

HRVATSKO FILOZOFSKO DRUŠTVO
CROATIAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
KROATISCHE PHILOSOPHISCHE GESELLSCHAFT
ASSOCIAZIONE CROATA DI FILOSOFIA

21. DANI FRANE PETRIĆA
21st DAYS OF FRANE PETRIĆ
21. FRANE-PETRIĆ-TAGE
21. GIORNI DI FRANCESCO PATRIZI

GLAVNA TEMA: *Ideja sveučilišta*
MAIN THEME: *The Idea of the University*
HAUPTTHEMA: *Die Idee der Universität*
TEMA PRINCIPALE: *Idea dell' Università*

Cres, Hrvatska, 23.–26. rujna 2012.
Cres, Croatia, September 23–26, 2012
Cres, Kroatien, 23.–26. September 2012
Cherso, Croazia, 23–26 settembre 2012



STALNA TEMA: *Od Petrića do Boškovića: Hrvatski filozofi u europskom kontekstu*
REGULAR ANNUAL THEME: *From Petrić to Bošković: Croatian Philosophers in the European Context*
STÄNDIGES THEMA: *Von Petrić zu Bošković: Kroatische Philosophen im europäischen Kontext*
TEMA FISSO: *Da Petrić a Bošković: Filosofi croati nel contesto europeo*

Cres, Hrvatska, 26.–29. rujna 2012.
Cres, Croatia, September 26–29, 2012
Cres, Kroatien, 26.–29. September 2012
Cherso, Croazia, 26–29 settembre 2012

Pokrovitelji 21. *Dana Frane Petrića*

predsjednik Republike Hrvatske Ivo Josipović,
Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i sporta
Republike Hrvatske,
Ministarstvo kulture Republike Hrvatske,
Primorsko-goranska županija

Patrons of the 21st *Days of Frane Petrić*

President of the Republic of Croatia Ivo Josipović,
Ministry of Science, Education and Sports
of the Republic of Croatia,
Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia,
Primorje-Gorski Kotar County

SADRŽAJ / CONTENTS

Organizacijski odbor i programski odbori / Organization Committee and Programme Committees	7
Uvod / Introduction	9
• MISLAV JEŽIĆ, <i>Ideja sveučiliša / The Idea of the University</i>	11
• IVICA MARTINOVIĆ, <i>Od Petrića do Boškovića: Hrvatski filozofi u europskom kontekstu / From Petrić to Bošković: Croatian Philosophers in the European Context</i>	18
Program / Programme	21
• Simpozij <i>Ideja sveučilišta / The Idea of the University Symposium</i>	23
• Simpozij <i>Od Petrića do Boškovića: Hrvatski filozofi u europskom kontekstu / From Petrić to Bošković: Croatian Philosophers in the European Context Symposium</i>	37
Sažeci izlaganja / Paper abstracts	43
• Simpozij <i>Ideja sveučilišta / The Idea of the University Symposium</i>	45
• Simpozij <i>Od Petrića do Boškovića: Hrvatski filozofi u europskom kontekstu / From Petrić to Bošković: Croatian Philosophers in the European Context Symposium</i>	135
Adresar izlagača / Addresses of the speakers	181
• Simpozij <i>Ideja sveučilišta / The Idea of the University Symposium</i>	183
• Simpozij <i>Od Petrića do Boškovića: Hrvatski filozofi u europskom kontekstu / From Petrić to Bošković: Croatian Philosophers in the European Context Symposium</i>	191
Dodatak: popratni tekstovi uz simpozij <i>Ideja sveučilišta / Appendix: supplementary materials of the symposium The Idea of the University</i>	193
Donatori 21. Dana Frane Petrića / Donors of the 21st Days of Frane Petrić	239
Kronologija Dana Frane Petrića 1992.–2012. / Chronology of the Days of Frane Petrić 1992–2012	243

**Organizacijski odbor *Dana Frane Petrića* /
Organization Committee of the *Days of Frane Petrić***

Nada Gosić (Rijeka), *predsjednik/President*, Ivana Zagorac (Zagreb), *glavna tajnica/Chief Secretary*, Mira Matijević (Zagreb), *poslovna tajnica/Business Secretary*, Pavo Barišić (Zagreb/Split), Ivan Bekavac Basić (Zagreb), Igor Čatić (Zagreb), Ante Čović (Zagreb), Heda Festini (Rijeka), Ljiljana Filipas (Cres), Mislav Ježić (Zagreb), Hrvoje Jurić (Zagreb), Kristijan Jurjako (Cres), Ivan Karlić (Zagreb), Gottfried Küenzlen (München), Mislav Kukoč (Split), Nenad Malović (Zagreb), Ivica Martinović (Zagreb), Maria Muccillo (Roma), Gaetano Negovetić (Cres), Sergio Negovetić (Cres), Tomáš Nejeschleba (Olomouc), Mirjana Parat (Cres), Mirko Parat (Cres), Attila Pató (Praha), Snježana Paušek-Baždar (Zagreb), Ante Pažanin (Zagreb), Tomislav Petković (Zagreb), Milan Polić (Medulin/Zagreb), Josip Pope (Cres), Walter Salković (Cres), Ljerka Schiffler (Zagreb), Nikola Skledar (Zagreb), Nikola Stanković (Zagreb), Igor Škamperle (Ljubljana), Lenart Škof (Koper), Fulvio Šuran (Pula), Christo Todorov (Sofija), Luka Tomašević (Split), Lino Veljak (Zagreb), Dragica Vujadinović (Beograd)

**Odbori simpozija *Ideja sveučilišta* /
Committees of *The Idea of the University Symposium***

Izvršni odbor / Executive Committee: Mislav Ježić (Zagreb), *predsjednik/President*, Ivana Zagorac (Zagreb), *tajnica/Secretary*, Mira Matijević (Zagreb), *poslovna tajnica/Business Secretary*, Krešimir Babel (Zagreb), Pavo Barišić (Zagreb/Split), Igor Čatić (Zagreb), Ante Čović (Zagreb), Hrvoje Jurić (Zagreb), Tomislav Krznar (Zagreb), Mislav Kukoč (Split), Walter Salković (Cres)

Počasni odbor / Honorary Committee: Aleksa Bjeliš (Zagreb), Damir Boras (Zagreb), Ivan Cifrić (Zagreb), Lada Čale Feldman (Zagreb), Branko Despot (Zagreb), Richard Francis Gombrich (Oxford), Radoslav Katičić (Wien), Lev Kreft (Ljubljana), Gottfried Küenzlen (München), Paul Konrad Liessmann (Wien), Davor Miličić (Zagreb), Rastko Močnik (Ljubljana), Henning Ottmann (München), Vladimir Paar (Zagreb), Zoran Parać (Zagreb), Ivan Pavić (Split), Günther Pöltner (Wien), Jana Rošker (Ljubljana), Marko Trogrlić (Split), Milena Žic-Fuchs (Zagreb)

Programski odbor simpozija *Od Petrića do Boškovića: Hrvatski filozofi u europskom kontekstu* / Programme Committee of the *From Petrić to Bošković: Croatian Philosophers in the European Context Symposium*

Ivica Martinović (Zagreb), *predsjednik/President*, Bruno Čurko (Zagreb), *tajnik/Secretary*, Davor Balić (Osijek), Marin Martinić Jerčić (Zagreb), Snježana Paušek-Baždar (Zagreb)

21. DANI FRANE PETRIĆA

Uvod



21st DAYS OF FRANE PETRIĆ

Introduction

IDEJA SVEUČILIŠTA

Mislav Ježić

Predsjednik Programskoga odbora simpozija

Ideja sveučilišta

Znanstveni skup ima za svrhu raspravljati o zamisli sveučilišta u prošlosti, sadašnjosti i u budućoj perspektivi.

Universitas, pandidakterion/panepistemion, sveučilište, naziv je učilišta gdje se stječe visoka naobrazba u svim znatnim područjima znanja. Kao ustanova podjeljuje znanstvena i umjetnička zvanja koja jamče da je onaj tko ih dobije stekao primjerenu naobrazbu i osposobljenost za zahtjevna zvanja koja traže visoke stupnjeve znanstvene spremne ili umjetničke izgrađenosti.

Postojala su visoka učilišta u raznim civilizacijama. Znale su to biti svećeničke, hramske ili aristokratske, državne škole. U staroj Indiji okupljali bi se učenici oko ugledna brahmana u 2. i 1. tisućljeću pr. Khr. i učili bi od njega Vede i s njima povezane znanosti, a nauk je mogao trajati i 16 godina. Poslije su se uz neke buddhističke samostane razvila prava visoka učilišta sa stotinama profesora i tisućama studenata, kao što je bila Nālanda od razdoblja Gupta do Pāla. U Kini se visoka naobrazba utemeljila na pet konfucijanskih klasika. Za loze Han car je Wu-ti u 2. st. pr. Khr. osnovao takvu visoku školu ili »Veliku akademiju«, na kojoj se utemeljio sustav naobrazbe za mnoga kasnija stoljeća carske Kine.

Na Zapadu su uzorima učilišta za kasnija vremena postale Platonova Akademeija i Aristotelov Lykeij. Sveučilište potječe na Zapadu od sustava naobrazbe kakav se razvijao u kasnome starome vijeku, tijekom srednjega vijeka te na novovjekovnim crkvenim i svjetovnim sveučilištima. Možda se prvim europskim sveučilištem može smatrati Pandidakterion u Konstantinopolu koji je osnovao Theodosij II. 425. g. Sveučilišna naobrazba temeljila se krajem antike u zapadnoj Europi na *septem artes liberales* i u njima sačuvala u vremenima seobe naroda i stvaranja feudalnoga poretka mnoga znanja stečena u razvijenoj antici. Bitno ju je obogatilo upoznavanje s cijelim obuhvatnim Aristotelovim

znanstvenim opusom u 13. stoljeću, koje je bitno potaklo razvoj studija filozofije, teologije i znanosti. Osim toga, iz praktičnih potreba vrlo su traženi bili studiji prava i medicine na srednjovjekovnim sveučilištima, osobito na tada razvijenijem jugu Europe. Već je tada, počevši od Sveučilišta u Bologni utemeljenoga krajem 11. stoljeća, utemeljeno i načelo sveučilišne autonomije od upletanja vlasti. Ta je autonomija omogućivala da najupućeniji odlučuju o razvoju znanosti i studija, a ne politika ili vlast, i da sveučilišta sama biraju svoje profesore i primjerno naobražene čelnike. Neka su imala i svoje sudove. Nakon razdoblja elitističkih akademija u renesansi koje su podigle razinu obrazovanosti, dijelom već u 16., a osobito u 17. i 18. stoljeću, šire se ti novi standardi na znatno šire krugove studenata na sveučilištima, pri čem dijelom imaju znatnu ulogu protestantska sveučilišta, a dijelom u Europi i misioniranim dijelovima svijeta sveučilišta pod skrbi katoličke Crkve, osobito isusovaca. U 18. stoljeću prodiru prosvjetiteljski nazori u školstvo i na sveučilišta koji daju naobrazbi naglašene društvene zadaće, a u 19. stoljeću sve se više sveučilišta sekulariziraju, ali se na njemačkim sveučilištima širi reforma koju je zacrtao Wilhelm von Humboldt i koja na širini naobrazbe, ali i utemeljenosti na humanističkim antičkim mjerilima, treba omogućiti dobru naobrazbu cjelovite osobe koje će prihvatiti na sebe zadaće i odgovornosti učenjaka i znanstvenika u društvu u kojem je znanost postajala sve djelatnijim kvascem društvenoga, tehničkoga i gospodarskoga razvoja.

U 20. i početkom 21. stoljeća mnogo je reforma zahvatilo školstvo i sveučilište, i nerijetko su išle za suprotnim ciljevima: s jedne strane za višim, elitnijim znanstvenim zahtjevima, s druge za širenjem kruga obrazovanih u društvu, a s treće za služenjem potrebama razvoja gospodarstva i svega što tomu razvoju i dobiti od njega služi. S jedne je strane, slijedeći ovaj zadnji cilj sveučilišna naobrazba dobila bogatu primjenu i pridonosila koristi i razvoju gospodarstva, kako su davno zamišljali ulogu znanosti još Francis Bacon, pa i René Descartes, ali s druge je manje služila otkrivanju istine, spoznaji, i stala je stavljati znanost u položaj *ancillae æconomiae*, što joj dugoročno može iskriviti i ograničiti spoznajne domete, a isto tako i etičke standarde koje je učenjak i znanstvenik trebao poštovati na humboldtovskome sveučilištu. Današnja upletanja države i gospodarstva u rad i ustroj sveučilišta, pro-

cesi centralizacije, standardizacije i menadžerskoga upravljanja bitno mijenjaju narav sveučilišta i uloge znanstvenika u društvu. Podvrgavaju sveučilište i znanstvenike interesima vlasti i dobiti, a ugrožavajući autonomiju sveučilišta ugrožavaju i demokratska načela društva i ljudska prava poput prava na slobodu mišljenja i prava na naobrazbu. U svijetu slobodnoga tržišta i zakona dobiti sveučilišta su ugrožena i od istraživačkih instituta u vlasništvu velikih, osobito međunarodnih, korporacija. Tu znanost prestaje biti općim dobrom i postaje patentom i poslovnom tajnom. Sveučilištu se pak nudi prilika da se financijski održi služeći takvim korporacijama jer su znanstvenici na njem jeftinija, a često i bolje naobražena, radna snaga od znanstvenika u skupim privatnim institutima. Pomaže li sprega s gospodarstvom kratkoročno ili dugoročno razvoju znanosti i sveučilišta ili ga ugrožava? Kakav bi odnos između znanosti i sveučilišta s jedne strane i gospodarstva i politike s druge strane bio dugoročno najpoželjniji za društvo, najplodniji za gospodarstvo, kakav najpoticajniji za spoznaju? Kako se u tome okviru pokazuju poticajno ili ograničavajuće zamisli bolonske reforme europskih sveučilišta? Kakvu tu ulogu imaju načela autonomije sveučilišta i autonomije znanosti? Razvijaju li se brže i poželjnije države i civilizacijski krugovi u kojima vlast ili kapital upravljaju sveučilištem i znanošću i odlučuju o njem, ili oni u kojima vlast, gospodarstvo i društvo traže savjete i poticaje od najistaknutijih ustanova i predstavnika akademske zajednice da bi upućenije usmjeravali svoje političke, poslovne i društvene odluke? Imaju li sveučilišta i znanost danas neku zadaću i odgovornost o kojima može ovisiti budućnost gospodarstva, spoznaje i etičkih vrijednosti, budućnost društvene i političke zajednice, budućnost zajedničkoga javnoga dobra, slobode i održanja svijeta u kojem živimo?

To su pitanja na koja očekujemo da pokušaju ponuditi odgovore sudionici na međunarodnome znanstvenome skupu o ideji sveučilišta, koji se održava u okviru ovogodišnjih *Dana Frane Petrića*.



THE IDEA OF THE UNIVERSITY

Mislav Ježić

President of the Programme Committee
of the *Idea of the University* Symposium

The aim of this scientific conference is to discuss the idea of the university in the past, the present, and future perspectives.

Universitas, pandidakterion/panepistemion, sveučilište and *university* are names for institutions of learning where higher education is attained in all significant fields of knowledge. As an institution, it distinguishes between scientific and artistic qualifications, guaranteeing that he who receives them has attained an appropriate education and preparation for those challenging professions requiring a high level of scientific training or artistic maturity.

Institutions of higher learning have existed in numerous civilisations, and were often either priestly and temple schools or aristocratic and state schools. In ancient India, in the 2nd and 1st millennia BCE, students would gather around an eminent Brahmin and would learn from him the Vedas and those sciences connected with them. Such training could last as long as 16 years. Later, true institutions of higher learning would develop within some Buddhist monasteries, with hundreds of professors and thousands of students, an example of which being Nālanda university between the Gupta and Pāla periods. In China, higher education was founded on the five Confucian classics. In the 2nd century BCE, Emperor Wu Ti of the Han dynasty founded such an institution of higher learning, known as the »Great Academy«, upon which the education system of imperial China was based for many subsequent centuries.

In the West, Plato's Academy and Aristotle's Lyceum became the paragons of the educational institution in later times. The university began in the West as a system of education that developed in late Antiquity, throughout the Middle Ages and in Modern-Age religious and secular universities. The Pandidakterion in Constantinople, founded by Theodosius II in 425 CE, could be considered the first European university. University education in late Antiquity in Western Europe was

founded on the *septem artes liberales*, and, throughout the Migration Period and the development of the feudal system, managed to preserve much knowledge that had been attained in classical Antiquity. It was greatly enriched through the acquaintance of scholars in the 13th century with the whole of Aristotle's scientific opus, which significantly spurred the development of the study of philosophy, theology and science. Aside from this, curricula of law and medicine were highly sought after out of practical necessity at mediæval universities, especially in the relatively more developed south of Europe. The foundation of the University in Bologna in the late 11th century also brought with it the establishment of the principle of autonomy of the university from government interference. This autonomy enabled the best-informed to decide upon the development of science and study, and not politics or the government, and allowed universities to choose their own professors and suitably educated leaders – some even had their own courts. After the Renaissance, in which elitist academies raised the overall quality of education, new standards began to be applied in the 16th, and especially the 17th and 18th centuries, over a significantly wider range of university students, in part spurred on by Protestant universities and in part by universities under the wing of the Catholic church – especially the Jesuit order – both in Europe and in missionary regions of the world. In the 18th century, Enlightenment notions made headway in schooling and at universities, giving education emphatic social tasks, and during the 19th century more and more universities became secular. At this same time, reforms outlined by Wilhelm von Humboldt spread throughout German universities, based upon breadth of scientific education as well as the humanistic foundations of Antiquity, and aimed at assuring the quality education and the full development of the character of those able to assume the tasks and responsibilities of a scholar and scientist in a society where science was becoming an ever more effective catalyst of social, technical and economic development.

In the 20th and early 21st centuries, many reforms took place throughout school systems and universities, frequently at opposing purposes: on one hand, the desire for higher, more elite scientific demands, and on the other for the expansion of the numbers of the educated in society, and on yet another for serving the needs of economic development and

all else in the service of such development and the profit it brings. On one hand, the latter has put university education to use in numerous ways and benefitted the development of the economy, just as Francis Bacon and even René Descartes imagined so long ago. On the other, however, this education has been less in the service of discovering and understanding the truth, and has begun to place science in the position of *ancilla æconomiae*, which can in the long term distort and limit both the range of its discoveries and the ethical standards that scholars and scientists should respect at a Humboldtian university. Modern-day interference of the state and economy in the work and organisation of the university, processes of centralisation, standardisation and management are significantly altering the nature of the university and the role of the scientist in society. They place universities and scientists in the service of power and profit, and by endangering the autonomy of the university, they endanger the democratic principles of society and human rights, such as the right to free thought and the right to education. In the world of free-market economics and the laws of profit, universities are also in danger from research institutes owned by large, especially international corporations. Here science ceases to be a public good, transforming instead into patents and business secrets. Universities are even offered the opportunity to survive financially by serving such corporations, since university scientists are a cheaper and often better-educated work force than those at expensive, private institutes. Does this union with business aid the development of the university in the short- and long-term or endanger it? What kind of relationship between the sciences and universities on one side and economics and politics on the other would be the best for society and the most profitable for the economy in the long-term, and what kind would provide the highest impetus for discovering and understanding the truth? Has the concept of the Bologna university reform of European universities in this light proven stimulative or limiting? What roles do the principles of university and scientific autonomy play here? Which states and cultural spheres develop faster and more desirably – those in which politics and capital control universities and the sciences and decide on them, or those in which politics, the economy and society seek advice and stimulus from the most eminent institutions and representatives of the academic community in order to better

direct their political, economic and social decisions? Do universities and the sciences today have a particular task and responsibility that is potentially vital to the future of the economy, knowledge and ethical values, the future of the social and political community, the future of the common good, vital to freedom and the maintenance of the world in which we live?

These are the questions we invite the participants to try to answer in their contributions to the international conference on the idea of university, which takes place within the framework of the *Days of Frane Petrić* in Cres in September 23–26, 2012. We invite you to contribute to inquiry into the theme and thereby to the fruitfulness of the conference.

OD PETRIĆA DO BOŠKOVIĆA: HRVATSKI FILOZOFI U EUROPSKOM KONTEKSTU

Ivica Martinović

Predsjednik Programskog odbora simpozija

Od Petrića do Boškovića: Hrvatski filozofi u europskom kontekstu

Lani, prigodom 300. obljetnice rođenja polihistora Ruđera Boškovića, naš je simpozij bio naslovljen »Od Petrića do Boškovića: Mijene u filozofiji prirode«. Zbog iskazanog interesa i ove će godine simpozij biti usmjeren na Petrića i Boškovića, ali je naslov, na temelju prošlogodišnjega iskustva, proširen: »Od Petrića do Boškovića: Hrvatski filozofi u europskom kontekstu«.

Međunarodni simpozij »Od Petrića do Boškovića: Hrvatski filozofi u europskom kontekstu« u sklopu 21. *Dana Frane Petrića* želi poslužiti istraživačima da izlože rezultate svojih istraživanja i doprinesu točnijoj prosudbi o ulozi i značenju Petrićeve misli u renesansnom kontekstu, a Boškovićeve filozofije u kontekstu 18. stoljeća. Simpozij je naročito otvoren multidisciplinarnim i poredbenim aspektima djela hrvatskih filozofa od 16. do 18. stoljeća. U tom su smislu primjerene ove istraživačke teme:

0. život, rukopisi i tiskana djela Frane Petrića i Ruđera Boškovića;
1. obilježja, značenje i dometi njihovih izvornih uvida;
2. izvori Petrićeve i Boškovićeve misli;
3. Petrićev i Boškovićev doprinos različitim filozofskim disciplinama, napose filozofiji prirode i filozofiji znanosti;
4. Petrićevi i Boškovićevi doprinosi matematici i prirodnim znanostima;
5. Petrićevi i Boškovićevi doprinosi tehničkim znanostima;
6. Petrićevi i Boškovićevi doprinosi humanističkim znanostima;
7. poredbene prosudbe Petrićevih i Boškovićevih zamisli;
8. recepcija Petrićeva i Boškovićeva djela, kako ona raznolika među suvremenicima, tako i kasnija koja odjekuje stoljećima.

Time, dakako, nije ograničen krug tema koje se mogu prijaviti za izlaganje na simpoziju »Od Petrića do Boškovića«. I Petrić i Bošković zaslužuju biti obrađeni kao polihistori. Što vrijedi za najveće, vrijedi i za sve ostale hrvatske filozofe: i njihova djela zaslužuju da budu istražena.



FROM PETRIĆ TO BOŠKOVIĆ: CROATIAN PHILOSOPHERS IN THE EUROPEAN CONTEXT

Ivica Martinović

President of the Programme Committee of the

*From Petrić to Bošković: Croatian Philosophers in the European
Context Symposium*

Last year, during the 300th anniversary of the birth polymath Ruđer Bošković, our symposium was entitled “From Petrić to Bošković: Changes in the Philosophy of Nature”. Because of the interest shown for last year symposium, this year symposium will be focused on Petrić and Bošković, but the title will be changed based on the experience from last year, this year title will be expanded: “From Petrić to Bošković: Croatian Philosophers in the European Context”.

The aim of the international “From Petrić to Bošković: Croatian Philosophers in the European Context” symposium within the framework of the 21st *Days of Frane Petrić* is to serve as a forum for research result presentation and contribution to a more detailed and accurate analysis of both the role and significance of Petrić’s thought within the context of the Renaissance, and Bošković’s philosophy within the context of the 18th century. Accordingly, the following research topics are appropriate:

0. The life, manuscripts and printed work of Frane Petrić and Ruđer Bošković;
1. The features import and reach of their original insights;

2. The sources of Petrić's and Bošković's thoughts;
3. Petrić's and Bošković's contribution to diverse philosophical disciplines and the philosophies of nature and science in particular;
4. Petrić's and Bošković's contribution to mathematics and the natural sciences;
5. Petrić's and Bošković's contribution to technical sciences;
6. Petrić's and Bošković's contribution to Humanities;
7. Comparative analyses of Petrić's and Bošković's ideas;
8. The reception of Petrić's and Bošković's work, both by their contemporaries and the centuries ahead to date.

This, naturally, does not limit the topics that can be submitted to the symposium "From Petrić to Bošković: Croatian Philosophers in the European Context". Petrić and Bošković deserve to be treated as men of many talents, as polymaths. What is true for the most famous Croatian philosophers, its true for all other Croatian philosophers; their works deserve to be explored.

21. DANI FRANE PETRIĆA

Program



21st DAYS OF FRANE PETRIĆ

Programme

Simpozij
IDEJA SVEUČILIŠTA
Symposium
THE IDEA OF THE UNIVERSITY

NEDJELJA, 23. rujna 2012. / SUNDAY, September 23, 2012

Dolazak i smještaj sudionika u hotel *Kimen* u Cresu /
Arrival and accommodation of participants at *Kimen* Hotel, Cres

19:30 *Piće dobrodošlice / Welcome drink*

20:00 *Večera / Dinner*

PONEDJELJAK, 24. rujna 2012. / MONDAY, September 24, 2012

9:00–10:00 Otvaranje skupa i pozdravne riječi /
Opening ceremony and welcoming speeches

UVODNA RASPRAVA ::: INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION

Sekcija A (Engleski) ::: Section A (English)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: PAVO BARIŠIĆ

10:00–11:00 RICHARD F. GOMBRICH (United Kingdom/Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo) & MISLAV JEŽIĆ (Croatia/Hrvatska), The Idea of the University / Ideja sveučilišta

11:00–11:30 *Pauza / Break*

Sekcija A (Hrvatski) ::: Section A (Croatian)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: LEV KREFT

11:30–11:45 LINO VELJAK (Hrvatska/Kroatien), Visoko obrazovanje na tržištu / Hochschulwesen auf den Markt

11:45–12:00 TONČI KOKIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Industrijalizacija sveučilišta i dehumanizacija / Industrialisation of the University and Dehumanisation

12:00–12:15 ALEN TAFRA (Hrvatska/Croatia), Humanističke znanosti između neoliberalne globalizacije i kritike eurocentrizma / The Humanities between Neoliberal Globalization and the Critique of Eurocentrism

12:15–12:30 HAJRUDIN HROMADŽIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Sveučilište, visoko obrazovanje i neoliberalna hegemonija / University, Higher Education, and Neoliberal Hegemony

12:30–13:00 *Rasprava / Discussion*

Sekcija B (Hrvatski) ::: Section B (Croatian)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: NENAD MALOVIĆ

11:30–11:45 TOMISLAV PETKOVIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), *Parcijalne* prosudbe o bolonjskoj reformi na Sveučilištu u Zagrebu i osvrt na Humboldtovu *ideju* sveučilišta / *Partial Assessments of the Bologna Reform at the University of Zagreb and Recall of the Humboldtian Idea of University*

11:45–12:00 KAREL TURZA (Srbija/Serbia), Zašto je univerzitet još uvijek važan? Osobno iskustvo / Why Is University Still Important? A Personal Experience

12:00–12:15 AMINA ISANOVIĆ (Bosna i Hercegovina/Bosnia and Herzegovina), Poimanje ideje obrazovanja unutar univerzitetskog prostora u kontekstu filozofije obrazovanja R. S. Petersa / The Idea of Education within the University Context as Reflected in R. S. Peters' Philosophy of Education

12:15–12:30 BUDISLAV VUKAS, ml. (Hrvatska/Croatia), Pravna povijest u kurikulumima hrvatskih pravnih studija – od imperativa dezideologiziranog i demokratskog pristupa ranih devedesetih do prvih »bolonjskih« iskustava /

Legal History in the Curricula of the Croatian Legal Studies – From the Imperative of Disideologised and Democratic Approach in the Early 1990s to the First “Bologna” Experiences

12:00–12:30 *Rasprava / Discussion*

Sekcija C (Engleski) ::: Section C (English)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: ESTELLA PETRIĆ-BAJLO

11:30–11:45 VALENTINA KANEVA (Bulgaria/Bugarska), Science and Ethics: Some Remarks on the Development of Knowledge and Human Development / Znanost i etika: neke napomene o razvoju znanja i ljudskom razvoju

11:45–12:00 BÉLA MESTER (Hungary/Mađarska), “System” in Philosophy as a Consequence of the Institutional Context of Universities / »Sustav« u filozofiji kao posljedica institucionalnog konteksta sveučilišta

12:00–12:15 BOJAN ŽALEC (Slovenia/Slovenija), Mass Higher Education, Its Effects and Value / Masovno visoko obrazovanje, njegovi učinci i vrijednosti

12:15–12:30 SREČKO GAJOVIĆ (Croatia/Hrvatska), Scientific Journals and University / Znanstveni časopisi i sveučilište

12:00–12:30 *Rasprava / Discussion*

13:00 *Ručak / Lunch*

14:00 Obilazak grada Cresa uz stručno vodstvo /
A sightseeing tour of the town of Cres with professional tour guide

Sekcija A (Hrvatski) ::: Section A (Croatian)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: LINO VELJAK

16:00–16:15 IGOR ČATIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Koji su stvarni ciljevi bolonjskog procesa? / Which Are the Real Objectives of the Bologna Process?

16:15–16:30 NEBOJŠA VASIĆ (Bosna i Hercegovina/Bosnia and Herzegovina), Bolonjski proces – rekvijem sveučilišne ideje / Bologna Process – Requiem of the University Idea

16:30–16:45 ZLATAN DELIĆ, HARIZ ŠARIĆ (Bosna i Hercegovina/Bosnia and Herzegovina), Mogućnost kritike Bolonjskog sustava obrazovanja u Bosni i Hercegovini iz perspektive održivog razvoja / The Possibility of Criticism of the Bologna Education System in Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Perspective of Sustainable Development

16:45–17:00 NUSRET ISANOVIĆ (Bosna i Hercegovina/Bosnia and Herzegovina), Ideja suvremenog islamskog univerziteta / The Idea of Modern Islamic University

17:00–17:30 *Rasprava / Discussion*

17:30–18:00 *Pauza / Break*

Predsjedava / Chairperson: IRIS TIĆAC

18:00–18:15 ŽELJKO ŠKULJEVIĆ (Bosna i Hercegovina/Bosnia and Herzegovina), Od alfabeta do akademije / From Alphabet to Academy

18:15–18:30 ZORAN DIMIĆ (Srbija/Serbien), Univerzitet i uživanje / Universität und Lust

18:30–18:45 JOSIP OSLIĆ (Hrvatska/Kroatien), *Integritas i universitas*. Skolastičke pretpostavke ozbiljenja ideje sveučilišta / *Integritas und Universitas*. Scholastische Voraussetzungen der Verwirklichung der Universitätsidee

18:45–19:00 BORISLAV DADIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Uloga rasprave (*disputatio*) u razvoju sveučilišta u Srednjem vijeku / The Roll of Discussion (*Disputatio*) in the Development of the Middle Age Universities

19:00–19:30 *Rasprava / Discussion*

Sekcija B (Hrvatski) ::: Section B (Croatian)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: BORISLAV DADIĆ

16:00–16:15 MARINA PRAŽETINA (Hrvatska/Croatia), Znanost u međunarodnom kontekstu / Science in the International Context

16:15–16:30 RAJKA ŠVRLJUGA (Hrvatska/Croatia), Objektivnost znanosti / Objectivity of Science

16:30–16:45 SANDRA RADENOVIĆ (Srbija/Serbia), »Novi Univerzitet« i orijentacijsko znanje – neka razmatranja / “New University” and Orientation Knowledge – Certain Considerations

16:45–17:00 KREŠIMIR CEROVAC (Hrvatska/Croatia), Transdisciplinarni pristup u učenju i istraživanju na sveučilištu / Transdisciplinary Approach to Teaching and Research at the University

17:00–17:30 *Rasprava / Discussion*

17:30–18:00 *Pauza / Break*

Predsjedava / Chairperson: JANEZ VODIČAR

18:00–18:15 IVANA ZAGORAC (Hrvatska/Croatia), Kritičko mišljenje i sustav obrazovanja / Critical Thinking and Educational System

18:15–18:30 MARIJA LAMOT (Hrvatska/Croatia), Gimnazija – priprema za sveučilište / Gymnasium – Preparation for University

18:30–18:45 BRUNO ČURKO (Hrvatska/Croatia), John Henry Newman i kritičko mišljenje na sveučilištima / John Henry Newman and Critical Thinking at Universities

18:45–19:00 MAJA POLJAK (Hrvatska/Croatia), Newmanovo shvaćanje sveučilišta / Newman’s Understanding of University

19:00–19:30 *Rasprava / Discussion*

Sekcija C (Njemački i hrvatski) ::: Section C (German & Croatian)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: GOTTFRIED KÜENZLEN

16:00–16:15 PAVO BARIŠIĆ (Kroatien/Hrvatska), Ist Bildung eine Voraussetzung für Demokratie? Von der Entmündigung des Bürgers durch Universitätsreform / Je li naobrazba pretpostavka demokracije? O stavljanju građanina pod skrbništvo putem reforme sveučilišta

16:15–16:30 NENAD MALOVIĆ (Kroatien/Hrvatska), Ort und Rolle der Geisteswissenschaften an der Universität / Mjesto i uloga humanističkih znanosti na sveučilištu

16:30–16:45 IRIS TIĆAC (Kroatien/Hrvatska), Dietrich von Hildebrands Idee der katholischen Universität und ihre Bedeutung heute / Diethrich von Hildebrandova ideja katoličkog sveučilišta i njeno značenje danas

16:45–17:15 *Rasprava / Discussion*

17:15–18:00 *Pauza / Break*

Predsjedava / Chairperson: SANDRA RADENOVIĆ

18:00–18:15 DAMIR KUKIĆ (Bosna i Hercegovina/Bosnia and Herzegovina), Sveučilište kao tvrđava / University as a Fortress

18:15–18:30 SPAHIJA KOZLIĆ (Bosna i Hercegovina/Bosnia and Herzegovina), Univerzitet između neopozitivizma i antiempirizma / University between Neo-Positivism and Anti-Empirism

18:30–18:45 MATKO MEŠTROVIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Može li preživjeti? / Can It Survive?

