

Men and Women in the Micro-Macro Context: 25 Years Later

I will present here my attempt to arrive at a new reading of Vjeran Katunarić's book *Ženski eros i civilizacija smrti* (*Women's Eros and the Civilization of Death*) from the perspective of contemporary sociological theory.¹ Such an attempt at re-reading is for me really new, since I think that previously – just as most people who read this book in its first edition – I did not notice three obvious contributions of this book to the history of feminism, and also to the history of sociological theory in Croatia. I have in mind, specifically, the following:

1. This was a very early attempt in Croatian sociology to supplement the macro-theoretical approach to relations between men and women, which was typical in the mid 1980s, if not with a micro-theoretical approach, at least with a meso-theoretical one. Although the problems the author treats in the text are not explicitly contextualised within a micro-macro link, his book supplements the macro-theoretical approach to relations between men and women with a socio-psychological approach to the family as a micro-generator of macro-social inequalities. (Incidentally, an explicit contextualisation of the micro-

¹ This text is part of the introduction to the discussion held on 17th June 2009 at the occasion of the second edition of the book *Ženski eros i civilizacija smrti* by author Vjeran Katunarić (Zagreb: Jesenski i Turk, 2009). It is being published here as a contribution to the discussion that began during the previous Forum (*Revija za sociologiju*, 39 [40], 1–2).

Muškarci i žene u mikro-makro kontekstu: 25 godina poslije

Ovdje ću iznijeti svoj pokušaj novog čitanja knjige Vjerana Katunarića *Ženski eros i civilizacija smrti* iz perspektive suvremenih socioloških teorija.¹ Pokušaj ovakvog čitanja za mene je doista nov, jer mislim da svojedobno nisam – kao vjerojatno ni većina onih koji su ovu knjigu čitali u prvom izdanju – uočila tri nezaobilazna doprinosa ove knjige za povijest feminizma, ali i za povijest socioloških teorija u Hrvatskoj. Mislim, naime, na sljedeće:

1. Riječ je o vrlo ranom pokušaju u Hrvatskoj sociologiji da se za sredinu osamdesetih godina dvadesetog stoljeća uobičajeni makroteorijski pristupi o odnosima muškaraca i žena nadopune, ako ne mikroteorijskim, a ono barem mezoteorijskim pristupom. Iako problematika kojom se autor bavi u tekstu nije teorijski izričito kontekstualizirana u mikro-makro vezu, njegova knjiga makroteorijski pristup o odnosu muškaraca i žena nadopunjuje sociopsihološkim pristupom obitelji kao mikrogeneratoru makrodruštvenih nejednakosti. (Usput rečeno, eksplicitne kontekstualizacije u mikro-makro vezu nije ni moglo biti,

¹ Tekst je dio uvoda u razgovor održan 17. lipnja 2009. u povodu drugog izdanja knjige *Ženski eros i civilizacija smrti* Vjerana Katunarića (Zagreb: Jesenski i Turk, 2009). Objavljuje se kao prilog raspravi započetoj u prošlom Forumu (*Revija za sociologiju*, 39[40], 1-2).

macro link was not yet possible, since as a concept it entered into world sociology only at the joint German and American sociological conference held in 1984, i.e. in the same year in which the book was published.)

2. The statements presented in the book converge with feminist critiques of Marxism which were at the same time developed, for example, by German feminists at the University of Bielefeld. Just as the German feminists, the author shows specifically in his book that Marxism did not enable the emancipation of women, but – exactly the opposite – contributed to establishing the notion that gender differences were “natural”.

3. By elaborating sociological theories as a traditionally male scientific approach the author, in this book, accepts feminist critiques of androcentrism.

In regard to the first point – i.e. going beyond the exclusivity of the macro-approach – the book *Ženski eros i civilizacija smrti* provides a critique of the effects of capitalism and patriarchy on women. It does so by postulating that male and female tasks began to be differentiated at the very beginning of human communities. Thus this book enters into the macro-discourse of Marxist feminists according to which neither patriarchy nor capitalism could be developed without the subjugation of women. From this perspective the author claims that not only the confrontation of male and female occupations is in question, but also the structural principle due to which an asymmetric gender division of labour becomes a mode of male domination over women in capitalism. The gender division of labour is thus in effect seen as an integral part of the functioning of capitalism on the macro-social level, and it is viewed as a prerequisite for the existence of capitalism, or as its supporting factor.

jer je ona kao pojam u svjetsku sociologiju ušla tek na zajedničkoj konferenciji njemačkog i američkoga sociološkog društva održanoj te iste, 1984. godine, kad je prvi put tiskana i ova knjiga.)

