Leburić, Anči & Tomić-Koludrović, Inga (2002a). »Croatian youth at the beginning of 2000: signs of new politicisation«, in: Blanka Tivadar & Polona Mrvar (eds). *Flying over or falling through the cracks? Young people in the risk society*. Ljubljana: Office for the Youth of the Republic of Slovenia, 59–66.
- Leburić, Anči & Tomić-Koludrović, Inga (2002b). *Nova političnost mladih*. Zagreb: Alinea.
- Leburić, Anči, Tomić-Koludrović, Inga & Radnić, Zrinka (1999). »Samorecepcija mladih kao ratne generacije«, *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru, Razdio filozofije, psihologije, sociologije i pedagogije*, 38 (15): 203–219.
- Marcelić, Sven & Krolo, Krešimir (2008). »Povijest Odjela za sociologiju: procesi, paradigme i sistemi«, Okrugli stol u počast Esadu Čimiću *Institucionalizacija akademskog studija sociologije u Zadru*, Zadar, 7. studenoga 2008.
- Mastnak, Tomaž (1987). »Dalje od istočnoevropskog marksizma«, in: *Mađarske alternative* (eds Slobodan Samardžić & Velimir Čurguz). [Beograd]: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu & Institut za međunarodni radnički pokret, 108–126.
- Močnik, Rastko (1984). »V boju za svobodu javne besede – danes«, in: Karl Marx. *Cenzura in svoboda tiska*. Ljubljana: Republiška konferenca ZSMS, Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS [KRT – Knjižnica revolucionarne teorije], 7–22.
- Močnik, Rastko (1988). »Latinum est, non legitur«, in: Bojan Baskar (ed.). *Latinščine, prosim: latinščina in njeno izganjanje na Slovenskem: 1849–1987*. Ljubljana: KRT, i–xiv.
- Petrić, Mirko (2006). »Bolonjski proces na Odjelu za sociologiju Sveučilišta u Zadru«, Okrugli stol *Hrvatska sociologija – prvih sto godina* u povodu 100. obljetnice osnivanja Katedre za kriminalne znanosti i sociologiju na Pravnom fakultetu u Zagrebu, Zagreb, 3. studenoga 2006.
- Petrić, Mirko (2008). »Cultural Studies and Interdisciplinarity in Sociology«, *Sociology and Interdisciplinarity: Central and South East European Perspectives* (International Conference of Croatian Sociological Association, ISA Council of National Sociological Associations, and Department of Sociology, University of Zadar), Zadar, 9 May 2008.
- Ravlić, Slaven (2008). »Sociologija i pravni studiji: uz povijest Katedre za sociologiju (1906–2006)«, in: Denisa Krbec (ed.). *Hrvatska sociologija: razvoj i perspektive*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko sociološko društvo, 59–67.
- Rotar, Braco (1988). »Studia humanitatis in moderni časi«, in: Bojan Baskar (ed.). *Latinščine, prosim: latinščina in njeno izganjanje na Slovenskem: 1849–1987*. Ljubljana: KRT, 146–150.
- [Sesardić, Neven] Сесардић, Невен (1983). »Марксизам: нефилозофске стране једне филозофије«, *Књижевна реч*, 12 (209): 3–4.
- Sesardić, Neven (1987). »Razmišljanja o filozofiji prakse«, *Theoria*, 30 (1-2): 107–116.
- Sesardić, Neven (1988). »Još jednom o filozofiji prakse«, *Theoria*, 31 (1-2): 21–32.
- Sesardić, Neven (1989). »Nova obrana filozofije prakse: s lošeg na gore«, *Pitanja*, 19 (2-3): 95–100.

- Sesardić, Neven (1991). *Iz analitičke perspektive: ogledi o filozofiji, znanosti i politici*. Zagreb: Sociološko društvo Hrvatske.
- Šporer, Željka (2006). »Između profesionalizacije i ideologizacije – razvoj sociologije u nas«, Znanstveni skup *Hrvatska sociologija – izazovi Bolonjskog procesa*, Zagreb, 24. veljače 2006.
- Štulhofer, Aleksandar & Matic, Davorka (1992). »Sociologija etničkih odnosa: skica jednog promašaja«, in: Ognjen Čaldarović, Milan Mesić & Aleksandar Štulhofer (eds). *Sociologija i rat*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko sociološko društvo, 63–74.
- Tomašić, Dinko (1997a [1937]). *Društveni razvitak Hrvata: rasprave i eseji*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko sociološko društvo & Naklada Jesenski i Turk.
- Tomašić, Dinko (1997b [1938]). *Politički razvitak Hrvata: rasprave i eseji*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko sociološko društvo & Naklada Jesenski i Turk.
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga (1992). *Alternativne inicijative in nova družbena gibanja na Hrvaškem (1974.–1988.)*. Magistrska naloga. Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za sociologijo.
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga (1993). »Alternativna kultura kao oblik otpora u samoupravnom socijalizmu«, *Društvena istraživanja*, 2 (4-5): 835–862.
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga (1996). »Teorijska sociologija i postsocijalizam«, in: Erma Ivoš (ed.). *Teorijski izazovi i dileme: prilog sociologiji hrvatskog društva*. Zadar: Filozofski fakultet, Odsjek za sociologiju, 5–12.
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga (2008). »Teorijska sociologija i Bolonjski proces«, in: Denisa Krbec (ed.). *Hrvatska sociologija: razvoj i perspektive*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko sociološko društvo, 25–36.
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga (2009). »The role of theory: Sociology's response to the Bologna educational reform in Croatia«, Conference of the ISA Council of National Sociological Associations *Challenges for Sociology in an Unequal World*, Taipei, 23-25 March 2009, http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/cna/download/5a_TomicKoludrovic
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga & Leburić, Anči (1997). »Kontekstualizacija istraživanja suvremene mladosti na primjeru mladih u Dalmaciji«, *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru, Razdio filozofije, psihologije, sociologije i pedagogije*, 36 (13): 149–165.
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga & Leburić, Anči (2001). *Skeptična generacija: životni stilovi mladih u Hrvatskoj*. Zagreb: AGM.
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga & Leburić, Anči (2002). »Lifestyle or survival strategy: Croatian youth in the late 1990s«, in: Blanka Tivadar & Polona Mrvar (eds). *Flying over or falling through the cracks? Young people in the risk society*. Ljubljana: Office for the Youth of the Republic of Slovenia, 113–119.
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga & Petrić, Mirko (2007a). »Hrvatsko društvo – prije i tijekom tranzicije«, *Društvena istraživanja*, 16 (4-5): 867–889.
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga & Petrić, Mirko (2007b). »Da società in transizione a società mista: la Croazia tra due modernizzazioni«, in: Franco Botta, Italo Garzia & Pasquale Guaragnella (eds). *La questione adriatica e l'allargamento dell'Unione europea*. Milano: Franco Angeli, 127–161.
- Ule, Mirjana (1988). *Mladina in ideologija*. Ljubljana: Delavska enotnost.

- Ule, Mirjana (1989). *Mladina – za modernizaciju slovenske družbe*. Ljubljana: MC CK.
- Vrcan, Srđan et al. (1986). *Položaj, svest i ponašanje mlade generacije Jugoslavije: preliminarna analiza rezultata istraživanja*. Beograd: Centar za istraživačku, dokumentacionu i izdavačku delatnost Predsedništva Konferencije SSOJ; Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Zrinščak, Siniša (1999). *Sociologija religije: hrvatsko iskustvo*. Zagreb: Pravni fakultet.