18:45–19:00 FULVIO ŠURAN (Hrvatska/Croatia), Ustrojstvo sveučilišta na određenom području za novi milenij / The Idea of University in a Particular Territory for the New Millennium

19:00–19:30 *Rasprava / Discussion*

20:00 *Večera / Dinner*

21:00 MISLAV KUKOČ (Croatia/Hrvatska), In Memory on Nikola Skledar (1942–2011): Philosopher, Cultural Anthropologist and Sociologist of Religion / U spomen Nikoli Skledaru (1942–2011): filozofu, kulturnom antropologu i sociologu religije

UTORAK, 25. rujna 2012. / TUESDAY, September 25, 2012

PLENARNO PREDAVANJE ::: PLENARY LECTURE
Sekcija A (Engleski) ::: Section A (English)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: MISLAV KUKOČ

9:30–10:00 LEV KREFT (Slovenia/Slovenija), University as Enterprise / Sveučilište kao poduzeće

10:00–10:15 *Pauza / Break*

Sekcija A (Hrvatski) ::: Section A (Croatian)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: RASTKO MOČNIK

10:15–10:30 RADOMIR VIDENović (Srbija/Serbia), Ideja sveučilišta i akademska sloboda / The Idea of University and Academic Freedom

10:30–10:45 HRVOJE JURić (Hrvatska/Croatia), Sveučilište i kapitalizam / University and Capitalism

10:45–11:00 ENIS ZEBić (Hrvatska/Croatia), Mediji: između vlasti, profita i javnog interesa / Media: Between Authorities, Profit and Public Interest

11:00–11:15 DIJANA ĆURKOVIĆ, ANITA LUNIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Sveučilište budućnosti / University of the Future

11:15–11:45 *Rasprava / Discussion*

11:45–12:00 *Pauza / Break*

Studentska sekcija ::: Students' section

Predsjedava / Chairperson: HRVOJE JURIĆ

12:00–12:15 LUKA MATIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Sveučilište: od spekulacije do krize / University: From Speculation to Crisis

12:15–12:30 FILIP ŠIPOŠ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Autonomija sveučilišta: teret ili temelj? / Autonomy of University: Burden or Fundament?

12:30–12:45 JURICA MLINAREC, IVANA RAMIĆ, MARTINA TOPALOVIC (Hrvatska/Croatia), Studentska borba za autonomiju sveučilišta – direktna demokracija / Students' Fight for the Autonomy of University – Direct Democracy

12:45–13:15 *Rasprava / Discussion*

Sekcija B (Hrvatski) ::: Section B (Croatian)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: IGOR ČATIĆ

10:15–10:30 NEDILJKO MATIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Sveučilište u e-društvu / The University in e-Society

10:30–10:45 DRAGAN ČALOVIĆ (Srbija/Serbia), Izazovi obrazovnome procesu u doba medijske kulture / The Challenges to the Educational Process at the Time of Media Culture

10:45–11:00 DIVNA VUKSANOVIĆ (Srbija/Serbia), Prilog kritici koncepta »Kreativnog univerziteta« / Contribution to the Critique of the concept of "Creative University"

11:00–11:15 IRFAN HOŠIĆ (Bosna i Hercegovina/Bosnia and Herzegovina), Joseph Beuys i Free International University / Joseph Beuys and the Free International University

11:15–11:45 *Rasprava / Discussion*

11:45–12:00 *Pauza / Break*

Predsjedava / Chairperson: JOSIP OSLIĆ

12:00–12:15 NENAD DAKOVIĆ (Srbija/Serbia), Poslije filozofije (poslije univerziteta) / Nach der Philosophie (nach der Universität)

12:15–12:30 JADRANKA BOŽIĆ (Srbija/Serbia), Postoje li još svetišta kulture i znanosti? / Are There Any Temples of Culture and Science?

12:30–12:45 VANI ROŠČIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Sveučilište i kultura / University and Culture

12:45–13:15 *Rasprava / Discussion*

Sekcija C (Engleski) :: Section C (English)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: TOMISLAV PETKOVIĆ

10:15–10:30 MERIÇ BILGIÇ (Turkey/Turska), The Logical Limits, and the Ontological Principle of the Idea of University / Logička ograničenja i ontološki princip ideje sveučilišta

10:30–10:45 JANEZ VODIČAR (Slovenia/Slovenija), University: A Place of Formation of Achievers or Thinkers? / Sveučilište: mjesto formacije izvrsnika ili mislilaca?

10:45–11:00 ANTON MLINAR (Slovenia/Slovenija), John Henry Newman on a University: Actuality of a 160 Years Old Discourse / John Henry Newman na sveučilištu: aktualnost diskursa starog 160 godina

11:00–11:15 DAFNE VIDANEC (Croatia/Hrvatska), The Need for Ethical Education: Implementation of the Ethical Knowledge in the Higher Economics Education / Potreba za etičkim obrazovanjem: Implementacija etičkog znanja u visokoškolskom, ekonomski profiliranom obrazovanju

11:15–11:45 *Rasprava / Discussion*

11:45–12:00 *Pauza / Break*

Predsjedava / Chairperson: ANTON MLINAR

12:00–12:15 HASAN BÜLENT GÖZKAN (Turkey/Turska), The Constitution of the Philosophy Department in Modern Turkey as a Case Study of an Authoritarian Intervention of the State / Ustroj odsjeka za filozofiju u modernoj Turskoj kao studija slučaja autoritarne intervencije države

12:15–12:30 FILIP KOVAČEVIĆ (Montenegro/Crna Gora), Michel Onfray and the People's University in the 21st Century / Michel Onfray i Narodni univerzitet u 21. stoljeću

12:30–12:45 ESTELLA PETRIĆ-BAJLO, VESNA UKIĆ-KOŠTA (Croatia/Hrvatska), Campus Novel and the Idea of Humiversity / Akademski roman i ideja humiverziteta

12:45–13:15 *Rasprava / Discussion*

13:15 *Ručak / Lunch*

14:00 Sastanak Organizacijskog odbora *Dana Frane Petrića* / Meeting of the Organization Committee of the *Days of Frane Petrić*

16:00 *Izlet / Excursion*

19:00 Javno predavanje u Osnovnoj školi Frane Petrića, Grad Cres / Public lecture in Frane Petrić Elementary School, Town of Cres
IGOR ČATIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Sve je više kiborga među nama / Cyborgs Are among Us

20:00 *Večera / Dinner*

21:00 Predstavljanje knjiga / Book presentation
(Engleski i hrvatski / English & Croatian)

Moderator: Krešimir Babel

▪ Mislav Kukoč (ur./ed.), *Filozofija i globalizacija / Philosophy and Globalization*, Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo, Zagreb 2011.

Predstavljajući / Presenters: Mislav Kukoč, Gottfried Küenzlen

▪ Stjepan Špoljarić, *Ars historica Frane Petrića / Frane Petrić's Ars Historica*, Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo, Zagreb 2012.

Predstavljatelj / Presenter: Estella Petrić-Bajlo

▪ Pavao Vuk-Pavlović, *Pjesme i aforizmi / Poems and Aphorisms*, Biblioteka *Sabrana djela Pavla Vuk-Pavlovića*, knjiga 6 / *Collected Works of Pavao Vuk-Pavlović*, Vol. 6, Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo, Zagreb 2012.

Predstavljatelj / Presenter: Radomir Videnović

Sekcija A (Hrvatski) ::: Section A (Croatian)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: SPAHIJA KOZLIĆ

9:30–9:45 IVANA KNEŽIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Hobbesova kritika sveučilišta / Hobbes' Critique of University

9:45–10:00 IGOR ETEROVIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Kantova ideja univerziteta / Kant's Idea of University

10:00–10:15 NENAD CEKIĆ (Srbija/Serbia), Utilitarizam i ideja sveučilišta / Utilitarianism and the Idea of University

10:15–10:30 ALEKSANDAR DOBRIJEVIĆ, PREDRAG KRSTIĆ (Srbija/Serbia), Samoobrazovanje i univerzitet / Self-Education and University

10:30–10:45 ANTE ČOVIĆ (Hrvatska/Kroatien), Neoliberalni totalitarizam kao zatiranje javnog dobra / Neoliberaler Totalitarismus als Zerstörung des öffentlichen Gutes

10:45–11:15 *Rasprava / Discussion*

11:15–11:30 *Pauza / Break*

Sekcija B (Hrvatski) ::: Section B (Croatian)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: VANI ROŠČIĆ

9:30–9:45 TOMISLAV KRZNAR (Hrvatska/Croatia), Obrazovanje narodâ i misija sveučilišta. Misao Ortege y Gasset / Education of Peoples and the Mission of the University. Thought of Ortega Y Gasset

9:45–10:00 IVAN PEKLIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Franjo Marković: Sveučilište kao duhovna lađa naroda / Franjo Marković: University as a Spiritual Vessel of the Nation

10:00–10:15 NENAD VERTOVŠEK (Hrvatska/Croatia), Smisao učenja i prenošenja znanja – susret istoka i zapada u vizijama Hermana Hessea / The Meaning of Learning and Knowledge Transfer – A Meeting of East and West in Visions of Herman Hesse

10:15–10:30 IVAN ZELIĆ (Hrvatska/Croatia), Logika na Katoličkom sveučilištu u Lublinu / Logic at the Catholic University of Lublin

10:30–11:00 *Rasprava / Discussion*

11:00–11:30 *Pauza /Break*

Sekcija C (Engleski) :: Section C (English)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: BOJAN ŽALEC

9:30–9:45 MARCEL V. MĂCELARU (Croatia/Hrvatska), The Bible as a Document of the University / Biblija kao dokument sveučilišta

9:45–10:00 CORNELIU CONSTANTINEANU (Romania/Rumunjska), Faith and Learning: Re-Visiting the Idea of Christian University / Vjera i učenje: preispitivanje ideje kršćanskog sveučilišta

10:00–10:15 LUKA ILIĆ (Germany/Njemačka), Matthias Flacius Illyricus as a Teacher at the Early Modern Lutheran Universities of Wittenberg and Jena / Matija Vlačić Ilirik kao profesor na ranonovovjekovnim evangeličkim sveučilištima u Wittenbergu i Jeni

10:15–10:30 ALEKSANDRA MAKSIĆ (The Netherlands/Nizozemska), University Visva-Bharati; Tagore's Open Education / Univerzitet Visva-Bharati; Tagorino otvoreno obrazovanje

10:30–11:00 *Rasprava / Discussion*

11:00–11:30 *Pauza /Break*

PLENARNA PREDAVANJA ::: PLENARY LECTURES
Sekcija A (Engleski) ::: Section A (English)

Predsjedava / Chairperson: MISLAV JEŽIĆ

11:30–12:00 RASTKO MOČNIK (Slovenia/Slovenija), The Rise of Higher Education – The Fall of University? / Uspon visokog školstva – zalazak sveučilišta?

12:00–12:30 VLADIMIR PAAR (Croatia/Hrvatska), The 21st Century University and the Basic Knowledge / 21. stoljeće i temeljna znanja

12:30–13:00 Završna rasprava i zatvaranje simpozija /
Closing discussion and closing of the Symposium

13:00 *Ručak / Lunch*

15:00 Polazak organiziranog autobusa za Zagreb /
Departure of organized bus to Zagreb

19. simpozij
OD PETRIĆA DO BOŠKOVIĆA:
HRVATSKI FILOZOFI U EUROPSKOM KONTEKSTU

19th Symposium
FROM PETRIĆ TO BOŠKOVIĆ:
CROATIAN PHILOSOPHERS IN THE EUROPEAN CONTEXT

SRIJEDA, 26. rujna 2012. / WEDNESDAY, September 26, 2012

Dolazak i smještaj sudionika u hotel *Kimen* u Cresu /
Arrival and accommodation of participants at *Kimen* Hotel, Cres

19:30 *Piće dobrodošlice / Welcome drink*

20:00 *Večera / Dinner*

21:00 Predstavljanje knjige / Book presentation

Ivica Martinović, *Ruđer Bošković and the Royal Society* (London: Royal Society, 2011)

Sudjeluju / Participants: Blanka Jergović, Snježana Paušek-Baždar, Ivica Martinović

ČETVRTAK, 27. rujna 2012. / THURSDAY, September 27, 2012

9:00–9:30 Otvaranje skupa i pozdravne riječi /
Opening ceremony and welcoming speeches

Predsjedavaju / Chairpersons: IVICA MARTINOVIĆ & BRUNO ĆURKO

9:30–10:15 Uvodno predavanje / Introductory lecture

Predsjedavaju / Chairpersons: IVICA MARTINOVIĆ & MARIN MARTINIĆ JERČIĆ

ERNA BANIĆ-PAJNIĆ (Zagreb), »Amor – copula mundi«: renesansni traktati o ljubavi (Ficino, Petrić, Gučetić) / “Amor – copula mundi”: Renaissance Tracts on Love (Ficino, Petrić, Gučetić)

10:15–10:30 *Rasprava / Discussion*

10:30–10:45 *Odmor / Break*

10:45–11:30 Od Petrića do de Dominisa: Tri kasnorenesansne teme u djelima hrvatskih filozofa / From Petrić to de Dominis: Three Late Renaissance Topics in the Works of Croatian Philosophers

Predsjedavaju / Chairpersons: MIHAELA GIRARDI-KARŠULIN & ERIKA ZLATKOV

IVANA SKUHALA KARASMAN (Zagreb), Usporedba Picova i Skalićeva razumijevanja kršćanske kabale / The Comparison of Pico’s and Skalić’s Understanding of Christian Cabala

MONIKA JURIĆ (Zagreb), Glazba i metafizika: neoplatoničke ideje o glazbi u djelu *Dialogo della bellezza* (1581) Nikole Vitova Gučetića / Music and Metaphysics: Neoplatonic Ideas on Music in *Dialogo della bellezza* (1581) by Nikola Vitov Gučetić

SNJEŽANA PAUŠEK-BAŽDAR (Zagreb), Sličnosti i razlike Petrićevih i de Dominisovih pogleda o strukturi tvari / Similarities and Differences between Petrić’s Views of the Structure of Matter and Those of de Dominis

11:30–11:45 *Rasprava / Discussion*

11:45–12:00 *Odmor / Break*

12:00 Predstavljanje knjige / Book presentation

Ivica Martinović, *Ruđer Bošković e il Collegio Romano*, prevela / translated by Jelena Poklepović (Zagreb: Filozofsko-teološki institut Družbe Isusove & Institut za filozofiju, 2011)

Sudjeluju / Participants: Snježana Husić, Mijo Korade, Ivica Martinović

13:00 *Ručak / Lunch*

16:00 Obilazak grada Cresa uz stručno vodstvo /
A sightseeing tour of the town of Cres with professional tour guide

19:00 Predstavljanje knjige / Book presentation

Franciscus Patricius / Frane Petrić, *Zoroaster et eius CCCXX oracula Chaldaica / Zoroaster i njegovih tristo i dvadeset kaldejskih proroštava*, transkribirao i preveo / transcribed and translated by Ivan Kapec, uredila / edited by Erna Banić-Pajnić (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2011)

Sudjeluju / Participants: Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin, Ivica Martinović, Erna Banić-Pajnić

20:00 *Večera / Dinner*

PETAK, 28. rujna 2012. / FRIDAY, September 28, 2012

9:00–9:45 Petrićevi putevi prema sreći /
Petrić's Paths towards Happiness

Predsjedavaju / Chairpersons: SNJEŽANA PAUŠEK-BAŽDAR & MONIKA JURIC

MIJO KORADE (Zagreb), Kršćanski ideal sreće u *Sretnom gradu* Frane Petrića u kontekstu europske i hrvatske misli 16. i 17. stoljeća / Christian Ideal of Happiness in Frane Petrić's *La città felice* Within the Context of European and Croatian Thought of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century

ERIKA ZLATKOV (Koper), Petrićev odnos prema prirodi u gradu iz perspektive njegova djela *La città felice* / Petrić's Attitude to Nature in the City from the Perspective of His *La città felice*

HEDA FESTINI (Rijeka), Petrićeva *La decia semisacra* kao moguće kodificiranje morala / *La decia semisacra* di Petrić come il possibile codificazione per la morale

9:45–10:00 *Rasprava / Discussion*

10:00–10:15 *Odmor / Break*

10:15–10:45 Petrićeve *Discussiones peripateticae* /
Petrić's *Discussiones peripateticae*

Predsjedavaju / Chairpersons: ERNA BANIĆ-PAJNIĆ & JAN ČIŽEK

OLGA PERIĆ (Zagreb), Odnos glagolskih oblika grčkog i latinskog jezika u Petrićevu prijevodu iz *Discussiones peripateticae* / The Relationship between Greek and Latin Verb Forms in *Discussiones peripateticae* of Franciscus Patricius

ĆIRIL ČOH (Varaždin), Petrićevo razumijevanje Platonova περιαιγωγῆ τῆς ψυχῆς (Resp. 521.c.5–8) / Petrić's Understanding of περιαιγωγῆ τῆς ψυχῆς (Plato, Resp. 521c.5–8)

10:45–11:00 *Rasprava / Discussion*

11:00–11:15 *Odmor / Break*

11:15–11:45 Petrić i Aristotelova *Metafizika* /
Petrić and Aristotle's *Metaphysics*

Predsjedavaju / Chairpersons: OLGA PERIĆ & SNJEŽANA HUSIĆ

ANTICA-NADA ĆEPULIĆ (Zagreb), Transliteracija grčkog rukopisa (Pseudo-)Filoponova *Komentara* Aristotelove *Metafizike* / The Transliteration of the Greek Manuscript of *Commentary* on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* by (Pseudo-)Philoponus

MIHAELA GIRARDI-KARŠULIN (Zagreb), Petrić i (Pseudo-)Filopon / Petrić and (Pseudo-)Philoponus

11:45–12:00 *Rasprava / Discussion*

13:00 *Ručak / Lunch*

18:30 Predstavljanje knjiga / Book presentation

Franciscus Patricius, *Discussionum peripateticarum tomus quartus (liber I–V)* / Frane Petrić, *Peripatetičke rasprave: Svezak četvrti (Knjiga I.–V.)*, transkribirao / transcribed by Tomislav Ćepulić, preveli / translated by Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin & Ivan Kapec, filološka redakтура / philological editing by Olga Perić, priredili / edited by Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin, Ivica Martinović & Olga Perić (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2012).

Franciscus Patricius, *Discussionum peripateticarum tomus quartus (liber VI–X)* / Frane Petrić, *Peripatetičke rasprave: Svezak četvrti (Knjiga VI.–X.)*, transkribirao /

transcribed by Tomislav Čepulić, prevela / translated by Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin, filološka redakтура / philological editing by Olga Perić, priredili / edited by Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin, Ivica Martinović & Olga Perić (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju, 2012).

Sudjeluju / Participants: Ivica Martinović, Erna Banić-Pajnić, Olga Perić, Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin

20:00 *Večera / Dinner*

21:00 Petrić i Bošković u digitalnom svijetu /
Petrić and Bošković in the Digital World

Predsjedavaju / Chairpersons: MIJO KORADE & IVANA SKUHALA
KARASMAN

BRUNO ĆURKO (Zagreb), Prisutnost Frane Petrića u digitalnom svijetu / The Presence of Frane Petrić in the Digital World

IVICA MARTINOVIĆ (Zagreb) & MARIN MARTINIĆ JERČIĆ (Zagreb),
Od Priestleya do Faradaya: Kako je digitalizirana rana recepcija Boškovićeve prirodne filozofije na Britanskom otočju (1772–1855) / From Priestley to Faraday: Digitisation of the Early Reception of Bošković's Natural Philosophy on the British Isles (1772–1855)

SUBOTA, 29. rujna 2012. / SATURDAY, September 29, 2012

9:00–9:45 Bošković u europskom kontekstu /
Bošković in the European Context

Predsjedavaju / Chairpersons: BLANKA JERGOVIĆ & ANTICA-NADA ČEPULIĆ
FRANJO SOKOLIĆ (Split), Ruđer Bošković između Newtona i Leibniza /
Ruđer Bošković between Newton and Leibniz

PERSIDA LAZAREVIĆ DI GIACOMO (Chieti-Pescara), Od Mjeseca do 'Mjesečara': Putanja Ruđera Boškovića kroz engleske intelektualne klubove / From Luna to 'Lunar Men': Ruđer Bošković's Path Through English Intellectual Clubs

IVICA MARTINOVIĆ (Zagreb), Recepcija Boškovićeve prirodne filozofije u tezarijima Leopolda Biwalda, Pála Makóa i Ivana Krstitelja Horvatha (1765–1777) /

The Reception of Bošković's Natural Philosophy in the Thesauri of Leopold Biwald, Pál Makó, and Ivan Krstitelj Horvath (1765–1777)

9:45–10:00 *Rasprava / Discussion*

10:00–10:15 *Odmor / Break*

10:15–10:45 Književnost i znanost: dva različita pristupa njihovim suodnosi-
ma u Boškovićevu djelu / Literature and Science: Two Different Approaches
to Their Interrelationship in Bošković's Work

Predsjedavaju / Chairpersons: PERSIDA LAZAREVIĆ DI GIACOMO &
FRANJO SOKOLIĆ

SNJEŽANA HUSIĆ (Zagreb), Književnost i neznanje: funkcije lika Licide u
Boškovićevim *Dijalogima o sjevernoj zori* / Literature and Ignorance: Func-
tions of Lycidas in the *Dialogi sull' aurora boreale* by Ruđer Bošković

BLANKA JERGOVIĆ (Zagreb) & IVICA MARTINOVIĆ (Zagreb), Boškovi-
ćevi motivi za priopćavanje Newtonovih otkrića u optici: analiza šestoga pje-
vanja Boškovićeva epa *De Solis ac Lunae defectibus* / Bošković's Motifs for
Communicating Newton's Discoveries in Optics: Case Analysis of the Sixth
Canto of Bošković's Epic *De Solis ac Lunae defectibus*

10:45–11:00 *Rasprava / Discussion*

11:00–11:30 *Odmor / Break*

11:30–12:00 Završno predavanje /
Closing lecture

Predsjedavaju / Chairpersons: ĆIRIL ČOH & BRUNO ĆURKO

JAN ČIŽEK (Olomouc), Johann Heinrich Alsted and John Amos Comenius:
Two Cases of the Reception of Franciscus Patricius in Early Modern Central
Europe / Johann Heinrich Alsted i Jan Amos Komenský: Dva slučaja Petrićeve
recepcije u novovjekovnoj Srednjoj Europi

12:30–13:00 Završna rasprava i zatvaranje skupa /
Closing discussion and closing of the Symposium

Predsjedavaju / Chairpersons: IVICA MARTINOVIĆ & BRUNO ĆURKO

13:00 *Ručak / Lunch*

Odlazak sudionika / Departure of participants

21. DANI FRANE PETRIĆA

Sažeci izlaganja



21st DAYS OF FRANE PETRIĆ

Paper abstracts

**Međunarodni simpozij
IDEJA SVEUČILIŠTA**

**International Symposium
THE IDEA OF THE UNIVERSITY**

PAVO BARIŠIĆ

*Institut für Philosophie Zagreb & Philosophische Fakultät, Universität Split,
Kroatien /*

Institut za filozofiju Zagreb & Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Splitu, Hrvatska

IST BILDUNG EINE VORAUSSETZUNG FÜR DEMOKRATIE?

Von der Entmündigung des Bürgers durch Universitätsreform

Die Geschichte der modernen Demokratie ist in den vergangenen zwei Jahrhunderten mit einer allgemeinen Verbreitung der Bildung und der Einführung der allgemeinen Schul- und Bildungspflicht wie insbesondere der Autonomie und der Freiheit der Universität eng verknüpft und verflochten. Da die Demokratie von ihren Bürgern mehr Verantwortung für das Gemeinwohl des politischen Gemeinwesens erfordert, beansprucht sie von ihnen gleichfalls mehr Ausbildung und kritisches Denken. Es besteht wohl eine enge Wechselwirkung zwischen der Erweiterung der Bildungspraxis der Bürger und der Entwicklung der Demokratie. Im Vortrag werde ich durch einen Vergleich der antiken und der modernen Demokratie auf ihre gemeinsame ethische und geistige Grundlage in der Erziehung und Bildung hinweisen. Die Ausgangsthese lautet, daß gerade diese zwei demokratischen Experimente gezeugt haben, wie und wo die Bildung und Erziehung am meisten geschätzt und am breitesten entwickelt wurden. Die Entwicklung der Erziehung und Bildung der Bürger in der Demokratie hat zum Grundziel, ihre Verantwortung und Mündigkeit als politische Subjekte zu stärken. Gerade darin steckt eine große Gefahr für

die gegenwärtige Massendemokratie, die durch ihre Nivellierungstendenzen in der großangelegten sog. Bologna-Universitätsreform gegenüber den Bürger zu entmündigen droht.

JE LI NAOBRAZBA PRETPOSTAVKA DEMOKRACIJE?

O stavljanju građanina pod skrbništvo putem reforme sveučilišta

Povijest moderne demokracije u posljednja dva stoljeća usko je povezana i prepletena s općim širenjem naobrazbe i uvođenjem opće obrazovne i školske obveze te osobito s autonomijom i slobodom sveučilišta. Postoji zacijelo usko povezano uzajamno djelovanje između širenja obrazovanja građana i razvoja demokracije. U predavanju ću usporedbom antičke i moderne demokracije ukazati na njezin zajednički etički i duhovni temelj u obrazovanju i odgoju. Ishodišna je teza da upravo ta dva demokratska eksperimenta svjedoče kako i gdje su odgoj i naobrazba najviše cijenjeni i najšire razvijani. Razvoj odgoja i naobrazbe građana u demokraciji ima za osnovni cilj jačati njihovu odgovornost i zrelost kao političkih subjekata. Upravo u tome leži velika pogibelj za suvremenu masovnu demokraciju koja tendencijama niveliranja u velebnj tzv. Bolonjskoj reformi sveučilišta prijeti staviti građanina pod skrbništvo, odnosno oduzeti mu punoljetnost.

MERIÇ BILGIÇ

Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Kocaeli University, Turkey /

Fakultet prirodnih i humanističkih znanosti, Sveučilište Kocaeli, Turska

THE LOGICAL LIMITS, AND THE ONTOLOGICAL PRINCIPLE OF THE IDEA OF UNIVERSITY

An idea can be accepted as necessarily true by a consensus among some reasonable people if and only if its premises could be grounded on true knowledge, and its result could be reached by a true reasoning. Then, we have three questions: what is the idea of university, why it ought to be necessary, and how a norm could be grounded on knowledge? Behind the idea of modern university there is a principle called ‘universitas’, named ‘metaphysics’ by Kant, and ‘*prote philosophia*’ by Aristotle. The opposite of it would be postmodern university, called ‘multiversity’ in principle. Here, we ground the norm *universitas* by the logical form of *reductio ad absurdum*, under the light of the knowledge of the value of some possibilities of human being, or simply, of human dignity.

LOGIČKA OGRANIČENJA I ONTOLOŠKI PRINCIP IDEJE SVEUČILIŠTA

Neka ideja može biti prihvaćena kao nužno istinita konsenzusom nekih razumnih ljudi ako i samo ako njene premise mogu biti utemeljene na istinitom znanju, a njen rezultat dosegnut istinitim zaključivanjem. Tako imamo tri pitanja: što je ideja sveučilišta, zašto bi trebala biti nužna, i kako neka norma može biti utemeljena na znanju? Iza ideje modernog sveučilišta nalazi se princip zvan ‘universitas’, kojega Kant naziva ‘metafizika’, a Aristotel ‘*prote philosophia*’. Suprotno tomu bi bilo postmoderno sveučilište, u principu zvano ‘multiversity’. Ovdje ćemo normu *universitas* utemeljiti pomoću logičke forme *reductio ad absurdum*, pod vidom znanja vrijednosti nekih mogućnosti ljudskog bića, ili jednostavnije, ljudskog dostojanstva.

JADRANKA BOŽIĆ

*Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Beograd, Srbija /
National Library of Serbia, Belgrade, Serbia*

POSTOJE LI JOŠ SVETIŠTA KULTURE I ZNANOSTI?

Rad će pokušati odgovoriti na sljedeća pitanja: Mogu li i trebaju li znanost i umjetnost još uvijek obrazovati čovječstvo u čovjeku? Gubi li znanost značaj u osmišljavanju našeg života? Time dovodimo u pitanje i pravi smisao i ideju univerziteta. Idu li nove reforme univerziteta u Europi s početka 21. stoljeća u pravcu produbljene sholarizacije, tj. postaje li obrazovanje sve manje cjelovito, jednostrano? Što se danas događa s autonomijom univerziteta, ali i znanosti? U kojoj mjeri današnji univerzitet doprinosi kulturnom samorazumijevanju, dijalogu kultura i intelektualnom prosvjećivanju, razvijanju kritičkog duha? U drugom dijelu rada ponudit ćemo pregled aktualnog stanja na visokoškolskim institucijama u Srbiji.

ARE THERE ANY TEMPLES OF CULTURE AND SCIENCE?

The paper will attempt to answer the following questions: Can/should science and art still educate manhood within the man? Is science losing importance in making sense out of our lives? This questions the true meaning and the idea of university. Do new reforms of the university in Europe in the early

21st century mean radicalization of scholarization, respectively, is education becoming less integrative and more one-sided? What is happening today with the autonomy of university and science? To what extent modern university contributes to the cultural self-understanding, dialogue of cultures and education of the intellect, development of a critical spirit? In the second part of the text, we will review the present status of the higher education institutions in Serbia.

HASAN BÜLENT GÖZKAN

*Faculty of Science and Letters, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Istanbul, Turkey /
Fakultet prirodnih i humanističkih znanosti, Umjetničko sveučilište Mimar Sinan,
Istanbul, Turska*

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT IN MODERN TURKEY AS A CASE STUDY OF AN AUTHORITARIAN INTERVENTION OF THE STATE

Kant's well-known text on the idea of university, "The Conflict of the Faculties", distinguished faculties of his time as "higher" and "lower" faculties. In this classification, philosophy is the lower faculty while higher faculties include law, medicine and theology. A faculty is considered "higher" if its teachings interest the government itself (today we can also consider economy, management and engineering as higher faculties). According to Kant, a "lower" faculty must be independent of the government's commands and should be free to evaluate everything; and it is authorized to speak out publicly, that is, it has the public presentation of truth as its function.