2. U knjizi iznesene tvrdnje konvergiraju s feminističkim kritikama marksizma koje su u isto vrijeme razvijale, primjerice, njemačke feministice na Sveučilištu u Bielefeldu. Kao i one, i on je naime u svojoj knjizi pokazao da marksizam nije omogućio emancipaciju žena nego da je – upravo obratno – pridonio etabliranju ideje kako su rodne razlike »prirodne«.

3. Elaboriranjem socioloških teorija kao tradicionalno muškoga znanstvenog pristupa autor u ovoj knjizi prihvaća feminističku kritiku androcentrizma.

Kad je riječ o prvoj točki – odnosno nadilaženju isključivosti makropriistupa – knjiga *Ženski eros i civilizacija smrti* kritizira zajedničko djelovanje kapitalizma i patrijarhata na žene. Čini to tezom da se početak razlikovanja muških i ženskih poslova javlja već u početku stvaranja ljudske zajednice. Tako ova knjiga ulazi u makrodiskurs marksističkog feminizma prema kojem se ni patrijarhat, ni kapitalizam nisu mogli razviti bez podređivanja žena. Iz te se perspektive tvrdi da nije posrijedi samo konfrontacija muških i ženskih zanimanja, nego strukturalni princip zbog kojeg asimetrična rodna podjela rada postaje način prevlasti muškaraca nad ženama u kapitalizmu. Rodna podjela rada tako se zapravo vidi kao sastavni dio djelovanja kapitalizma na makrodruštvenoj razini te se shvaća kao pretpostavka postojanja kapitalizma, odnosno kao njegovo pomoćno sredstvo.

S druge strane, knjiga ne ostaje samo na tom makroteorijskom pristu-

On the other hand, the book does not remain only on the level of a macro-theoretical approach, but also introduces a socio-psychological perspective in explaining capitalism. From this perspective the author interprets the evolution of the division of labour in society as a result of the "expanded reproduction" of the oedipal model of the division of roles in the family. In this way this book links the polarisation of gender roles, which to many people today seems natural, to micro-relations of reproduction in the oedipal model of the family.

True, the book stays within the discourse of the Marxist feminist paradigm that was prevalent in the world at the time, which can be seen in its statement that the relationship between men and women is structured by social institutions and rules. Yet in contrast to Marxist feminism, which analyses the social position of women exclusively in the context of economic-political circumstances, this book indicates the importance of dynamic relations between the genders as a prerequisite for family socialisation. It achieves this by introducing the oedipal model of the division of family roles. Family relations established in this model are reflected, according to the author, in relations in the field of labour. Thus the book questions the domination of the macro-approach not only in theory, but also in feminism, and points to the possibility that some other approaches, in this case socio-psychological ones, might be used in an attempt to escape from the macro-narrative of Marxism and systems theory.

It seems that this contribution of Katunarić's book has not been recognised either in sociological theory, or in feminism. Now that I have read it again, having received new theoretical insights, it seems to me that I see this contribution clearly. Although in the book there is no explicit theoretical attempt to establish a macro-

pu, nego uvodi i sociopsihološku perspektivu objašnjenja kapitalizma. Iz te perspektive tumači evoluciju podjele rada u društvu kao posljedicu »proširene reprodukcije« edipovskog modela podjele uloga u obitelji. Tako se polariziranje odnosa među rodovima, koje danas mnogima izgleda prirodnim, u ovoj knjizi dovodi u vezu s mikroodnosima reprodukcije edipovskog modela obitelji.

Istina je da knjiga ostaje u diskursu tada i u svijetu dominantne paradigme marksističkog feminizma, što se vidi iz tvrdnje da je odnos između muškaraca i žena strukturiran društvenim institucijama i pravilima. No, za razliku od marksističkog feminizma, koji društveni položaj žena analizira isključivo u kontekstu ekonomsko-političkih okolnosti, u ovoj se knjizi upućuje na važnost dinamike odnosa među rodovima kao uvjeta obiteljske socijalizacije. Ovo se postiže uvođenjem edipovskog modela obiteljske podjele uloga. Obiteljski odnosi uspostavljeni u tom modelu, reflektiraju se, prema autoru, i na odnose u području rada. Tako knjiga propituje dominaciju makropristupa ne samo u teoriji, nego i u feminizmu, te upućuje na mogućnost da se nekim drugim pristupima, u ovom slučaju sociopsihološkim, pokuša izići iz makropriče marksizma i teorije sustava.

