

PUTNICI I STATISTI: O POLITICI (AKADEMSKE) MOBILNOSTI

IVONA GRGURINOVIĆ

Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu
Odsjek za etnologiju i kulturnu antropologiju
10000 Zagreb, Ivana Lučića 3

UDK 314.7-057.85

314.7-057.875

Izvorni znanstveni rad

Primljeno: 10. 3. 2013.

Prihvaćeno: 29. 7. 2013.

Prebacivanjem analitičkoga fokusa s putujućega/mobilnoga subjekta diskursa o putovanju / (akademske) mobilnosti na njegove statične figure, autorica u radu pokušava ukazati na pukotine u romantiziranim, elitno koncipiranim monolitnim predodžbama putovanja/mobilnosti, koje otvaraju prostor za analizu politike takvih diskursa i praksi. U metafori statične figure koja je u (glorificirajućem i unificiranom zapadnjačkom) diskursu o putovanju nevidljiva, a javlja se unutar paradigme "nove mobilnosti", raskriva se dinamika koja može iz nove perspektive, perspektive onih koji ostaju u mobilnom svijetu putnika, osvijetliti ekonomiju moći na razne načine prisutnu u svim praksama putovanja/mobilnosti i diskursima o njima. S tim u vezi, u uvodu teksta kritički se naznačuju osnovne tendencije i problematične točke zapadnjačkog diskursa o putovanju te teme unutar paradigme "nove mobilnosti". U nastavku se promišljaju neke politički neuralgične točke koncepta akademske mobilnosti (i diskursa o njoj), koje ostaju zakrivene njezinom pozitivnom konceptualizacijom.

Ključne riječi: putovanje, mobilnost, akademska mobilnost, društveni kapital, kulturni kapital

UVOD

Putovanje i tekstualni proizvodi putničkih praksi u posljednjih su nekoliko desetljeća postali zvijezde interdisciplinarnoga znanstvenog neba. U kritičkoj teoriji operira se uglavnom, više ili manje kritički, zapadnjačkim tropom putovanja, s većim ili manjim odmakom prema konceptu opterećenom "poviješću europskih, književnih, muških, buržujskih, znanstvenih, herojskih, rekreativnih značenja i praksi" (Clifford 1997:33). Međutim, usprkos činjenici kako se u okviru obnovljenoga interdisciplinarnog interesa (na sjecištu postkolonijalnih studija, antropologije, kulturnih studija, kulturne geografije) za putovanje i tekstualne proizvode putničkih praksi pozornost najčešće pridavala pitanjima poput (post)kolonijalizma, eurocentrizma, rodnih identiteta i sl., ipak "termini izmještanja u euro-američkoj kritičkoj praksi rijetko priznaju (...) materijalne uvjete" (Kaplan 1996:1)

u kojima prakse putovanja i izmještanja¹ postoje, odnosno “[h]istorijski fenomen modernog imperijalizma u kontekstu europske i američke industrijalizacije, ekonomsko i kulturno pripajanje regija u ‘Treći svijet’ i dekolonizaciju koja je uslijedila, te pomake i destabilizaciju uzrokovanu deindustrijalizacijom takozvanoga Prvog svijeta” (ibid. 1). Vrijedi dodati kako je osim zanemarivanja suvremenih putničkih praksi koje postoje onkraj zapadnjačkoga, buržujskoga, rekreativnoga, literarnoga putovanja iz užitka, zamjetno i zanemarivanje historijskih praksi koji su postojale izvan diskursa o zapadnjačkom putovanju konceptualiziranom na već navedeni način. Drugim riječima, manje privilegirane putničke prakse, poput emigracije, izbjeglištva ili beskućništva, ponekad u takvom diskursu o putovanju nađu mjesto u metaforičkoj formi, ali rijetko kao smisleni proizvođači diskursa (ibid. 2), jednako kao što “[p]utovanje’ nije riječ koja se jednostavno može koristiti kada se govori o Srednjem prolazu (*Middle Passage*), Putu suza (*Trail of Tears*), iskrcavanju kineskih imigranata, prisilnom premještanju Amerikanaca japanskog porijekla ili teškom položaju beskućnika”² (Hooks prema Hutnyk 2004:23). Usprkos, dakle, nekim pokušajima (v. npr. Clifford 1997) da se koncept putovanja očisti od ovoga ideološkog balasta³,

¹ Iako koncept *putovanja* smatra izrazito modernom praksom, Kaplanova korištenjem termina *putovanje* i *izmještanje* ne pokušava sugerirati kako je ovo drugo isključivo postmoderna praksa. Teorijskim i konceptualnim pomakom prema izmještanju želi “istražiti konstrukciju i proliferaciju modernizama iz postmodernog kritičkog očišta” (Kaplan 1996:3). Putovanje i izmještanje ne promatra kao suprotstavljene strane jedne binarne opozicije, niti kao sinonime, već “kao znakove različitih kritičkih registara i raznolikih historiziranih instanci” (ibid. 3). Pri tome postmodernost shvaća kao “skup ekonomskih i kulturnih odnosa koji proizvode specifične diskurse prostora, vremena i subjektivnosti u određenom vremenskom razdoblju i u odnosu prema višestrukim lokacijama” (ibid. 11).

² Potrebno je također naglasiti da su granice među različitim kategorijama putnika (u smislu dobrovoljnog putovanja iz užitka) sve nejasnije. Amit tako piše o preklapanju više kategorija, pa čak i “zaposjedanju” kategorija nekada rezerviranih za nepriviligirane putnike (primjerice, različite vrste migranata) od strane dobrovoljnih, “iskustvenih” putnika, pripadnika srednje klase: “(...) trenutno postoji značajna globalna radna snaga mladih putnika, od kojih mnogi putuju prije ili nakon postsekundarnog obrazovanja, koji plaćaju putovanja od nekoliko mjeseci, ponekad i godina, tako što rade na određestima na koja putuju. Ironično, mnogi od tih mladih pustolova plaćaju vlastiti turizam radeći u uslužnoj industriji, uslužujući druge turiste. (...) Sve značajniji segment ‘gostujućih’ radnika, status nekada poistovjećivan s relativno nepriviligiranim migrantima, sada, ironično, čine mladi Zapadnjaci, pripadnici srednje klase, koji su istovremeno turisti i

čini se kako se on, okoštao u dugome trajanju europskog (neo)kolonijalizma i (neo)imperijalizma te nadmoći europskog diskursa i hegemonije europskog znanja, ne može proširiti kako bi obuhvatio manje dobrovoljne, manje rekreativne, manje muške i buržuske putničke prakse.

Nadalje, kao što je ovakav unificirajući diskurs o putovanju isključivao prakse koje su postojale onkraj “europskih, književnih, muških, buržuskih, znanstvenih, herojskih, rekreativnih (...) praksi” (Clifford 1997:33), jednako je tako propuštao uključiti i svoje statične figure kao antipode putnika, u smislu ekonomije moći uključene u putovanje shvaćeno u gore opisanom smislu. U ovom radu želimo promotriti taj odnos te ukazati na političku pozicioniranost statičnoga u odnosu na mobilni subjekt.

U posljednje vrijeme na interdisciplinarnom (iako nešto više kulturno-geografsko usmjerenom) nebu dolazi do uzleta nove “ključne riječi”, odnosno do takozvanog “zaokreta prema mobilnosti” ili paradigme “nove mobilnosti” (v. Duda 2012:12), unutar koje “niz teoretičara iz raznih disciplina (...) zagovara promišljanje u kojem je mobilnost središnja činjenica modernog ili postmodernog života” (Cresswell 2010:551), odnosno “geografska činjenica koja se nalazi u središtu konstelacija moći, stvaranja identiteta i mikrogeografija svakodnevnog života” (ibid.). Paradigma nove mobilnosti tako, osim putovanja, promišlja razne druge forme kretanja u prostoru. Kako piše Cresswell u već citiranom tekstu, poticaj ovom privilegiranju mobilnosti kao temeljne činjenice (post)modernoga svijeta tendencije su, između ostaloga, i u antropologiji (napose rad Jamesa Clifforda)⁴, koje pozivaju na

jeftina, popustljiva i privremena radna snaga” (Amit 2007:4, 5). Ovakva preklapanja, čini se, destabiliziraju i ionako “neplodnu, fiksnu dihotomiju” (Duda 2012:28) *putnik – turist* kojom se pokušavaju razgraničiti različiti tipovi strukturiranja putničkog iskustva.

³ Iako Clifford navodi primjere znanstvenog bavljenja drugim vrstama putovanja i drugačijim putničkim praksama (primjerice, radovi Redikera i Linebaugha), sasvim je jasno da “[ako] samo uzmemo u obzir apsurdnost uključivanja rasističkog nasilja i okrutnosti trgovine robljem u bilo kakav prerađeni koncept ‘putovanja’, shvatit ćemo neprikladnost generalizirajućih proširenja tropa putovanja u njegovom euro-američkom obliku” (Hutnyk 2004:23).