After the university reform in 1933 in modern Turkey, the philosophy department was constituted as a "higher faculty" the function of which was to serve as the public presentation of the command of the state (i.e., a top-down modernization and westernization of the people).

This talk tries to compare the constitution of philosophy departments in Turkey and in Modern Western Europe, by considering Habermas' analysis on the public sphere and Şerif Mardin's writings on Modern Turkey in particular, and the status and function of philosophy departments in the actual world in general.

USTROJ ODSJEKA ZA FILOZOFIJU U MODERNOJ TURSKOJ KAO STUDIJA SLUČAJA AUTORITARNE INTERVENCIJE DRŽAVE

Kantov poznati tekst o ideji sveučilišta »Spor fakulteta« dijeli fakultete njegova vremena na »više« i »niže« fakultete. U toj klasifikaciji filozofija se smatra nižim, a pravo, medicina i teologija višim fakultetima. Fakultet se smatra »višim« ako su njegova učenja od interesa za samu vlast (danas također višim fakultetima možemo smatrati ekonomiju, menadžment, i inženjerstvo). Prema Kantu, »niži« fakultet ne smije ovisiti o naredbama vlasti i treba biti slobodan preispitivati sve, te je ovlašten javno istupati, tj. funkcija mu je javno izlaganje istine.

Nakon sveučilišne reforme u modernoj Turskoj 1933., odsjek za filozofiju ustrojen je kao »viši fakultet« čija je funkcija bila u službi javnog izlaganja naredaba države (tj., modernizacija odozgor prema dolje i vesternizacija naroda).

Ovo izlaganje će pokušati usporediti ustroj odsjeka za filozofiju u Turskoj i u modernoj Zapadnoj Europi, uzimajući u obzir posebno Habermasovu analizu javne sfere i spise Šerifa Mardina o modernoj Turskoj, kao i općenito status i funkciju odsjeka za filozofiju u aktualnom svijetu.

NENAD CEKIĆ

*Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Srbija /
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Serbia*

UTILITARIZAM I IDEJA SVEUČILIŠTA

Utilitaristički »princip najveće sreće« mogao bi kontraintuitivno opravdati prakse kao što su: kažnjavanje i žrtvovanje nevinih, kršenje obećanja ili manipulaciju. Bazična pretpostavka je da najviši cilj (tj. najveća *moгуća* sreća) mora biti u stanju opravdati nanošenje patnje ili štete nekolicini i manipulaciju. Činjenica je da se u procesu obrazovanja i odgoja djece manipulacija čini gotovo nužnom. U tom procesu djecu ne učimo da je zadovoljstvo jedino dobro, čak i ako smo uvjereni hedonistički utilitaristi.

Može li se *sve*-učilište (»univerzitet«) izgraditi na čisto utilitarističkim nacelima? Na umu moramo imati da je ova institucija namijenjena odraslim i zrelim ljudima. Zašto sada ne biti otvoren i na sveučilištu ne razotkriti brižljivo

čuvanu tajnu da ništa što činimo nije zarad dužnosti već zarad hedonističke koristi? Utilitaristički pristup moralu, naročito milovskog tipa, ima tendenciju podijeliti čovječanstvo u dvije klase: 1.) moralnu aristokraciju koja teži »višim zadovoljstvima«, i 2.) »ostale« (»plebs«) kojima razlika između viših i nižih zadovoljstava nije bitna. Znači li to da moralna aristokracija, radi izbjegavanja »plebejske kontaminacije« treba organizirati *tajne* univerzitete? Dalje, znači li to da moralna aristokracija, shodno principu korisnosti koji dozvoljava manipulaciju, treba organizirati javne univerzitete za nižu klasu na kojima će se promovirati deontološka načela? Priznati utilitaristički orijentirani filozof R. M. Hare upozorio nas je da moramo napraviti razliku između onoga koji obrazuje (nastavnika i profesora) i indoktrinatora (manipulatora). Ali, kako je to moguće s utilitarističke točke gledišta? I je li svaka vrsta obrazovanja *ipso facto* i manipulacija? S druge strane, sama ideja univerziteta (*sve-učilišta*) čak je i semantički povezana s idejom univerzalnosti. A univerzalnost »ne podnosi« tajnost i manipulaciju. To je kantovska, a ne utilitaristička ideja.

UTILITARIANISM AND THE IDEA OF UNIVERSITY

Radical utilitarian approach to general morality has many problems. The so-called "Greatest-Happiness Principle" could justify counter-intuitive practices such as: punishing and sacrifice of innocents, breaking of promises and manipulation. The underlying presumption is that the greatest cause (general utility, "happiness") must be capable of justifying of causing suffering of the few. The fact is that in upbringing and education of humans (children) some degree of manipulation is needed. Instead, in that process we use concepts which belong to deontological prescriptions ("obligations", "duties") such as: "Do not lie" or "Do not steal".

The question is: Can we have *University* guided by the pure utility principle? The University is for adults, not for children. Why now not be open and say at the University that everything we do we do for the sake of hedonistic "happiness", not for the sake of duty. However, utilitarianism tends to divide humanity into two classes: moral aristocracy which seeks "higher pleasures" and others who do not. Does that mean that utilitarians must organize *secret* utilitarian universities for moral aristocracy? Does it mean that moral aristocracy, according to the utility principle, has to organize "deontological", manipulative public universities for lower classes? Prominent utilitarian philosopher R. M. Hare warned us that we have to recognize the difference between educators and indoctrinators. What is the real difference from the utilitarian standpoint? Is every kind of education *ipso facto* manipulation? That is one

problem. On the other hand, the very idea of “university” is connected with the concept of “universality”. Universality cannot “stand” secrets and manipulation. And that is a Kantian, not a utilitarian idea.

KREŠIMIR CEROVAC

Zagreb, Hrvatska /

Zagreb, Croatia

TRANSDISCIPLINARNI PRISTUP U UČENJU I ISTRAŽIVANJU NA SVEUČILIŠTU

U radu se razmatra novi pristup u učenju i istraživanju na sveučilištu – transdisciplinarni pristup. Sveučilišta su se stoljećima razvijala koristeći tradicionalnu strukturu odvojenih odjela za odvojene discipline. Suvremeno sveučilište postaje sve više razdijeljeno specijalizacijom akademskih odjela i fakultetskih interesa do te mjere da ta fragmentacija potkopava sposobnost sveučilišta glede učinkovitog odgovora na šire potrebe i zahtjeve društva. Ako sveučilišta žele biti valjani sudionici u održivom razvitku, trebaju u prvom redu prepoznati pojavu novog tipa znanja – transdisciplinarnost. Propusti li to, sveučilište će biti zamijenjeno obrascem škole te partikularizmom koji on povlači za sobom. Postizanjem transdisciplinarnog pristupa sveučilište će moći njegovati ideju o znanosti kao obliku života, koja se zauzvrat pokazuje kao moralni oblik znanosti i akademskog obrazovanja. Transdisciplinarni pristup povezuje discipline, pretpostavlja sudjelovanje različitih sudionika, akademskih ili neakademskih, te uzima u obzir etičke vrijednosti u duhu suradnje i integracije.

TRANSDISCIPLINARY APPROACH TO TEACHING AND RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY

This paper discusses a new approach to teaching and research at the University – transdisciplinarity. For centuries, universities have evolved using a traditional structure of separate departments for separate disciplines. The contemporary university finds itself increasingly compartmentalized by the specialization of academic departments and faculty interests to the point that the fragmentation has undermined the ability of universities to respond effectively to the broader needs and demands of society. If the universities intend to be valid actors in sustainable development, they have first to recognize the emer-

gence of a new type of knowledge – the transdisciplinarity. Failing this, the university will be replaced by the paradigm of the school, and the particularism that entails. But in achieving this transdisciplinarity (TD) universities will be able to foster the notion of science as a form of life, which in turn reveals itself to be the moral form of science and academic education. TD combines disciplines, assumes the participation of various stakeholders, academic or not, and takes into account ethical values in the spirit of collaboration and integration.

CORNELIU CONSTANTINEANU

*Theological Institute of the Pentecostal Union of Romania, Bucharest, Romania /
Teološki institut Pentakostalne unije Rumunjske, Bukurešt, Rumunjska*

FAITH AND LEARNING: RE-VISITING THE IDEA OF CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

A decade or two ago few people would have tried so hard to connect and integrate faith and learning. In recent times, however, there is a remarkable movement and a growing interest, especially among Christians in different academic fields of knowledge, to find appropriate ways to integrate faith and life, faith and learning, faith and the academy. Many still raise the question of the necessity or even the legitimacy of a (close) link between religion and scientific enterprise! The present paper highlights the somewhat spectacular and unexpected return of the religious phenomenon as an important factor in the social arena and explores several proposals for integrating faith and learning in a meaningful and acceptable way. It argues that the great concern for integration is given by the genuine desire to solve the existential tension between two realities of life we care about: faith and academy. The paper concludes with a brief sketch of some essential elements in a Christian university project.

VJERA I UČENJE: PREISPITIVANJE IDEJE KRŠĆANSKOG SVEUČILIŠTA

Prije desetljeće ili dva, malo tko je čvrsto nastojao povezati i integrirati vjeru i učenje. Međutim, u novije vrijeme postoji značajan pokret i rastuće zanimanje, posebno među kršćanima u različitim akademskim poljima znanja, za pronalaskom prikladnih načina integriranja vjere i života, vjere i učenja, te vjere i akademije. Mnogi još uvijek postavljaju pitanje nužnosti ili čak le-

gitimnosti (bliske) veze između religije i znanstvenog istraživanja! Ovaj rad ukazuje na donekle spektakularni i neočekivani povratak religijskog fenomena kao važnog čimbenika u društvenoj areni te istražuje nekoliko prijedloga za integraciju vjere i učenja na smislen i prikladan način. U radu se tvrdi da veliko zanimanje za integraciju proizlazi iz istinske želje za rješavanjem egzistencijalne napetosti između dviju životnih stvarnosti do kojih nam je stalo: vjere i akademije. Rad završava kratkom skicom nekih bitnih elemenata projekta kršćanskog sveučilišta.

IGOR ČATIĆ

*Fakultet strojarstva i brodogradnje, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska /
Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, University of Zagreb,
Croatia*

KOJI SU STVARNI CILJEVI BOLONJSKOG PROCESA?

Uskoro navršava prvo desetljeće uvođenja sveučilišnih studija po odredbama *bolonjskog procesa* (Fakultet strojarstva i brodogradnje, 2003.). Popularna *Bolonja* zamah dobiva sredinom prošloga desetljeća. Bujaju studiji, množe se kolegiji do neprepoznatljivosti. Studij se pretvara u školu. Doktorski studij postaje usporediv s ranijim magistarskim studijem. Kritike na odluku o usvajanju *Bolonjske deklaracije* se množe. Čini se da je za odlike i nedostatke odgovornost na akademskoj zajednici. Nisu ministri predložili oko 2.700 razolikih diploma, već ta zajednica. Ono što zabrinjava jest činjenica da si akademska zajednica nije nikada postavila pitanje zašto je Europi uopće potrebna *Bologna*. Jedan od mogućih razloga je odluka da bogatima, moćnima i nasilnima trebaju jeftini, izobraženi ali neobrazovani stručnjaci za radno mjesto. Što se sada promiče s najviših mjesta u Hrvatskoj. I to u trenutku kada će prosječni Amerikanac do 38. godine promijeniti 10 do 14 radnih mjesta. Još je jedna ideja iza *Bologne*. Iz siromašnijih zemalja treba izvući sve što vrijedi, osobito na području prirodosnanstva i tehnike.

WHICH ARE THE REAL OBJECTIVES OF THE BOLOGNA PROCESS?

Soon the first decade will pass since the introduction of the university studies according to the *Bologna Process* provisions in Croatia (Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, 2003). The popular *Bologna*

went into full swing in the middle of the last decade. The studies are flourishing, the subjects are proliferating until changing beyond recognition. The studies have been turned to school. The doctoral studies have become comparable to the previous master study. The criticism regarding the decision on the adoption of the *Bologna Declaration* has been multiplying. It seems that the academic community carries the responsibility for the upsides and the downsides. It was not the ministers who proposed about 2,700 different diplomas, but rather the mentioned community. What worries is the fact that the academic community has never asked itself the question why Europe should need Bologna at all. One of the possible reasons is the decision that the rich, the powerful, and the aggressive need cheap, trained but uneducated professionals for workplaces. And this is now promoted from the highest places in Croatia, and precisely at the moment when an average American will change 10 to 14 workplaces until the age of 38. There is one more idea behind the *Bologna*. Everything that has any value has to be pulled out of the poorer countries, especially in the field of natural sciences and technology.

ANTE ČOVIĆ

*Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska /
Philosophische Fakultät, Universität Zagreb, Kroatien*

NEOLIBERALNI TOTALITARIZAM KAO ZATIRANJE JAVNOG DOBRA

Glavna je značajka totalitarizma kao ideologije, kao prakse i kao političkog sustava težnja za potpunim ovladavanjem društvenim i individualnim (javnim i privatnim) životom građana. Klasični oblici totalitarizma – poput fašizma, nacionalsocijalizma, staljinizma – zasnivali su se neposredno na represiji i teroru, dok se neoliberalizam kao suvremeni oblik totalitarizma tek posredno zasniva na represiji i teroru dok se neposredno temelji na manipulaciji. Manipulacija počinje u medijskom prostoru odakle gotovo neprimjetno prelazi u manipulaciju u političkoj domeni te naposljetku u manipulaciju »krajnjim argumentom« fizičke moći u prepoznatljivim oblicima represije i terora (waterboarding, Guantanamo, napad na Irak, politička umorstva i sl.). Osim prema metodologiji, klasični i suvremeni totalitarizam razlikuju se i prema nositelju; dok je nositelj, odnosno subjekt klasičnog totalitarizma u pravilu devijantni oblik državne tvorevine, suvremeni je totalitarizam mrežnog karaktera i nema

striktnog državnog nositelja. On je, u najdubljem smislu, protu-državan, jer potpuno uništenje države kao civilizacijske tvorevine i kao ustanove javnog dobra predstavlja jedan od krajnjih ciljeva suvremenog totalitarizma. To međutim ne znači da države, posebice one najmoćnije koje teže svjetskoj dominaciji, ne mogu u većoj ili manjoj mjeri biti nositelji totalitarnih težnji. No, upravo u mjeri u kojoj izražavaju i provode totalitarne težnje one same dospijevaju u vazalni položaj prema mrežnom subjektivitetu totalitarnog interesa i postaju sredstvom za ostvarivanje tog interesa. Utoliko neoliberalni totalitarizam u prvom redu razara demokratsko tkivo i izvorne javne funkcije svojih državnih nositelja.

Neoliberalni totalitarizam sadržajno je određen i vođen trostrukim ciljem: 1. u sferi države to je zatiranje države shvaćene kao *res publica* i pretvaranje državnog aparata u instrument totalitarnog interesa; 2. u sferi društva to je uništavanje proizvodnje kao osnovice za uspostavljanje društvene strukture i njeno svodenje na instrument trgovinskog i bankarskog sustava; 3. u sferi duhovnosti to je zatiranje kreativnosti i kritičnosti, njihovo nadomještanje diktatom isprazne ispravnosti te sustavno uništavanje znanosti, obrazovanja i kulture uopće kao područja javnog dobra. Posebna je nakana ovog izlaganja rasvijetliti fenomenologiju djelovanja neoliberalnog totalitarizma iz mrežnog punkta u znanosti i visokom školstvu u Republici Hrvatskoj.

NEOLIBERALER TOTALITARISMUS ALS ZERSTÖRUNG DES ÖFFENTLICHEN GUTES

Der Totalitarismus als Ideologie, Praxis und politisches System offenbart sein Hauptmerkmal das Bestreben, das gesellschaftliche und individuelle (öffentliche und private) Leben der Bürger vollkommen zu beherrschen. Die klassischen Formen von Totalitarismus – etwa Faschismus, Nationalsozialismus, Stalinismus – gründeten sich unmittelbar auf Repression und Terror, während sich der Neoliberalismus als zeitgenössische Form von Totalitarismus lediglich indirekt auf Repression und Terror stützt, unmittelbar jedoch auf Manipulation. Die Manipulation beginnt in der Mediensphäre und wechselt von dort fast unmerklich in die politische Domäne, um schließlich mit dem „ultimativen Argument“ physischer Macht in den erkennbaren Formen von Repression und Terror zu enden (Waterboarding, Guantanamo, Angriff auf den Irak, politische Morde u.ä.). Der klassische und der zeitgenössische Totalitarismus unterscheiden sich, außer unter dem Aspekt der Methodologie, auch im Hinblick auf ihren jeweiligen Träger: Im klassischen Totalitarismus ist der Träger

bzw. das Subjekt in der Regel ein Staatsgebilde in devianter Form, hingegen der zeitgenössische Totalitarismus hat Vernetzungscharakter und keinen staatlichen Träger *stricto sensu*. Vielmehr ist er, im tiefsten Sinne, staatsfeindlich, denn zu den ultimativen Zielen des zeitgenössischen Totalitarismus gehört die vollständige Vernichtung des Staates als eines zivilisatorischen Gebildes und einer Einrichtung des öffentlichen Gutes. Allerdings bedeutet dies nicht, dass Staaten, zumal die mächtigsten, die nach Weltherrschaft streben, in größerem oder geringerem Umfang nicht auch Träger totalitärer Bestrebungen sein können. Jedoch in genau dem Umfang, in dem sie ihre totalitären Bestrebungen zum Ausdruck bringen und umsetzen, geraten diese Staaten selbst in Abhängigkeit zur vernetzten Subjektivität des totalitären Interesses und werden zum Mittel, durch das dieses Interesse realisiert wird. Insofern ist der neoliberale Totalitarismus in erster Linie darauf ausgerichtet, das demokratische Gewebe und die ursprünglich öffentlichen Funktionen seiner staatlichen Träger zu zerstören.

Den neoliberalen Totalitarismus bestimmt und leitet in inhaltlicher Hinsicht folgende dreifache Zielsetzung: 1. In der Sphäre des Staates verfolgt er das Ziel, den Staat als *res publica* zu zersetzen und den Staatsapparat in ein Instrument des totalitären Interesses zu verwandeln; 2. in der gesellschaftlichen Sphäre soll die Produktion als Grundlage für den Aufbau der Gesellschaftsstruktur zerstört und auf ein Instrument des Handels- und Bankwesens reduziert werden; 3. in der spirituellen Sphäre sollen Kreativität und Kritikfähigkeit ausgebremst und durch das Diktat sinnentleerter Korrektheit ersetzt werden, des Weiteren sollen Wissenschaft, Bildung und Kultur insgesamt als Bereiche des öffentlichen Gutes systematisch vernichtet werden. Dieser Beitrag verfolgt insbesondere die Absicht, am Fallbeispiel eines innerhalb der Wissenschaft und des Hochschulsystems der Republik Kroatien gelagerten Netzpunktes den neoliberalen Totalitarismus in der Phänomenologie seines Wirkens zu beleuchten.

DRAGAN ČALOVIĆ

Fakultet za kulturu i medije, Megatrend univerzitet & Filološki fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Srbija /

Faculty of Culture and Media, Megatrend University & Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, Serbia

IZAZOVI OBRAZOVNOME PROCESU U DOBA MEDIJSKE KULTURE

U tekstu se razmatra odnos prema znanju i obrazovnom procesu u kontekstu razvoja medijske kulture. Autor ispituje utječu li iskustvo dobivanja informacija putem masovnih i novih medija, te upotreba informacijskih tehnologija, na izmjenu odnosa prema obrazovnom procesu. Razvoj novih oblika »čitanja« i informacijski konzumerizam, potaknuti razvojem informacijskih tehnologija, prepoznati su kao manifestacija izmijenjenog odnosa prema znanju. Ovakva tendencija, u tekstu shvaćena kao zaokret od težnje ka znanju prema težnji ka stjecanju vještine brzog pronalaženja informacija, čini se naročito problematičnom u uvjetima suvremenih reformi visokoškolskog obrazovanja kojima se ishod obrazovnog procesa primarno podređuje praktičnim zahtjevima privrede.

THE CHALLENGES TO THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS AT THE TIME OF MEDIA CULTURE

Article considers the relationship to knowledge and education process in the context of media culture. The author examines does the experience of getting information through the mass and new media, and use of information technology, influence on the changes of approaches to the educational process. The development of new forms of "reading" and informational consumerism, have been recognized as a manifestation of altered relations to knowledge. This tendency, in the text understood as the change from seeking knowledge to acquiring the skills to find information quickly, seems particularly problematic in terms of modern higher education reforms by which the outcomes of the educational process primarily subordinate to the practical demands of the economy.

BRUNO ĆURKO

Institut za filozofiju, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Institute of Philosophy, Zagreb, Croatia

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN I KRITIČKO MIŠLJENJE NA SVEUČILIŠTIMA

John Henry Newman 1851. godine napisao je djelo *Discourses on the Scope and Nature of University Education* koje je posvetio katolicima u Dublinu. Isto djelo objavljeno je 1852. pod naslovom *The Idea of a University*. U ovom djelu Newman promišlja o sveučilišnoj razini obrazovanja. Newman tvrdi kako je, uz čitanje knjiga i svladavanje novih znanja, za buduće kritičko građanstvo važna preciznost uma. Ona se uvježbava te je rezultat rada, discipline i navike. Ono o čemu govori Newman nije ništa drugo nego kritičko mišljenje. Radi toga se Newman i njegovo djelo nalaze u svim boljim priručnicima i enciklopedijama koje obrađuju povijesni razvoj teorija kritičkoga mišljenja. Newman zahtjeva uvježbavanje onog što danas nazivamo 'kritičko mišljenje' na sveučilištima i tvrdi kako takvo obrazovanje »daje čovjeku jasan pogled na vlastito mišljenje i sudove, istinu u njihovom razvoju, rječitost u njihovom izražavanju i snagu u njihovom pozivu« (Newman, 1999., 126). Na kraju izlaganja prikazat ću koliko je (i je li?) Bolonjski proces u skladu s navedenim Newmanovim tezama.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN AND CRITICAL THINKING AT UNIVERSITIES

In 1851 John Henry Newman has written the book *Discourses on the Scope and Nature of University Education*. The same work was published in 1852 entitled *The Idea of a University*. In this work Newman reflects on the university education. Newman argues that for future critical citizens merely reading books and accepting the new knowledge is not enough. He argues in favor of possessing sharpness and the precision of the mind, which can be practiced, and at the end it is the results of work, discipline and habits. Newman talks about the critical thinking. That is why we can find Newman and *The Idea of a University* in all handbooks and encyclopedias that deal with the historical development of the theory of critical thinking. Newman requires practicing of what we today call 'critical thinking' in universities and argues that such education "gives a man a clear conscious view of his own opinions and jud-

gments, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them” (Newman, 1999, 126). At the end of the presentation I will show how much (if any?) accordance exists between Bologna process and Newman’s theories.

DIJANA ĆURKOVIĆ¹, ANITA LUNIĆ²

*¹ Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics, Zagreb, Croatia*

*² Dugi Rat, Hrvatska /
Dugi Rat, Croatia*

SVEUČILIŠTE BUDUĆNOSTI

Imajući u vidu promjene koje se posljednjih desetljeća pokušavaju uvesti u znanost i visoko školstvo, a i druge sfere ljudskoga djelovanja, bilo od strane vlasti, bilo od sindikata i nezavisnih inicijativa, pokušat ćemo projicirati dvojaku sveučilišnu budućnost. Rad dakle predstavlja dvije krajnosti: utopijsku i distopijsku. Utopijsko sveučilište zamišljeno je kao direktnodemokratski uređena institucija, dok je distopijsko centralizirano i striktno hijerarhizirano. Utopijsko proizlazi iz anarhističkih, a distopijsko iz neoliberalnih pogleda na svijet, a mogući razvoj predstavljen je na primjeru Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, i to kroz hijerarhiju te kroz direktnu demokraciju.

UNIVERSITY OF THE FUTURE

With regards to the efforts to change the scientific, academic and other spheres of human activities we have encountered in the past few decades, coming either from the government or unions or independent initiatives, we will try to project a dual future of the universities. Thus, the paper shows two extremes: utopian and dystopian. The utopian university is seen as a direct democratic institution, while the dystopian is centralised and strictly hierarchical. The utopia grows from anarchistic, and dystopia from neoliberal viewpoints. Possible developments are presented on the example of the University of Zagreb, one a hierarchy and one a directly democracy.

BORISLAV DADIĆ

*Odjel za filozofiju, Sveučilište u Zadru, Hrvatska /
Department of Philosophy, University of Zadar, Croatia*

ULOGA RASPRAVE (*DISPUTATIO*) U RAZVOJU SVEUČILIŠTA U SREDNJEM VIJEKU

Svjedoci smo svekolikih nastojanja oko reforme visokog školstva kod nas, pa i reforme samog sveučilišta kao takovog. Prije donošenja konačnih odluka i zakona vezanih za navedene reforme, svi smo pozvani na javnu raspravu o prijedlozima tih zakona. No kakvu ulogu imaju te rasprave i pod kakvim uvjetima se odvijaju? U našem izlaganju ćemo se pozabaviti nastankom, razvojem i aktualnosti sveučilišnih rasprava. Pokazati ćemo kako se je na prvim europskim sveučilištima od predavanja (*lectio*), preko pitanja (*questio*) do rasprave (*disputatio*). Potom ćemo detaljno obraditi bit i vrste rasprava koje su nastale u sveučilišnom ambijentu, te njihov golemi doprinos u razvoju kako sveučilišta u cjelini tako i pojedinih fakulteta. U zaključnom promišljanju ćemo pokazati nužnost i aktualnost sveučilišnih rasprava, kako za život sveučilišta i razvoj znanosti tako i za sveopći boljitak društva u cjelini.

THE ROLL OF DISCUSSION (*DISPUTATIO*) IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MIDDLE AGE UNIVERSITIES

Today we are witnessing an overall reformation effort in the field of higher education, even extending to the reformation of the university as such. Before reaching the final decisions and laws concerning above mentioned reforms, we are all invited in a public discussion on the bills of the law. But what is the role of such discussions and under which conditions do they occur? Our presentation deals with the origin, development and today's importance of University discussions. We intend to show how, the first European Universities, lectures (*lectio*), which were followed by questions (*questio*), led to the development of discussion (*disputatio*). We will also investigate the nature and the types of discussions which came into being in the University environment, and their enormous contribution to the development, not just of the University as a whole, but of certain Faculties as well. In the concluding segment we will show the necessity and today's importance of University discussions for the life of the University and the development of science on one side, and for general good of the whole society on the other side.

NENAD DAKOVIĆ

*Beograd, Srbija /
Belgrad, Serbien*

POSLIJE FILOZOFIJE (POSLIJE UNIVERZITETA)

Moja osnovna ideja ili problem koji ću razmatrati u predavanju glasi: Je li danas vrijeme poslije filozofije i poslije sveučilišta?

NACH DER PHILOSOPHIE (NACH DER UNIVERSITÄT)

Meine Hauptidee, oder das Problem, das ich im Vortrag erörtern werde, lautet: Ist heute Zeit nach der Philosophie und nach der Universität?

ZLATAN DELIĆ, HARIZ ŠARIĆ

*Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Tuzli, Bosna i Hercegovina /
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

MOGUĆNOST KRITIKE BOLONJSKOG SUSTAVA OBRAZOVANJA U BOSNI I HERCEGOVINI IZ PERSPEKTIVE ODRŽIVOG RAZVOJA

Bavimo se socijalnim i ekološkim posljedicama ekonomske komodifikacije, komercijalizacije i fragmentacije Bolonjskog obrazovanja u Bosni i Hercegovini. Razvijamo tezu da je o globalnoj, regionalnoj i lokalnoj važnosti očuvanja Bosne i Hercegovine i njenih imanentnih raznolikosti potrebno govoriti na temelju kvalitativne analize, a ne isključivo uz pomoć ekonometrijske analize koja je ugrađena i u Bolonjski sustav definiranja samog pojma kvalitete i održivosti. Centralni autoreferencijalni problem je što se Bolonjski sustav, već u jeziku, podčinjava vladajućem diskursu ekonomije znanja te i opisuje isključivo ekonomskim kategorijama ('efikasnost', 'efektivnost', 'stakeholderi', 'zadovoljstvo' itd., pri čemu se ignorira činjenica da oko 50% nezaposlenih čine upravo mladi ljudi, od kojih veliki broj ima završenu srednju školu i fakultete). Stoga se zalažemo za drugačija mjerila održivog razvoja u Bosni i Hercegovini koja bi priznavala specifičnu povijest i (buduće) okruženje ove države.

THE POSSIBILITY OF CRITICISM OF THE BOLOGNA EDUCATION SYSTEM IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

We are engaged in social and environmental consequences of economic commodity, commercialization and fragmentation of the Bologna education in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We advocate the thesis which claims that in order to speak about the global, regional and local importance of maintaining Bosnia and Herzegovina and its immanent diversity, we are to speak on the basis of qualitative analysis, and not only with the help of econometric analysis that is integrated in the Bologna system, defining the very concept of education, university, quality and sustainability. The central auto-referential problem is that the Bologna system – in the language itself – is subordinated to the dominant discourse of econometric fundamentalism and the so-called “knowledge economy”, and therefore is also exclusively described through the economic categories (e.g. ‘efficiency’, ‘effectiveness’, ‘stakeholders’, ‘satisfaction’, etc. The fact that about 50% of unemployed are young people, of whom the majority has completed high school and college, is completely ignored). Therefore, we advocate for a different (meaningful) measures of sustainable development in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which would recognize the specific history as well as the present and future sustainable environment of this state.

ZORAN DIMIĆ

*Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Nišu, Srbija /
Philosophische Fakultät, Universität Niš, Serbien*

UNIVERZITET I UŽIVANJE

Budući da se danas, u pokušaju jednog novog promišljanja ideje univerziteta, ne možemo više skrivati iza nacije, države ili same institucije (Fichte, Humboldt, Schleiermacher), težište i oslonac takvog procesa moramo tražiti izvan njih. Gdje nam onda preostaje otvoriti nove horizonte ovoj ideji? Kako da danas shvatimo Habermasovu sugestiju da se »ideji univerziteta novi život može udahnuti jedino još *extra muros*« ili Derridaovu da takva jedna »odluka mišljenja ne može biti unutar-institucionalni događaj, akademski momenat«. Dok su antičke visokoškolske institucije (Akademija, Lykei) djelovale

u atmosferi *aphetéos-ēdone*, univerzitet i njegovi akteri u srednjem vijeku i modernom dobu žive u atmosferi *represija-entuzijizam*. Iako su Fichte, Humboldt, Schelling i Schleiermacher vjerovali da će država i privreda ograničiti sebe u zahtjevima koje iznose pred univerzitet, ta se represija nastavila do danas. U naše doba opće merkantilizacije univerziteta, ona dostiže svoj vrhunac. Srednjovjekovni studenti i nastavnici na ovu su represiju odgovorili povećanim nasiljem, o čemu govore mnogobrojni pisani izvještaji. Hoćemo li i mi doživjeti njihovu sudbinu ili ćemo moguće putove za izlazak iz ove situacije tražiti u drugome pravcu – možemo li danas obnoviti uvid, koji su antičke visokoškolske institucije duboko iskusile, da su uživanje i sreća prirodni pratitelji znanja i studiranja? Može li se takva mogućnost danas misliti?

UNIVERSITÄT UND LUST

Da wir uns heute, in einem neuen Versuch die Idee der Universität zu denken, nicht mehr hinter der Nation, Staat oder der Institution selbst verstecken könnten (Fichte, Humboldt, Schleiermacher), müssen wir den Fokus und die Unterstützung eines solchen Prozesses außerhalb suchen. Wo ist dann möglich der Idee der neuen Horizonte zu öffnen? Wie könnten wir heute den Habermass Vorschlag verstehen „der Idee der Universität könne nur noch *extra muros* neues Leben eingehaucht werden“ oder Derridas „dass eine solche Entscheidung des Denkens kann nicht ein intra-institutionelles Ereignis sein, ein akademischer Moment“. Während die alte Hochschulinstitutionen (Akademie, Lykei) in der Atmosphäre *aphetéos-ēdone* funktioniert haben, lebten soweit die Universität und ihre Akteure im Mittelalter und Neuzeit in einer Atmosphäre der *Repression-Begeisterung*. Obwohl Fichte, Humboldt, Schelling und Schleiermacher glaubten daß Staat und Wirtschaft in den vorgelegten Anforderungen der Hochschule sich begrenzen könnten, hat diese Repression bis heute sich fortgesetzt. In unserer Zeit der allgemeinen Marktalisierung erreicht sie ihren Höhepunkt. Reaktion der mittelalterlicher Schüller und Lehrer war höhere Gewalt, was in vielen Berichten erörtert wurden. Ob wir in ihr Schicksal stellen werden oder werden die mögliche Wege aus dieser Situation in die andere Richtungen suchen? Ob wir heute die Einsicht wieder aufbauen, dass die alte Hochschulinstitutionen tief erlebten, daß die Freude und das Glück natürliche Begleiter des Wissens und der Studie sind? Können wie heute eine solche Möglichkeit denken?