Čini mi se da je taj doprinos ove knjige ostao neprepoznat i u sociološkim teorijama i u feminizmu. Sada sam je ponovo pročitala, raspoložujući novim teorijskim spoznajama, pa mi se čini da taj doprinos jasno vidim. Iako u knjizi nije riječ o teorijski eksplicitnom pokušaju uspostavljanja mikro-makro veze, nedvojbeno jest riječ o pokušaju da se kroz edipovski model obitelji makro-

micro link, undoubtedly there is an attempt, by using the oedipal model of the family, to supplement the macro-approach of systems theory at least with a meso-socio-psychological level of analysis. The socialisation of gender roles in this model of the family assumes, specifically, not only the adaptation of social norms and external social expectations, but also the development of a suitable socio-psychic apparatus to internalise these norms on the micro-family level.

One might make, perhaps, the critical comment that there is no departure here from the macro-level of systems theory or from the Parsonian theory of roles, according to which the demands of the social system are transferred through roles to the personal system. Yet this book upholds precisely the opposite thesis. According to it, micro-relations between women and men, established within the family, are reflected in their behaviour on the macro-system of society. I repeat, perhaps this thesis is not so explicitly linked to approaches, according to which – on the micro-level and in private and professional contacts – people are always experienced as being either women or men (the micro-macro feminist approach). Nevertheless, the author did anticipate the necessity of applying a macro-micro approach in order to overcome the exclusivity of the macro-theoretical approach to analysing gender relations and society.

As I have already said in my opening comments, the book also expresses the thesis – although not so radically as in the claims of feminist critics of Marxism – that Marxism did not enable the emancipation of women, but that it instead actually contributed to establishing the notion that gender differences were “natural”, due to which women were placed in the family and connected to bearing children.

Emphasising patriarchy as the foundation of unequal power relations is in ac-

pristup teorije sustava nadopuni barem mezosociopsihološkom razinom analize. Socijalizacija rodnih uloga u tom modelu obitelji, pretpostavlja, naime, ne samo prilagodbu društvenim normama i izvanjskim društvenim očekivanjima, nego i razvoj prikladnoga društveno-psihičkog aparata internalizacije tih normi na mikroobiteljskoj razini.

Netko će možda kritički primijetiti da tu uopće nije riječ o napuštanju makrorazine teorije sustava i parsonsovske teorije uloga, prema kojoj se zahtjevi društvenog sustava preko uloga prenose na osobni sustav. No, u ovoj se knjizi zastupa upravo suprotna teza. Prema njoj se mikroodnosi žena i muškaraca, uspostavljeni unutar obitelji, odražavaju na njihovo ponašanje u makrosustavu društva. Ponavljam, možda ta teza u knjizi nije toliko izričito povezana s pristupima prema kojima se – na mikro-razini i u privatnim i u profesionalnim kontaktima – ljudi uvijek doživljavaju ili kao žena, ili kao muškarac (mikro-makrofeministički pristupi). No, autor je ipak anticipirao potrebu da se mikromakropristupom nadiđe isključivost makroteorijskih paradigmi u analizi odnosa roda i društva.

Kao što sam već rekla u uvodnim napomenama, u knjizi je također prisutna – iako opet ne toliko radikalno kao u tvrdnjama feminističkih kritičarki marksizma – i teza da marksizam nije omogućio emancipaciju žena, nego da je zapravo pridonio etabliranju ideje o »prirodnosti« rodnih razlika, zbog koje se žena smješta u obitelj i povezuje s rađanjem.

Isticanje patrijarhata kao temelja nejednakih odnosa moći sukladno je povezivanju patrijarhata s kapitalističkom eksploatacijom, što je rezultiralo

cordance with associating patriarchy with capitalist exploitation, which resulted in the concept of patriarchal capitalism. This is a concept that during the 1980s distanced many feminist approaches both from Marxism and from the macro-approach. Discussions on whether women were oppressed in the sphere of work or in the private sphere of the home, i.e. in the area of production or in the area of reproduction, quickly led to a rejection of analyses that studied the relations between women and men exclusively in dependence of macro-economic structures and institutions.

A similar rejection can be found in the concluding chapter of the book *Ženski eros i civilizacija smrti*, in which the author introduces the topic of a third feminist wave and explains the appearance of post-capitalist society as a coproduction between male potentials (the so-called pacified Animus) and newly created female creative potentials (which he calls Anima).

Finally, with this book the author also joins feminist critiques of androcentrism, by claiming that sociology was from the start a male discipline. Due to this fact women were not only excluded from influential positions in sociology, but were not even able to impose their themes and problems in sociological debates. Today in both feminist and social theory it is commonplace to claim that domination of the male “objective scientist” discourse slowed down not only the emergence of female perspectives in science, but also the appearance of qualitative methodological approaches. Androcentrism, namely, did not manifest itself only in the choice of research areas, but also in research methodology. Precisely for this reason female issues were mainly analysed from the male perspective.