⁴ Nadalje, kao prethodnike “zaokreta prema mobilnosti” Cresswell navodi i Marca Augéa i njegova “filozofska promišljanja potencijala antropologije ‘ne-mjesta’, kao što su zračne luke i autoceste, čija obilježja su konstantna prolaznost i privremenost”, Castellsov koncept umreženog društva te Kaplaničinu feminističku analizu koja propituje orodene metafore putovanja u zapadnom diskursu o putovanju (Cresswell 2010:551).

odbacivanje *mjesta* kao jedinoga konstitutivnoga u konstrukciji identiteta. Clifford tako u svom tekstu "Travelling cultures" nudi smjernice za "de-lokalizaciju" kulture, odnosno promišljanje kulture u terminima mobilnosti, putovanja, jednako kao i u terminima statičnosti, prebivanja. Drugim riječima, dok je kulturi (i terenskomu radu u sociokulturnoj antropologiji) konstitutivno prebivanje, statičnost, jednako joj je tako konstitutivno i putovanje, kretanje, razmjena, kontakti: "skupine neokaljane kontaktom s ostatkom svijeta vjerojatno nikada nisu ni postojale" (Appadurai prema Clifford 1997:24). Upravo je lokalizacija terenskoga istraživanja u antropologiji zakrivala nekoliko "graničnih područja i historijskih realnosti"⁵, doprinoseći tako, između ostalog, i predodžbi o neproblematičnosti terenskoga istraživanja i iskustva te terena kao mjesta koje se jednostavno nalazi "tamo"⁶ i čeka da bude otkriveno⁷. Isto tako, lokalizacijske prakse u odnosu na kulturu zakrivaju povijest međukulturne interakcije jer kultura nije statična i nepromjenjiva, već izložena cijeloj mreži historijskih odnosa i kontakata. Lokalizacijske prakse u odnosu na subjekte istraživanja konceptualizirale su kazivača, tu problematičnu figuru kako je naziva Clifford, kao statičnoga,

⁵ Clifford ih navodi nekoliko: "1) Prijevozna sredstva – brod, terenski automobil, misijski zrakoplov itd. Ove tehnologije daju naslutiti prethodne i kontinuirane kontakte i trgovinu s vanjskim mjestima i silama koje nisu dio terena/objekta. Diskurs etnografije ('biti tamo') je previše jasno odvojen od putovanja ('doći tamo'). 2) Glavni grad, nacionalni kontekst je izbrisan. To je ono što George Condominas naziva 'préterrain', sva ona mjesta kroz koja morate proći, s kojima morate biti u vezi kako biste došli do svog sela ili mjesta koje nazivate terenom. 3) Izbrisan je i sveučilišni dom istraživača. Posebice sada, kada je putovanje i na najudaljenija mjesta jednostavno i kada svakakva mjesta u 'prvom svijetu' mogu biti tereni (crkve, laboratoriji, uredi, škole itd.), dolaznje i odlaznje na teren i s terena od strane domorodaca i istraživača može biti jako često. 4) Mjesta i odnosi *translacije* su minimizirani. Kada je teren prebivanje, dom daleko od doma, gdje govorite jezik i imate neku vrstu vernakularne kompetencije, kozmopolitski posrednici – i kompleksni, često politički pregovori s tim u vezi – znaju nestati. Ostaje nam promatranje sa sudjelovanjem, neka vrsta hermeneutičke slobode kretanja unutar i izvan društvenih situacija" (Clifford 1997:23).

⁶ Kada govori o privilegiranju prebivanja nad kretanjem i putovanjem u terenskom istraživanju u sociokulturnoj antropologiji, Clifford se referira na idealtipsko moderno istraživanje u tradiciji Malinowskoga, koje podrazumijeva dugotrajan *boravak* i uranjanje u istraživanu zajednicu, promatranje sudjelovanjem, učenje domorodačkog jezika i naknadnu sistematizaciju u etnografskoj monografiji.

⁷ O konstruktivističkoj prirodi terena vidi Amit 2000 te Čapo Žmegač et al. 2006.

bespovijesnoga, lišenoga i vlastite povijesti putovanja. Clifford dakle predlaže promišljanje kulture u terminima i prebivanja i putovanja, umjesto privilegiranja jednoga odnosno drugog momenta u njezinoj konstituciji. Za našu svrhu važna točka Cliffordova teksta jest njegova metafora hotela kao epitoma “određenoga ulaska u kompleksnu povijest putujućih kultura (i kultura putovanja) u kasnom dvadesetom stoljeću” (Clifford 1997:31). Iako svjestan višestruke problematičnosti kronotopa hotela u kontekstu rasne, klasne, rodne privilegije te njegovih nostalgичnih konotacija⁸ i neprimjerenosti postmodernom stanju⁹, iz fokusa mu ipak izmiče još jedna problematična dimenzija na koju sam uputila već ranije (Grgurinović 2012), a to je hotel kao mjesto klasne nejednakosti, ne čak u smislu privilegiranih i nepriviligiranih *putnika*, već onih ne-mobilnih, statičnih, sobarica, nosača, svih koji rade dok drugi putuju. Upravo se ovaj “statični” moment diskursa o putovanju čini kao dobra ulazna točka u promišljanje politike putovanja/mobilnosti iz perspektive pozicioniranosti njezinih različitih aktera¹⁰.

⁸ “Predodžba hotela sugerira stariju formu džentlmenskoga zapadnjačkog putovanja kada su dom i inozemstvo, grad i država, Istok i Zapad, metropola i antipodi, bili jasnije određeni” (ibid. 31).

⁹ Kojem bi primjereniji kronotop bio kronotop motela: “Motel nema pravog predvorja, vezan je za mrežu autocesta – prijenosnik ili čvor prije nego mjesto susreta koherentnih kulturnih subjekata” (ibid. 32).

¹⁰ Dihotomiju mobilnosti i statičnosti koristimo tek kao analitičku smjernicu te nam namjera nipošto nije plošno sagledavati tu opoziciju. I jedna i druga pozicija su složene te podrazumijevaju cijeli niz nijansi koje onemogućuju svaki pokušaj pojednostavlivanja. Jedan od aspekata na koje u tom smislu treba barem uputiti jesu različite vrste mobilnosti koje se iz perspektive statičnih subjekata ovog para mogu činiti privilegiranim s obzirom na klasnu poziciju ili mogućnost socijalne mobilnosti. Uzmimo za primjer razne skupine “dobrovoljnih migranata”, obrazovanih stručnjaka koji “obično ne dolaze iz najsiromašnijih dijelova populacije. Kako industrijalizirane države preusmjeravaju svoju ekonomiju prema industrijama temeljenim na znanju, njihova imigracijska politika sve više se fokusira na zapošljavanje visoko stručnih i dobro obrazovanih pridošlica” (Amit 2007:5). Međutim, ovakve migrantske/mobilne prakse nikako ne možemo jednoznačno i monolitno identificirati kao privilegirane s obzirom na, primjerice, ekonomsku krizu na globalnoj razini i u Europi, razinu nezaposlenosti, posebice mladih, u pojedinim državama Europske unije (prema podacima Eurostata u 2012. u Španjolskoj i Grčkoj nezaposlenost mladih prelazi 50%, vidi http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Unemployment_statistics#Youth_unemployment_trends) i na razini EU27 (nezaposlenost mladih je u 2012. iznosila 22.8% te raste od 2010. godine), prekarizaciju i, naravno, odnos europske periferije i centra.

Vratimo se, međutim, autorima i tekstovima koji se, više ili manje osviješteno, smještaju unutar paradigme “nove mobilnosti”, gdje činjenica *kretanja* kao privilegiranoga mjesta promišljanja (post)moderne stvarnosti povezuje razne geografske poddiscipline s uvidima iz društvenih i humanističkih znanosti (Cresswell 2010). Zaokret prema mobilnosti “fokusira se na (...) temeljnu geografsku životnu činjenicu – kretanje” (ibid. 551) a “ta činjenica povezuje raznovrsne oblike kretanja u istraživačkim poljima koja su dosada često bila odvojena” (ibid. 551). Znanstvena produkcija s ključnom riječi mobilnost raste i, iako znanstvenici iz područja geografije igraju ključnu ulogu, ona je izrazito interdisciplinarna (ibid.). Teme sežu od mobilnosti i etike, preko rodne dinamike mobilnosti, mobilnosti u kontekstu istraživanja turizma, mobilnosti u vezi s različitim načinima i sredstvima putovanja (automobil, zrakoplov, željeznica), ali i “manje očitim oblicima mobilnosti” (putovanje trajektom, motociklom, ali i primjerice različiti oblici ritmičkog kretanja – od ritmova urbanih javnih prostora do prirodnih ritmova plime i oseke; ibid. 553). Unutar ove paradigme analitički prostor odnedavno se otvara i *mirovanju*, *statičnosti*, čime se “ne predlaže povratak disciplini temeljenoj na ograničenosti i ukorijenjenosti, već na svijesti o tome kako je mirovanje potpuno inkorporirano u prakse kretanja” (Cresswell 2012:648). Promišljanje statičnosti u kontekstu paradigme nove mobilnosti bavi se temama čekanja, mirovanja u tijeku putovanja (primjerice, čekanje u redovima), ali i

“često prisilnim mirovanjem nedokumentiranih migranata zaključanih u kontejnerima i hladnjačama [kako bi se] mirovanje (kao iskustvo elita) otrgnulo konotacijama kozmopolitske autentičnosti. Dok elite imaju svoje čahure u ograđenim zajednicama (engl. *gated communities*) i poslovnim salonima, gdje su zaštićene od uznemirujućeg meteža mobilnoga svijeta, ljudi uhvaćeni u trgovinu ljudima zaključani su u čahure potpuno drugačije vrste” (ibid. 648; v. i Martin 2011).