ALEKSANDAR DOBRIJEVIĆ¹, PREDRAG KRSTIĆ²

*¹ Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Beogradu, Srbija /
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Serbia*

*² Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju, Sveučilište u Beogradu, Srbija /
Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade, Serbia*

SAMOOBRAZOVANJE I UNIVERZITET

U ovom tekstu autori preispituju na izričit način nedovoljno tematizirani odnos između ideja samoobrazovanja i univerziteta – dva koncepta za koja se obično misli da se međusobno podržavaju. Ispostavlja se, međutim, da ideja autodidaktike pruža ustrajan otpor svakoj, koliko god liberalno shvaćenoj, institucionalizaciji. Moderna ideja univerziteta u tom pogledu nije izuzetak. Na primjeru pojedinih filozofskih koncepcija iskušava se (ne)mogućnost da suvremeni univerzitet postane utočištem onoga modela obrazovanja koje samoobrazovanje obećava.

SELF-EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITY

The authors of this text are re-examing insufficiently explicit thematization of the relation between the idea of self-education and the idea of university. There is common opinion that those two concepts support each other. However, the idea of self-education gives rise to persistent resistance to every, even to the most liberal form of institutionalization. In that sense, the modern idea of university is no exception. The authors follow some philosophical conceptions that unfold (im)possibility of contemporary image of university to become asylum for the model of official education that tries to surpass the promises of self-education.

IGOR ETEROVIĆ

*Medicinski fakultet, Sveučilište u Rijeci, Hrvatska /
School of Medicine, University of Rijeka, Croatia*

KANTOVA IDEJA UNIVERZITETA

U *Sporu fakulteta* Immanuel Kant je ne samo ponudio koncept sveučilišta nego je možda posljednji mislitelj same ideje univerziteta. Ta ideja ne samo da u historijskom smislu predstavlja artikulaciju klasične ideje humboldtov-

skog tipa sveučilišta nego su u njoj utkani brojni elementi koji posjeduju trajnu aktualnost. Neki od tih elemenata su: jurisdikcija pojedinih područja znanja, pretenzije pojedinih znanosti (znanstvenika), autonomija znanosti i fakultetâ, odnosi pojedinih fakulteta itd. U ovom je djelu Kant ponudio proširenje svog prosvjetiteljskog projekta, dao nastavak svoje filozofije prava i filozofije povijesti te dodao i značajne dopune svojoj filozofskoj antropologiji i filozofiji odgoja. Već je ovaj osvrt dovoljan da naznači veličinu i nezaobilaznost Kantova djela kada se govori o ideji univerziteta.

KANT'S IDEA OF UNIVERSITY

In his *Conflict of the Faculties*, Immanuel Kant has given not only the concept of university, but he is maybe the last thinker of the idea of university itself. This idea not only presents the articulation of classical idea of the Humboldtian type of university, but there are a lot of elements of lasting actuality rooted in it. Some of these elements are: jurisdiction of particular fields of knowledge, pretensions of particular sciences (scientists), autonomy of sciences and faculties, relations between faculties, etc. In this work Kant has expanded his Enlightenment project, he has presented further thoughts of his philosophy of law and philosophy of history, and has contributed significantly to his anthropology and philosophy of education. It is already this sketch that points out the greatness and indispensability of Kant's work when we speak about the idea of university.

SREĆKO GAJOVIĆ

*Croatian Medical Journal, School of Medicine, University of Zagreb, Croatia /
Croatian Medical Journal, Medicinski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska*

SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS AND UNIVERSITY

Croatian Medical Journal is scientific journal owned by 4 Croatian medical schools, members of 4 Croatian universities. Journal is financially supported by Ministry of Science, Education and Sports. *Croatian Medical Journal* activities are judged by measurable indicator Impact Factor, according to which it is the best Croatian scientific journal.

In many cases numbers are predominantly used to evaluate success, and a chase for higher Impact Factor becomes the main goal for many journals.

Still the important question arises – what is the purpose of the journal within university, and why tax payers should give financial support?

I suggest following answers:

- University needs excellent journal as an indicator and promoter of the own excellency – therefore journal must act independently, and select only the best national articles according to the transparent criteria.
- Journal activities include important knowledge and skills, which are of national importance – therefore the journal should be international, publish articles from all over the world and establish its global position.
- The published knowledge generates new value, entrepreneurship, and new jobs – therefore the tax payers' interest is to support the excellency in scientific publishing.

ZNANSTVENI ČASOPISI I SVEUČILIŠTE

Croatian Medical Journal je znanstveni časopis, čiji vlasnik su 4 medicinska fakulteta, sastavnice 4 hrvatska sveučilišta. Časopis financijski potpomaže Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i sporta. Kriterij djelovanja *Croatian Medical Journala* je mjerljivi podatak izražen kao čimbenik odjeka, po kojem je to najbolji hrvatski znanstveni časopis.

U suvremenom društvu brojka postaje sama sebi opravdanje, te potjera za što boljim čimbenikom odjeka počinje bivati sama sebi smislom. Stoga je opravdano postaviti pitanje: koja je svrha časopisa u sklopu Sveučilišta i zašto ga financiraju porezni obveznici?

Predlažem sljedeće odgovore:

- Sveučilište treba vrhunski znanstveni časopis kao pokazatelj i promotor izvrsnosti svoga djelovanja – zato časopis mora biti nezavisan i transparentnim kriterijima odabirati samo najbolje hrvatske znanstvene radove.
- Djelovanje časopisa predstavlja skup znanja i vještina koje predstavljaju nacionalnu vrijednost – zato časopis mora biti međunarodan i dokazati se inozemnim radovima i na inozemnom tržištu kao ravnopravan sudionik globalne znanosti.
- Objavljeno znanje pretvara se u novu vrijednost, poduzetništvo i nova radna mjesta – zato je u interesu poreznih obveznika poticati rad izvrsnog znanstvenog časopisa.

RICHARD F. GOMBRICH

*Faculty of Oriental Studies & Balliol College, University of Oxford, United Kingdom /
Fakultet za orijentalne studije & Balliol College, Sveučilište u Oxfordu, Ujedinjeno
Kraljevstvo*

THE IDEA OF THE UNIVERSITY

Introductory discussion with Professor Mislav Ježić on the topic of the idea of the university. Materials for the discussion can be found in the Appendix.

IDEJA SVEUČILIŠTA

Uvodna rasprava s akademikom Mislavom Ježićem na temu ideje sveučilišta. Materijali za raspravu nalaze se u Dodatku.

IRFAN HOŠIĆ

*Tehnički fakultet, Sveučilište u Bijaču, Bosna i Hercegovina /
Faculty of Technical Engineering, University of Bihać, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

JOSEPH BEUYS I FREE INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Joseph Beuys jedan je od značajnijih umjetnika druge polovine 20. stoljeća u širem umjetničkom kontekstu. Pored njegova umjetničkog značaja na polju *happeninga*, *performansa*, skulpture, instalacija i crteža, Beuys će ostati poznat po raspravama širokog sociološkog, filozofskog i političkog opsega. Neke od njih, a vezane uz pojam univerziteta u najširem smislu riječi, su pokretanje Njemačke studentske stranke (DSP) 1967. godine, kontroverzno djelovanje s mjesta profesora na Akademiji likovnih umjetnosti u Düsseldorfu u razdoblju od 1961. do 1972. godine, kao i uspostavljanje Slobodnog međunarodnog Univerziteta (Free International University, FIU) 1973. godine.

JOSEPH BEUYS AND THE FREE INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Joseph Beuys is one of the most important artists in the second half of the 20th century in the broader art context. In addition to his importance in art happenings, performances, sculptures, installations and drawings, Beuys will remain known by the discussions of broad sociological, philosophical, and political scale. Some of them, related to the concept of a university in its broadest sense, are forming of the German Student Party (DSP) in 1967, a controversial action through his professorship at the Academy of Fine Arts in Düsseldorf from 1961 to 1972, and the establishment of the Free International University (FIU) in 1973.

HAJRUDIN HROMADŽIĆ

*Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Rijeci, Hrvatska /
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Rijeka, Croatia*

SVEUČILIŠTE, VISOKO OBRAZOVANJE I NEOLIBERALNA HEGEMONIJA

Sveučilište kao institucija i visoko obrazovanje kao dugotrajan i kompleksan proces stjecanja znanja, povijesno sagledano, od samih su svojih početaka bili izloženi transformativnim imperativima. Temeljna nakana izlaganja jest ponuditi dijakronijsko-sinkronijski prikaz oprečnih tendencija koje određuju recentnije gospodarske i političke rasprave po pitanjima svrhe i poslanstva sveučilišta i visokog obrazovanja danas, a okvirno bi se mogli svesti na dihotomijske prijepore, primjerice: ideali obrazovne univerzalnosti i totaliteta *vs.* sveučilišna specijalizacija i fragmentacija znanja; obrazovanje kao univerzalno načelo koje svoju legitimaciju stječe i potvrđuje unutar svojih vlastitih kriterija (sveučilišna autonomija) *vs.* poimanje sveučilišta kao servisnog agensa u službi ekonomskih ili političkih interesa i tržišnih prioriteta. Pritom će fokus izlaganja biti postavljen na aktualne tendencije kada je riječ o sveučilištu i visokom obrazovanju, uz pokušaj da se ukaže na simptomatičnost intenzivne diskurzivne produkcije označitelja prethodno spomenutih trendova, poput društva znanja, sveučilišne izvrsnosti i mobilnosti, protočnosti, umrežavanja... Izlaganje će pokazati da već bazični analitički napor u dekonstrukciji ovih termina može jasno ukazati na činjenicu da se radi o ideologemima u službi hegemonijskih tendencija neoliberalizma i njegovih interesa.

UNIVERSITY, HIGHER EDUCATION, AND NEOLIBERAL HEGEMONY

Historically perceived, university as an institution, and higher education as a lengthy and complex process of acquiring knowledge, were exposed, from the very beginning, to their transformative imperatives. The basic intention of this presentation is to offer diachronic-synchronic view of contradictory tendencies that determine recent economic and political debate on the issues of purpose and mission of university and higher education today. They can be roughly reduced to dichotomy disputes, for example: educational ideals of universality and totality vs. university specialization and fragmentation of knowledge; education as a universal principle that gains its legitimacy and confirmation within their own criteria (university autonomy) vs. notion of university as a service agent in service of economic or political interests and market priorities. The focus of presentation will be placed on current trends related to university and higher education, with an attempt to emphasize the intensive discursive production of symptomatic signifiers of previously mentioned trends, such as knowledge society, academic excellence and mobility, flow, networking... The presentation will show that even a basic analytical effort in deconstructing these terms can clearly point out the fact that they are ideologemes in the service of the hegemonic tendencies of neoliberalism and its interests.

LUKA ILIĆ

*Leibniz Institute of European History, Mainz, Germany /
Leibniz Institut za europsku povijest, Mainz, Njemačka*

MATTHIAS FLACIUS ILLYRICUS AS A TEACHER AT THE EARLY MODERN LUTHERAN UNIVERSITIES OF WITTENBERG AND JENA

This paper explores the teaching career of the Croatian-born Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520–1575) at the newly founded early modern evangelical universities in Saxony and Thuringia. Flacius, who had been a student in Wittenberg, obtained his first teaching post at the Faculty of Arts as a teacher of Hebrew in 1544, a position he held until Easter 1549. After an academic hiatus between 1549 and 1557 spent in Magdeburg, which nonetheless denoted an important period of gaining broad recognition as a theologian and church historian, Flacius was invited to take up the post of chair in New Testament at

the *Collegium Jenense*. The University of Jena functioned from its beginning as a Lutheran confessional academic institution and Flacius' role as a leading theologian was of great significance in setting a course for the religious landscape of Ernestine Saxony.

How did Flacius fit into the system of early modern Protestant universities and to what degree did he challenge its norms and limits? This paper will also address issues of hierarchy concerning faculties, disciplines and professors, and touch upon the related questions of institutional flexibility versus rigidity within the university system through Flacius' example. Additionally, it sets out to explore some of the important facets of how the confessional identity of the universities was managed and maintained within the principle *cuius regio, eius religio* that operated in the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation.

MATIJA VLAČIĆ ILIRIK KAO PROFESOR NA RANONOVOVJEKOVNIM EVANGELIČKIM SVEUČILIŠTIMA U WITTENBERGU I JENI

Ovaj rad istražuje sveučilišnu karijeru Matije Vlačića Ilirika (1520–1575), rodom iz Labina, na novoosnovanim ranonovovjekovnim evangeličkim sveučilištima u Saskoj i Tirinškoj. Vlačić, koji je prvo bio student u Wittenbergu, dobio je svoje prvo učiteljsko mjesto 1544. na Filozofskom fakultetu kao predavač hebrejskog jezika, a na tom položaju ostao je do Uskrsa 1549. Nakon akademske pauze od 1549. do 1557. provedene u Magdeburgu, koja ipak označava važno razdoblje u kojem je Vlačić dobio mnoga važna priznanja kao teolog i crkveni povjesničar, Vlačić je pozvan da zauzme profesuru Novog Zavjeta na *Collegium Jenense*. Sveučilište u Jeni je od svoga početka djelovalo kao luteranska konfesionalna akademska institucija i Vlačićeva uloga kao jednog od vodećih teologa bila je od velikoga značaja u postavljanju smjera za vjerski krajolik Ernestinske Saske.

Ovaj rad bavi se pitanjima kako se Vlačić uklopio u sistem ranonovovjekovnih protestanskih sveučilišta kao i hijerarhije koje se tiču fakulteta, discipline i profesora, te će upravo kroz Vlačićev primjer dotaknuti pitanja institucionalne fleksibilnosti naspram krutosti unutar sveučilišnog sustava. Zatim, rad istražuje neke od važnih aspekata zadržavanja vjerskog identiteta protestantskih sveučilišta po načelu *cuius regio, eius religio* koje se provodilo od 1555. u Svetom rimskom carstvu njemačke narodnosti.

AMINA ISANOVIĆ

*Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Sarajevu, Bosna i Hercegovina /
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

POIMANJE IDEJE OBRAZOVANJA UNUTAR UNIVERZITETSKOG PROSTORA U KONTEKSTU FILOZOFIJE OBRAZOVANJA R. S. PETERSA

Rad je pokušaj davanja odgovora na dva pitanja: 1.) što se podrazumijeva pod obrazovanjem unutar suvremene relevantne misli u filozofiji odgoja i obrazovanja?; 2.) kako se poima ideja obrazovanja na univerzitetu danas? U nastojanju da se dođe do odgovora na postavljena pitanja, u prvom dijelu rada predstavljen je pregled djela iz filozofije obrazovanja nedavno preminulog britanskog autora Richarda Stanleja Petersa. Predstavljeno je Petersovo analitičkom filozofijom inspirirano poimanje obrazovanja i obrazovanosti. Kao osnovni referentni okvir uzeta je Petersova ideja o *obrazovanju kao prijenosu vrijednosti*. U skladu s time, u drugom dijelu rada tragalno se za odgovorom na istraživačko pitanje: kako se unutar univerzitetskog prostora definira vrijednost koja se obrazovanjem valja prenijeti? S ciljem dolaska do odgovora, provedeno je empirijsko istraživanje sa studentima i nastavnicima zaposlenima na Filozofskom fakultetu u Sarajevu. Primijenjena je tehnika kvalitativne metodologije ekspertnog intervjua. Rezultati istraživanja interpretirani su u skladu s Petersovom filozofijom obrazovanja i trenutnim gibanjima uzrokovanim reformama univerzitetskog obrazovanja.

THE IDEA OF EDUCATION WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY CONTEXT AS REFLECTED IN R. S. PETERS' PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

In the main focus of this paper are two questions: 1) How is education treated in the relevant contemporary thought within the philosophy of education?; 2) How is the idea of education perceived within today's university? In the attempt of giving answers to the posed questions, the first part of this paper presents a review of works in philosophy of education by the late British author Richard Stanley Peters. The focus is on Peters' idea of education, which is strongly inspired by analytic philosophy. The main referent framework is Peters' idea of *education as transmission of values*. According to this, in the second part of the paper the main research question is: How is the value that is to

be transmitted by education defined within the university context? In order to come to the answer, empirical research is conveyed with lecturers and students at the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo. Qualitative technique of expert interview is applied. Results are interpreted according to Peters' philosophy of education and current movements resulted from reforms of university education.

NUSRET ISANOVIĆ

*Islamski pedagoški fakultet, Univerzitet u Zenici, Bosna i Hercegovina /
Islamic Pedagogical Faculty, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

IDEJA SUVREMENOG ISLAMSKOG UNIVERZITETA

Visoko obrazovanje u muslimanskom svijetu stoljećima se nalazi u krizi. Tradicionalna paradigma, na kojoj je zasnovano, potrošena je i neproduktivna, nespособna odgovoriti na izazove suvremenosti. Muslimanski intelektualci reformističke orijentacije smatrali su da je u osnovi slabosti muslimanskog svijeta i razgrađenosti njegovih društava bolest visokog obrazovanja. U radu se predstavlja pokušaj vodećih muslimanskih umova današnjice da rehabilitiraju matrični koncept islamskog znanja i obrazovanja i da, u skladu s njim, definiraju ideju suvremenog islamskog univerziteta. Ideja je zasnovana na načelu jedinstva i konceptu znanja kao cjeline i svjetla čiji je izvor u Transcendenciji te se kao takva suprotstavlja podavanju diktatu fragmenta. Prvi put je prezentirana na Prvoj svjetskoj konferenciji o muslimanskom obrazovanju, a eksperimentalno primijenjena osnivanjem IIUM u Kuala Lumpuru. U posljednjem dijelu rada autor propituje realitet ideje islamskog univerziteta u usporedbi s Kantovom idejom i W. von Humboldtovim konceptom univerziteta te u kontekstu aktualne situacije visokog obrazovanja u zapadnoeuropskom svijetu.

THE IDEA OF MODERN ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY

Higher education in Muslim World is in crisis for centuries. Traditional paradigm on which it was founded is wasted and unproductive, unable to respond to the challenges of modernity. Reform-oriented Muslim intellectuals think that in the very core of weakness of the Muslim World and degradation of its societies lays illness of its higher education. The paper presents attempts of the leading Muslim thinkers to rehabilitate matrix concept of Islamic university. The idea is founded on the principle of Unity and the concept of knowled-

ge as a whole and the light whose origin is in the Transcendent, and as such, it opposes the dictate of fragmentization. The idea has been initially presented at the First World Conference on Muslim Education and its experimental application was seen in founding IIUM in Kuala Lumpur. In the concluding part, the author questions the reality of the idea of Islamic university compared to Kant's line of thought and W. von Humboldt's concept of university, contextualising it into the current situation in higher education in the Western European World.

MISLAV JEŽIĆ

*Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia /
Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska*

THE IDEA OF THE UNIVERSITY

Universitas, pandidakterion/panepistemion, sveučilište and *university* are names for institutions of learning where higher education is attained in all significant fields of knowledge.

Institutions of higher learning have existed in numerous civilisations, and were often either priestly and temple schools or aristocratic and state schools. There were prominent university institutions in ancient China and India.

In the West, Plato's Academy and Aristotle's Lyceum became the paragons of the educational institution in later times. The university began in the West as a system of education that developed in late Antiquity, throughout the Middle Ages and in Modern-Age religious and secular universities.

The foundation of the University in Bologna in the late 11th century also brought with it the establishment of the principle of autonomy of the university from government interference. This autonomy enabled the best-informed to decide upon the development of science and study, and not politics or the government, and allowed universities to choose their own professors and suitably educated leaders.

Modern-day interference of the state and economy in the work and organisation of the university, processes of centralisation, standardisation and management are significantly altering the nature of the university and the role of the scientist in society. They place universities and scientists in the service of power and profit, and by endangering the autonomy of the university, they endanger the democratic principles of society and human rights, such as the

right to free thought and the right to education. In the world of free-market economics and the laws of profit, universities are also in danger from research institutes owned by large, especially international corporations. Here science ceases to be a public good, transforming instead into patents and business secrets. Universities are even offered the opportunity to survive financially by serving such corporations, since university scientists are a cheaper and often better-educated work force than those at expensive, private institutes. Does this union with business aid the development of the university in the short- and long-term or endanger it? What kind of relationship between the sciences and universities on one side and economics and politics on the other would be the best for society and the most profitable for the economy in the long-term, and what kind would provide the highest impetus for discovering and understanding the truth? Has the concept of the Bologna university reform of European universities in this light proven stimulative or limiting? What roles do the principles of university and scientific autonomy play here?

The question we must raise today is whether universities and the sciences today still have a particular task and responsibility that is potentially vital to the future of the economy, knowledge and ethical values, the future of the social and political community, the future of the common good, vital to freedom and the maintenance of the world in which we live.

IDEJA SVEUČILIŠTA

Universitas, pandidakterion/panepistemion, sveučilište naziv je učilišta gdje se stječe visoka naobrazba u svim znatnim područjima znanja.

Postojala su visoka učilišta u raznim civilizacijama. Poznati su primjeri Kine i Indije. Znale su to biti svećeničke, hramske ili aristokratske, državne škole.

Na Zapadu su uzorima učilišta za kasnija vremena postale Platonova Akademija i Aristotelov Lykeij. Sveučilište potječe na Zapadu od sustava naobrazbe kakav se razvijao u kasnome starome vijeku, tijekom srednjega vijeka te na novovjekovnim crkvenim i svjetovnim sveučilištima.

Već je tada, počevši od Sveučilišta u Bologni utemeljenoga krajem 11. stoljeća, utemeljeno i načelo sveučilišne autonomije od upletanja vlasti. Ta je autonomija omogućivala da najupućeniji odlučuju o razvoju znanosti i studija, a ne politika ili vlast, i da sveučilišta sama biraju svoje profesore i primjereno naobražene čelnike.

Današnja upletanja države i gospodarstva u rad i ustroj sveučilišta, procesi centralizacije, standardizacije i menadžerskoga upravljanja bitno mijenja-

ju narav sveučilišta i uloge znanstvenika u društvu. Podvrgavaju sveučilište i znanstvenike interesima vlasti i dobiti, a ugrožavajući autonomiju sveučilišta ugrožavaju i demokratska načela društva i ljudska prava poput prava na slobodu mišljenja i prava na naobrazbu. U svijetu slobodnoga tržišta i zakona dobiti sveučilišta su ugrožena i od istraživačkih instituta u vlasništvu velikih, osobito međunarodnih, korporacija. Tu znanost prestaje biti općim dobrom i postaje patentom i poslovnom tajnom. Sveučilištu se pak nudi prilika da se financijski održi služeći takvim korporacijama jer su znanstvenici na njem jeftinija, a često i bolje naobražena, radna snaga od znanstvenika u skupim privatnim institutima. Pomaže li sprega s gospodarstvom kratkoročno ili dugoročno razvoju znanosti i sveučilišta ili ga ugrožava? Kakav bi odnos između znanosti i sveučilišta s jedne strane i gospodarstva i politike s druge strane bio dugoročno najpoželjniji za društvo, najplodniji za gospodarstvo, kakav najpoticajniji za spoznaju? Kako se u tome okviru pokazuju poticajno ili ograničavajuće zamisli bolonjske reforme europskih sveučilišta? Kakvu tu ulogu imaju načela autonomije sveučilišta i autonomije znanosti?

U izlaganju će se postaviti pitanje: imaju li sveučilišta i znanost danas neku zadaću i odgovornost i može li o tome ovisiti budućnost gospodarstva, spoznaje i etičkih vrijednosti, budućnost društvene i političke zajednice, budućnost zajedničkoga javnoga dobra, slobode, pa i održanja svijeta u kojem živimo.

HRVOJE JURIĆ

*Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska /
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia*

SVEUČILIŠTE I KAPITALIZAM

Zabrinjavajuće trendove transformacije sveučilišta diktira prvenstveno vladajući ekonomski sistem, odnosno neoliberalistički kapitalizam, koji redefiniira pojmove obrazovanja, znanosti i znanja, te njihovu svrhu i smisao, u čemu mu asistiraju suvremene forme znanosti i politike – tehnoznanost i liberalna demokracija.

U izlaganju će ova problematika, među ostalim, biti razmatrana na podlozi jednog dokumenta u kojem se provodi analiza stanja, ukazuje na moguće točke otpora te iznose prijedlozi vezani uz znanost i obrazovanje u aktualnom društveno-političkom kontekstu. To je *Deklaracija o znanosti i visokom obrazovanju*, koju je u ožujku 2012. objavio Sindikat visokog obrazovanja i znanosti »Akademska solidarnost«.

UNIVERSITY AND CAPITALISM

Worrying trends in the transformation of university are primarily dictated by the dominant economic system, i.e. neoliberal capitalism, which redefines notions, purpose and meaning of education, science and knowledge. This redefinition is assisted by the contemporary forms of science and politics – technology and liberal democracy.

This paper considers these issues on the basis of a document that aims to analyze the current situation, point to possible points of resistance, and bring additional suggestions regarding science and education in the contemporary socio-political context. This is *The Declaration on Science and Higher Education*, proposed in March 2012 by the “Academic Solidarity” Union of Higher Education and Science.

VALENTINA KANEVA

*Faculty of Philosophy, St. Kliment Ohridski University of Sofia, Bulgaria /
Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište Sv. Klimenta Ohridskog u Sofiji, Bugarska*

SCIENCE AND ETHICS: SOME REMARKS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

The university is the main institution engaged in development, preservation and transmission of knowledge: knowledge of the world, of nature and natural processes as well as knowledge of human world and human values. The long tradition of humanitarian education in the universities of Europe reveals the processes of both developing knowledge and human development. The development of sciences in the last decades, and especially life sciences, raises difficult questions concerning the progress of scientific knowledge and its power to transform individual and social life. These questions require rethinking of the aims of science and its role in the society. Some gaps and discrepancies of this development are reasons for the recent emphasis on research ethics as well as for the advance of bioethics. This paper focuses on the complexities and ambiguities of the processes, ongoing in the societies in East Europe with regard to the spheres of science and education.

ZNANOST I ETIKA: NEKE NAPOMENE O RAZVOJU ZNANJA I LJUDSKOM RAZVOJU

Sveučilište je glavna institucija koja se bavi razvojem, očuvanjem i prenošenjem znanja: znanja o svijetu, o prirodi i prirodnim procesima, kao i znanja o ljudskom svijetu i ljudskim vrijednostima. Duga tradicija humanističkog obrazovanja na europskim sveučilištima otkriva procese kako razvijanja znanja tako i ljudskog razvoja. Razvoj znanosti posljednjih desetljeća, posebno znanosti o životu, otvara teška pitanja o napretku znanstvenog znanja i njegove moći transformiranja individualnog i društvenog života. Ova pitanja zahtijevaju preispitivanje ciljeva znanosti i njezine uloge u društvu. Neki jazovi i diskrepancije ovog razvoja razlozi su za aktualno pridavanje pažnje etici istraživanja kao i za razvoj bioetike. Ovaj rad se fokusira na složenosti i nejasnoće ovih procesa u društvima Istočne Europe s obzirom na sfere znanosti i obrazovanja.

IVANA KNEŽIĆ

*Odjel za filozofiju, Sveučilište u Zadru, Hrvatska /
Department of Philosophy, University of Zadar, Croatia*

HOBBSOVA KRITIKA SVEUČILIŠTA

Kao oksfordski student, Thomas Hobbes nije bio osobito oduševljen nastavnim sadržajima koji su mu se na Sveučilištu nudili. Averzija prema sveučilištima trajala je cijeloga života, a u njegovim zrelim i kasnim godinama manifestirala se kroz žestoke rasprave s nekim sveučilišnim profesorima. Otpor prema sveučilištima svoj teoretski izričaj pronalazi u djelima ovog britanskog filozofa u obliku bespoštedne kritike upućene na račun sveučilišta. No, premda neumoljivi kritičar sveučilišta, filozof iz Malmesburyja nije zagovarao njihovo ukidanje, nego njihovu reformu. U našem izlaganju donosimo ključne momente Hobbesove kritike sveučilišta, ukazujući na njihovu neposrednu vezu s njegovom filozofijom. Također, u izlaganju ćemo prikazati i osnovne Hobbesove ideje za reformu sveučilišta prema njegovim vlastitim filozofskim principima, uz kritičku prosudbu tih ideja.

HOBBS' CRITIQUE OF UNIVERSITY

As an Oxford student, Thomas Hobbes was not very impressed by the content of lessons offered to him at the University. The aversion towards universities lasted throughout his life and in his mature and late years this aversion manifested itself in a form of intense disputes with certain university professors. The resistance to universities finds its theoretical expression in the works of this British philosopher in the form of the inexorable critique of the universities. Though an unrelenting critic of universities, philosopher from Malmesbury did not advocate for their abolition, but rather for their reform. Our presentation will offer key moments of Hobbes' critique of universities, pointing to their direct relation to his philosophy. We will also show Hobbes' basic ideas for reform of universities according to his own philosophical principles, together with critical judgment of these ideas.

TONČI KOKIĆ

*Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Splitu, Hrvatska /
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Split, Croatia*

INDUSTRIJALIZACIJA SVEUČILIŠTA I DEHUMANIZACIJA

Tradicionalno sveučilište utemeljeno na Humboldtovoj ideji ima obrazovne ciljeve u dobrom temeljnom obrazovanju, razumijevanju načela znanosti i obuci za određeno zanimanje, te usmjeravanju pojedinačne naravi prema slobodi i neovisnosti. Ova koncepcija pretpostavlja samostalnog profesora koji slobodno i stvaralački traži istinu, prenoseći znanje u osobnom odnosu sa studentima u zajednici učitelja i učenika (*universitas*). Industrijalizaciju sveučilišta označava masovni upis na skraćeni studij, nestanak sveučilišne zajednice i obrazovne ciljeve oblikovane u stjecanje vještina potrebnih za natjecanje na tržištu rada. Industrijalizirano sveučilište gubi svoju izvornu narav, postajući samo jedna od gospodarskih djelatnosti koja proizvodi i trguje svojom robom. Industrijalizirano sveučilište razotkriva mit tzv. *društva znanja* o ostvarenju pravednog i boljeg društva jer masovno i površno poučavanje lako kvarljivih i promjenjivih vještina čovjeka čini oruđem gospodarstva i profita. Čovjek tako postaje sredstvom gdje njegova vrijednost ovisi o izvanjskim materijalnim ciljevima pa industrijalizacija sveučilišta tako znači masovnu dehumanizaciju.

INDUSTRIALISATION OF THE UNIVERSITY AND DEHUMANISATION

The traditional university, as founded upon Humboldt's idea, derives its educational aims from a solid basic education, the understanding of the principles of science, and training for a particular profession, as well as directing the individual nature towards freedom and independence. This conception presupposes an independent professor/lecturer, freely and creatively searching for truth, transmitting his/her knowledge to students through a personal contact in a community of teachers and students (*universitas*). Industrialisation of the university, conversely, is marked by a mass admission to condensed courses of study, a disappearance of the university community, with educational aims being solely directed towards acquiring the skills required for the competition in the labour market. The industrialised university is bound to lose its original nature and role, thereby being merely reduced to one of the many economic activities, producing and selling its own goods. The industrialised university thus unveils the myth of the so-called *society of knowledge*, aimed at creating a just and better society, since a superficial teaching of easily degradable, not to say perishable, and variable skills, is bound to result in converting making man into no more than a tool in the hands of economy and profit. Man is thereby inevitably reduced to a mere tool, his value dependent upon external materialistic goals. Consequently, industrialisation of the university will undoubtedly result in a mass dehumanisation.