It is paradoxical, however, that the book *Ženski eros i civilizacija smrti* became in a certain sense itself a victim of the circum-

konceptom patrijarhalnog kapitalizma. Riječ je o konceptu koji je osamdesetih godina 20. stoljeća mnoge feminističke pristupe udaljilo i od marksizma i od makropristupa. Rasprave o tome jesu li žene ugnjetavane u sferi rada ili u sferi privatnosti doma, odnosno u području produkcije ili u području reprodukcije, ubrzo su dovele do odbacivanja analiza koje su odnos žena i muškaraca istraživale isključivo u ovisnosti o makroekonomskim strukturama i institucijama.

Slično se odbacivanje nalazi u zaključnom poglavlju knjige *Ženski eros i civilizacija smrti*, u kojem autor uvodi problematiku trećega feminističkog vala te pojavu postkapitalističkog društva objašnjava kao koprodukciju muških potencijala (tzv. pacificirani Animus) i novoostvarenih ženskih stvaralačkih potencijala (naziva ih Anime).

Ovom se knjigom, konačno, autor uključuje i u feminističku kritiku androcentrizma tvrdnjom da je sociologija od početka bila muška disciplina. Zbog te činjenice žene nisu bile isključene samo iz utjecajnih pozicija unutar sociologije, nego uopće nisu bile u prilici nametati svoje teme i probleme sociološkim raspravama. Danas je opće mjesto i feminističkih i društvenih teorija tvrdnja da je dominacija muškog diskursa »objektivnog znanstvenika« usporila pojavu ne samo ženske perspektive u znanosti, nego i kvalitativnih metodoloških pristupa. Androcentrizam se, naime, nije manifestirao samo u izboru područja istraživanja, nego i u istraživačkim metodologijama. Upravo su se zato problemi žena uglavnom analizirali iz muške perspektive.

Paradoksalno je, međutim, da je knjiga *Ženski eros i civilizacija smrti* na neki način i sama postala žrtvom činje-

stance that it was written by a man. Namely, non-critical acceptance of the anti-androcentric position contributed to the fact that this book – although it deals with male-female relations – was less often mentioned and cited in feminist literature than would have been the case if it had been written by a woman.

nice što ju je napisao muškarac. Nekritičko preuzimanje antiandrocentričnog diskursa pridonijelo je, naime, tome da se knjiga – iako se bavi muško-ženskim odnosima – manje spominje i citira u feminističkoj literaturi, nego što bi to bio slučaj da ju je napisala žena.

Inga Tomić-Koludrović

Odjel za sociologiju, Sveučilište u Zadru / Department of Sociology, University of Zadar

For Sociology Inspired by Anima

One of the questions emphasized by M. Petrić in his critical review (*Revija za sociologiju*, 39[40], 1-2) of the discussion about the second release of V. Katunarić book *Women's Eros and the Civilization of Death* is the question about the relationship between sociology and feminism. Even though the proper answer would demand comprehensive research – as would be the case with answers to many other questions raised that evening – the article “Analyzing Analytic Autoethnography” (Ellis and Bochner, 2006), which I have recently read, inspired me to note some thoughts on the topic.

Feminism has paved its way into the study programmes of sociology at our universities within the form of courses such as the Sociology of Gender, or Feminist Theories. We can read also about feminist epistemology in scientific journals, but the question remains: how much has the feminist critique of science influenced the epistemological subject of Croatian sociology? How much have we moved away from the traditional, modernist paradigm based on

Za sociologiju inspiriranu Animom

Jedno od pitanja koje M. Petrić apostrofira u svom kritičkom osvrtu (*Revija za sociologiju*, 39[40], 1-2) na razgovor povodom drugog izdanja knjige V. Katunarića *Ženski eros i civilizacija smrti*, jest i ono o odnosu sociologije i feminizma. Iako bi odgovor na njega (uostalom kao i na mnoga druga pitanja otvorena te večeri) zahtijevao opsežno istraživanje, članak »Analyzing Analytic Autoethnography« (Ellis i Bochner, 2006) koji sam nedavno pročitala potaknuo me da zabilježim neka promišljanja.

Iako feminizam u formi kolegija poput Sociologije roda, Feminističkih teorija i sl. posljednjih godina pronalazi svoj put u studijske programe sociologije na našim sveučilištima, a u stručnim je časopisima otvorena tema feminističke epistemologije, nadaje se pitanje koliko je doista feministička kritika znanosti utjecala na epistemološki subjekt domaće sociologije? Koliko smo se odmaknuli od tradicionalne,