Ovaj prostor za promišljanje statičnosti kroz prizmu mobilnosti čini se plodnim terenom za zauzdavanje “idealiziranja kretanja” (ili destabiliziranje romantičnoga, unificirajućeg diskursa o putovanju o kojem se govorilo ranije u tekstu), ali i za, uvjetno rečeno, ujednačavanje perspektiva. Naime, i kod Cliffordova pokušaja de-lokalizacije kulture i

u kontekstu paradigme “nove mobilnosti” postoji opasnost od zatvaranja fokusa. Kod Clifforda smo to zatvaranje metaforički saželi kritikom njegova osvrta na kronotop hotela, a u kontekstu nove mobilnosti na određeni ga način otvorili uvrštenjem varijable statičnosti u jednadžbu mobilnosti. Kako ne bismo i sami pali u zamku zatvaranja fokusa, potrebno je naglasiti nedvojbeno pozitivne aspekte kretanja, putovanja, mobilnosti, a koji se očituju u povijesti interakcija, susreta s drugošću, razmjene znanja i sl. Ono što se ovdje problematizira nisu *prakse*¹¹ i njihovi pozitivni učinci, već su to koncepcije koje svojim univerzalizmom zaklanjaju složenost ekonomskih i političkih uvjeta u kojima se te iste prakse odvijaju. Na sličan se način potrebno ograditi i u kontekstu sljedećega poglavlja ovog teksta, u kojem se problematizira *akademska mobilnost* na način na koji je ona konceptualizirana jezikom institucija Europske unije, kao *a priori* pozitivna. Međutim, takva pozitivna konceptualizacija skriva cijeli niz problematičnih točaka koje dijele statične od mobilnih znanstvenika, od kojih ćemo se ovdje usredotočiti na dvije – rodnu i klasnu. Pozitivne prakse znanstvenoga internacionalizma u smislu razmjene znanja nisu predmet ovoga rada, već je to diskurs koji monolitno koncipira mobilnost te strukturne uvjete koji uzrokuju ne-mobilnost.

AKADEMSKA STATIČNOST/MOBILNOST

Kako piše Susan L. Robertson u kritičkome osvrtu na temat o međunarodnoj akademskoj mobilnosti objavljenom 2010. u znanstvenom časopisu *Discourse*, “[m]obilnost se poima kao pozitivna sila; snažan mehanizam društvene promjene. Međutim, ovakve izjave predstavljaju pretjerano romantično poimanje mobilnosti” (Robertson 2010:642). Robertson se referira na službeni diskurs tijela Europske unije, ali i na širi diskurs o mobilnosti koja se odnosi na prakse kretanja koje sežu onkraj granica akademske zajednice, pri čemu dolazi do ““idealiziranja kretanja, ili transformacije kretanja u fetiš”” (Ahmed prema Robertson 2010:646),

¹¹ Naravno, promjena fokusa na prakse putovanja/mobilnosti iz smjera periferija – centar (u kontekstu post/neo/kolonijalizma, ali i u kontekstu Europske unije) dodaje nove dimenzije koje kompliciraju ovu sliku te u jednadžbu uvode pitanja etike putovanja.

a mobilnost postaje “upečatljiva ključna riječ za dvadeset prvo stoljeće” (Hannam, Sheller i Urry prema Robertson 2010:642). Primjere takvih izjava možemo pronaći u cijelom nizu službenih dokumenata Europske unije, primjerice: “Mobilnost osoblja, studenata i diplomanata jedan je od ključnih elemenata bolonjskog procesa, koji stvara prilike za osobni rast, razvoj međunarodne suradnje između pojedinaca i institucija, poboljšanje kvalitete visokog obrazovanja i istraživanja te koji daje značenje europskoj dimenziji” (London Communiqué). Mobilnost, međutim, ne znači samo fizičko kretanje, internacionalnu razmjenu znanja, već i mobilnost istraživača u druge sektore, primjerice: “Mobilnost, transnacionalna i među sektorima, uključujući stimulaciju sudjelovanja industrije i otvaranje istraživačkih centara i akademskih pozicija na razini Europe, jest ključna komponenta Europskog istraživačkog prostora te je nezamjenjiv čimbenik u povećanju europskih kapaciteta i izvedbe u istraživanju” (Decision No. 1982/2006/EC).

Mobilnost je također ključna ne samo za karijeru, već i osobni rast i razvoj znanstvenika: “Komisija se nada da će poticati usavršavanje i mobilnost kako bi europski istraživači mogli postići svoj puni potencijal” (*Seventh Framework Programme (2007 to 2013)*). Riječju, “smatra se kako mobilnost proizvodi ‘učinke’ od poboljšanja kvalitete programa, do stvaranja izvrsnosti u istraživanju, jačanja akademske i kulturne internacionalizacije europskoga visokog obrazovanja, promicanja osobnog razvoja i zapošljivosti, poštovanja različitosti, poticanja jezičnog pluralizma te poboljšanja suradnje i konkurencije među institucijama visokog obrazovanja” (Robertson 2010:642, istaknula I. G.).

Međutim, kako smo već napomenuli, ovakva pozitivna i neproblematična konceptualizacija mobilnosti, osim što mnogo govori o diskursu institucija Europske unije, puno više skriva nego što otkriva. Više je problema koji se otvaraju u promišljanju mobilnosti u Europskome istraživačkom prostoru, a jedan od njih tiče se različitih koncepcija obrazovanja, one koja obrazovanje poima kao robu koja sudjeluje na tržištu kao svaka druga roba te one koja ga poima kao javno dobro (v. Milat 2010). Naime, projekt akademske mobilnosti neodvojiv je od europskog projekta bolonjske reforme, koja već u svojem utemeljiteljskom dokumentu naglašava promicanje mobilnosti kao jednoga od ključnih ciljeva na putu izgradnje Europskoga

prostora visokog obrazovanja¹². Osim nekih univerzalnih ciljeva iznesenih u Deklaraciji (i dokumentima koji su joj prethodili, npr. *Magna Charta Universitatum*¹³ ili Deklaracija iz Sorbonne¹⁴), poput uloge obrazovanja u izgradnji demokratskih društava i slično, ili onih koji se tiču “veće kompatibilnosti i usporedivosti sustava visokog obrazovanja” (*Bologna Declaration*) te globalne kompetitivnosti europskog sustava visokog obrazovanja, ona udara temelje budućim tendencijama obrazovanja na razini Europe i u pojedinim nacionalnim sustavima obrazovanja, naime “unifikacij[i] europskog tržišta rada”¹⁵ (Milat 2010) pri čemu znanje sve više postaje robom

¹² “Promicanje mobilnosti prevladavanjem zapreka slobodnom kretanju, posebice: studentima: dati priliku za učenje, omogućiti im pristup studiju i relevantnim službama; nastavnicima, istraživačima i administrativnom osoblju: priznati i valorizirati vrijeme koje su proveli u Europi istražujući, predajući ili učeći, bez prejudiciranja njihovih statutarnih prava” (*Bologna Declaration*).

¹³ Potrebno je istaknuti kako su univerzalna načela iznesena u ovom dokumentu u potpunosti suprotnosti s kasnijim (zakonomavnim i inim) razvojem događaja u području visokog obrazovanja i znanosti u velikom broju europskih zemalja članica i kandidatkinja za pristup. Navedimo kao primjer tek načelo neovisnosti podučavanja i istraživanja od političke i ekonomske moći, načelo koje postaje neodrživo u vremenu krize i mjera štednje, te samu činjenicu otvaranja područja obrazovanja tržištu, ali i imperativom “povezivanja znanosti i industrije” u kontekstu neoliberalnog kapitalizma. Potrebno je napomenuti isto tako kako *Magna Charta Universitatum* naglašava važnost mobilnosti studenata i nastavnika u razmjeni znanja. Također, indikativna je i ograda od ovoga dokumenta u *Bolonjskoj deklaraciji*: “Europske visokoobrazovne institucije prihvatile su izazov te igraju glavnu ulogu u stvaranju europskog prostora visokog obrazovanja, nastavljajući se također na temeljna načela iznesena u dokumentu Bologna Magna Charta Universitatum iz 1988. To je od ključne važnosti, *pod pretpostavkom* da se visoko obrazovanje i istraživački sustavi *kontinuirano prilagođavaju* promjeni potreba, zahtjeva društva i unapređivanja znanstvenoga znanja” (*Bologna Declaration*, istaknula I. G.).

¹⁴ Ova deklaracija referira se uglavnom na ujednačavanje visokoobrazovnih stupnjeva. Međutim, ona isto tako već jasno povlači paralelu između stjecanja znanja i tržišta rada, odnosno stjecanja znanja isključivo u svrhu zapošljavanja. Ponovno, veliku važnost u procesu ima mobilnost: “Studente na preddiplomskoj i diplomskoj razini poticati će se da provedu najmanje jedan semestar na sveučilištima izvan vlastite zemlje. U isto vrijeme, sve više nastavnog i istraživačkog osoblja trebalo bi raditi u drugim europskim zemljama” (*Sorbonne Joint Declaration*).