FILIP KOVAČEVIĆ

*Faculty of Political Science, University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro /
Fakultet političkih nauka, Sveučilište Crne Gore, Podgorica, Crna Gora*

MICHEL ONFRAY AND THE PEOPLE'S UNIVERSITY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Michel Onfray (1959) is a well-known French philosopher who has so far published more than 50 books. His philosophy can be described as hedonist, anarchist, and atheist. In 2002, with the money he earned through the sales of his books, he has founded an innovative kind of university in Caen, Normandy. He called this university the People's University (l'Université populaire) and established it on the principle of education unencumbered by diplomas or tuition. In other words, it is a place where knowledge can truly be pursued

only for knowledge's sake. My paper examines Onfray's claims explaining and justifying the foundation and functioning of such a university, taking into consideration all aspects of its existence (faculty, courses, enrollment, media exposure, philosophical significance, etc). I also explore the possibility of the application of his ideas on a wider scale, considering that there are already several universities of this kind in France and beyond. In addition, I discuss my own application of Onfray's educational principles at the Center for Civic Education in Podgorica, Montenegro.

MICHEL ONFRAY I NARODNI UNIVERZITET U 21. STOLJEĆU

Michel Onfray (1959.) poznati je francuski filozof koji je do sada objavio više od 50 knjiga. Njegova filozofija može biti opisana kao hedonistička, anarhistička i ateistička. Onfray je 2002. godine novcem koji je zaradio prodajom svojih knjiga otvorio jedan inovativni univerzitet u Caenu, gradiću u Normandiji. Nazvao ga je Narodni univerzitet (l'Université populaire) i zasnovao na principu besplatne školarine i neizdavanja diploma. Drugim riječima, to je mjesto gdje se znanje stječe samo radi znanja i ničega drugog. Moj rad analizira Onfrayeve teze koje objašnjavaju i opravdavaju formiranje i funkcioniranje univerziteta ovakvoga tipa, uzimajući u obzir sve aspekte njegove egzistencije (nastavničkog kadra, predmeta, upisa, medijskog prisustva, filozofskoga značaja itd.). Također, razmatram i mogućnost primjene Onfrayevih ideja na šire geografsko područje, imajući u vidu da nekoliko sličnih univerziteta već postoji u Francuskoj i izvan nje. Na kraju, predstavljam i vlastitu primjenu Onfrayevih obrazovnih principa u Centru za građansko obrazovanje u Podgorici.

SPAHIJA KOZLIĆ

*Pravni fakultet, Univerzitet u Zenici, Bosna i Hercegovina /
Faculty of Law, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

UNIVERZITET IZMEĐU NEOPOZITIVIZMA I ANTIEMPIRIZMA

Autor u radu nastoji ukazati na, s jedne strane, sve negativnosti rastuće komercijalizacije visokog obrazovanja koja za posljedicu ima ovisnost znanosti i edukacije o privatnom kapitalu i skretanje s fundamentalnih ka tzv. primijenje-

nim, odnosno profitabilnim istraživanjima, te, s druge strane, kolebanje univerziteta između dva znanstveno-metodološka pristupa zbilji. Jedan je antimetafizički neopozitivizam kao scient(e)ološko dogmatsko uvjerenje da znanosti (posebno prirodne) dosežu preciznu istinu i smisao realiteta, a drugi, upravo obrnuto, zbilju izvanzbiljski pokušava antiempirijski reproducirati u vidu lakomislenog, gotovo dogmatskog vraćanja velikim filozofskim teorijama.

UNIVERSITY BETWEEN NEO-POSITIVISM AND ANTI-EMPIRISM

The author endeavours to point to the increasing negative trend of commercialization of higher education which aftermath is the dependence of science and education on private capital as well as turning from fundamental towards so-called applied – in other words lucrative research – thus causing fluctuations between the two scientific-methodological approaches towards reality. One approach is antimetaphysical neo-positivism as the scientifically founded dogmatic conviction that sciences (particularly natural sciences) reach the level of accurate truth and the meaning of reality, while other approach, on the contrary, tries to reproduce the very reality in an antiempirical way – in the form of superficial, almost dogmatic regression towards major philosophical theories.

LEV KREFT

*Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia /
Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Ljubljani, Slovenija*

Plenary lecture

UNIVERSITY AS ENTERPRISE

Enterprise is a company which means business. Is university an enterprise, can it become one, and should it become an enterprise? To get at least a provisional answer, let us follow three steps of examination:

1. What does 'university' denote? The first source of its name means that university is a community of scholars (teachers and students) with approved limited sovereignty or autonomy, and corporation in body politic. The second and later source of its name tells that university is a community of all sciences which builds universal knowledge out of all

of its disciplines. However, during modern history of university important and perhaps fundamental changes on both sides of this source were introduced. Progressive optimism which promoted science as myth of modernity has been diminished and deconstructed lately. Does this deconstruction produce a *bricolage*, or a change of totalitarian unity into wholeness?

2. How does university manage its intertwined mission (to produce highly educated workers who enter labor market with their useful abilities and to produce scholars who pursue the ideal of universal knowledge for its own sake) at the same time? This is not just recent idea really, as Schiller's inaugural lecture in Jena (May 1789) exemplifies. At the same time, university is expected to produce knowledge as its highest good and useful solutions for trivial applications needed in profit-making processes, and for domination and hegemony necessary for social management. Famous Humboldt university reform (1810) was shaped as much by enlightened philosophical principles as by need to recreate Prussia into strong and stable state with the mission to unite all Germany, with a touch but not too much of modernization. Can both these double missions continue to live hand in hand?
3. Neoliberal approach to the reform of university which became especially stressed and stressful part of so-called Bologna process is contradictory: fundamental tenet of neoliberalism is that state and economy have to stay apart, and that politics should not try to direct business and market processes; in case of university and other public services, however, it is expected that state power and not university as autonomous enterprise has to pressure university into more business-like behavior, with the aim to produce "fast-food" labor force with directly applicable skills and knowledge, profit-ready solutions for productive processes, and practical ideas of how to maintain social stability. If university is or can become an enterprise, it should, according to neoliberal principles, be left alone, because state pressure cannot have positive managerial effects on entrepreneurship; but, on the other side, neoliberal mantra insists that state is to pressure all public services to become market oriented, and to sell them on the market finally, to privatize them – from prison to university. At another level of contradiction, university is expected to embrace managerial leadership over its pedagogical and research activities, while this kind of management applies exactly those methods and motives which were exposed by university itself as destructive to science, and dangerous for society as a whole. This is more than simple contradiction, because it reveals that neoliberal vision is to

disable competition, not to introduce it: there has to be but one choice for everybody, and that is wage labor, and there has to be just one kind of institutions and those are profit-oriented enterprises. What university encounters nowadays is a will to universalize profit as the only reason for existence of human beings and their desire to know more about their world and themselves. Theological and philosophical question “Why is there something rather than nothing?” is getting very plausible answer: “To make profit.”

Plenarno predavanje

SVEUČILIŠTE KAO PODUZEĆE

Poduzeće je udruženje koje se bavi poslovanjem. Je li sveučilište poduzeće, može li i treba li postati poduzeće? Kako bismo dobili barem privremeni odgovor, slijedit ćemo tri koraka ispitivanja:

1. Što znači ‘sveučilište’? Prvi izvor imena znači da je sveučilište zajednica istraživača (učitelja i učenika) s odobrenim ograničenim suverenitetom ili autonomijom, te pravna osoba. Drugi i kasniji izvor imena kaže da je sveučilište zajednica svih znanosti koja gradi univerzalno znanje iz svih svojih disciplina. Međutim, tijekom moderne povijesti sveučilišta uvedene su važne i možda temeljne promjene na objema stranama ovih izvora. Progresivni optimizam koji promovira znanost kao mit modernosti u posljednje je vrijeme umanjen i dekonstruiran. Proizvodi li ova dekonstrukcija *bricolage*, ili promjenu totalitarnog jedinstva u cijelost?
2. Kako sveučilište istovremeno ostvaruje svoju zapletenu misiju (proizvodnje visoko obrazovanih radnika koji ulaze na tržište rada sa svojim korisnim sposobnostima i proizvodnje istraživača koji slijede ideal univerzalnog znanja radi samog ideala)? Ovo zaista nije nedavna ideja, kao što to ilustrira Schillerovo nastupno predavanje u Jeni (svibanj 1789.). U isto vrijeme, od sveučilišta se očekuje da proizvodi znanje kao njezovo najviše dobro, kao i korisna rješenja za trivijalne primjene potrebne u procesima stvaranja profita te za dominaciju i hegemoniju nužnu za društveno upravljanje. Poznata Humboldtova reforma sveučilišta (1810.) oblikovana je kako prosvijećenim filozofskim principima tako i potrebom za pretvaranjem Pruske u snažnu i stabilnu državu s ciljem ujedinjenja čitave Njemačke, s dozom modernizacije, doduše ne prevelikom. Mogu li ove dvostruke misije nastaviti živjeti jedna uz drugu?

3. Neoliberalni pristup reformi sveučilišta, koji je postao posebno naglašen i stresan dio tzv. Bolonjskog procesa, je kontradiktoran: temeljno načelo neoliberalizma jest odvojenost države i ekonomije, pri čemu politika ne bi smjela pokušati upravljati gospodarskim i tržišnim procesima; međutim, u slučaju sveučilišta i drugih javnih službi očekuje se da državna moć, a ne sveučilište kao autonomni poduhvat, mora prisiliti sveučilište na ponašanje sukladno gospodarstvu, s ciljem proizvodnje »fast food« radne snage s direktno primjenjivim vještinama i znanjima, profitabilnim rješenjima za procese proizvodnje, kao i praktičnim idejama za održanje društvene stabilnosti. Ako sveučilište jest ili može postati poduzeće, ono bi prema neoliberalnim načelima, trebalo biti pušteno na miru, budući da pritisak države ne može imati pozitivan učinak na poduzetništvo; no s druge strane neoliberalna mantra inzistira da država treba prisiliti sve javne službe na orijentiranje k tržištu, i na koncu ih i prodati na tržištu, privatizirati – od zatvora do sveučilišta. Na drugoj razini kontradikcije, od sveučilišta se očekuje da prihvati menadžersko vodstvo nad svojim pedagoškim i istraživačkim aktivnostima, tip menadžmenta koji primjenjuje upravo one metode i motive koje je sveučilište prokazalo kao destruktivne za znanost te opasne za društvo u cijelosti. Ovo nije jednostavna kontradikcija zato što otkriva da je neoliberalna vizija onemogućiti konkurenciju, a ne uvesti je: mora postojati samo jedan izbor za sve, a to je plaćeni rad, i mora postojati samo jedan tip institucija, a to su profitno orijentirana poduzeća. Ono što sveučilište danas sreće je volja za univerzaliziranjem profita kao jedinim razlogom za postojanje ljudskih bića i njihovom željom da spoznaju više o njihovom svijetu i njima samima. Teološko i filozofsko pitanje »Zašto uopće nešto, a ne radije ništa?« dobiva vrlo uvjerljiv odgovor: »Zbog profita.«

TOMISLAV KRZGAR

*Učiteljski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska /
Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb, Croatia*

OBRAZOVANJE NARODÂ I MISIJA SVEUČILIŠTA

Misao Ortege y Gasset

U kontekstu rasprave o ulozi sveučilišta u suvremenom društvu, susrećemo se s nekoliko značajnih pitanja koja dotiču odnosa društva i znanosti,

socijalnih mehanizama upotrebe znanja u društvu te odnosa kulture, shvaćene kao temeljnog obrasca nekog društva, i znanosti, shvaćene kao produktivnog mehanizma. O ovim pitanjima vrlo je plodonosno pisao i španjolski filozof Ortega y Gasset (1883.–1955.). U okviru ovoga izlaganja dotaknut ćemo se nekih misli iz dvaju Orteginih djela: *Misija sveučilišta* (1930.) i *Pobuna masa* (1930.). Središnje pitanje Orteginih uvida je sljedeće: zašto sveučilišta na zapadu izgledaju ovako kako izgledaju? Nadalje, koji je njihov »europski supstrat«, a po čemu su značajna primjerice germanska ili francuska sveučilišta? Dva su temeljna pravca koja ćemo slijediti u ovome izlaganju. Prvi je vezan uz Ortegino shvaćanje 'naroda', potrebama kojega akademsko školovanje mora odgovoriti, dok je drugi vezan uz dimenzije tehnikalizacije života čovjeka. Ovo potonje razvijeno je sintagmi 'barbarstvo specijalizacije' koju Ortega podvrgava kritici navodeći osnovnu tezu da suvremeno tehnikalizirano znanje ne odgovara duhovnim potrebama čovjeka i 'naroda'. Temeljna zamisao ovoga izlaganja je, u kontekstu Ortegine misli, preispitati koja je zadaća sveučilišta.

EDUCATION OF PEOPLES AND THE MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY

Thought of Ortega Y Gasset

In the context of the discussion on the role of the university in contemporary society we encounter several very important questions: some of them concern relation of society with science, other concern social mechanisms of the use of knowledge and relation between culture, understood as a basic social model, and science, understood as a model of social production. Very considerable contribution to the consideration of the mentioned problems we can find in the thought of Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset (1883–1955). In this paper, on the basis of the Ortega's insights, mostly from his work *Mission of the University* (1930) and *The Revolt of the Masses* (1930), we will try to answer the following question: why European universities function the way they do, or rather: what is the specificity, besides the "European substrate", of German or French universities? There are two basic directions we wish to follow in this paper. First, on the basis of Ortegian understanding of the concept of 'people', we must try to find an answer to the following question: what is the purpose of the University? Second important insight of this paper, considering Ortega's term 'barbarism of the specialisation', is to show Ortega's insight shaped in the following question: Why contemporary highly technical knowledge does not respond to cultural demands of human and 'people'?

DAMIR KUKIĆ

*Pedagoški fakultet, Univerzitet u Zenici, Bosna i Hercegovina /
Pedagogical Faculty, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

SVEUČILIŠTE KAO TVRĐAVA

Veliko je pitanje predstavlja li moderno sveučilište poseban prostor u kojem se kreiraju nove ideje, traže rješenja i vode dijalozi, promišljaju problemi i čovjekova budućnost. Ovo pitanje je aktualno i u kontekstu europske reforme visokog obrazovanja označene kao Bolonjski proces. Ističe se dilema da li i kome danas služi sveučilište, kakva je njegova funkcija, te u kojoj mjeri ono predstavlja uporište za različite ideološke matrice i instrument određenih centara društvene moći.

Podređenost sveučilišnih principa interesima ekonomskih centara moći postala je bitna odlika današnje egzistencije akademske zajednice. Znanstvenici funkcioniraju kao tržišni produkti, pa se i njihovo pojavljivanje modelira kao medijska senzacija i dio *celebrity* kulture. Ali, i suvremeni društveni kontekst prepoznaje utjecaj političkih struktura. Ovo je zanimljiv fenomen, naročito u Bosni i Hercegovini, gdje se koncept sveučilišta često poistovjećuje s konceptom tvrđave – utvrde koja treba zaštititi »domaći« nacionalni prostor.

UNIVERSITY AS A FORTRESS

The big question is whether the modern university is a special space in which to create new ideas, seek solutions and lead dialogues, reflecting the problems and the future of a man. This issue is actual in the context of European higher education reform marked as the Bologna process. This paper highlights the dilemma on the purpose of the university as well as to whom it serves today, what is its function, and to what extent it represents a stronghold for various ideological matrixes and an instrument of certain centers of social power.

The principles of university are subordinated to the interests of the economic centers of power and that has become an essential feature of the present existence of the academic community. Scientists operate as a market products, and their appearance is modeled as a media sensation and a part of celebrity culture. However, modern social context recognizes the impact of political structures as well. This is an interesting phenomenon, especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the concept of universities is often equated with the concept of fortress – the fortress, which primarily is to protect “domestic” national space.

MISLAV KUKOČ

*Faculty of Philosophy, University of Split, Croatia /
Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Splitu, Hrvatska*

IN MEMORY ON NIKOLA SKLEDAR (1942–2011):
PHILOSOPHER, CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGIST
AND SOCIOLOGIST OF RELIGION

“*Eros* and *Thanatos* are not mutually unrelated and separate as it usually takes too simple. Death is an imminent tendency of life. What brings us here has been akin to what takes us out. However, death is for everyone strictly individual and personal, but also a kind of deliverance, an eliminating – establishing bond of the individual person and the cosmos. *Thanatos*, therefore, is not merely the opposite of *Eros* and *Bios*, death is not only a negation of life, but also a deliberation for the return to the timeless-eternal origin of the overall being...” – Thus spoke Nikola Skledar, an outstanding Croatian philosopher, cultural anthropologist and sociologist of culture and religion, who passed away last year in November, some forty days after we had sent him the plaque and the signed postcard with good wishes.

With his impressive versatile multidisciplinary oeuvre, with scholarly, social and human engagement he left the permanent marker not only in Croatian philosophical life. The participants of the *Days of Frane Petrić* will remember him as one of the most regular participants from the first days of the conference, not only by his philosophical contribution, but also by his recognizable Dionysian moment celebrating life, wine, friendship and love.

U SPOMEN NIKOLI SKLEDARU (1942–2011):
FILOZOFU, KULTURNOM ANTROPOLOGU
I SOCIOLOGU RELIGIJE

»*Eros* i *thanatos* nisu međusobno nepovezani i odvojeni kako se to obično prejednostavno shvaća. Smrt je imanentna tendencija života. Ono što nas donosi srodno je onome što nas odnosi. I smrt je za svakoga strogo pojedinačna i vlastita, ali istovremeno i izbavljenje od toga, ukidajuća – uspostavljajuća sveza pojedinca, osobe i kozmosa. *Thanatos*, dakle, nije puka suprotnost *erosu* i *biosu*, smrt nije samo puka negacija života, nego i njegovo oslobođenje za povratak u nevremeniti-svevremeni iskon svekolika bića...« – tako je govorio Nikola Skledar, ugledni hrvatski filozof, sociolog i antropolog, koji je premi-

nuo 7. studenoga 2011. u Zaprešiću, mjesec i pol nakon što smo mu sa Cresa poslali plaketu i razglednicu sa željama za oporavak.

Svojim svestranim i impresivnim opusom, znanstvenim, društvenim i ljudskim angažmanom ostavio je trajan biljeg ne samo u hrvatskom filozofskom životu. Sudionici *Dana Frane Petrića* pamtit će ga kao jednog od najredovitijih sudionika od prvih dana konferencije, ne samo po njegovim filozofskom i doprinosu nego i po dionizijskom momentu slavljenja života, vina, prijateljstva i ljubavi.

MARIJA LAMOT

*Srednja škola – Gimnazija Krapina, Hrvatska /
High School – Gymnasium Krapina, Croatia*

GIMNAZIJA – PRIPREMA ZA SVEUČILIŠTE

Priprema li gimnazija za sveučilište? Postoji li ideja gimnazije kao srednjoškolskog općeg obrazovanja koje svojom širinom priprema nastavak školovanja i pobuđuje filozofski i znanstveni interes? Doprinosu li tome humanistički predmeti (latinski jezik, književnost, umjetnost, povijest, filozofija) ili su oni naprosto historijski ostatak vrijedan tek kao informacija?

Treba li danas čovjeku cjelovito obrazovanje (*l'uomo universale*) čiji je obrazovni ishod ujedno mjerilo ljudske i moralne kvalitete? Trebaju li mladi ljudi i na taj način prepoznati i razvijati svoje intelektualne i kreativne sposobnosti, te razvijati kritičku svijest spram društva u kojem žive, ili to suvremenom društvu nije potrebno? Je li ideja kurikularne nastave na tom tragu? Treba li razvijati sposobnosti mišljenja? Poteškoće »na putu«, situacija u Hrvatskoj i u drugim zemljama.

GYMNASIUM – PREPARATION FOR UNIVERSITY

Does Gymnasium prepare high-school students for admission to university? Is there an idea of Gymnasium as a place where high-school students gain general knowledge which, when considered entirety, prepares them for the continuation of education and does the school foster students' interest in philosophy and science? Do courses in the Humanities (Latin, Literature, Art, History, Philosophy) contribute to it, or are they simply historical remains, valuable only as information? Does a human being nowadays actually need universal education (*l'uomo universale*) with its final outcome being the stand-

ard of their human and moral qualities? Furthermore, should young people recognize and develop their intellectual and creative abilities, as well as critical consciousness towards society they live in, or contemporary society does not need it? Can the idea of curriculum follow that path? Is it necessary to pursue abilities of critical thinking? Difficulties “on the way to it”, situation in Croatia and other countries.

MARCEL V. MÄCELARU

*Evangelical Theological Seminary, Osijek, Croatia /
Evandeoski teološki fakultet, Osijek, Hrvatska*

THE BIBLE AS A DOCUMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

This article addresses the issue of the legitimacy of using and teaching the Bible within a university context. It is argued that the Bible remains relevant at three levels:

1. as a historical artifact it provides socio-historical data on several centuries of Ancient Near Eastern history;
2. as a piece of world literature its impact on humanity’s cultural output and the resulting connections to various disciplines should not be ignored;
3. as a religious document it is an important factor in the sociopolitical makeup of the contemporary world and its power to further shape our communities should be explored.

The article also shows that, although all the above have been true in the past, there is a new role the Bible may play as a document of the university. Within the contemporary context, in which higher education is predominantly secular, the Bible has lots of promise as counter-culture – and since questioning the status quo is a must in any scientific inquiry, the role the Bible may play within contemporary university education should be reevaluated.

BIBLIJA KAO DOKUMENT SVEUČILIŠTA

Ovaj rad se bavi pitanjem legitimnosti korištenja i poučavanja Biblije u kontekstu sveučilišta. Smatra se da je Biblija i dalje relevantna na tri razine:

1. kao povijesni artefakt nudi društveno-povijesne podatke o nekoliko stoljeća antičke bliskoistočne povijesti;

2. budući da je dio svjetske književnosti, ne smije se ignorirati njen utjecaj na kulturnu proizvodnju čovječanstva i posljedične veze s raznim disciplinama;
3. kao religijski dokument, važan je čimbenik u društveno-političkom sastavu suvremenog svijeta te bi se trebala istraživati njezina moć daljnjeg oblikovanja naših zajednica.

Rad također pokazuje da, iako je gore navedeno bilo istinito u prošlosti, postoji nova uloga koju bi Biblija mogla imati kao dokument sveučilišta. U suvremenom kontekstu u kojem je visoko obrazovanje pretežito sekularno, Biblija puno obećava u obliku kontra-kulture – budući da je propitivanje *statusa quo* nužno u svakom znanstvenom istraživanju, uloga koju Biblija može imati u sklopu suvremenog sveučilišta treba biti preispitana.

ALEKSANDRA MAKSIĆ

*Martin Buber University, Kerkrade, The Netherlands /
Sveučilište Martin Buber, Kerkrade, Nizozemska*

UNIVERSITY VISVA-BHARATI; TAGORE'S OPEN EDUCATION

This paper has attempted to present the possibilities and challenges in the field of philosophy of education today with reference to Tagore's (1861–1941) time and work. He did not believe in a closed system of finished knowledge with unchangeable borders, but perceived education as an attempt to realise the infinite diversity of human understanding. University Visva-Bharati was conceived as a place for cross-cultural examination and resistance to oppression and marginalization, *a place where the whole world forms a single nest*. Instead of loading education with facts and information, Tagore wanted learning and teaching to be an endeavor in the discovery of a form of truth. He gave us a creative, humanistic and intercultural philosophy of education, providing theoretical, artistic, pedagogical and practical examples from which the entire world can learn today.

UNIVERZITET VISVA-BHARATI; TAGORINO OTVORENO OBRAZOVANJE

Ovaj rad pokušao je predstaviti mogućnosti i izazove u području filozofije obrazovanja s posebnim osvrtom na Tagorino (1861.–1941.) vrijeme i djelo. On nije vjerovao u zatvoren sustav konačnoga znanja s nepromjenljivim granicama, već je imao viziju obrazovanja koje ostvaruje raznovrsnost ljudskog razumijevanja. Univerzitet Visva-Bharati osnovan je kao mjesto prožimanja različitih kultura i otpora ugnjetavanju i marginalizaciji, *mjesto gdje čitav svijet čini jedno gnijezdo*. Umjesto reproduktivnog, Tagore je želio obrazovanje koje je stvaralačko i u kojemu se postupno otkriva istina. On je ponudio kreativnu, humanističku i interkulturnu filozofiju obrazovanja s mnoštvom teorijskih, umjetničkih, pedagoških i praktičnih primjera koji mogu i danas biti uzorom.

NENAD MALOVIĆ

*Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät, Universität Zagreb, Kroatien /
Katolički bogoslovni fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska*

ORT UND ROLLE DER GEISTESWISSENSCHAFTEN AN DER UNIVERSITÄT

Die Ökonomisierung der Gesellschaft und des Menschen brachte mit sich auch die Ökonomisierung des Wissens. Der Marktpreis des Wissens droht immer mehr zur inneren Logik und zum Hauptziel der Ausbildung überhaupt zu werden. In einem solchen marktorientierten Klima, begleitet von den vielversprechenden Ergebnissen der technisch-digitalen Zivilisation, scheinen die Geisteswissenschaften überflüssig zu werden. Ohne die Bedeutung der „Nicht-geisteswissenschaften“ (aber doch nicht ohne Geist) in Frage zu stellen, wird hier ein Versuch unternommen, die Wichtigkeit der Geisteswissenschaften für die Universität, aber auch für den Menschen als solchen und für die Gesellschaft zu zeigen.

MJESTO I ULOGA HUMANISTIČKIH ZNANOSTI NA SVEUČILIŠTU

Ekonomizacija društva i čovjeka donijela je sa sobom i ekonomizaciju znanja. Postoji opasnost da tržišna cijena znanja sve više postane unutarnjom

logikom i glavnim ciljem obrazovanja uopće. U jednoj takvoj tržišno orijentiranoj klimi, praćenoj obećavajućim rezultatima tehničko-digitalne civilizacije, čini se da humanističke znanosti postaju suvišne. Bez postavljanja u pitanje značenja »nehumanističkih znanosti« (koje nisu bez duha i čovjeka), ovdje se pokušava pokazati važnost humanističkih znanosti za sveučilište, ali i za čovjeka kao takvoga te za društvo.

LUKA MATIĆ

Osijek, Hrvatska (student) /

Osijek, Croatia (student)

SVEUČILIŠTE: OD SPEKULACIJE DO KRIZE

U izlaganju ću se usmjeriti na problematiku koju je na četrnaest predavanja posvećenih određenju akademija razmatrao njemački filozof Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775–1854). Inače, ta predavanja objavljena su pod zajedničkim naslovom *Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums*.

U svojem izlaganju ponajprije ću se baviti prvim trima Schellingovim predavanjima, a koja su se odnosila na apsolutni pojam znanosti, na znanstveno i ćudoredno određenje akademija te na prve pretpostavke akademskoga studija. Naime, na sveučilištu je moguće i nužno ostvariti idealno shvaćeno znanje, i to tako što se na njemu, prema Schellingu, odvijaju aktivnosti zahvaljujući kojima se realitet pretvara u idealitet, čime se proizvodi znanje. Izlaganje Schellingova nauka o metodi akademskoga studija poslužit će mi kao orijentir za ocjenu sadašnjega stanja sveučilišta.

Dakle, u izlaganju ću se očitovati i o aktualnom stanju na sveučilištu. Pritom smatram da u današnje vrijeme sveučilište ponajviše obilježava kriza. Gubitak koncepta identiteta znanja i djelovanja, a koji identitet karakterizira utemeljenje modernog sveučilišta, danas dovodi do raspršivanja produktivnih snaga u znanosti i, posljedično tome, do ukidanja znanja kao bezuvjetne svrhe znanstveno-istraživačkoga rada. Zbog toga, kao što je zaključio austrijski znanstvenik Konrad Paul Liessmann, znanje gubi svoj društveni značaj i njegovo mjesto zauzima informacija i upravljanje informacijama.

UNIVERSITY: FROM SPECULATION TO CRISIS

In this presentation I will focus on a problem that German philosopher Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775–1854) explored in his lectures dedicated to academy disposition, which were titled and published as *On University Studies (Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums)*.

I will particularly focus on the first three out of fourteen Schelling's lectures, which dealt with the absolute idea of science, scientific and moral disposition of academy, and with the preconditions for academic studies. According to Schelling, achieving the ideally perceived knowledge at a university is not only possible, but also necessary, due to ongoing activities of transforming reality into ideality, which results in knowledge. Presenting Schelling's teaching on methods of academic studies will serve as an orientation for evaluating the state in which university finds itself today.

Therefore, in my presentation I will also respond to the current state of university for which I argue that is first and foremost marked by crisis. The loss of identity of knowledge and action, which characterizes the foundations of modern university, leads to dispersion of productive strengths of science, and consequently to elimination of knowledge as an unconditional purpose of research and scientific work in general. As a result of that, just as Austrian scientist Konrad Paul Liessmann stated, knowledge loses its meaning in society and its importance is replaced by information and information management.

NEDILJKO MATIĆ

*Hrvatski Crveni križ, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Croatian Red Cross, Zagreb, Croatia*

SVEUČILIŠTE U E-DRUŠTVU

Autor razmatra razvoj sveučilišta u virtualnom društvu visoko razvijenih oblika komuniciranja i sudjelovanja u virtualnim zajednicama, ali bez fizičke prisutnosti samih članova. Može li sveučilište, u zajednici koja ne poznaje geografske granice i koja samim time iskače iz izvorne definicije 'zajednice', ponuditi novu mogućnost obrazovanju da postane istinsko razumijevanje, potiče razvitak i oblikovanje pojedinca, ili će se usmjeravati prema političkim i ekonomskim interesima, prema komercijaliziranju i ekonimiziranju znanja.

THE UNIVERSITY IN E-SOCIETY

The author problematizes the development of the university in a virtual society, a highly developed form of communication and involvement in virtual communities, but without any physical presence of the members of community themselves. Can the university, in a community which does not acknowledge geographical limitations and therefore does not correspond to the original definition of society, offer a new possibility for education to become the true understanding, to encourage development and to shape an individual, or will the university (re)direct towards political and economic interests, towards commercialization and economization of knowledge.

BÉLA MESTER

*Institute for Philosophical Research, Research Centre for Humanities, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary /
Institut za filozofska istraživanja, Istraživački centar za humanističke znanosti, Mađarska akademija znanosti, Budimpešta, Mađarska*

“SYSTEM” IN PHILOSOPHY AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT OF UNIVERSITIES

Importance of the educational context in the creation of works of philosophy is known well by the historians of philosophy. Without a target audience consisted by disciples, any philosophical work could not be formulated from Aristotle's works through Hegel's lectures to the present context of a philosophical work in our today academic life. First aim of my lecture is to analyse the connection between this educational context and the phenomenon of the “system” in philosophy. Second aim of mine is to characterise a new cultural requirement in the 19th-century European philosophy for philosophical system-building. Third topic of my lecture is the adaptation of the requirement of “system-philosophy” to the program of establishing national cultures in the 19th-century Central Europe. The consequence of this program in the age of decline of philosophical systems is the last topic of my contribution.

»SUSTAV« U FILOZOFIJI KAO POSLJEDICA INSTITUCIONALNOG KONTEKSTA SVEUČILIŠTA

Važnost obrazovnog konteksta u stvaranju filozofskih djela dobro je poznata povjesničarima filozofije. Bez ciljne publike koja se sastoji od učenika, niti jedno filozofsko djelo, od Aristotelovih djela, preko Hegelovih predavanja do sadašnjeg konteksta filozofskog djela u današnjem akademskom životu ne bi moglo biti formulirano. Prvi cilj moga izlaganja je analizirati vezu između ovog obrazovnog konteksta i fenomena »sustava« u filozofiji. Drugi mi je cilj karakterizirati novi kulturni zahtjev za stvaranjem filozofskih sustava u europskoj filozofiji 19. stoljeća. Treća tema mog izlaganja je prilagodba zahtjeva za »sustavnom filozofijom« programu uspostave nacionalnih kultura Srednje Europe u 19. stoljeću. Posljedica ovoga programa u dobu pada filozofskih sustava je posljednja tema mog priloga.

MATKO MEŠTROVIĆ

*Ekonomski institut, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Institute of Economics, Zagreb, Croatia*

MOŽE LI PREŽIVJETI?

Val sveučilišnog obrazovanja pokrenut je u velikom broju zemalja koje do 1945. godine uopće nisu imale sveučilišnih institucija ili su ih imale vrlo malo. Visoko obrazovanje postalo je svjetska pojava. Ta blistava slika brojčanog porasta sveučilišta potamnijela je oko 1970. godine. Krivulja razvoja razdvojila se u dva suprotna smjera – prema sve manje novca i prema sve više troškova. Zatim je počelo vrednovanje čitavih sveučilišta ili njihovih odjela po tome koliki je probitak od u njih uloženih novaca.

Svekolike napetosti – ekonomske, kulturne, duhovne – traju i produbljuju se sa sustavom obrazovanja zasnovanim na vrijednostima prošlih stoljeća, ubrzano povećavajući neravnotežu između suvremenih socijalnih struktura i promjena koje se zbivaju u današnjem svijetu.

Sveučilište bez uvjeta zapravo ne postoji, kao što vrlo dobro znamo. Svejedno, u načelu i u skladu s njegovom deklariranom vokacijom, njegovom ispovijedanom biti, sveučilište mora ostati krajnje mjesto kritičkoga otpora – i više nego kritičkoga – spram svih sila dogmatskog i nepravednog prisvajanja. Je li to jako Derridino uvjerenje još održivo?

CAN IT SURVIVE?

University education was launched in a large number of countries that had few or no university institutions before 1945. Higher education became worldwide. This rosy picture came into difficulty after about year 1970. The story ever since has been that of the two curves going in opposite directions – less money and increased expenses. There began to be evaluations of whole universities and of departments within universities in terms of their output for the money invested.

All the various tensions – economic, cultural, and spiritual – are inevitably perpetuated and deepened by a system of education founded on the values of another century, and by a rapidly accelerating unbalance between social structures and the changes which are currently taking place in the contemporary world.

A university without conditions does not, in fact, exist, as we know only too well. Nevertheless, in principle, and in conformity with its declared vocation, its professed essence, it should remain an ultimate place of critical resistance – and more than critical – to all the powers of dogmatic and unjust appropriation. Can this strong Derrida's believe still survive?

ANTON MLINAR

*Science and Research Centre, University of Primorska, Koper, Slovenia /
Znanstveno-istraživački centar, Sveučilište Primorska, Koper, Slovenija*

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN ON A UNIVERSITY: ACTUALITY OF A 160 YEARS OLD DISCOURSE

Newman's famous treatise on university, which was originally dedicated to his plan of founding a new Catholic university in Dublin, is a classic demonstration of an ideal of liberal education. Newman defended with it his idea of integrity of education necessary for whichever autonomous development of scientific knowledge. At first, it was a defense of the position of the theology among other disciplines within the university's curricula, but gradually it became a key footnote to a much more important question regarding the autonomy of a university's education and the collegial character of knowledge. Newman's original discourse written in 1852 was going back to his total dedication to the collegiality of education, convinced that the education was (or should be) the turning point of life much more important than a mere

curricula's subjects. For him, the university is a civilization achievement and therefore not a question of political or some other hierarchies. In my presentation I will expose some Newman's ideas which could be topical in front of the replacement of the Bologna reform from 1989 through Bologna process – and the following subordination of the whole reform process to the economic policy – and in front of European junction between Lisbon strategy and Bologna process after 1999.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN NA SVEUČILIŠTU: AKTUALNOST DISKURSA STAROG 160 GODINA

Newmanova poznata rasprava o sveučilištu, koja je izvorno bila posvećena njegovu planu za osnivanje novoga katoličkoga sveučilišta u Dublinu, klasična je demonstracija ideala liberalnog obrazovanja. U njoj je Newman branio svoju ideju integriteta obrazovanja nužnog za bilo koji autonoman razvoj znanstvenog znanja. Isprva je ta rasprava bila obrana položaja teologije među drugim disciplinama unutar sveučilišnih kurikula, no postupno je postala ključna bilješka za mnogo važnije pitanje o autonomiji sveučilišnog obrazovanja i kolegijalnim karakterom znanja. Newmanova originalna rasprava napisana 1852. prožeta je potpunom predanošću kolegijalnosti znanja, pri čemu je bio uvjeren da je obrazovanje (ili bi trebalo biti) prekretnica u životu koja je puno važnija od pukih predmeta u kurikulumima. Za njega je sveučilište civilizacijsko postignuće i stoga nije pitanje političke ili neke druge hijerarhije. U izlaganju ću predstaviti neke Newmanove ideje koje bi mogle biti aktualne u kontekstu izmjena Bolonjske reforme od 1989. kroz Bolonjski proces – i pratećim podređivanjem cijelog procesa reforme ekonomskoj politici – te u kontekstu europskog spajanja Lisabonske strategije i Bolonjskog procesa nakon 1999.

JURICA MLINAREC, IVANA RAMIĆ, MARTINA TOPALOVIĆ

*Fakultet političkih znanosti, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska (studenti) /
Faculty of Political Science, University of Zagreb, Croatia (students)*

STUDENTSKA BORBA ZA AUTONOMIJU SVEUČILIŠTA – DIREKTNA DEMOKRACIJA

Blokada Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu 2009. godine bio je najduži i najmasovniji studentski prosvjed na ovim prostorima. Nastala je u sklopu

»Globalnog tjedna akcije 2009.« kojeg je organizirala nezavisna studentska platforma »Međunarodni studentski pokret«.

Kroz svih 35 dana trajanja blokade studenti su funkcionirali po načelima direktne demokracije. Taj način djelovanja pokazao se kao vrlo učinkovit i uspješan te su nakon blokade na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zagrebu nastale mnoge direktno-demokratske inicijative koje djeluju i danas. Tada prvi puta spomenuta, borba za besplatno obrazovanje ušla je u javni diskurs i postala tema o kojoj se i dalje priča te na kojoj javnost i dalje inzistira. Termin 'borba za besplatno obrazovanje' počeo se učestalo pojavljivati i u hrvatskim *mainstream* medijima koji su na početku vrlo neozbiljno shvaćali blokadu i zahtjeve studenata.

Ovaj je prosvjed zasigurno pokazatelj toga da studenti teže autonomiji sveučilišta i da se udruženo na globalnoj razini bore protiv privatizacije visokog obrazovanja i podređivanja sveučilišta interesima kapitala.

Kroz predavanje, pokušat ćemo pokazati koji su glavni razlozi tolikog uspjeha blokade i koje je promjene taj prosvjed donio u visoko školstvo u Hrvatskoj. Predstaviti ćemo povijest blokade te iskustva nekih od glavnih aktera. Osim toga, predočit ćemo glavna načela direktne demokracije (dir-dema) i predstaviti neke od najuspješnijih dir-dem inicijativa koje su izravan produkt blokade.

STUDENTS' FIGHT FOR THE AUTONOMY OF UNIVERSITY – DIRECT DEMOCRACY

Students' blockade of the Zagreb Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in 2009 was the longest and the most massive student protest in Croatia. It was a part of "Global Week of Action 2009" organised by independent student platform "International Student Movement".

During 35 days of protest students used direct democracy as a way of functioning. This way of functioning proved to be very effective and successful and resulted in many direct democracy initiatives which still exist and act at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb. Fight for free education, which was mentioned for the first time in Croatia during the blockade, became a part of public discourse, an issue on which public strongly insists. The term 'fight for free education' became frequently used in Croatian mainstream media who were very cynical about the subject of protests during the blockade.

This protest shows that students want independent university and that they fight on global level against privatization of higher education.

During our presentation we will try to show the main reasons of success of the blockade. Also, we will try to show changes this student protest brought in Croatian higher education. We will present history of the blockade and experiences of some of the main participants. Also, we will talk about some main principles of direct democracy and present some of the most successful direct democracy initiatives which are products of the blockade.

RASTKO MOČNIK

*Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia /
Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Ljubljani, Slovenija*

Plenary lecture

**THE RISE OF HIGHER EDUCATION –
THE FALL OF UNIVERSITY?**

Plenarno predavanje

**USPON VISOKOG ŠKOLSTVA –
ZALAZAK SVEUČILIŠTA?**

JOSIP OSLIĆ

*Katolički bogoslovni fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska /
Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät, Universität Zagreb, Kroatien*

INTEGRITAS I UNIVERSITAS

Skolastičke pretpostavke ozbiljenja ideje sveučilišta

Integritas, kod Tome Akvinskoga »nepovredivo stanje« ili sinteza svih, znanstvenih, filozofskih i teoloških postignuća, predstavlja prije svega zahtjev da se u jedan sustav (dogmu) integriraju ne samo stare i od crkvenoga autoriteta priznate istine, već ponajprije zahtjev da se sam sustav kao takav drži potpuno otvorenim za sve nove i novospoznate istine. Stoga autor ovoga priloga pokušava pokazati u kojoj mjeri *integritas*-ideja sačinjava nužnu pretpostavku za *universitas*, odnosno za *universitas studiorum*, i to polazeći najprije od one potpune otvorenosti koja povratno treba prevladati svaki znanstveni ili filozofski i teološki dogmatizam. Kao primjer daljnjega ozbiljenja te ideje odabrali smo u drugome koraku Zimmermannovu borbu za autonomiju Sveučilišta u doba Drugog svjetskog rata i Bajsićevo dijaloško i »pluriperspektivističko« shvaćanje današnjih znanosti – to su dva neoskolastička filozofa koji su uvijek iznova pokušavali izvršiti takvo posredovanje *integritas* i *universitas* da se unaprijed onemogućuje svaki dogmatizam u korist slobode znanstvenoga istraživanja. U trećem koraku razmatra se današnja integrativna uloga filozofije za sveučilišni život i sveučilišnu djelatnost.

INTEGRITAS UND UNIVERSITAS

Scholastische Voraussetzungen der Verwirklichung der Universitätsidee

Integritas, bei Thomas von Aquin der „unverletzliche Zustand“ oder Synthese aller wissenschaftlichen, philosophischen und theologischen Errungenschaften, stellt vor allem den Anspruch dar, nicht nur alte und durch die kirchliche Autorität angeeignete Wahrheiten in ein System (Dogma) zu integrieren, sondern zunächst die Forderung, das System selbst als solches für alle neue und neu erkannte Wahrheiten völlig offen zu halten. Deshalb versucht der Verfasser dieses Beitrags zu zeigen, inwiefern die *Integritas*-Idee eine notwendige Voraussetzung für *Universitas* bzw. für die Idee *universitas studiorum* ausmacht, und zwar ausgehend zuerst von jener vollkommenen Offenheit, die rückwirkend jede disziplinär-wissenschaftliche oder philosophischen und theologischen Dogmatismus überwinden soll. Als das Beispiel weiterer Verwirklichung dieser Idee haben wir im zweiten Schritt Stjepan Zimmermanns Kampf um die Autonomie

der Universität in der Zeit des Zweiten Weltkrieges einerseits und Vjekoslav Bajsićs dialogische und „pluriperspektivistische“ Auffassung der heutigen Wissenschaften ausgewählt – zwei neuscholastische Philosophen, die immer wieder es versuchten, die Ideen des *integritas* und *universitas* so zu vermitteln, dass jeden Dogmatismus um die Freiheit des wissenschaftlichen Forschens schon im voraus verbietet wird. Im dritten Schritt wird die heutige integrative Rolle der Philosophie für das Universitätsleben und – tätigkeit erörtert.

VLADIMIR PAAR

*Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb, Croatia /
Prirodoslovno-matematički fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska*

Plenary lecture

THE 21st CENTURY UNIVERSITY AND THE BASIC KNOWLEDGE

The topics to discuss:

- The nature of the scientific and technological revolution in the 21st century.
- New challenges of future economic and social developments.
- The increasing role of the basic knowledge in the University education.
- Need to reconcile University education and lifelong learning.
- The role of University and requirements of increasing interdisciplinarity.
- Pitfalls for University in new circumstances.
- New paradigm for the idea of the University in the 21st century.

Plenarno predavanje

21. STOLJEĆE I TEMELJNA ZNANJA

Teme o kojima će biti govora:

- Narav znanstveno-tehnološke revolucije u 21. stoljeću.
- Novi izazovi budućega ekonomskog i društvenog razvoja.
- Rastuća uloga temeljnih znanja u sveučilišnoj nastavi.
- Potreba za usklađivanjem sveučilišne nastave i cjeloživotnoga učenja.
- Uloga sveučilišta i uvjeti rastuće interdisciplinarnosti.
- Stupice za sveučilište u novim uvjetima.
- O novoj paradigmi ideje sveučilišta u 21. stoljeću.

IVAN PEKLIĆ

*Gimnazija Ivana Zakmardija Dijankovečkoga, Križevci, Hrvatska /
Gymnasium "Ivan Zakmardi Dijankoveči", Križevci, Croatia*

FRANJO MARKOVIĆ: SVEUČILIŠTE KAO DUHOVNA LAĐA NARODA

Djelatnost Franje Markovića uvelike je vezana za hrvatsko Sveučilište. Marković je prvi dekan Filozofskoga fakulteta, predavač na istome Fakultetu od 1874. do 1914. godine te rektor zagrebačkoga Sveučilišta. Djelatnost Markovića vezana je za same početke hrvatskog Sveučilišta kada je kao dekan Filozofskoga fakulteta okupljao profesore za rad na Fakultetu. Marković je predavao Etiku, Estetiku, Psihologiju, Povijest filozofije, Pedagogiju i Logiku. Kao rektor zagrebačkoga Sveučilišta, Marković je vodio veliku brigu o školovanju mladih studenata, o profesorima i o materijalnom stanju Sveučilišta. Svoje stavove i razmišljanja o zadaćama koje bi Sveučilište trebalo imati Marković je izrazio u svoja dva nastupna govora. U govoru »K Logici« povodom otvaranja Sveučilišta 18. listopada 1874. Marković je naglasio ulogu filozofije u stvaranju domovine. Budući da je, prema Markoviću, filozofija jedna od prvih znanosti koje treba predavati na Sveučilištu, onda jasno da je uloga Sveučilišta u oblikovanju nacionalne države nezaobilazna. Marković u govoru »K Logici« ističe: »I on kao pridošlica [misli na hrvatsku narod] ulazi u njezin hram, pak ako narod naš uztraje za jedan viek, bit će i on starosjedilac«. U svojem nastupnom rektorskom govoru »Filosofijske struke pisci hrvatskoga roda s onkraj Velebita u stoljećih XV. do XVIII.« 19. listopada 1881. godine Marković je »istaknuo samo onaj narod, koji si je stekao domovinu misli, prisvojio si je čvrsto i svoju tvarnu domovinu«. U svojem izlaganju dat ću pregled svega što je Marković učinio za hrvatsko Sveučilište te iznijeti zadatke koje je pred njega postavio u kontekstu stvaranja moderne hrvatske države.

FRANJO MARKOVIĆ: UNIVERSITY AS A SPIRITUAL VESSEL OF THE NATION

Activity of Franjo Marković is to the great extent connected with Croatian University. Marković is the first dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, lecturer at the same faculty from 1874 to 1914 and rector of the University of Zagreb. Marković's activity relates to the very beginnings of Croatian University when he, as dean of Faculty of Philosophy, gathered professors to teach at the Faculty. Marković taught Ethics, Aesthetics, Psychology, History of Phi-

losophy, Pedagogy and Logics. As the rector of the University of Zagreb, he cared about education of young students, about professors and financial affairs of the University. In his two inaugural speeches, Marković elaborated on his opinions and thoughts on objectives that the University should achieve. In the speech “Towards Logics” on the occasion of opening of the University on 18 October 1874, Marković emphasized the role of philosophy in creating the country. Since, according to Marković, philosophy is one of the first scientific disciplines to be taught at university, it is evident that the role of philosophy in creating the national state is unavoidable. In his speech “Towards logics” Marković emphasizes: “And it as a newcomer [he means Croatian people] enters its temple, and should our people persist one century, they too will become indigenous”. In his inaugural rectorial speech “Croatian Writers of Philosophical Profession across Velebit from XV to XVIII Century” on 19 October 1881, Marković emphasized that “only the people that obtained their homeland of the thoughts, firmly assumed their real country”. In this presentation, I will provide an outline of everything Marković did for Croatian University and also list the tasks Marković assigned to it in the context of creation of the modern Croatian state.

TOMISLAV PETKOVIĆ

Zavod za primijenjenu fiziku, Fakultet elektrotehnike i računarstva, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska /

Department of Applied Physics, Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computing, University of Zagreb, Croatia

PARCIJALNE PROSUDBE O BOLONJSKOJ REFORMI NA SVEUČILIŠTU U ZAGREBU I OSVRT NA HUMBOLDTOVU IDEJU SVEUČILIŠTA

Sveučilišta i fakulteti danas su izdašna mjesta razvoju znanja, istraživačkih metoda, vještina i vrlina, gdje se školuju visokoobrazovani kadrovi. Ostale škole koriste i primjenjuju *znanje i metode* učenja što se stvaraju na sveučilištu, te je u takvoj hijerarhiji sveučilište najviša škola. Koji je najbolji model (konceptija) modernog fakulteta u evoluciji sveučilišta? U Europi je stanje bilo raznoliko da bi u novije vrijeme zaživio novi model sveučilišta pod imenom *bolonjske reforme sveučilišta* u zemljama članicama EU, a u Hrvatskoj od 2005. godine na njenih 8 sveučilišta s manjim ili većim zamahom. Novi režim

bolonjske nastave na hrvatskim sveučilištima izazvao je nalete metodološko-didaktičkih nastojanja za novim udžbenicima, priručnicima i ostalim pomagalima u skladu s bolonjskom dinamikom. Očevidno je, po definiciji, da prijašnja izdanja i pomagala postaju anakrona. Studentima treba pokazivati putove za njihovo kreativno (samostalno) učenje – koji potiskuju tradicionalno studiranje u Hrvatskoj, ukorijenjeno na njemačkom modelu braće W. von Humboldta (1767–1835) i A. von Humboldta (1769–1859). Prva *parcijalna* fenomenološka prosudba o bolonjskom režimu jest da popularnima postaju što su moguće kraći udžbenici ili priručnici (tiskana i/ili e-izdanja) s jezgrom (*katalogom*) znanja i primjena (tzv. *very short introduction*) za pojedine kolegije. Studenti u Hrvatskoj danas »trpe« i trpjet će još ovo karakteristično akademsko razmeđe. Oni su između *Scilē* tradicionalnog *Humboldtovog* sveučilišta (temeljna predavanja – problematske vježbe /zadaci/, seminari – laboratorijske vježbe) i *Hàribdē* u bolonjskim virovima za boljim sabiranjem bodova za većom ocjenom i ECTS-bodovima. U tome se, pak, podrazumijeva virtualno povećanje kvalitete što izranja iz novih oblika i metoda nastave u jakoj bolonjskoj interakciji nastavnika i studenata. U referatu ćemo se uz Humboldtovu ideju sveučilišta, najduljeg života s realnim modelom (ustrojem) na europskom tlu, osvrnuti i na noviju *klasičnu ideju* sveučilišta K. Jaspersa (1883–1969) prije dolaska bolonjske reforme. On je u Baselu širio ideju »koncentričnog ili stratificiranog sveučilišta« u kojem čiste znanosti (filozofija, matematika, fizika i klasična filologija) čine srž, dok ostale vijence i slojeve daju prije svega tehničke (primijenjene) i druge znanosti. Naše prosudbe o bolonjskoj reformi proizlaze iz analize *bolonjskog spektra* tek dvaju fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu: FER i PBF. Prosudbe zato nose kvantifikaciju *parcijalne* i *prethodne* jer se odnose na jednu (temeljnu) komponentu spektra: *fiziku*. Dualni su razlozi takvome izboru. Prvi je čisto znanstveni: *epistemičkoj* jezgri suvremenom znanju na sveučilištima krucijalno pridonosi fizika. Ona s matematikom i filozofijom znanosti (*filozofskim mišljenjem*) zajedno zauzimaju središnje mjesto u sustavu znanosti. Njihovom sinergijom nastaju otkrića što utječu na spoznaju prirode (svemira), na materijalnu i duhovnu kulturu čovječanstva. Drugi je činjenica da autor na FER-u nastavno (neprekinuto) djeluje od 1975. u polju fizike, a na PBF-u je u razdoblju 1991–2012 postavio moderni program kolegijā fizike, kao i bolonjski model nastave 2005. godine. Ukratko će se opisati struktura i dinamika ispitā iz *opće fizike*, pokazati odabrani histogrami s odgovarajućim bolonjskim parametrima prolaza (uspješnosti) za kolegije fizike, za oba navedena fakulteta. Konačne prosudbe će biti (*preliminarno*) referirane usporodbom bolonjskog sa starim modelom nastave, algebarskom jednostavnom metodom: kvaliteti *boljeg* (+) ili *goreg* (–) jednoj ili drugoj opciji. Kritički će

biti pobrojane uočene *anomalije* i neka *strana* (*egzotična*) rješenja u aktualnom hodu bolonjske reforme.

PARTIAL ASSESSMENTS OF THE BOLOGNA REFORM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB AND RECALL OF THE HUMBOLDTIAN IDEA OF UNIVERSITY

Universities with their faculties are places today rich for the development of knowledge and methods of researching, with the intellectual skills and moral virtues, where high level education are usually attained by scholars. Other schools are using and applying *knowledge* and *methods* that being produced by the universities, and within that hierarchy, a university may be understood as the highest school. What is the best model (conception) of the modern faculty throughout the evolution of the University? A status was rather diversity in the history of European universities, but a new model of university has been set-up in the recent times in the countries – members of the EU, under the key-note name *Bologna university reform*. The same process was also started in Croatia by 2005 in all 8 universities with smaller or higher momentum of changes in them, respectively. A current *regime* of the Bologna education in the Croatian universities provoked bursts of the methodological-didactic requesting for the new course books, handbooks and other guides, in accordance with Bologna dynamics. It is more than obvious that previous editions and manuals become anachronism. A new ways for creative and independent (by itself) learning has to be shown to students, which suppress a traditional studying in Croatia that had been based upon the German model developed by the brothers of W. von Humboldt (1767–1835) and A. von Humboldt (1769–1859). By the first partial phenomenological assessments of the Bologna regime, we judge that short textbooks or manuals (printed and/or e-editions) become very attractive for the particular teaching courses, even as shorter as possible (so called “very short introduction”) that includes a core (*catalog*) of knowledge and applications of the subjects. In Croatia students today “are suffering” and will be suffered by the characteristic academic crossroad. They are in between *Scylla* of the traditional *Humboldtian’s* university and *Charybdis* of the Bologna’s vortices gathering up the ECTS-points and better grade, where the Humboldtian’s type implies structure: fundamental lectures – followed by the thematic exercises (problems), and seminars – laboratory exercises. However, a virtual self-gaining of the quality of education is assumed due to the new forms and methods of teaching and of the high interaction of students and educators. Next to the Humboldtian idea of university, characterized by the longest life time with a

real model (system) of education existing in the European space so far, a *classic idea* of university by K. Jaspers (1883–1969) introducing quite some time before the Bologna reform will be also emphasized in the presentation. In Basel Jaspers has proclaimed the idea of “concentric and stratified university” where pure science (philosophy, mathematics, physics and classical philology) form a core, whereas wreaths and strata were closely filling up by the applied (mostly technical) and other sciences. Our assessments of the Bologna reform were derived from the analyses of *spectra* just of the two faculties of the University of Zagreb: FER (Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computing) and PBF (Faculty of Food Technology and Biotechnology). Therefore they bring quantitative properties *partial* and *preliminary* because referring to the one (basic) component: *physics*. The choice is due to dual reasons. The first is pure scientific: physics crucially contributes to the *epistemic* core of contemporary knowledge. Physics with mathematics and philosophy of science (*philosophical thinking*) together occupy a central place of the system of sciences. By synergy of them new discoveries are born, by influencing knowledge of nature (universe) as well as material and spiritual culture of the mankind. The second reason arising up of the fact that author of the paper has been continuously acting since 1975 in the field of physics at the FER, and at the PBF for the non-interrupted period of 1991–2012 where he has set-up modern courses of physics as well as the Bologna model of physics in 2005. The structure and dynamics of the exams of the courses of *general physics* will be shortly described then selected histograms with attached Bologna’s parameters indicating level of passing (success) for both faculties, respectively. Final assessments will be (*preliminary*) reported in the form of comparison of Bologna with the old model of education, by simple algebraic technique: qualities of *better* (+) or *worse* (–) assign up to one or other option. Observed *anomalies* and few other *strange* (*exotic*) solutions found in the current walk of Bologna reform will be critically discussed.

ESTELLA PETRIĆ-BAJLO, VESNA UKIĆ-KOŠTA

*English Department, University of Zadar, Croatia /
Odjel za anglistiku, Sveučilište u Zadru, Hrvatska*

CAMPUS NOVEL AND THE IDEA OF HUMIVERSITY

The idea of university has had a long tradition in human history. University teachers, among them physicists, philosophers, men of letters and the like, educate some future physicists, philosophers or men or letters. Their intellec-

tual endeavours contribute the social authority of the universities, the supposed bastions of sciences, knowledge and humanistic attitudes. But, as noted by Z. Radman, what is prior to the existence of physicists, philosophers or men of letters is the existence of human individuals performing all those activities (Radman, 1995: 80). As a result, our perception of the world is necessarily and only human, or, in other words, what scientists consider *universe* is rather to be labelled as *humiverse* (ibid.). Nevertheless the Scientist (in Latour's terms) sometimes identifies his position with that of God, not only in terms of the perception of the world, but equally so in terms of his power position as the social authority figure. This is what happens in one of the best known campus or academic novels, *Disgrace* (J. M. Coetzee, 1999), whose protagonist, David Lurie, a university teacher in Cape Town in post-apartheid South Africa, dedicates his life to abstract thought, "the dominant intellectual tradition of modernity" (P. Armstrong, 2008: 221). But the fact is that intellectual superiority does not necessarily presume one's spiritual integrity, either personal or professional. Lurie invites his students of Romanticism to meditate on Wordsworth's lines (from Book 6 of *The Prelude*) about Mont Blanc as a site representing the heights of human spiritual endeavour and power of the mind, the world of "pure ideas" (Coetzee: 21). But this Platonic substratum of his teaching does not prevent him from sexual predation of his student Melanie Isaacs. By the end of the story the predator becomes the prey himself, after his own daughter is brutally raped. Having lost his university position, Lurie decides to live with his daughter in the countryside, devoting his life to unwanted animals (waiting for elimination in the so called animal shelter). Lurie is now being taught by his daughter that "there is no higher life. This is the only life there is. Which we share with animals" (74). This multi-layered novel is analysed in this presentation in the first place in the context of the genre of English university fiction. Campus novels have seen an enormous growth in Britain and the US since the 1950s but they also enjoy much longer history in the annals of literary studies (K. Womak, 2005: 326). These novels are focused on private and professional queries that persons involved in the academic life are usually being faced with.

AKADEMSKI ROMAN I IDEJA HUMIVERZITETA

Ideja sveučilišta ima dugu tradiciju u ljudskoj povijesti. Sveučilišni nastavnici poput fizičara, filozofa, literata i drugih, obrazuju neke buduće fizičare, filozofe i literate. Njihova intelektualna pregnuća doprinose društvenom ugledu koji uživaju sveučilišta, ti hramovi znanosti, znanja i humanističkog

svjetonazora. Ali, kako je to primijetio Z. Radman, »prije nego što postoji fizičar, filozof ili pjesnik ... postoji čovjek u ulozi fizičara, filozofa ili pjesnika« (Radman, 1995: 80). Čovjeku je stoga proučavanje svijeta dostupno jedino iz ljudske perspektive, zbog čega bi u znanstvenom smislu *humiverzum* bio primjereniji izraz od *univerzuma* (ibid.). Unatoč tome, ponekad se Znanstvenik (prema Latouru) poistovjećuje s Bogom, ne samo u smislu perspektive iz koje promatra svijet nego jednako tako i u smislu društvenog položaja koji uživa kao član akademske zajednice. Upravo tom se temom bavi jedan od najpoznatijih akademskih romana, *Sramota* (J. M. Coetzee, 1999), čiji protagonist, David Lurie, sveučilišni profesor u južnoafričkom gradu Cape Town u vrijeme nakon ukinuća rasističkog režima, posvećuje svoj život apstraktnom razmišljanju, toj »dominantnoj intelektualnoj tradiciji moderniteta« (P. Armstrong, 2008: 221). No, činjenica jest da intelektualna nadmoć ne pretpostavlja nužno i duhovni integritet, bilo na osobnoj, bilo na profesionalnoj razini. Lurie na kolegiju iz Romantizma poziva svoje studente da se duboko zamisle nad stihovima Wordsworthova *Preludija*, u kojima pjesnik poistovjećuje visinu Mont Blanca s uzvišenošću postignuća i snage ljudskog duha i uma, prikazujući na taj način svijet »čistih ideja« (Coetzee: 21). Kao čista suprotnost platonističkim temeljima njegova nastavnčkog, dakle profesionalnog angažmana, djeluje događaj koji će uslijediti, a to je njegovo prisiljavanje studentice Melanie Isaacs na spolno općenje. Do kraja priče grabežljivac će sam postati plijenom u rukama sudbine, nakon što je njegova kćerka brutalno silovana. Izgubivši radno mjesto na sveučilištu, Lurie odlučuje živjeti s kćerkom na selu, posvećujući sada svoj život napuštenim životinjama (čiji će životi okončati u skloništu za nezbrinute životinje). Njegova mu kćerka objašnjava kako »ne postoji nikakav viši život. Ovo je jedini život koji postoji. Život koji dijelimo sa životinjama« (74). Ovo će se slojevito književno djelo razmotriti prvenstveno u kontekstu engleskog akademskog romana. Taj je romaneskni žanr doživio veliki procvat pedesetih godina dvadesetog stoljeća u Britaniji i SAD-u, no njegova je povijest u analima književnih studija mnogo duža (K. Womak, 2005: 326). Akademski se romani prvenstveno usredotočuju na osobne i profesionalne nedoumice s kojima se suočavaju osobe uključene u akademski život.

MAJA POLJAK

*Odjel za filozofiju, Sveučilište u Zadru, Hrvatska /
Department of Philosophy, University of Zadar, Croatia*

NEWMANOVO SHVAĆANJE SVEUČILIŠTA

John Henry Newman zasigurno spada među vodeće engleske mislitelje XIX. st. koji je svojim djelima ostavio trajan doprinos na raznim područjima. Kada je riječ o filozofiji, njegov je utjecaj najvidljiviji na području filozofije spoznaje i filozofije religije. No, osim pitanja vezanih za spomenute discipline, jedna od tema koja ga je posebno zaokupljala je obrazovanje. Svoje temeljne ideje na spomenutu temu Newman je iznio u djelu *Ideja sveučilišta* koje predstavlja skup od niza predavanja održanih u Dublinu prilikom otvaranja Katoličkog sveučilišta na kojem je bio rektor nekoliko godina. U svome izlaganju težimo sažeto iznijeti Newmanovo shvaćanje uloge i zadatka spomenute visokoškolske ustanove, s posebnim naglaskom na važnost proučavanja i doprinos humanističkih znanosti, te njihovog međusobnog odnosa.

NEWMAN'S UNDERSTANDING OF UNIVERSITY

John Henry Newman can surely be placed amongst the leading British thinkers of the 19th century who left a definite mark on a variety of fields. As for philosophy, Newman's influence is most seen in the area of epistemology and philosophy of religion. Beside the questions relating to the prior mentioned disciplines, one of the themes which captured his attention was education. His fundamental ideas can be found in the work titled *The Idea of a University* which represents a collection of discourse Newman gave in Dublin during the institution of Catholic University of which he was a rector for several years. In our presentation we hope to give a shore overview of the role and mission given to the University by Newman. Special attention will be drawn to the importance and contribution of Humanities, their mutual relation as well as their relation to other sciences.

MARINA PRAŽETINA

Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Zagreb, Croatia

ZNANOST U MEĐUNARODNOM KONTEKSTU

Cilj ovog rada je ispitati ulogu znanosti i odgovornost znanstvenika prema znanju, budućoj socijalnoj i političkoj zajednici i etičkim vrijednostima.