¹⁵ Ključna veza između obrazovnog sustava i (europskog) tržišta rada vrlo je jasno artikulirana u inicijalnim dokumentima “bolonjskog procesa”. Primjerice: “Krećemo se prema razdoblju velikih promjena u obrazovanju i uvjetima rada, prema diversifikaciji

na tržištu, studenti korisnici i platitelji, a sveučilišta isporučitelji usluga (kako na razini diskursa, tako i u praksi). U taj kontekst, dakle, smješta se i mobilnost¹⁶. Diskurs o mobilnosti, gotovo u maniri europske obrazovne podvrste “nove planetarne vulgate” (v. Bourdieu i Wacquant 2001), “iz koje su izuzeti pojmovi kao što su kapitalizam, klasa, eksploatacija, dominacija, nejednakost” (ibid. 45) skriva nekoliko ključnih prijepornih mjesta, a koja možemo metaforički sažeti i dihotomijom putnik – statist.

Jedno od njih je i rodna dimenzija akademske mobilnosti, koja postaje posebno akutnom ako u obzir uzmemo imperativ mobilnosti u razvoju karijere (posebice mladih) znanstvenika. Studije pokazuju kako su znanstvenice općenito manje geografski mobilne od znanstvenika (v. npr. Kulis i Sicotte 2002; Leeman 2010), a ta ograničenja mogu proizlaziti između ostalog i iz obiteljske dinamike i dinamike rodnih uloga (Kulis i Sicotte 2002:2; Leeman 2010). Čak i kada specifične studije pokazuju na prvi pogled male razlike u akademskoj mobilnosti muškaraca i žena, pornija analiza upućuje na “razlike u obrascima mobilnosti žena i muškaraca koje dugoročno vode k nejednakim razinama društvenoga, kulturnoga i simboličkog kapitala” (Leeman 2010:622). Sličnu sliku prikazuju i podaci Europske unije: u publikaciji *She Figures. Gender in Research and Innovation* iz 2012. godine navodi se kako su u EU 27 “između 2006. i 2009. godine istraživačice bile općenito manje mobilne od svojih muških kolega, pri čemu se mobilnost definira kao boravak u inozemstvu u razdoblju od najmanje tri mjeseca u posljednje tri godine” (European Commission 2013:43). Jedine iznimke su Irska i Bugarska, gdje je akademska mobilnost muškaraca i žena u navedenom razdoblju ili veća u korist mobilnosti žena ili otprilike izjednačena. U ostalim državama postoje velike varijacije, a u Latviji je primjerice mobilnost žena u navedenom razdoblju bila nepostojeća (ibid.). Dakle, znanstvenice koje *nisu mobilne*

profesionalnih karijera, a edukacija tijekom cijelog života postaje jasna obveza” (*Sorbonne Joint Declaration*). Ili: “stvaranje europskoga prostora visokog obrazovanja kao ključnog načina promicanja mobilnosti i zapošljivosti građana te ukupnog razvoja kontinenta” (*Bologna Declaration*), itd.

¹⁶ Mislimo na šire konceptualiziranu mobilnost u Europi kao dio politike tzv. fleksigurnosti, ali i na užu, akademsku mobilnost.

imaju manje mogućnosti za akumuliranje društvenoga i kulturnoga kapitala, a posljedično i lošijoj pozicioniranosti u akademskoj zajednici.

To nas dovodi i do klasne obilježenosti akademske mobilnosti (kako u geografskom tako i u socijalnom smislu). Kako piše Leeman, “transnacionalni društveni kapital” (Leeman 2010) u obliku mreže međunarodnih kontakata, a koji se stječe “u kontekstu svakodnevnog rada, tijekom razdoblja kvalifikacije, pri posjećivanju konferencija¹⁷, putem suradnji u istraživanju i tijekom vremena provedenog u inozemstvu” (ibid. 616), sve je važniji u akademskom svijetu. On, nadalje,

“omogućuje pristup drugim oblicima kapitala i može se transformirati u kulturni kapital (publikacije, međunarodno usmjereni habitus, jezične vještine) te simbolički kapital (ugled, kredit, moć) koji su važni za uspostavljanje statusa u akademskom svijetu. Ako se članovi akademske zajednice ne uključe u ove procese akumulacije i transformacije društvenog kapitala, postaju marginalizirani. Naposljetku, nađu se na rubu akademskog polja i ispadaju iz igre.” (ibid. 616)

S druge strane, možemo pretpostaviti kako je sposobnost stjecanja transnacionalnoga društvenog kapitala povezana s već postojećim akumuliranim kulturnim (i društvenim) kapitalom. Prema Bourdieuu, kulturni kapital pojedinca ključan je za reprodukciju društvenih klasa te za razlike u obrazovnom uspjehu (djece) koja potječu iz različitih društvenih klasa (i u akademskom svijetu općenito), a ovisi o obiteljskoj transmisiji kulturnoga kapitala (Bourdieu 2011). Akademski uspjeh tako nije rezultat urođenog “talenta” i “prirodnih” sposobnosti, već su “sposobnost ili talent sami po sebi proizvodi uloženog vremena i kulturnog kapitala” (ibid. 83). Nadalje, “inicijalna akumulacija kulturnog kapitala, preduvjet za brzu, jednostavnu akumulaciju svake vrste korisnoga kulturnog kapitala, počinje na samom početku, bez odgođe, bez gubljenja vremena, samo za potomke obitelji obdarene snažnim kulturnim kapitalom” (ibid. 84). Društveni kapital

¹⁷ Ako uzmemo u obzir progresivno smanjenje financiranja znanstvenih istraživanja, posebice u humanističkom području, i mobilnost u vidu odlazaka na konferencije sve više izlazi iz domene mogućnosti znanstvenika s malom količinom ekonomskog kapitala, što ima potencijalno dalekosežne posljedice po klasnu reprodukciju unutar akademske zajednice.

prema Bourdieuovoj definiciji¹⁸, te njegov oblik preveden u transnacionalni društveni kapital (u obliku *međunarodnih* mreža) u kontekstu mobilnosti, još je jedna od ključnih komponenata koja razlikuje mobilne od statičnih znanstvenika, a i kulturni i društveni kapital povezani su, više ili manje izravno, s posjedovanjem ekonomskog kapitala, s obzirom na to da “duljina vremena tijekom kojega pojedinac može produljiti proces stjecanja [kulturnog kapitala] ovisi o duljini vremena za koju mu njegova obitelj može osigurati slobodno vrijeme, tj. vrijeme slobodno od ekonomske potrebe, što je preduvjet za inicijalnu akumulaciju” (ibid. 85). Drugim riječima, dok su pojedincu osigurana ekonomska sredstva u vidu obiteljske financijske potpore, toliko dugo može akumulirati kulturni kapital, pri čemu, naravno, ključnu ulogu ima i važnost koja se kulturnom kapitalu pridaje u obitelji. Isto tako, društveni kapital u vidu društvenih veza, a koji se povećava proporcionalno s veličinom mreže, ovisi o ekonomskom kapitalu, s obzirom na to da “reprodukcija društvenog kapitala pretpostavlja stalni napor društvenosti, neprekinuti niz razmjene u kojoj se priznanje stalno iznova potvrđuje”, a taj rad na reprodukciji društvenog kapitala “pretpostavlja trošenje vremena i energije i tako, izravno ili neizravno, i ekonomskog kapitala” (ibid. 87). Možemo, dakle, zaključiti kako mobilnost (odnosno statičnost) znanstvenika ovisi o nizu strukturnih čimbenika, zamaskiranih unificirajućim pozitivnim predodžbama o mobilnosti koje operiraju u, primjerice, službenim dokumentima Europske unije. Nečija statičnost tako automatizmom ne signalizira “nesposobnost”, već, između ostaloga, rodnu i klasnu dinamiku koja obilježava akademski svijet, te povezanost rodne dinamike i mogućnosti (i vremena) dostupnih za stjecanje kulturnoga i društvenog kapitala (v. Leeman 2010). Isto tako iz promišljanja politike mobilnosti ne možemo isključiti ni neke druge (u geografskom/globalnom i disciplinarnom smislu) odnose moći, kao što su odnosi europske periferije i centra (ne samo u smislu politike akademske mobilnosti, već i u smislu ekonomske/monetarne politike na razini Europske unije) ili odnosi među disciplinama, prije svega u tržišnom (ali i ideološkom) smislu.

¹⁸ “Društveni kapital skup je stvarnih ili potencijalnih resursa povezanih s posjedovanjem trajne mreže više ili manje institucionaliziranih odnosa međusobnih poznanstava i priznanja – ili, drugim riječima, s pripadnošću određenoj skupini – koja svakom od svojih članova osigurava potporu kolektivnog kapitala, ‘kvalifikacija’ koja im daje pravo na kredit, u raznim značenjima te riječi” (Bourdieu 2011:86).