Predlažemo pristup pitanjima tehnologije, znanosti i inovacija iz perspektive pluralizma i korištenje metodologije koja uključuje pluralizam perspektiva. U prvom dijelu istražiti ćemo gdje i kako se znanost provodi diljem svijeta kako bismo dobili uvid u globalni pregled znanstvenog krajolika i međunarodne suradnje, a drugi i treći dio rada bit će usmjereni na znanost u Europi i Hrvatskoj.

SCIENCE IN THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

The aim of the paper is to question the role of science and the responsibility of scientists towards knowledge, social and political community of the future, and ethical values.

We propose that issues concerning technology, science and innovation are to be approached from the perspective of pluralism, with the use of methodology that covers the plurality of perspectives. In the first part we investigate where and how science is implemented around the world, with the aim of producing a global overview of the scientific landscape and international collaboration. In the second and third part of the paper we focus on the science in Europe and Croatia.

SANDRA RADENović

Medicinski fakultet, Sveučilište u Beogradu, Srbija /
School of Medicine, University of Belgrade, Serbia

»NOVI UNIVERZITET« I ORIJENTACIJSKO ZNANJE – NEKA RAZMATRANJA

Autorica obrazlaže osnovne ideje koncepta takozvanog seminarskog fakulteta u djelu Alfreda Nort Whiteheada. Riječ je o kritici *ex-cathedra* koncepta nastave i takozvanog predavačkog fakulteta, a u korist »Novog Uni-

verziteta«, točnije, seminarskog fakulteta i živog, stvaralačkog znanja. Je li koncept orijentacijskog znanja (Jürgen Mittelstraß) kompatibilan konceptu stvaralačkog znanja i seminarskog fakulteta? Autorica razmatra ovo pitanje.

“NEW UNIVERSITY” AND ORIENTATION KNOWLEDGE – CERTAIN CONSIDERATIONS

The authoress exposes basic ideas of the conception of so-called seminary faculty in the work of Alfred North Whitehead. It is about the critique of *ex-cathedra* classes and so-called teaching faculty and it pleads for “New University” or, more precisely, for seminary faculty and alive, creative knowledge. Is the conception of orientation knowledge (Jürgen Mittelstraß) compatible with the conception of creative knowledge and seminary faculty? The authoress considers this question.

VANI ROŠČIĆ

*Odjel za filozofiju, Sveučilište u Zadru, Hrvatska /
Department of Philosophy, University of Zadar, Croatia*

SVEUČILIŠTE I KULTURA

Tijekom vrlo zahtjevnog vremena od 1941. do 1948. Luigi Pareyson objavljuje niz tekstova nadahnutih egzistencijalističkom filozofijom kojima se intenzivno uključuje u kulturno-političku raspravu o reformi obrazovanja u Italiji. Sveučilište kao povijesni i kulturni subjekt od samih početaka u sebi utjelovljuje ideal koji je usmjeren neprestanom istraživanju u različitim znanstvenim granama i njihovoj jedinstvenoj otvorenosti prema istini. Čista ideja sveučilišta je upravo ono što čuva od redukcionističke vizije osobe, a time i kulture. Niz ideja koje Pareyson donosi ulazi u projekt opće reforme edukacijskog sustava od kojih su neke i danas aktualne.

UNIVERSITY AND CULTURE

During a very demanding period between 1941 and 1948 Luigi Pareyson published a number of papers inspired by existentialistic philosophy which testify to his intensely active role in the cultural political discussion concerning the reform of education in Italy. University, as a historical and cultural entity,

from its very beginning embodies an ideal directed towards constant research in different scientific areas and their unique openness towards the truth. Pure idea of a university safeguards from reductionist view of a person and culture. Number of ideas which Pareyson gives, enter into the project of a general reform of educational system and some of them are present to this day.

FILIP ŠIPOŠ

Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska (student) /

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia (student)

AUTONOMIJA SVEUČILIŠTA: TERET ILI TEMELJ?

U radu će biti iznesene perspektive iz kojih je moguće promijeniti, učvrstiti i unaprijediti funkciju i poziciju sveučilišta u svjetlu recentnih i aktualnih pokušaja destabilizacije sveučilišta bilo kroz uvođenje birokratiziranih i politiziranih zakona od strane nadležnog ministarstva ili kroz denuncirane napade iz medija. Vanjski uzroci dakako nisu jedini »krivac« za postupnu ali jasno vidljivu smanjenu ulogu sveučilišta na hrvatskoj znanstvenoj, kulturnoj i društvenoj sceni. Jedan od njih je politika koja nije sramežljivo provirila glavu iz više od tristo godina stare institucije. Drugi je intimniji i filozofski, gdje smo zastranili u odnosu na Kantovu ili Nietzscheovu ideju univerziteta. Bez oklijevanja možemo spomenuti i studentsku borbu koja se javila na proljeće 2009. godine, uzbukala javnost i pokazala nepravde i nelogičnosti u sustavu znanosti i obrazovanja te prvi puta jasno artikulirala borbu za besplatno obrazovanje. Osnovna teza rada je da se pravilnim operiranjem s »teretom autonomije« i njegovim pravovremenim i preciznim smještanjem, »temelj sveučilišta« može ojačati. Unaprijediti rad sveučilišta moguće je jedino kroz konstantan dijalog i suradnju među sastavnicama sveučilišta i gradnjom jačih odnosa na relaciji fakultet–sveučilište. Glavno pitanje je kako mijenjati stvari unutar organizacije sveučilišta, a u suradnji s institucijama koje imaju odgovornost sudjelovati u procesima stvaranja znanstvene i društvene politike, bez da se direktno ugrožava autonomija sveučilišta.

AUTONOMY OF UNIVERSITY: BURDEN OR FUNDAMENT?

In this presentation the perspectives will be outlined from which the function and position of university could be altered, consolidated and improved, in the light of recent and current attempts of destabilisation of university through

either bureaucratic and politicized laws introduced by responsible ministry or through denounced media assaults. External causes of course are not the only culprit for gradually reduced role that university has in Croatian scientific, cultural and social scene. One of them is politics, which did not timidly protrude its head out of more than 300 years old institution. The other reason is more intimate, philosophical one, where have we astrayed from the Kantian or Nietzschean idea of university. Without hesitation we can remind on students' struggle that started in spring 2009, caused a lot of commotion in public and showed injustices and inconsistencies in higher education system. The fight for free education was then articulated for the first time. Main thesis of this presentation is that if the "burden of autonomy" is skillfully handled and properly situated, the "fundament of the university" can be strengthened. Improvement of the university as a whole can only be achieved through the permanent dialogue and cooperation between its components (faculties) and by strengthening relation faculty–university. Main question is how to change frames and relationships within the university itself in cooperation with institutions responsible for participation in the processes of creating science and social politics, without directly imperiling the autonomy of university.

ŽELJKO ŠKULJEVIĆ

*Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Zenici, Bosna i Hercegovina /
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

OD ALFABETA DO AKADEMIJE

Ako se zna da je prva državna četvororazredna osnova škola, tzv. narodna škola, u Zenici otvorena školske godine 1885/1886. (spomenimo i to da je 2381 godina poslije Platonove osnovana Akademija u Zenici, te Univerzitet koji je *de facto* krenuo s radom 2006.), onda je zaista teško zamisliti kako je institucionalno obrazovanje uopće (za)počelo na nekim drugim geografskim prostorima prije, možda, dvadeset i pet stoljeća. Jesu li te institucije nastajale stihijski ili racionalno-planski, jesu li bile sporadične ili organizirane, privatne ili državne, svjetovne ili duhovne? Ili su, pak, imale od svega toga pomalo, ovisno gdje su se javljale, na kojim geografsko-narodnim i (h)istorijsko-duhovnim koordinatama?

FROM ALPHABET TO ACADEMY

Having in mind that the first state four-grade elementary school (so called “national school”) was founded in 1885/1886 in Zenica (let us remind on the fact that 2381 years after foundation of Plato’s Academy Zenica University started with its work – 2006), it is hard to imagine how the institutional education (in general sense of the word) began in other geographical sites 25 centuries ago. Were those institutions founded randomly or deliberately as rationally based planned projects, were they private or public, mundane or spiritual? Or, the foundation of educational institutions was the mixture of the above mentioned – depending on geographical, national, historical, and spiritual coordinators?

FULVIO ŠURAN

Odjel za studij na talijanskom jeziku, Sveučilište Jurja Dobrile u Puli, Hrvatska / Department for Studies in the Italian Language, Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Croatia

USTROJSTVO SVEUČILIŠTA NA ODREĐENOM PODRUČJU ZA NOVI MILENIJ

U trenutku opsežne preobrazbe sveučilišnoga i školskoga sustava obvezno je razmisliti i suočiti se s epistemološkim pretpostavkama koje želimo identificirati kao temeljni model izgradnje spoznaja i znanja koje ove institucije žele ostvariti. Razlog je i u činjenici što različite ideje Sveučilišta, u suštini, određuju različite odgovore na pitanja koja su povezana s nacrtom, dominantnom svrhom i sredstvima nužnima u dostizanju poželjnih ciljeva akademske institucije, kako je uobičajeno reći, u svijetu promjena.

Kako bismo odgovorili na pitanja poput: Koju ulogu imaju sveučilišta u suvremenom društvu informacija i spoznaja? Kako u doba ubrzane promjene institucija i organiziranoga sustava ponovno odrediti djelovanje i samu ideju sveučilišta? Koji je razvojni scenarij moguće predvidjeti danas, nakon didaktičkoga osamostaljenja, pred sve angažiranim javnim prostorom – više nego ikada prije – za budućnost institucije? Kako bismo odgovorili na ta i slična pitanja potrebno je razvijati inovativne metodološke modele, sposobne nositi se s problemima ponovnoga određenja statusa nove ideje i novoga izgleda sveučilišta u trećem tisućljeću.

Jedna od tih je, svakako, ideja sveučilišta na određenom području, u mom slučaju, na području Istarske županije. I to posebice zato što se vrijednost institucije vidi i po odražavanju koje se aplicira na područje na kojem ona djeluje, pogotovo kada se radi o djelovanju koje je oblikovano temeljnim odnosom društveno-kulturne i gospodarske veze koja može izazvati posebne rezultate. Takav diskurs naročito odgovara onim institucijama koje se iz raznih razloga bave uspostavljanjem i širenjem odgojno-obrazovnih paradigmi koje imaju kulturno i socijalno značenje na tom području.

Sveučilište je svakako među njima.

THE IDEA OF UNIVERSITY IN A PARTICULAR TERRITORY FOR THE NEW MILLENNIUM

At the time of extensive transformation of university and school system, it is necessary to consider and face the epistemological assumptions we would like to identify as the founding model of building knowledge these institutions want to realize. In fact, on the whole, different ideas of university determine different answers about the project, the main objectives and the means to attain the desired aims set by each academic institution, in a constantly changing world.

To be able to answer questions such as: What is the role of universities in the modern society of information and knowledge? How to redefine the function and the very idea of university in a time of rapid change of institutions and state system? Which development scenario is it possible to predict nowadays, a few years after the achievement of educational autonomy and facing the engaged public space – more than ever before – regarding the future of the academy? It is necessary to develop innovative methodological models, able to cope with the problems of redefining the status of a new idea and a new image of the University in the third millennium.

One of these is certainly the idea of University in a particular territory, in my case, the territory of the Istria County. The value of an institution is stated also by the way it reflects in its territory of action, especially when this action is shaping the relationship with the socio-cultural and entrepreneurial environment and is able to trigger special results. This applies in an even more pressing way to the institutions that, for the variety of reasons, are engaged in the foundation and diffusion of formative paradigms of a certain social and cultural level.

The University is certainly one of these.

RAJKA ŠVRLJUGA

*OŠ Vladimira Nazora, Crikvenica, Hrvatska /
Elementary School "Vladimir Nazor", Crikvenica, Croatia*

OBJEKTIVNOST ZNANOSTI

U današnje vrijeme u privilegiranom su položaju osobito instituti koji se bave biomedicinom, molekularnom biologijom i kvantnom mehanikom. Oni nose epitet elitnosti i objektivnosti. Suvremeni antropolog Levi-Strauss svojim je djelima pokazao da društvene znanosti mogu postići rigoroznost i objektivnost prirodnih znanosti, nešto što im se – pogotovo u drugoj polovici 20. st. – često spočitavalo.

OBJECTIVITY OF SCIENCE

At the present time especially the institutes involved in biomedicine, molecular biology and quantum mechanic are in a privileged position. They carry the title of the elite and objectivity. Contemporary anthropologist Levi-Strauss has shown in his work that social sciences can achieve rigor and objectivity of science, something they were often criticized for, especially in the second half of the 20th century.

ALEN TAFRA

*Gimnazija Pula, Hrvatska /
Gymnasium Pula, Croatia*

HUMANISTIČKE ZNANOSTI IZMEĐU NEOLIBERALNE GLOBALIZACIJE I KRITIKE EUROCENTRIZMA

U vrtlogu akademskog kapitalizma, marginalizacija humanističkih znanosti predstavlja osobit primjer. Slijedom podvrgavanja utilitarističko-pozitivističkim načelima i kriterijima, njihovu ugroženost pojačava taksonomijska razdvojenost od društvenih znanosti. No, dekonstrukcijska zadaća novih humanističkih znanosti nije zamisliva bez permanentnih transgresija propisanih akademskih granica. Naime, genealogija diskurzivnih struktura humanistike izvediva je jedino kroz prizmu njene upletenosti u historijsku genezu aktualnih struktura moći. Drugim riječima, potrebna je nova filozofija sadašnjosti/povi-

jesti kao holistički okvir za istraživanje simultanog razvoja kako kapitalizma, kolonijalizma i eurocentričnog svjetskog sustava, tako i temeljnih kategorija modernih humanističkih znanosti. Na tragu Vattimove interpretacije Heideggerova pojma *Verwindung*, narečeni projekt stoga postavlja dijagnozu i perspektivu humanistike u adekvatnijem horizontu Dusselove »planetarne paradigme«.

THE HUMANITIES BETWEEN NEOLIBERAL GLOBALIZATION AND THE CRITIQUE OF EUROCENTRISM

In the vortex of academic capitalism, the marginalization of humanities represents a peculiar case. Besides subjugation to principles and criteria of utilitarianism and positivism, their precariousness has been aggravated by means of their taxonomic separation from social sciences. Nevertheless, the deconstructionist task of the new humanities is not conceivable without the permanent transgressions of prescribed academic borders. Namely, the genealogy of discursive structures of humanities is possible only through the prism of their involvement in the historical genesis of actual power structures. In other words, the new philosophy of present/history has been called for. It should operate as a holistic framework for the investigations of the simultaneous developments not only of capitalism, colonialism and the Eurocentric world system, but of the main categories of modern humanities as well. Following Vattimo's interpretation of Heidegger's concept of *Verwindung*, this project inserts the diagnosis and perspective of humanities within the more adequate horizon of Dussel's "planetary paradigm".

IRIS TIĆAC

*Abteilung für Philosophie, Universität Zadar, Kroatien /
Odjel za filozofiju, Sveučilište u Zadru, Hrvatska*

DIETRICH VON HILDEBRANDS IDEE DER KATHOLISCHEN UNIVERSITÄT UND IHRE BEDEUTUNG HEUTE

In diesem Beitrag wird der Versuch unternommen, in Anlehnung an D. von Hildebrands philosophisches Durchdenken der Idee einer katholischen Universität, auf die fundamentale Probleme die für jede Universität implizierte Voraussetzungen sind, und auf einige relevante Aspekte die mit der Frage nach Sinn und Ziel der Universität in Zusammenhang stehen, hinzuweisen.

Es werden die Fragen nach dem Wesen des Erkennens, den Zusammenhängen zwischen der Grundhaltungen des Menschen und seiner Erkenntnisfähigkeit und die Frage nach dem Verhältnis zwischen Universität und Rangordnung der Werte thematisiert. Dabei gehen wir von der These aus, dass Hildebrands Beantwortung diese Fragen, im Gegensatz zu herrschenden Tendenzen der Instrumentalisierung der Wissenschaft und Universität, die Grundlage für Überlegung über Perspektive und Ziel der Universität bildet.

DIETHRICH VON HILDEBRANDOVA IDEJA KATOLIČKOG SVEUČILIŠTA I NJENO ZNAČENJE DANAS

S osloncem u Hildebrandovom filozofijskom promišljanju ideje katoličkog sveučilišta, ukazat će se na fundamentalne probleme koji su implicitne pretpostavke za svako sveučilište i neke relevantne aspekte povezane s pitanjem smisla i cilja sveučilišta. To uključuje raspravu pitanja o biti spoznaje, o svezi između temeljnih držanja čovjeka i njegove sposobnosti spoznaje, te o odnosu između sveučilišta i poretka vrijednosti. Pritom se polazi od teze da Hildebrandovi odgovori na ta pitanja, u suprotnosti spram vladajuće tendencije instrumentalizacije znanosti i sveučilišta, tvore podlogu za promišljanje perspektive i svrhe sveučilišta.

KAREL TURZA

*Medicinski fakultet, Sveučilište u Beogradu, Srbija /
School of Medicine, University of Belgrade, Serbia*

ZAŠTO JE UNIVERZITET JOŠ UVIJEK VAŽAN? OSOBNOST I ISKUSTVO

U ovom radu autor prvo izlaže kratku povijest univerziteta ukazujući na činjenicu da se radi o instituciji koja je, od kada je nastala, svoj značaj i autoritet gradila prvenstveno kroz znanje, staro i novo. Suvremeni univerzitet još uvijek je područje u kojem nastaju najznačajnija saznanja o nama, svijetu i univerzumu. Kao dokaz ili, u najmanju ruku, uvjerljivu ilustraciju rečene teze, autor koristi vlastito iskustvo rada na Medicinskom fakultetu Univerziteta u Beogradu gdje, između ostalog, predaje medicinsku sociologiju, medicinsku etiku, komunikaciju u medicini, bioetiku...

WHY IS UNIVERSITY STILL IMPORTANT? A PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

In this paper the author exposes, firstly, a short history of university, stressing the fact that it is an institution which, ever since it came into being, has built its significance and authority primarily through knowledge – old/ancient and new. University today is still an area in which the most important knowledge on us, on the world and the universe, comes into being. To prove or, at least, to convincingly illustrate the thesis, the author uses his personal experiences at the Faculty of Medicine, University of Belgrade, where he teaches – among other subjects – medical sociology, medical ethics, communication in medicine, bioethics...

NEBOJŠA VASIĆ

*Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Zenici, Bosna i Hercegovina /
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

BOLONJSKI PROCES – REKVIJEM SVEUČILIŠNE IDEJE

Tema izlaganja je kriza sveučilišne ideje inicirane nekritičkim prihvaćanjem bolonjskog procesa kao neuspješnog pokušaja osuvremenjivanja akademskog obrazovanja. Nakon nekoliko godina nastojanja da se primijeni bolonjski proces, sveučilišni profesori postaju svjesniji restriktivnosti »bolonje«. »Bolonja« je nastala s nakanom da se akademsko obrazovanje učini demokratičnijim u smislu pristupačnosti najvišim razinama obrazovanja. Određene ideje »bolonje« svakako zaslužuju našu pažnju (interaktivnost nastave, mobilnost studenata i nastavnika, kontinuirane provjere znanja) i kao takve mogle su se integrirati u »staru« akademiju, ali bez radikalnih i nepromišljenih promjena (3+2+3 i sl.). Sveučilišnim nastavnicima nije jednostavno rješavati nepotrebnu kvantifikaciju koja se čini kao supstanca bolonjskog procesa. Skupljanje bodova nerijetko stvara konfuziju kao što je »nagrađivanje« redovnosti nastave koja bi se trebala podrazumijevati za redovne studente. Takve i slične matematičke zavrzlake čine se kao nepotreban ustupak studentima, jer ono što je imperativ redovnoga studiranja ne treba naknadno motivirati bodovima. Aktivnost studenata svakako treba potencirati i ostaviti prostor za priznavanje, ali ne na rigidan način bodovanja. Nastavniku se tako postepeno oduzima dignitet osobne procjene koja ne mora biti uvijek jednaka i akribijski precizna. Matematički model pretvara nastavnika u »računovođu« pred kojim stoje naizgled jednostavna, ali nimalo elegantna i inspirativna rješenja. Osim navedenih problema kvantifikacije, »bolonja« neumitno vodi ka profaniranju ideje sveučilišta.

Gotovo nikome nije jasno što znači master struke nakon trogodišnjeg ciklusa. Tržište rada ne prepoznaje takve diplome, što stvara opravdano nezadovoljstvo kod studenata. Poseban problem je i doktorski studij, o čemu bih govorio u svome izlaganju. Za nekoliko godina imat ćemo značajan broj nezaposlenih mastera i doktora znanosti, što je jedna od najozbiljnijih prijetnji sveučilišnoj ideji. Između elitizma i *štanca*nja diploma, nameću se »srednja« rješenja – što zahtjeva (već danas) ozbiljan angažman akademske zajednice da bi se spriječili problemi koje »bolonja« u sadašnjem obliku ne može izbjeći. Smatram da ova tema zaslužuje našu pažnju.

BOLOGNA PROCESS – REQUIEM OF THE UNIVERSITY IDEA

The topic of my paper is the crisis of University concept caused by an uncritical acceptance of Bologna process which is unsuccessful attempt to incorporate modernity in the core of academic education. After first few years of the application of Bologna principles, university teachers are aware of many restrictions and stumbling blocks in their daily work. Namely, one of the key ideas of Bologna concept is to create a more democratic education regarding the accessibility to the highest levels of education. Nevertheless, certain Bologna guidelines deserve our attention (interactivity, teacher and student mobility, continuous and regular verification of acquired knowledge...) which could have been easily and fruitfully integrated into "traditional" academic education without radical and superficial modifications (3+2+3 study cycles). University teachers are dealing with demanding mathematical operations which seem to be the essence of Bologna process. Scoring students and thus rewarding them for regular attendance is an illustration of unnecessary mathematical efforts to evaluate students with "deadly accuracy". Regular attendance of full-time students goes in brackets – therefore it should not be rewarded. The activity of students must be encouraged (as well as interactivity) in a way which is more flexible than strict scores. The role of university teachers is thus reduced to the level of "accountants" who must constantly calculate certain numbers. Apart from incessant counting, the very concept of master of vocation is highly dubious. What is the meaning of master of education is not precisely defined and employability after the first and second study cycle is far from being promising. One of the major "collateral damages" of Bologna process is the quality of education. We will soon have great number of unemployed "masters" and doctors, mainly because of overly democratic entrance policies. Our dilemma is how to find equilibrium between traditional and modern approaches regarding academic education. Certain revival of traditional academic values is inevitable if we want to raise the quality of academic education.

LINO VELJAK

*Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska /
Philosophische Fakultät, Universität Zagreb, Kroatien*

VISOKO OBRAZOVANJE NA TRŽIŠTU

U vremenima rastuće apsolutizacije tržišta visoko obrazovanje izloženo je dvostrukom pritisku. S jedne strane u sve se većoj mjeri nameće tendencija prepuštanja sveučilišta i općenito visokog obrazovanja zakonima tržišta (što se očituje i u smanjivanju javnih izdataka za znanost i visoko obrazovanje), dok se s druge strane povećavaju one dimenzije regulacije (među ostalime u obliku tzv. standardizacije) koje služe rastu državne kontrole nad sveučilištem. U tom prividnom rascjepu deregulacijskih i regulacijskih tendencija (gdje se država povlači iz sfere osiguravanja provedbe javnog dobra, a istovremeno jača svoju kontrolnu funkciju, čime se klasična autonomija nadomješta etatiističkim modelima upravljanja visokim obrazovanjem) cijenu plaća kvaliteta visokog obrazovanja, te se ujedno i smanjuje prostor u kojemu se razvija kritički duh. Dijagnoza bi mogla glasiti: na djelu je potiskivanje uma u ime bezumlja instrumentalnog razuma.

HOCHSCHULWESEN AUF DEN MARKT

Um die Zeit der wachsenden Absolutisierung des Markts wird das Hochschulwesen dem zweifältigen Druck ausgesetzt. Einerseits geht es um die Tendenz, dass die Universität und Hochschulwesen im allgemeinen den Gesetzen des Markts in vergrößertem Maße ausgesetzt werden (diese Tendenz äußert sich u. a. durch die Verringerung der öffentlichen Finanzierung im Bereich der Wissenschaft und Hochschulwesen); andererseits wird offenbar, dass diejenige Dimensionen der Regulierung (u. a. durch die Erscheinung des sog. Standardisierens) zunehmen, die zur Verstärkung der Staatskontrolle über die Universität dienen. Zum Opfer dieser scheinbaren Spaltung zwischen deregulierenden und regulierenden Tendenzen (der Staat zieht sich aus dem Bereich der Versicherung der öffentlichen Wohlfahrt zurück und gleichzeitig erhöht seine Kontrollfunktion, wodurch die klassische Autonomie der Universität durch etatistischen Verwaltungsmodelle im Bereich des Hochschulwesens ersetzt wird) fällt die Qualität des Hochschulwesens. Dadurch wird auch den Raum reduziert, in dem der kritischen Geist entwickelt wird. Die Diagnose könnte lauten: Es geht um die Verdrängung der Vernunft im Namen des instrumentellen Verstands.

NENAD VERTOVŠEK

*Odjel za kroatistiku i slavistiku, Sveučilište u Zadru, Hrvatska /
Department of Croatian and Slavic Studies, University of Zadar, Croatia*

SMISAO UČENJA I PRENOŠENJA ZNANJA – SUSRET ISTOKA I ZAPADA U VIZIJAMA HERMANA HESSEA

Između filozofskih eseja i fikcije Hesse traži smisao ljudskog postojanja i podučavanja, od tradicije antičkih agora do samostanskih učilišta, i to spaja s istočnjačkom simbolikom i filozofijom. Antički uzor slobodna i produhovljena čovjeka koji preispituje sebe i svoje ponašanje i razmišljanje Hesse obogaćuje istočnjakom koji praksom podučavanja prevladava materijalna ograničenja. Zapadni je intelekt razdiran individualizmom i elitizmom, dobrim i zlom, ratom i mirom, duhom i tijelom, stoga Hesse spaja Konfucija i Sokrata. Pomoć traži i dobiva u vedama i upanišadama, uzori su mu i Lao Tse, Li Tai Po, Buddha, Chuang Tse. Smisao učenja i prenošenja znanja za njega je uvijek u jedinstvu čovjeka i prirode, čovjeka i društva, te harmoniji čovjeka unutar samog sebe. Koncept Učitelja i Učenika za njega je spoj najboljih misaonih i praktičnih tradicija Istoka i Zapada. Hesse to postavlja kao putovanje prema »Istoku«, kao simbolični odlazak u »zoru« duhovnosti, tamo gdje je »domovina i mladost duše«. Hesseovi svjetovi, od Siddharte do Jozefa Knechta nisu obične utopije, već škole života u jednoj od opcija budućnosti. Hesse predviđa i konačno raskrižje za Čovjeka – učenje, prenošenje znanja, konstantno i smisljeno podučavanje mladih umova za njega je jedno od ključnih rješenja protiv moguće samodestrukcije, otuđenosti i ne-ljudske budućnosti.

THE MEANING OF LEARNING AND KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER – A MEETING OF EAST AND WEST IN VISIONS OF HERMAN HESSE

Between the fiction and philosophical essays Hesse seeks the meaning of human existence and the teaching tradition from the ancient agora to the monastic institutions, and connects them with the Eastern symbolism and philosophy. The ancient model of free and spirited man, who examines himself and his behavior and thinking, Hesse enriches with an Easterner whose teaching practice goes beyond the material limitations. Western intellect is torn by individualism and elitism, good and evil, war and peace, spirit and body, and that is why Hesse joins Confucius and Socrates. Therefore he seeks

assistance in the Vedas, Upanishads, in models of Lao Tse, Li Tai Po, Buddha, Chuang Tse. The purpose of learning and knowledge transfer to him is always the unity of man and nature, man and society, and harmony within man himself. The concept of the Teacher and the Student for him is the blend of the best thoughtful and practical traditions of the East and the West. Hesse sets it as a journey towards the “East”, as a symbolic trip to “dawn” of spirituality, where is the “home of the youth of the soul”. His worlds of Sidharta and Jozef Knechts are not just the utopias, but schools of life in one of the options of the future. Hesse predicts the final intersection of Man – learning, knowledge transfer, constant and meaningful teaching of young minds is one of the key solutions against possibilities of self-destruction, alienation and non-human future.

DAFNE VIDANEC

*Accredited College of Business and Management “B.A. Krčelić”, Zaprešić, Croatia /
Visoka škola za poslovanje i upravljanje »B. A. Krčelić«, Zaprešić, Hrvatska*

THE NEED FOR ETHICAL EDUCATION: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ETHICAL KNOWLEDGE IN THE HIGHER ECONOMICS EDUCATION

Business ethics is a relatively new philosophical discipline, in the broad sense, a branch of social ethics oriented to questioning and evaluating business conduct of individuals and corporations in the (contemporary) business world. Business ethics arose in the last quarter of the 20th century from the pure business practice – from the need for “fair” and “justice” business conduct.

Nowadays, business ethics has been in the public, academic milieu of the Western modern societies recognized as one of the crucial educational forms especially at higher, economically profiled institutions: faculties of economics, accredited colleges for business and management and the like. Analyzing socio-cultural, political and economic milieu of some European societies that have gone through certain social, juridical, political and economic metamorphoses in the last twenty years – since the fall of the Berlin Wall – what we can notice is a certain decline: decline of the basic human, i.e. social values, in the Aristotelian theoretical manner, that shape the structure of the social dimension of human life: social and economic justice, economic equality, social freedom, etc. The main task of the business ethics in the business world and in

the human life, generally speaking, is to show how we can build our individual and social life as rational, socially engaged beings gifted by capacity of understanding and evaluating ourselves, our deeds, desires, decisions, choices.

In this elaboration the author tends to investigate and to describe the structure of ethical education directed towards business and managing in the contemporary business world, on the one side, and in the economically oriented education, on the other.

POTREBA ZA ETIČKIM OBRAZOVANJEM: IMPLEMENTACIJA ETIČKOG ZNANJA U VISOKOŠKOLSKOM, EKONOMSKI PROFILIRANOM OBRAZOVANJU

Poslovna etika je relativno nova (filozofijska) disciplina, pod-disciplina socijalne etike, koja, u širem smislu gledano, propituje i vrednuje djelovanje pojedinaca i korporacija u poslovnome svijetu. Poslovna je etika u posljednjoj trećini 20. stoljeća izniknula iz čiste prakse – iz potrebe za pravednim i pravičnim poslovanjem.

U današnje vrijeme, posebice u modernim zapadnim društvima, poslovna je etika zadobila na popularnosti i značaju kako u javnom tako i u znanstvenom, akademskom miljeu te je prepoznata i priznata kao ključna, znanstveno-obrazovna forma na visokoškolskim ustanovama, primjerice na državnim ekonomskim fakultetima, ali i na veleučilištima i (privatnim) visokim školama u tuzemstvu i inozemstvu. Analizirajući sociokulturni, politički i ekonomski milje pojedinih europskih društava, posebice onih koji su u posljednjih dvadesetak godina – uzimam vrijeme rušenja Berlinskoga zida – prošli kroz snažne socijalne, ekonomske, pravne, administrativne, političke i ine metamorfoze, ono što možemo zapaziti jest značajni pad temeljnih – humanih, odnosno, a u aristotelijanskoj misaonoj maniri, društvenih vrijednosti koje oblikuju strukturu društvene dimenzije ljudskoga života: socijalna i ekonomska pravednost, ekonomska jednakost, građanska sloboda itd. Glavna je, nazovimo, zadaća poslovne etike, kako u poslovnom životu tako i u životu općenito, pokazati na koji je način moguće izgrađivati i oblikovati i individualni i društveni život polazeći od pretpostavke da smo, a kako je to davno uočio Aristotel, budući smo ljudi, racionalna bića obdarena kapacitetom razum(ijevanj)a i prosuđivanja te evaluiranja naših djela, čina, poslova, odluka, želja, izbora itd.

U ovome elaboratu autorica želi istražiti i opisati ono što naziva strukturom etičkoga obrazovanja orijentiranoga prema poslovanju i upravljanju, ali i šire, općenito u obrazovnom sustavu.