ZAKLJUČAK

U uvodnome dijelu teksta konceptualno smo razgraničili *putovanje* (u značenjskome opsegu zapadnjačkoga koncepta opterećenoga problematičnom popudbinom) i *mobilnost*¹⁹ (posebice se osvrnuvši na paradigmu “nove mobilnosti”), stavlajući naglasak na one aspekte tih koncepata koji nude potencijal za promišljanje politike statičnosti u kontekstu putovanja/mobilnosti. Zatim smo, s obzirom na to konceptualno razgraničenje, naznačili nekoliko problematičnih graničnih područja diskursa o akademskoj mobilnosti koji se koncipira unificirano pozitivno. Ona nam otkrivaju kako mobilnost nije uvjetovana samo postojanjem institucionalnog okvira ili naprosto željom za mobilnošću, već nizom strukturnih čimbenika, kao što su rodna ili klasna dinamika u akademskom polju. Ti strukturni čimbenici od velike su važnosti za fizičku, a posljedično i karijernu/socijalnu statičnost znanstvenika, s obzirom na važnost koja se mobilnosti (institucionalno i simbolički) pridaje. Namjera nam nije bila apriorna kritičnost prema mobilnosti – posebno kada ona implicira pozitivni akademski internacionalizam u smislu razmjene znanja i cirkuliranja ideja – niti uspostava neke vrste vrijednosne hijerarhije između statičnosti i mobilnosti. Umjesto toga, namjera je otvoriti prostor kritike nekritičkoga, unificirajućeg diskursa o akademskoj mobilnosti kao aspekta šire politike znanosti, obrazovanja²⁰ i znanja općenito, koja veliku pažnju pridaje mobilnosti kao čimbeniku nejasno definirane znanstvene “izvrsnosti” (institucija i pojedinačnih znanstvenika) i dodatne prednosti u kvantificiranom, prekarnom, kompetitivnom polju akademskog rada.²¹

¹⁹ Ovdje konkretno mislimo na konceptualne okvire unutar kojih se interdisciplinarno promišlja kretanje. Pri tome *putovanje* razumijevamo, kako je već naznačeno u uvodu, na Cliffordovu tragu, kao prožimajući zapadnjački trop opterećen “poviješću europskih, književnih, muških, buržujskih, znanstvenih, herojskih, rekreativnih značenja i praksi” (Clifford 1997:33). Kada govorimo o mobilnosti, referiramo se na nešto širi konceptualni okvir koji, za razliku od *putovanja* (koncipiranoga na navedeni način), u svoje granice pripušta promišljanje o mnogo širem rasponu praksi kretanja.

²⁰ Mislimo na komodificirano obrazovanje i znanost (nasuprot obrazovanju i znanosti kao javnome dobru) u kontekstu neoliberalnog kapitalizma, vođene načelima i logikom tržišta (vidi npr. *Academia Europaea* 2012; Callinicos 2006).

²¹ Nije naodmet spomenuti i paradoks imperativa povećanja međunarodne *suradnje* (na institucionalnoj i individualnoj razini) u svrhu povećanja *kompetitivnosti* (bilo institucije – na akademskom *tržištu*, bilo pojedinačnog znanstvenika – na *tržištu rada*).

Takav plošni diskurs, kao segment šire “transformacije kretanja u fetiš” (Ahmed prema Robertson 2010:646) unutar koje mobilnost postaje gotovo poštapalicom, samorazumljivim smatra neophodnost mobilnosti. U tom se smislu čini analitički korisnim da se zauzme pozicija suprotna “mitu o neophodnosti [mobilnosti]” (Kovačević 2012:25) u kojem je kretanje postalo samo sebi svrhom u vremenu kada tehnologija omogućuje dostupnost informacija bez potrebe za fizičkim izmještanjem²² (ibid.). Međunarodna suradnja (možemo reći – i mobilnost) tako, prema Kovačeviću, postaje mitska i ritualna.²³

Naposljetku, naličje akademske mobilnosti (i mobilnosti općenito) nije samo statičnost. Posljedice diskurzivnoga i profesionalnog imperativa mobilnosti zahvaćaju i sam koncept mobilnosti. Drugim riječima, ovim tekstom pokušali smo naglasiti da jednodimenzionalno promatranje mobilnih znanstvenika može značiti zatvaranje prostora analizi samog iskustva mobilnosti iz kritičke perspektive. Takva bi perspektiva mogla uključiti, kako je ovdje već naznačeno, promišljanje cijene mobilnosti koju znanstvenici plaćaju u privatnom životu ili klasnu, rodnu, generacijsku, disciplinarno specifičnu dimenziju mobilnosti u pokušaju licenciranja akademske izvrsnosti.

²² Mislimo na mobilnost u kontekstu društveno-humanističkih znanosti.

²³ “[mitska] jer ničim ne doprinosi realnoj razmjeni informacija, koja se može obaviti s daleko manjim utroškom novca i energije, a ritualna je jer, osim klasične ritualne repetitivnosti (godišnji kongresi i sl.), postoji čitav niz radnji koje, odražavajući statuse i distribuciju moći, imaju funkciju internoga i eksternog ovjeravanja neophodnosti samih manifestacija” (ibid. 26).

**THE TRAVELLERS AND THE STILL:
ON THE POLITICS OF (ACADEMIC) MOBILITY**
(Translation)

IVONA GRGURINOVIĆ
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology
Croatia, 10000 Zagreb, Ivana Lučića 3

UDC 314.7-057.85
314.7-057.875
Original scientific paper
Received: 10 March 2013
Accepted: 29 July 2013

By shifting the analytical focus from the travelling/mobile subject of the discourse on travel/ (academic) mobility to its still figures, the author is attempting to point to the cracks in the romanticized, elitist monolithic images of travel/mobility that open the space for the analysis of the politics underlying such discourses and practices. The metaphor of a still figure that is invisible in the (glorifying and unifying Western) discourse of travel, and emerges in the “new mobility” paradigm reveals a dynamic that can, if viewed from a new perspective, namely the perspective of those who stay still in a world of mobile travellers, and sheds light on the economy of power present in different ways in all travel/mobility practices (and discourses. The introduction gives a critical outline of the tendencies and problems in the Western discourse on travel and the topics within the “new mobility” paradigm. Furthermore, the author points to some politically relevant aspects of (the discourse on) academic mobility, which remain hidden behind its positive conceptualization.

Key words: *travel, mobility, academic mobility, social capital, cultural capital*

INTRODUCTION

In the last few decades travel and textual products of travelling practices have become the bright stars in the sky of interdisciplinary science. Critical theory deals mainly with the Western trope of travel, more or less critically, distancing itself to a greater or lesser extent from the concept burdened with “a history of European, literary, male, bourgeois, scientific, heroic, recreational meanings and practices” (Clifford 1997:33). However, despite the fact that the renewed interdisciplinary interest (at the intersection of postcolonial studies, anthropology, cultural studies, cultural geography) in travel and textual products of travelling practices focuses most often on issues such as (post)colonialism, Eurocentrism, gender identity, etc. still “the terms of displacement found in Euro-American critical practice rarely

admit to (...) material conditions” (Kaplan 1996:1) in which the practices of travel and displacement¹ exist, namely “the historical phenomenon of modern imperialism in the context of European and U.S. industrialisation, the economic and cultural annexation of regions into a ‘Third world’ and subsequent decolonisations, as well as the shifts and destabilisations engendered by the deindustrialisation of the so-called First World” (ibid. 1). It is worth adding that apart from ignoring the contemporary travel practices beyond Western, bourgeois, recreational, literary travel for pleasure, there is also disregard of historical practices that have existed beyond the discourse on Western travel and its conceptualisation as referred to above. In other words, although less privileged travel practices of migrants, refugees or homeless persons, are sometimes given place in the discourse on travel as metaphors, they are rarely meaningful discourse agents (ibid. 2), just as “[t]ravel’ is not a word that can be easily evoked to talk about the *Middle Passage*, *The Trail of Tears*, the landing of Chinese immigrants, the forced relocation of Japanese Americans or the plight of the homeless”²

¹ Although the concept of travel is considered a distinctively modern practice, by using the terms *travel* and *displacement* Kaplan is not trying to suggest that the latter is an exclusively postmodern practice. Introducing a theoretical and conceptual shift towards displacement the author wishes to “[quere] the construction and proliferation of modernisms from a postmodern critical standpoint” (Kaplan 1996:3). Travel and displacement are viewed neither as juxtaposed sides of a binary opposition, nor as synonyms, but “as signs of different critical registers and varied historicized instances” (ibid. 3). In so doing the author understands postmodernity as “a set of economic and cultural relationships that produce specific discourses of space, time and subjectivity in a time period and in relation to multiple locations” (ibid. 11).

² It is also important to emphasise that the boundaries between various categories of travellers (i.e. voluntary travel for pleasure) are becoming blurred. Thus Amit writes about the overlap of several categories and even the “appropriation” of categories that used to be reserved for unprivileged travellers (e.g. various types of migrants) by voluntary “experiential” middle class travellers: “(...) there is now a significant global workforce of young travellers, many voyaging as a break before or after completing postsecondary studies, who are supporting journeys of several months, occasionally even years, by working at the destination they are visiting. Ironically, many of these young adventurers are supporting their own tourism by working in service industries serving other tourists. (...) An increasingly important segment of ‘guest’ workers, a status once identified with relatively disadvantaged migrants, is thus now ironically comprised of middle-class Western youths who can at one and the same time be wooed as tourists and serve as cheap,

(Hooks in Hutnyk 2004:23). The attempts (see e.g. Clifford 1997) to relieve the concept of travel of its ideological burden³ notwithstanding, it seems that it has hardened during the long period of European (neo)colonialism and (neo)imperialism as well as the superiority of European discourse and hegemony of European knowledge and cannot expand to include less voluntary, less recreational, less male and bourgeois travel practices.

Furthermore, just as this unifying discourse on travel failed to include practices which have existed beyond “European, literary, male, bourgeois, scientific, heroic, recreational (...) practices” (Clifford 1997:33), it also failed to include its still figures as antipodes to travellers in the sense of economy of power intrinsic to travel as it is understood and described above. This paper wishes to observe this relationship and point to the political position of a still subject in relation to a moving one.

Recently new “key words” have appeared on the interdisciplinary sky (albeit with a more cultural and geographical orientation). There is a so-called “turn towards mobility” or “new mobilities” paradigm (see Duda 2012:12) within which “a number of theorists across disciplines [...] have argued for a kind of thinking that takes mobility as the central fact of modern or postmodern life” (Cresswell 2010:551), that is to say the geographical fact which is “at the centre of constellations of power, the creation of identities and the microgeographies of everyday life.” (ibid.). Thus, the new mobilities paradigm takes into consideration other forms of moving in space apart from travel. As Cresswell writes in the text quoted above, the incentive for giving mobility its privileged position as the basic fact of the (post)modern world comes from the tendencies which inter alia occur in anthropology (especially works of

compliant, and temporary labor” Amit 2007:4, 5). Such overlaps seem to destabilise the already “unfruitful, fixed dichotomy” (Duda 2012:28) *traveller – tourist* used to differentiate different types of structuring the experience of travel.

³ Although Clifford gives examples of scientific observations of different types of travel and different travel practices (e.g. the work of Rediker and Linebaugh), it is quite clear that “just considering the absurdity of including the racist violence and atrocity of the slave trade under any revamped notion of ‘travel’ would be sufficient to show the likely inappropriateness of generalising extensions of the travel trope in its Euro-American modes” (Hutnyk 2004:23).

James Clifford)⁴, that call for rejecting the *place* as the only constitutive element in identity construction. In his text *Travelling Cultures* Clifford offers guidelines for the “de-localisation” of culture, i.e. rethinking culture in terms of mobility and travel as well as in terms of stillness and dwelling. In other words, just as dwelling and staying put constitute elements of culture (and of fieldwork in socio-cultural anthropology), so do travelling, moving, exchange, contacts: “groups unsullied by contact with a larger world, have probably never existed” (Appadurai in Clifford 1997:24). The localisation of field research in anthropology was obscuring several “border areas and historical realities”⁵, contributing, inter alia, to the idea of the unproblematic nature of fieldwork and experience and of the field as a place “out there”⁶ waiting to be

⁴ Furthermore, Cresswell lists Marc Augé among the precursors of the “mobility turn”, and his “philosophical musings on the potentials for an anthropology of ‘non-places’, such as airport and motorways, marked by constant transition and temporality”, Castells’ concept of network society and Kaplan’s explorations of various metaphoric uses of travel in feminist theory in Western discourse about travel (Cresswell 2010:551).

⁵ Clifford lists several of them: “1) means of transport – the boat, the land rover, the mission airplane, etc. These technologies suggest systematic prior and ongoing contacts and commerce with exterior places and forces which are not part of the field/object. The discourse of ethnography (‘being there’) is separated from that of travel (‘getting there’). 2) The capital city, the national context, is erased. This is what George Condominas refers to as *‘préterrain’*, all those places you have to go through and be in relation with just to get to your village or to that place of work you will call your field. 3) Also erased: the university home of the researcher. Especially now that one can travel more easily to even the most remote sites and now that all sorts of places in the ‘First World’ can be fields (churches, labs, offices, schools, shopping malls), movement in and out of the field by both natives and anthropologists may be very frequent. 4) The sites and relations of *translation* are minimised. When the field is a dwelling, a home away from home, where one speaks the language and has a kind of vernacular competence, the cosmopolitan intermediaries – and complex, often political, negotiations involved – tend to disappear. We are left with participant observation, a kind of hermeneutic freedom to circle inside and outside social situations” (Clifford 1997:23).

⁶ When he talks about privileging dwelling over moving and travel in field research in socio-cultural anthropology, Clifford refers to the ideal type of modern research in the tradition of Malinowski, which involves long-term *dwelling* and immersion in the explored community, participant observation, learning the native language and subsequent systematization in an ethnographic monograph.

discovered⁷. Also, localisation practices in relation to culture obscure the history of intercultural interaction because culture is neither static nor unchangeable, but rather exposed to a whole network of historical relations and contacts. Localisation practices in relation to the research subject conceptualised the informant, a problematic figure according to Clifford, as a static figure, ahistorical and lacking their own travel history. Therefore, Clifford suggests that in thinking about culture both dwelling and travelling need to be considered, instead of emphasizing one or the other constitutive element. For our purpose, the important point in Clifford's text is his metaphor of the hotel as an epitome of "a specific *way into* complex histories of travelling cultures (and cultures of travel) in the late twentieth century" (Clifford 1997:31). Although he is aware of the multiple problems with the hotel chronotope in the context of racial, class, gender privilege and its nostalgic connotations⁸ and their unsuitability to the post-modern condition⁹, there is also another problematic dimension that eludes him, to which I pointed earlier (Grgurinović 2012), and that is the hotel as a place of class inequality, not so much in terms of privileged and unprivileged *travellers* but rather in terms of static figures who are not moving, such as chambermaids and porters, i.e. all those who are working while others are travelling. It seems that this particular "static" moment of the discourse is a good entry point into thinking about the politics of mobility/travel from the perspective of the positions of its different actors.¹⁰

⁷ More on the constructivist nature of field work see Amit 2000 and Čapo Žmegač et al. 2006.

⁸ "The hotel image suggests an older form of gentlemanly occidental travel, when home and abroad, city and country, East and West, metropole and antipodes, were more clearly fixed" (ibid. 31).

⁹ A more appropriate chronotope would be that of the motel: "The motel has no real lobby, and it's tied into a highway network – a relay or node rather than a site of encounter between coherent cultural subjects" (ibid. 32).

¹⁰ The mobile – static dichotomy is used merely as an analytical guideline, without intention to see it onedimensionally. Both positions are complex and imply a variety of nuances that thwart all attempts of simplification. One of the important aspects that need mentioning are the different types of mobility that, from the perspective of the static subject of the pair, can appear privileged in terms of class position or opportunities for

However, let us go back to the texts and authors who, whether consciously or not, belong to the “new mobilities” paradigm, in which the fact of *movement* as a privileged place of rethinking (post) modern reality connects various geographic sub-branches with insights from humanities and social sciences (Cresswell 2010). The turn towards mobility “focuses on (...) a fundamental geographical fact of life – moving” (ibid. 551) and that “fact connects forms of movement across scales and within research fields that have often been held apart” (ibid. 551). Scientific production with mobility as the key word is flourishing and although scientists from the field of geography still play the key role, it is markedly interdisciplinary (ibid.). The topics range from mobility and ethics, to gender dynamics of mobility, mobility in tourism research, mobility in connection with different ways and means of travel (car, plane, railway), but also “the less obvious forms of mobility” (travelling by ferry, motorcycle, including for example different types of rhythmic movement – from rhythms of urban public spaces to the natural rhythm of tides; ibid. 553). Analytical space has recently opened within this paradigm for *stillness*, *immobility*, which “is not suggesting a return to a discipline based on boundedness and rootedness, but rather to an alertness to how stillness is thoroughly incorporated into the practices of moving” (Cresswell 2012:648).

Rethinking stillness within the context of the new mobilities paradigm deals with the topics of waiting, stillness during travel (for example, queuing), but also with:

social mobility. Take, for example, the different groups of “voluntary migrants”, educated professionals “usually not drawn from among the poorest and most destitute sending populations. As industrialized countries have reoriented their economies (or at least their economic aspirations) toward knowledge-based industries, their immigration policies have featured an increased emphasis on recruiting highly skilled and well-educated newcomers” (Amit 2007:3). However, these migrant/mobile practices can by no means be simply and monolithically identified as privileged, especially taking into consideration, for example, the economic crisis on the global and European level, unemployment rates, especially youth unemployment in certain European Union countries (according to Eurostat youth unemployment in Spain and Greece in 2012 exceeded 50%, see http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Unemployment_statistics#Youth_unemployment_trends) and in EU27 (in 2012 youth unemployment was 22.8% and has been on the increase since 2010.), precarity, and, of course, the relationship between European center and periphery.

“(…) the often enforced stillness of undocumented migrants who are locked into containers and refrigerated trucks in order to strip stillness (as experienced by elites) of connotations of cosmopolitan authenticity. While the elite have their capsules in gated communities and business lounges where they are protected from the troubling turmoil of a mobile world, people being trafficked are locked into capsules of a very different sort.” (ibid. 648, see also Martin 2011)

This space for rethinking stillness through a prism of mobility seems to be a fertile ground for curbing the “idealisation of movement” (or the destabilisation of the romantic, unifying discourse of travel which was mentioned earlier in the text), but also for a unification of perspectives of sorts. Namely, both in Clifford’s attempt of the delocalisation of culture and the “new mobilities” paradigm there is a risk of narrowing the focus. When referring to Clifford, we metaphorically summarized this narrowing by reviewing his usage of the hotel chronotope, and when referring to the new mobilities paradigm we widened the focus in a way by introducing a new variable – stillness. To avoid being trapped by the same narrowing of focus, it is important to emphasise the positive aspects of movement, travel and mobility that are evident in the history of interactions, encounters with the other, sharing of knowledge, etc. What is problematized here are not the *practices*¹¹ and their positive effects, but rather the concepts which in their universality obscure the complexity of economic and political circumstances within which they take place. Similarly, a certain distancing is also required in the context of the next chapter of the text which problematizes *academic mobility* and its conceptualization in the language of the European Union institutions as *a priori* positive. However, this positive conceptualisation hides a whole range of problematic points which divide mobile from static scientists. We shall focus on two of these points, namely gender and class. The topic of this paper are not the positive practices of scientific internationalism, such as exchange of knowledge; instead, we will deal with the discourse which has a monolithic view of the conceptualisation of mobility and the structural conditions behind stillness.

¹¹ Of course, the change of focus on travel/mobility practices from periphery to the centre (in the context of post/neo/colonialism, but also in the EU context) adds new dimensions which further complicate this picture and bring the ethics of travel into the equation.

STATIC/MOBILE ACADEMICS

According to Susan L. Robertson's critical overview of the international academic mobility published in a scientific magazine *Discourse* in 2010 "mobility is conceived of as a positive force; a powerful mechanism of social change. However, statements like this are an overly romantic rendering of mobility" (Robertson 2010:642). Robertson is referring to the official discourse of European Union bodies, but also to a wider discourse on mobility having to do with movement practices that go beyond academia, showing an 'the idealization of movement, or transformation of movement into a fetish (Ahmed in Robertson 2010:646), whereas mobility becomes an "evocative keyword for the twenty-first century" (Hannam, Sheller and Urry in Robertson 2010:642). Examples of such statements can be found in a whole range of official European Union documents, e.g.: "Mobility of staff, students and graduates is one of the core elements of the Bologna Process, creating opportunities for personal growth, developing international cooperation between individuals and institutions, enhancing the quality of higher education and research, and giving substance to the European dimension" (London Communiqué). However, mobility does not only mean physical movement and international exchange of knowledge but also intersectoral mobility of researchers, e.g.: "Mobility, both trans-national and intersectoral, including the stimulation of industrial participation and the opening of research careers and academic positions at European scale, is a key component of the European Research Area and indispensable to increasing European capacities and performance in research" (Decision No. 1982/2006/EC). Mobility is also key not only for career development but also for scientists' personal growth and development: "the Commission hopes to encourage training and mobility so that European researchers can realise their full potential" (*Seventh Framework Programme (2007 to 2013)*). In a word, "mobility is viewed as producing 'effects' that range from enhancing the quality of programmes, to creating excellence in research, strengthening the academic and cultural internationalisation of European higher education, promoting personal development and employability, fostering respect for diversity, encouraging linguistic pluralism, and increasing cooperation *and* competition between higher education institutions" (Robertson 2010:642, emphasis by I. G.).

However, as mentioned earlier, apart from revealing plenty about the discourse of European Union institutions, this positive and unproblematic conceptualization of mobility, actually obscures more than it reveals. Several problems emerge when rethinking mobility in the European research area. One of them has to do with different concepts of education. On the one hand, there is the concept of education as a commodity, sold on the market just as any other commodity, and on the other, there is the concept of education as a common good (see Milat 2010). Namely, the project of academic mobility is inextricably connected with the project of the European Bologna Reform, which emphasises in its founding document that promoting mobility is one of the key objectives on the path of building European higher education area.¹² Apart from some universal goals set out in the Declaration (and documents preceding it, e.g. *Magna Charta Universitatum*¹³ or the Sorbone Declaration¹⁴) such as the role of education in building democratic societies

¹² “Promotion of mobility by overcoming obstacles to the effective exercise of free movement with particular attention to: for students, access to study and training opportunities and to related services; for teachers, researchers and administrative staff, recognition and valorisation of periods spent in a European context researching, teaching and training, without prejudicing their statutory rights“ (*Bologna Declaration*).

¹³ It is important to emphasize that the universal principles laid down in this document have shown to be in complete opposition to the developments in higher education and science in many European Union member states and candidate countries. Let us take the principle of independence in teaching and research from political and economic power as an illustration. This principle has become unsustainable in the time of crisis and austerity measures. Another such example is the fact that education is opening to the market under the imperative of “connecting science and industry” within the context of neoliberal capitalism. It is also important to mention that *Magna Carta Universitatum* emphasises the importance of student and teacher mobility in the exchange of knowledge. Moreover, the distancing from this document in the *Bologna Declaration* is indicative: “European higher education institutions, for their part, have accepted the challenge and taken up a main role in constructing the European area of higher education, also in the wake of the fundamental principles laid down in the Bologna Magna Charta Universitatum of 1988. This is of the highest importance, given that Universities’ independence and autonomy ensure that higher education and research systems continuously adapt to changing needs, society’s demands and advances in scientific knowledge” (*Bologna Declaration*, emphasis I. G.).

¹⁴ This declaration refers mainly to the unification of higher education degrees. However, it also draws a clear parallel between acquiring knowledge and the labour market – that is to say acquiring knowledge exclusively in order to get employment. Again, mobility plays an

or the goals connected with “the greater compatibility and comparability of the systems of higher education” and the global competitiveness of European higher education systems, it also paves the way for future trends in European education and national education systems, or rather it aims at: “the unification of the European labour market”¹⁵ (Milat 2010). In this way knowledge becomes a commodity on the market, students become users who pay for services delivered by Universities (both in terms of discourse and in practice). This is therefore the context in which mobility is located.¹⁶

Discourse of mobility, almost in the manner of European educational subcategory of “the new planetary vulgate” (see Bourdieu and Wacquant 2001), “from which the terms ‘capitalism’, ‘class’, ‘exploitation’, ‘domination’ and ‘inequality’ are conspicuous by their absence” (ibid. 45) hides several important issues, which can metaphorically be narrowed down to the static/mobile subject dichotomy.

One of them is the gender aspect of academic mobility, which becomes especially acute if we consider the mobility imperative in (especially young) scientists’ career development. “Women scientists in academia have been shown to be less geographically mobile than their male counterparts” (see. e.g. Kulis and Sicotte 2002; Leeman 2010). “Constraints on women’s mobility may stem from family and gender role dynamics” (Kulis and Sicotte 2002:2; Leeman 2010). Even when specific studies show seemingly small differences in academic mobility of men and women, a deeper analysis always points to “differences in the mobility patterns of women and men that

important role in the process: “At both undergraduate and graduate level, students would be encouraged to spend at least one semester in universities outside their own country. At the same time, more teaching and research staff should be working in European countries other than their own” (*Sorbonne Joint Declaration*).

¹⁵ The key link between the education system and (European) labour market is clearly articulated in the initial Bologna Process documents. For example: “We are heading for a period of major change in education and working conditions, to a diversification of courses of professional careers with education and training throughout life becoming a clear obligation (*Sorbonne Joint Declaration*). Or: “the creation of the European area of higher education as a key way to promote citizens’ mobility and employability and the Continent’s overall development” (*Bologna Declaration*), etc.

¹⁶ We are referring to the more general conceptualisation of mobility in Europe as a part of the so-called flexicurity but also to academic mobility more specifically.

lead, in the long term, to unequal amounts of social, cultural and symbolic capital” (Leeman 2010:622). European Union data paint a similar picture: the publication entitled *She Figures. Gender in Research and Innovation* from 2012 states that in EU 27 “between 2006 and 2009 female researchers have generally been less mobile than male researchers, mobility being defined as having moved abroad for a period of at least three months in the last three years” (European Commission 2013:43). The only exceptions are Ireland and Bulgaria where academic mobility of male and female scientists in this period is either larger for female mobility or more or less equal. The gender gap in mobility varies widely in the remaining countries. In Latvia, for example, mobility of the female researcher population has been zero over recent years (ibid.). Therefore, female scientists who are *not mobile* have less possibility to accumulate social and cultural capital, which in turn leads to the deterioration of their position in academia.

This brings us to the class features of academic mobility (in a geographical as well as in a social sense). According to Leeman “transnational social capital” (Leeman 2010) in the form of a network of international contacts, which one develops “in the context of daily work, during qualification periods, while attending conferences, in research cooperation and through periods spent abroad” (ibid. 616), is gaining more and more importance in the academia.

Furthermore, it

“gives access to other forms of capital and can be transformed into cultural capital (publications, internationally oriented habitus, language skills) and symbolic capital (reputation, credit, power) that are relevant for establishing status in academia. If academics are not involved in these processes of accumulation and transformation of social capital, they get marginalised. Eventually, they are placed on the edge of the academic field and fall out of the game.” (ibid. 616)

On the other hand, it can be assumed that the ability to accumulate transnational social capital is connected with the already accumulated cultural (and social) capital. According to Bourdieu, one’s cultural capital is essential for the reproduction of social classes as well as for the differences in academic achievements of those (children) who come from different

social classes (and in the academia in general) and depends on the family transmission of cultural capital (Bourdieu 2011). Academic achievement is not the result of inherent “talents” or “natural” ability, rather “ability or talent is itself the product of an investment of time and cultural capital” (ibid. 83). Moreover, “the initial accumulation of cultural capital, the precondition for the fast, easy accumulation of every kind of useful cultural capital, starts at the outset, without delay, without wasted time, only for the offspring of families endowed with strong cultural capital” (ibid. 84). Social capital according to Bourdieu’s definition¹⁷ and its form translated into transnational social capital (in the form of *international* networks) in the context of mobility, is another key component differentiating mobile and static scientists, while cultural and social capital remain, more or less directly, connected with the possession of economic capital, regarding that “the length of time for which a given individual can prolong his [cultural capital] acquisition process depends on the length of time for which his family can provide him with free time, i.e. time free from economic necessity, which is the precondition for the initial accumulation” (ibid. 85). In other words, so long as the individual is provided with economic means in the form of family financial support, he/she can accumulate cultural capital, wherein the importance that the family attaches to the cultural capital plays the key role. Also, the social capital in the form of social networks, which increases proportionally to the size of the network, depends on the economic capital, considering that “the reproduction of social capital presupposes an unceasing effort of sociability, a continuous series of exchanges in which recognition is endlessly affirmed and reaffirmed”. This work on the reproduction of social capital “implies expenditure of time and energy and so, directly or indirectly, of economic capital” (ibid. 87). Therefore, it can be concluded that the being a mobile (or static) scientists depends on a number of structural factors, obscured by unifying positive representations of mobility which are at work, for

¹⁷ “Social capital is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition – or in other words, to membership in a group – which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectivity-owned capital, a ‘credential’ which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word” (Bourdieu 2011:86).

example, in the official documents of the European Union. One's being static does not automatically indicate "inability" but points to, among other things, gender and class dynamics at work in the academia. It also shows the connections between gender dynamics and opportunities (and time) available for accumulating cultural and social capital (see Leeman 2010). Also, when considering the politics of mobility, we cannot disregard other (geographic/global and disciplinary) relations of power, such as the relation between European periphery and centre (not only with regards to the politics of academic mobility, but also with regards to the European Union's economic/monetary policy) or the relations between different areas of science, primarily regarding competition (but also ideology).

CONCLUSION

In the introduction conceptual delineations were made between *travel* (signifying the Western concept with a problematic baggage) and *mobility*¹⁸ (especially in reference to the "new mobilities" paradigm), emphasising those aspects of the concepts that offer the potential for considering the politics of stillness within the context of travel/mobility. Furthermore, taking into account these conceptual delineations, several problematic borderline areas were indicated in the discourse on academic mobility, which is uniformly conceptualised as positive. They enable us to see that mobility is not always conditioned only by the existing institutional framework or pure desire to be mobile, but also by a number of structural factors such as gender or class dynamics in the academic field. These structural factors have a big impact on the physical and subsequently career/social stillness of scientists, taking into consideration the (institutional and symbolic) importance attached to mobility. The aim was not to be *a priori* critical towards mobility, especially

¹⁸ This specifically refers to conceptual frameworks within which movement is considered in an interdisciplinary way. In so doing *travel* is understood, as was indicated in the introduction, in accordance with Clifford, prevailing Western trope is burdened with "a history of European, literary, male, bourgeois, scientific, heroic, recreational meanings" (Clifford 1997:33). When we talk about mobility we refer to a broader conceptual framework which, unlike *travel* (conceptualised in the mentioned way), allows for considerations of much broader range of movement practices.

when it implies a positive academic internationalism reflected in the exchange of knowledge and the circulation of ideas, nor was it to establish a kind of hierarchy of values between mobility and stillness. Instead, the intention was to open the space for a critical consideration of the uncritical, unifying discourse of academic immobility as an aspect of wider politics of science, education¹⁹ and knowledge, which puts great emphasis on mobility as an important factor in what is vaguely defined as scientific “excellence” (of institutions and individual scientists) and an additional advantage in a quantified, precarious, competitive sphere of academic work²⁰. Such one-dimensional discourse, as the segment of a broader “transformation of movement into a fetish” (Ahmed in Robertson 2010:646) in which mobility becomes almost a buzz regards the necessity of mobility as self-evident. Along those lines it seems that taking an attitude opposite to the “myth and necessity of [mobility]” (Kovačević 2012:25) is analytically useful in a time when technology enables us to access information without the need for physical relocation²¹ (ibid.). Thus, according to Kovačević, international cooperation (and mobility) is becoming mythical and ritual²².

Finally, opposite to academic mobility (and mobility in general) is not only stillness. The consequences of discursive and professional imperative of mobility affect the concept of mobility itself. In other words, this text attempts to emphasise the fact that one-dimensional perception of mobile scientists can close the space for a critical analysis of the experience of

¹⁹ This pertains to commodified education and science (versus education and science as a public good) in the context of neoliberal capitalism, following market principles and logic (see e.g. *Academia Europaea* 2012; Callinicos 2006).

²⁰ It does not hurt to mention the paradox of the imperative of enhancing international *cooperation* (between institutions and individuals) for the purpose of increasing *competitiveness* (of an institution on the academic *market*, or of individual scientists on the *labour market*).

²¹ This refers to mobility in the context of humanities and social sciences.

²² “[mythical] because it does not contribute to the actual exchange of information in the least, which can be achieved by spending much less money and energy; and it is ritual because, apart from the ritual repetitiveness (annual conferences, etc.), there is a whole range of activities which are a reflection of statuses and power distribution but also function as an internal and external verification of the necessity of manifestations themselves” (ibid. 26).

mobility. Such a perspective could, as was pointed out here, include looking at the price scientists pay for mobility in their private life or the dimensions of mobility which are specific in terms of class, gender, generation or scientific area.

REFERENCES / LITERATURA I IZVORI

- Academia Europaea position paper on the situation of the Humanities and Social Sciences in Europe*. 2012. http://www.acadeuro.org/fileadmin/user_upload/publications/press_releases/Humanities_and_Social_Sciences_paper_to_the_Commission_Jan_2012_Fin_.pdf.
- AMIT, Vered, ed. 2000. *Constructing the field. Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary World*. London – New York: Routledge.
- AMIT, Vered and Nigel RAPPORT. 2002. *The Trouble with Community. Anthropological Reflections on Movement, Identity and Collectivity*. London: Pluto Press.
- AMIT, Vered, ed. 2007. *Going First Class? New Approaches to Privileged Travel and Movement*. New York – Oxford: Berghan Books.
- Bologna Declaration. Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education*. 1999 http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/990719BOLOGNA_DECLARATION.PDF (Accessed on 2/5/2013).
- BOURDIEU, Pierre and Loic WACQUANT. 2001. “Nova planetarna vulgata“. *Diskrepancija* 2–3:45–48. (Pierre Bourdieu and Loic Wacquant. 2001. “NewLiberalSpeak: Notes on the new planetary vulgate“. *Radical Philosophy. A Journal of Socialist and Feminist Philosophy* 105. (January/February):2–5.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. 2011. “Forms of Capital“. In *Cultural Theory: An Anthology*, ed. Imre Szeman and Timothy Kaposy. Chichester: Wiley–Blackwell.
- CALLINICOS, Alex. 2006. *Universities in a Neoliberal World*. London: Bookmarks Publications.
- CLIFFORD, James. 1997. “Travelling Cultures“. U *Routes. Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge – London: Harvard University Press.
- CRESSWELL, Tim. 2010. “Mobilities I. Catching Up“. *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 35(4):550–558.
- CRESSWELL, Tim. 2012. “Mobilities II. Still“. *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 36(5): 645–653.
- ČAPO ŽMEGAČ, Jasna, Valentina GULIN ZRNIĆ and Goran Pavel ŠANTEK (eds.). *Etnologija bliskoga. Poetika i politika suvremenih terenskih istraživanja*. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku – Naklada Jesenski i Turk.

- Decision No. 1982/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of Europe. 2006. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32006D1982:EN:HTML> (Accessed on 30/4/2013).
- DUDA, Dean. 2012. *Kultura putovanja. Uvod u književnu iterologiju*. Zagreb: Ljevak.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION. 2013. *She Figures 2012. Gender in Research and Innovation*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- GRGURINOVIĆ, Ivona. 2012. "Antropologija i putovanje: praksa i tekst". *Studia ethnologica Croatica* 24: 31–44.
- HUTNYK, John. 2004. *Bad Marxism: Capitalism and Cultural Studies*. London – Ann Arbor: Pluto Press.
- KAPLAN, Caren. 1996. *Questions of Travel. Postmodern Discourses of Displacement*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- KOVAČEVIĆ, Ivan. 2012. "O antropolozi ili koliko antropologija jeste zbir intelektualnih kvaliteta". *Etnoantropološki problemi*, n. s. 7/1:19–34.
- KULIS, Stephen and Diane SICOTTE. 2002. "Women Scientists in Academia: Geographically Constrained to Big Cities, College Clusters, or the Coasts?". *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 43/1:1–30.
- LEEMAN, Regula Julia. 2010. "Gender Inequalities in Transnational Academic Mobility and the Ideal Type of Academic Entrepreneur". *Discourse. Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, vol. 31/5:609–625.
- LONDON COMMUNIQUÉ. Towards the European Higher Education Area: responding to challenges in a globalised world. 2007 http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Declarations/London_Communique18May2007.pdf (Accessed on 3/5/2013).
- MARTIN C. 2011. "Turbulent stillness: The politics of uncertainty and the undocumented migrant". In *Stillness in a Mobile World*, ed. D. Bissell and G. Fuller. Abingdon: Routledge, 192–208.
- MILAT, Andrea. 2010. "Visoko obrazovanje u EU". H-alter. <http://www.h-alter.org/vijesti/kultura/visoko-obrazovanje-u-eu/print:true> (Accessed on 4. 5. 2013.).
- ROBERTSON, Susan L. 2010. "Critical response to Special Section: International academic mobility". *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, vol. 31/5: 641–647.
- Seventh Framework Programme (2007 to 2013)*. 2010. (http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/energy/european_energy_policy/i23022_en.htm (Accessed on 2/5/2013)).
- Sorbonne Declaration*. 1998. http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/Sorbonne_declaration.pdf (Accessed on 2/5/2013).