RADOMIR VIDENVIĆ

*Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Nišu, Srbija /
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš, Serbia*

IDEJA SVEUČILIŠTA I AKADEMSKA SLOBODA

Sveučilište je (ili bi trebalo biti) slobodna znanstvena (i obrazovna?!) ustanova koja traga za istinom i predaje istinu. Ali, proširenje osnovice javnog obrazovanja (koje je u organizaciji države) dovodi do proširenja i na razini sveučilišta, pa se ne predaje (prenosi) istina, već korisno, upotrebljivo znanje.

Na autonomiju sveučilišta utječe država – etatizirano znanje, ali i sveopći merkantilizam, tržište. Je li i obim pojma akademske slobode (neopravdano) proširen? Odnosno, nije li to proširenje jedan od uzroka urušavanja autonomije, a time i same ideje sveučilišta?!

THE IDEA OF UNIVERSITY AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The University is (or should be) a free scientific (and educational) institution with the task of searching for the truth and teaching the truth. But the expansion of the basis of public education (organized by the state) leads to an expansion at the University level as well, so what is now being taught is not the truth, but useful, useable knowledge.

The autonomy of the University is influenced by the State – etatized knowledge, as well as the general mercantilism, the market. Does this (unjustified) expansion include the scope of the concept of academic freedom? In other words, is not this expansion one of the causes of the collapse of the autonomy, and with it the very idea of University?

JANEZ VODIČAR

*Faculty of Theology, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia /
Teološki fakultet, Sveučilište u Ljubljani, Slovenija*

UNIVERSITY: A PLACE OF FORMATION OF ACHIEVERS OR THINKERS?

Knowledge became a source that the modern society wishes to exploit for resources in the market of competitiveness. The Bologna reform of study program is based on this philosophy. One of the first requirements on the evaluation list is usefulness and competitiveness of the profile of graduates on the workforce market. Today, we no longer speak about the needs of the individual but about the necessary international comparison and competitiveness, which, according to K. P. Liessmann, leads to a society of ignorance and sameness, instead of a society of uniqueness and humanness. Despite having more resources invested in higher education, the society of knowledge is increasingly further out of reach, according to J. T. Gatto. Must one acknowledge the anthropological findings of M. Wesch about the new "internet" human, who not only has a different path to knowledge, but also defines this knowledge differently? We should not forget Illich's placing of education in the sphere of ideology, which is founded on the motto that has been known since Spencer: "Better is still to come."

SVEUČILIŠTE: MJESTO FORMACIJE IZVRŠNIKA ILI MISLILACA?

Znanje je postalo izvor kojeg moderno društvo želi iskoristavati za resurse na tržištu konkurentnosti. Bolonjska reforma programa studija temelji se na ovoj filozofiji. Jedan od prvih zahtjeva na evaluacijskom popisu je korisnost i konkurentnost profila diplomiranih na tržištu radne snage. Danas više ne govorimo o potrebama pojedinca, nego o nužnim međunarodnim usporedbama i konkurentnosti, koje vode, prema K. P. Liessmannu, prema društvu neznanja i istovrsnosti, umjesto prema društvu jedinstvenosti i humanosti. Usprkos povećanju ulaganja u visoko obrazovanje, društvo znanja je sve više izvan dosega, kako tvrdi J. T. Gatto. Moramo li priznati antropološke nalaze M. Wescha o novom »internetskom« čovjeku, koji ne samo da ima drugačije putove do znanja nego i to znanje drukčije definira? Ne smijemo zaboraviti ni Illichevo smještanje obrazovanja u sferu ideologije koja je utemeljena na motu poznatom od vremena Spencera: »Bolja vremena će doći.«

BUDISLAV VUKAS, ml.

*Pravni fakultet, Sveučilište u Rijeci, Hrvatska /
Faculty of Law, University of Rijeka, Croatia*

PRAVNA POVIJEST U KURIKULUMIMA HRVATSKIH PRAVNIH STUDIJA

Od imperativa dezideologiziranog i demokratskog pristupa ranih devedesetih do prvih »bolonjskih« iskustava

U kontekstu općih rasprava o ideji sveučilišta, što je dodatno dinamizirao proces uvođenja tzv. Bolonjskog procesa, ali i recentne rasprave o prijedlozima izmjena odnosnih zakona, rasprava je vođena i sa svrhom novog promišljanja i koncipiranja pravnog studija. Pravni studij, koji spada među najstarije visokoškolske i znanstvene sveučilišne institucije, kako u europskoj tako i hrvatskoj baštini, nije bio izuzet iz sličnih rasprava. To je sasvim razumljivo, budući da su u okolnostima novog vremena i novih društvenih odnosa i tendencija, nova promišljanja o gotovo svim pravnim institutima i pojavama uvjetovala reformu tog studija.

Raznolikost interesa i pogleda o pravnom studiju, kao i o važnosti i ulozi nekih pravnih grana i pojava, uvjetovali su i različita gledišta o ulozi pravne povijesti kao neosporne pravne discipline. Iako je pravo samo po sebi historična disciplina, a u kontinentalno-europskom kontekstu pravo se shvaća kao znanost (ne vještina), postoje i takvi stavovi koji umanjuju važnost pravne povijesti u usporedbi s drugim, navodno »važnijim ili značajnijim« pravnim disciplinama.

No, i sama pravna povijest doživljava temeljite mijene. Ona više nije ideološka disciplina čiji je cilj promišljanje ili argumentiranje elemenata socijalističke ili bilo kakve ideološke paradigme u znanosti. Novi su i opći uvjeti i standardi izučavanja i predavanja pravne povijesti, diktirani »Bolonjskim« imperativima.

Želeći doprinijeti diskusiji o ideji sveučilišta, autor objašnjava ulogu pravne povijesti u kontekstu suvremene pravne znanosti hrvatskih sveučilišta, ali i nove standarde i iskustva predstavljanja pravnopovijesnih disciplina na našim pravnim fakultetima (dakako osobito Pravnom fakultetu u Rijeci) u okviru novih misija znanstveno-istraživačkog rada, kako ga određuje tzv. Bolonjska reforma.

LEGAL HISTORY IN THE CURRICULA OF THE CROATIAN LEGAL STUDIES

From the Imperative of Disideologised and Democratic Approach in the Early 1990s to the First “Bologna” Experiences

In the context of general discussions related to the idea of university, additionally intensified by the introduction of the so-called Bologna process, as well as recent debates concerning the proposed amendments to the pertinent legislation, the discussion was also held with the aim of conceptualising and structuring anew the legal studies. Belonging among the oldest higher educational and scientific studies in European as well as Croatian tradition, the legal studies was not spared from those discussions. This is perfectly understandable given that, against the background of new era and new social relations and tendencies, the new conceptualisations of nearly all legal institutes and phenomena brought about the reform in these studies.

Variety of interests and views on legal studies as well as on importance and function of certain legal fields and phenomena resulted in different positions on the role of legal history, which unquestionably is a legal discipline. Although law *per se* is a historical discipline, and in the continental European milieu it is understood as a science (and not skill), there are opinions lessening the importance of legal history in comparison to other supposedly “more important or relevant” legal disciplines.

Yet, legal history itself undergoes fundamental transformations. It is no longer an ideological discipline, whose objective is to contemplate or present arguments supporting elements of socialist or any other ideological paradigm in the science. Likewise, the general circumstances and standards of researching and teaching legal history are novel due to the “Bologna” imperatives.

Desiring to contribute to the discussion on the idea of university, the author explains the role of legal history in the context of contemporary legal science at the Croatian universities, as well as new standards and experiences in presenting legal-historical disciplines at our law faculties (naturally, with emphasis on the Faculty of Law in Rijeka) in the event of new missions attributed to scientific work and teaching by the so-called Bologna reform.

DIVNA VUKSANOVIĆ

*Fakultet dramskih umjetnosti, Sveučilište umjetnosti u Beogradu, Srbija /
Faculty of Dramatic Arts, University of Arts in Belgrade, Serbia*

PRILOG KRITICI KONCEPTA »KREATIVNOG UNIVERZITETA«

Izlaganje na kritički način uspostavlja vezu između tradicionalnog pojma univerziteta i tzv. *kreativnih industrija*, koje univerzitet »trebaju približiti« tržišnim strategijama razvoja društvenih odnosa, sagledanih u razvojnom kontekstu globalnog okruženja. U ovom smislu riječi, sintagme poput 'društva znanja' ili 'informatičkog društva' relevantne su za oblikovanje koncepcije novog, »kreativnog« univerziteta, koji sistematski treba obrazovati ljudske resurse za participiranje u »zajednici znanja«, te generiranje njenih ključnih vrijednosti. Osnovna svrha ove transformacije sastojala bi se u tome da univerzitet treba postati »logistička podrška« razvoju globalnog tržišta, posredstvom upotrebe »kreativnosti«, odnosno kulturnog, umjetničkog i medijskog stvaralaštva.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE CRITIQUE OF THE CONCEPT OF "CREATIVE UNIVERSITY"

The paper critically establishes a connection between the traditional concept of the university and the so-called *creative industries*, which are "supposed to bring" the university "closer" to market-based strategies for the development of social conditions, formulated in the development context of the global environment. In this sense, phrases such as 'knowledge society' or 'information society' become the relevant design concepts for the new, "creative" university, which should systematically educate human resources for participation in the "community knowledge" and production of its key values. The main purpose of this transformation lies in the fact that the university should become a "logistical support" to the development of global markets, through the use of "creativity" and the cultural, artistic and media creation.

IVANA ZAGORAC

*Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska /
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia*

KRITIČKO MIŠLJENJE I SUSTAV OBRAZOVANJA

Kritičko mišljenje razumije se kao jedna od najvažnijih karakteristika svakog slobodno mislećega pojedinca te bi trebalo predstavljati nužan preduvjet svakog istraživanja i, posljedično, svakog novog intelektualnog doprinosa. Razvoj kritičkoga mišljenja također se ističe i kao jedan od osnovnih zadataka suvremenih obrazovnih sustava na svim razinama. S druge strane, a to zapažanje predstavlja i polazište ovoga rada, svaki sustav koji ga zaziva mora biti spreman na znatne strukturalne promjene ako želi takvome tipu mišljenja dati produktivnu, a ne puko ukrasnu ulogu. Put kritičkoga mišljenja od odgojne mantre do punokrvnoga koncepta omeđen je spremnošću sustava na vlastitu rekonceptualizaciju. Osnovno pitanje koje se istražuje u radu stoga nije što kritičko mišljenje može ponuditi sustavu, nego što sustav može ponuditi kritičkome mišljenju.

CRITICAL THINKING AND EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Critical thinking is understood as one of the main characteristics ascribed to the freely thinking individual, therefore being assumed as a vital precondition of every research as well as of every new intellectual breakthrough. The development of critical thinking has often been highlighted as one of the basic tasks of the modern educational systems on all levels. On the other hand, each system that promotes it must be prepared for major structural changes if it advocates productive rather than decorative role of critical thinking. Such an objection represents the starting position of this paper. The capacity of critical thinking to develop from a merely educational mantra to a strong and sustainable concept is dependable on the capability and willingness of the system for its own re-conceptualization. Main question of the paper therefore is not what critical thinking can do for the system, but what the system can do for critical thinking.

ENIS ZEBIĆ

Zagreb, Hrvatska /

Zagreb, Croatia

MEDIJI: IZMEĐU VLASTI, PROFITA I JAVNOG INTERESA

Problemi sveučilišta u 21. stoljeću – između Scile vlasti i Haribde kapitala, a u trajnoj okrenutosti prema humanističkim vrijednostima – okvir su unutar kojeg treba propitati samorazumijevanje, a potom i obrazovanje novinarske profesije, kao one koja bi u demokratskom društvu svim sudionicima omogućila pravo na kvalificirano i kompetentno sudjelovanje u demokratskom procesu. Tri su moguće pozicije i tri moguća razumijevanja novinarstva – ono koje ga razumije kao slugu/servis ekonomije i/ili kapitala, ono koje ga razumije kao slugu/servis politike i ono koje ga razumije kao servis javnosti. Ove prve dvije opcije imaju i svoju »legalnu« inačicu – to su eksperti za odnose s javnošću. Gdje počinje, a gdje prestaje novinarstvo kao neizostavan i konstitutivan dio demokratskog procesa (od posredovanja u pribavljanju informacija potrebnih za sudjelovanje i odlučivanje u demokratskom procesu do elementarnog ljudskog prava na iskazivanje vlastitog mišljenja), a gdje počinje (i gdje prestaje?!) servisiranje vlasti i/ili kapitala?

MEDIA: BETWEEN AUTHORITIES, PROFIT AND PUBLIC INTEREST

The problems of universities in the 21st century – caught between the Scylla of government and the Charybdis of capital, but in permanent orientation towards humanistic values – are the framework within which the self-perception, and, thereupon, the education of the journalist profession should be questioned, since it should empower all the participants in a democratic society to skillfully and competently participate in the democratic process. There are three possible positions and three possible perceptions of journalism – the one seeing it as a servant/service of economy and/or capital, the one seeing it as a servant/service of politics, and the one seeing it as a public service. The first two options have their “legal” version – the experts for public relations. Where is the beginning, and where the end, of journalism as an integral and constitutive part of the democratic process (from mediation in obtaining information needed for participating and decision making in the democratic process, to the elementary human right to express one’s opinion), and where is the beginning (and where is the end?!) of servicing the government and/or capital?

IVAN ZELIĆ

Split, Hrvatska /

Split, Croatia

LOGIKA NA KATOLIČKOM SVEUČILIŠTU U LUBLINU

Poljska logika doživjela je procvat između dva svjetska rata i igrala je važnu ulogu na poljskim sveučilištima. Taj procvat bitno je obilježio filozofiju u Poljskoj u 20. stoljeću. Katoličko sveučilište u Lublinu (Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski – KUL) osnovano je 1918. godine, a njegov Filozofski fakultet (tada Fakultet kršćanske filozofije – Wydział Filozofii Chrześcijańskiej) i Katedra za logiku 1946. godine. Ovo sveučilište bilo je jedino katoličko sveučilište u komunističkome svijetu. Uloga koju je logika imala na njemu odražava tipičnu poljsku tradiciju iz prve polovice stoljeća. Među logičarima koji su predavali i/ili bili formirani na ovom sveučilištu ističu se Jerzy Kalinowski, Stanisław Kamiński, Ludwik Borkowski, Witold Marciszewski i Stanisław Kiczuk. Oni su dali značajan doprinos logici i njezinoj primjeni u filozofiji, ne samo u Poljskoj.

LOGIC AT THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN

Polish logic flourished between the two World Wars and played a major role at Polish universities. This flowering essentially marked the philosophy in Poland in the 20th century. The Catholic University of Lublin (Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski – KUL) was founded in 1918, and its Faculty of Philosophy (then the Faculty of Christian Philosophy – Wydział Filozofia Chrześcijańskiej) and Chair of Logic in 1946. This university was the only Catholic university in the communist world. The role that logic had in it reflects the typical Polish tradition from the first half of the century. Among logicians who taught and/or were formed at this university stand out Jerzy Kalinowski, Stanisław Kamiński, Ludwik Borkowski, Witold Marciszewski and Stanisław Kiczuk. They have made significant contributions to logic and its application in philosophy, not only in Poland.

BOJAN ŽALEC

*Faculty of Theology, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia /
Teološki fakultet, Sveučilište u Ljubljani, Slovenija*

MASS HIGHER EDUCATION, ITS EFFECTS AND VALUE

Are contemporary universities and colleges decent institutions of higher education? How to evaluate this? How can universities improve themselves? These are the burning questions of our time. They trigger the consideration of higher education from the point of view of accountability, market and trust. This last sentence includes also the words for the main topics of this paper. Its central thesis is that the transformation of higher education from elite to mass education has resulted in several important changes in the area of higher education. Two of them are the central topic of the paper: decrease in trust and increase in accountability. The author considers also some other related topics: importance, aims and value of (mass) higher education; effects of decline in trust and increase of accountability; possible ways of assessing of the quality of teaching and education and reasons for the applications of the new such ways.

MASOVNO VISOKO OBRAZOVANJE, NJEGOVI UČINCI I VRIJEDNOSTI

Jesu li suvremena sveučilišta i koledži prikladne institucije visokog obrazovanja? Kako ovo procijeniti? Kako se sveučilišta mogu poboljšati? Ovo su goruća pitanja našeg vremena. Ona potiču razmatranje visokog obrazovanja iz perspektive odgovornosti, tržišta i povjerenja. Ova posljednja rečenica uključuje riječi koje su glavna tema ovog rada. Središnja je teza da je transformacija visokog obrazovanja iz elitnog u masovno dovela do nekoliko važnih promjena u području visokog obrazovanja. Dvije promjene su središnja tema rada: smanjenje povjerenja i povećanje odgovornosti. Autor razmatra i neke druge vezane teme: važnost, ciljevi i vrijednost (masovnog) visokog obrazovanja; posljedice smanjenja povjerenja i povećanja odgovornosti; mogući načini ocjenjivanja kvalitete nastave i obrazovanje te razlozi za primjenu tih novih načina.

19. simpozij
OD PETRIĆA DO BOŠKOVIĆA:
HRVATSKI FILOZOFI U EUROPSKOM KONTEKSTU

19th Symposium
FROM PETRIĆ TO BOŠKOVIĆ:
CROATIAN PHILOSOPHERS IN THE EUROPEAN CONTEXT

ERNA BANIĆ-PAJNIĆ

*Institut za filozofiju, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Institute of Philosophy, Zagreb, Croatia*

»AMOR – COPULA MUNDI«: RENESANSNI TRAKTATI
O LJUBAVI (FICINO, PETRIĆ, GUČETIĆ)

Možda u nijednom drugom duhovno-povijesnom razdoblju ljubav nije bila toliko često tematizirana kao u razdoblju renesanse. Renesansni tekstovi o ljubavi svakako imaju svoje tematske preteče, ponajprije u trubadurskoj, a kasnije i u petrarkističkoj poeziji, no već i iz površnog uvida u renesansne traktate, napose one nastale sredinom 15. stoljeća i kasnije, jasno je da se oni u pristupu i u koncepciji bitno razlikuju od tih svojih srednjovjekovnih prethodnika. Ono što primarno čini razliku jest uvođenje Platonova nauka o ljubavi u zapadni kulturni krug. Naime, okosnicu renesansnog tematiziranja ljubavi uspostavlja upravo ponovno oživljavanje interesa za taj nauk što ga renesansi posreduje Marsilio Ficino svojim prijevodom i komentarom Platonova dijaloga *Gozba*.

Ficino je svojim stavovima o ljubavi utjecao i na dvojicu hrvatskih renesansnih filozofa: Franu Petrića, koji ljubavi izričito posvećuje svoja djela *L'amorosa filosofia* i *Il Delfino ovvero del baccio*, te Nikolu Vitova Gučetića, koji temi ljubavi posvećuje svoj *Dialogo d'amore detto Antos*, ali o ljubavi piše i u drugom svom značajnom dijalogu *Dialogo della bellezza detto Antos*.

Petrić i Gučetić svoje traktate o ljubavi pišu gotovo stoljeće nakon Ficina i u njihovim tekstovima o ljubavi, u kojima je nesporno prisutan Ficinov utjecaj, zamjetni su novi naglasci u obradi teme ljubavi. Upravo ćemo se time baviti u ovom izlaganju. Namjera nam dakle nije izložiti iscrpnu poredbenu analizu koncepcija ljubavi trojice renesansnih filozofa, već u osnovnim crtama naznačiti ono novo u Petrićevu i Gučetićevoj pristupu filozofiji ljubavi u odnosu na Ficina. Da bi se razumjeli ti novi naglasci, zahtijeva se uvid u značajke Ficinove koncepcije ljubavi, pa su u prvom dijelu izlaganja izloženi Ficinovi stavovi na temelju analize njegova komentara Platonove *Gozbe*, dok su u drugom dijelu izložene specifičnosti utjecaja što ga je izvršio na dvojicu naših filozofa te ono novo što oni unose u filozofiju ljubavi.

Za razliku od Ficina, koji iznosi jednu ontologijski utemeljenu koncepciju ljubavi, u kojoj prorada određenih aspekata zemaljske manifestacije ljubavi logički slijedi iz temeljnog određenja ljubavi kao sveprisutnog božanskog počela, čija jedinstvenost dopušta da se poveže ono božansko i ono ljudsko, u Petrića i Gučetića izostaje takvo ontologijsko utemeljenje ljubavi (s tim da ćemo ontologijsku razradu ljubavi u Petrića naći tek u njegovu kasnijem djelu *Novoj sveopćoj filozofiji*), a naglasak se premješta na prikaz konkretnog utjelovljenja ljepote kao predmeta ljubavi u liku pojedinca, točnije ženske osobe. Pritom je iskazivanje divljenja prema tjelesnoj, moralnoj i intelektualnoj ljepoti ženskih likova na neki način ilustracija onoga što je izloženo u Ficinovu teorijskom izlaganju o ljubavi. I za Petrića i za Gučetića odredbeni su detaljistički prikazi ženske i to upravo tjelesne ljepote, premda je sve to ipak iznijeto u kontekstu platoničkog poimanja odnosa duhovnog i tjelesnog, tj. tjelesna ljepota još je uvijek sagledana primarno kao slika duhovne ljepote. S tim je u vezi i naglašena prisutnost fiziološkog tumačenja tjelesnih manifestacija ljubavnog čuvstva te astrologijsko tumačenje čovjekovih svojstava i njegova djelovanja, napose u ljubavi, u čemu se očituje prisutnost renesansnog stava o čovjeku mikrokozmosu kao slici makrokozmosa.

Na temelju uvida u značajke filozofije ljubavi u trojice renesansnih filozofa pokušava se na kraju ponešto zaključiti o ljubavi kao jednoj od središnjih tema renesansne filozofije te o nekim značajnim tendencijama renesansnog tematiziranja ljubavi. Sva se trojica obrađenih filozofa, naime, susreću s istim načelnim problemima – prije svega s problemom usklađivanja novoplatoničke i kršćanske koncepcije ljubavi, ali onda i s još od Platona naslijeđenim otvorenim pitanjima što ih je zaoštreno postavio novoplatonizam: s pitanjem horizma Platonove filozofije i mogućnošću njegova prevladavanja te napose s pitanjem odnosa i veze ljubavi kao čuvstva i ljubavi kao sveopćeg počela, iskazanim u dilemi ljubav – demon ili ljubav – bog.

Središnju poziciju teme ljubavi u okviru renesansne filozofije treba razumijevati iz činjenice da je upravo renesansni novoplatonizam bitan segment renesansne filozofije, a ono što bitno određuje renesansni novoplatonizam jest sinkretizam koji se očituje primarno kao težnja za onim što povezuje. U skladu s tom tendencijom onda i novoplatonički koncipiranom ontologijskom sustavu ključnu poziciju ima ono ‘srednje’, ono ‘između’, što povezuje krajnosti i što zbog te povezujuće funkcije nužno mora biti dvojakog značaja. Takvu posredničku ulogu ima prije svega *ljubav*. Stoga se može zaključiti da renesansni sinkretizam kulminira upravo u renesansnim traktatima o ljubavi.

Ključne riječi: renesansna filozofija, filozofija ljubavi; Marsilio Ficino, Frane Petrić/Patricius, Nikola Vitov Gučetić/Gozze

“AMOR – COPULA MUNDI”: RENAISSANCE TRACTS ON LOVE (FICINO, PETRIĆ, GUČETIĆ)

In no other historical era has the love theme been given such prominence as in the period of the Renaissance. Indeed, Renaissance texts on love had their thematic predecessors, notably in the poetry of the troubadours, and later in the Petrarchan verse, but a fleeting glimpse into the Renaissance tracts, especially those written in the mid-fifteenth century and later, makes it clear that in terms of approach and concept they greatly differ from their medieval forerunners. At the core of this difference lies the introduction of Plato’s doctrine on love into the Western cultural circle. Namely, the popularity of the Renaissance thematisation of love should be sought in the revival of the interest in Plato’s doctrine, rediscovered through the translation of Marsilio Ficino and his commentary on Plato’s dialogue *Symposium*.

With his views of love, Ficino also influenced two Croatian philosophers of the Renaissance: Frane Petrić, who, explicitly to love, devoted his works *L’amorosa filosofia* and *Il Delfino ovvero del baccio*, and Nikola Vitov Gučetić, whose *Dialogo d’amore detto Antos* is devoted to the love theme, the latter also being discussed in his *Dialogo della bellezza detto Antos*.

Petrić and Gučetić wrote their tracts on love almost a century after Ficino, and their texts on love, in which Ficino’s influence is undisputed, bring novel accents in the treatment of the love theme, which will be the focus of this paper. Our aim is not to present a thorough comparative analysis of the love concepts of the three Renaissance philosophers, but to outline the novel elements in Petrić’s and Gučetić’s approach to the philosophy of love in relation to Ficino. In order to understand these new accents, it is necessary to provide an insight into the features of Ficino’s concept of love. Therefore the first part

of the paper deals with Ficino's views as interpreted on the basis of his commentary on Plato's *Symposium*, while the second discusses the specific characteristics of Ficino's influence on the two Croatian philosophers, as well as the novelty that they introduce into the philosophy of love.

Unlike Ficino, who comes forward with an ontological foundation of the concept of love, in which the elaboration of some aspects of the worldly manifestation of love logically follows from the fundamental determination of love as an omnipresent divine principle, whose oneness allows the divine and the human to unite, Petrić and Gučetić fail to follow the ontological foundation of love (with Petrić, however, this concept will appear in his mature work *Nova de universis philosophia*), the accent being shifted towards the presentation of the concrete embodiment of beauty as love object in the form of an individual, more precisely, of a female person. In doing so, the expression of admiration for the physical, moral and intellectual beauty of the female characters is in a specific kind of way an illustration of what is expounded in Ficino's treatise on love. Characteristic of both Petrić's and Gučetić's approach are the most detailed descriptions of female physical beauty, though still within the frame of the Platonic understanding of the relationship between the spiritual and the physical—that is, physical beauty being primarily viewed as an image of spiritual beauty. Coupled with this topic is also an accentuated presence of the physiological interpretation of the physical manifestations of the love emotions, as well as astrological interpretation of man's characteristics and his activities, predominantly in love, reflecting the Renaissance view of man the microcosm as an image of the macrocosm.

It may be concluded that all the three philosophers encounter the same problems of principle nature—first of all, the problem of harmonisation of Neoplatonic with the Christian concept of love, but also with some of the open issues since Plato's day, abruptly posed by Neoplatonism: with the question of the ὁρισμός of Plato's philosophy and the possibility of its being overcome, and especially with the question of the relationship between love as emotion and love as universal principle, expressed in the dilemma love – demon or love – God.

Central position of the love theme within Renaissance philosophy should be understood from the fact that the Renaissance Neoplatonism was an important segment of the Renaissance philosophy, and what essentially determines the Renaissance Neoplatonism is the syncretism which is witnessed mainly as a tendency towards that which unites. In accordance with this tendency, then the key position in the Neoplatonically conceived ontological system is awarded to the 'middle,' to the 'in-between,' that unites the extremes and which, because of this uniting function, necessarily has to be of dual meaning. Such a

mediating role is primarily bestowed on *love*. Thus it may rightly be concluded that it was in the Renaissance tracts on love that the Renaissance syncretism reached its culmination.

Key words: Renaissance philosophy, philosophy of love; Marsilio Ficino, Frane Petrić/Patricius, Nikola Vitov Gučetić/Gozze

JAN ČÍŽEK

Centre for Renaissance Texts, Faculty of Arts, Palacký University of Olomouc, Czech Republic /

Centar za renesansne tekstove, Fakultet umjetnosti, Sveučilište u Olomouci, Češka Republika

JOHANN HEINRICH ALSTED AND JOHN AMOS COMENIUS: TWO CASES OF THE RECEPTION OF FRANCISCUS PATRICIUS IN EARLY MODERN CENTRAL EUROPE

The paper deals with the question of the reception of Franciscus Patricius and his philosophical work in early modern Central Europe, especially in two cases – of Jan Amos Comenius and his teacher Johann Heinrich Alsted. Based on the analysis of *Nova de universis philosophia* (1591) by Patricius and *De rerum humanarum emendatione consultatio catholica* by Comenius, I have earlier stated (Čížek 2010) that Comenius' work resembles that of Patricius in many aspects, which shows an obvious influence of the Croatian thinker.

First and foremost there is the metaphysics of light and its central concept *panaugia*, which Comenius no doubt takes over from Patricius, whereas the reception of the concept further influenced his methodology, in which light features as a fundamental principle. A clear effect of Patricius' philosophy can also be seen in Comenius' terminology. Not only that Comenius accepts a number of terms in the field of philosophy and natural philosophy, he also borrows from Patricius the Greek prefix *pan-*, which was to play an irreplaceable role in the formation and naming of various parts of his *Consultatio catholica*. Regarding the apparent similarities, it also seems possible that Patricius' metaphysical notions might have been reflected in Comenius' epistemological views. In fact, their distinctiveness (triadic and processual conception of the whole cognitive process, interaction of sensory and intellectual knowledge, the key role of light) appears to refer to the influence of Franciscus Patricius.

If we accept that Comenius was strongly influenced by Patricius, we ought to establish when exactly Comenius encountered Patricius' views. The question is the more topical considering that an indirect reference to Patricius' work can be found in Comenius' treatise *Conatuum pansophicorum dilucidatio*, written several years before he travelled to London where, according to the present opinion of the historians of philosophy, he became familiar with the contents of *Nova de universis philosophia*.

Apparently, Johann Heinrich Alsted, Comenius' teacher in Herborn, may rightly be considered the mediator of Patricius' work. In view of the analysis of Alsted's explicit references to Franciscus Patricius as well as of the comparison of the theoretical contents of the writings of both authors, the assumed intermediary role of Alsted in the Patricius-Comenius relationship turned out to be highly improbable: Alsted's interest is focused primarily on angelological, geographical or cosmological problems, whereas Comenius primarily draws on Patricius' metaphysical and epistemological conceptions that are not represented in the works of the Herborn encyclopaedist. So the question of how Comenius encountered the philosophical views of Patricius remains to be answered.

Key words: Franciscus Patricius, Johann Heinrich Alsted, Jan Amos Comenius; the metaphysics of light, *panaugia*, triadism, encyclopaedism

JOHANN HEINRICH ALSTED I JAN AMOS KOMENSKÝ: DVA SLUČAJA PETRIĆEVE RECEPCIJE U NOVOVJEKOVNOJ SREDNJOJ EUROPI

Rad istražuje pitanje recepcije Frane Petrića i njegova filozofskoga djela u novovjekovnoj Srednjoj Europi, posebice u dvama slučajevima – djelima Jana Amosa Komenskoga i njegova učitelja Johanna Heinricha Alsteda. Na temelju usporedbe Petrićeve *Nove sveopće filozofije* (1591) i *De rerum humanarum emendatione consultatio catholica* Komenskoga, već sam ranije utvrdio (Čížek 2010) da djelo Komenskoga nalikuje Petrićevu u mnogim aspektima, što pokazuje očigledan utjecaj hrvatskoga mislioca.

Prvo i najprije, metafiziku svjetla i njezin središnji pojam *panaugia* Komenský nedvojbeno preuzima od Petrića, a prihvaćanje toga pojma dalje utječe ne njegovu metodologiju, u kojoj svjetlost nastupa kao temeljno počelo. Učinak Petrićeve filozofije može se uočiti i u terminologiji Komenskoga. Ne samo da Komenský prihvaća niz Petrićevih nazivaka iz filozofije i prirodne filozofije, nego on od Petrića posuđuje grčki prefiks *pan-*, koji igra nenadomjestivu

ulogu u oblikovanju i imenovanju različitih djelova njegova djela *Consultatio catholica*. S obzirom na očigledne sličnosti, izgleda da su se Petrićevi metafizički pojmovi odrazili i u epistemološkim gledištima Komenskoga. Zapravo, njihova razlikovnost (trijadička i procesualna koncepcija cijeloga kognitivnog procesa, međudjelovanje osjetilne i intelektualne spoznaje, ključna uloga svjetlosti) upućuje, čini se, na Petrićev utjecaj.

Prihvati li se da je Petrić snažno utjecao na Komenskoga, treba ustanoviti kad se Komenský točno susreo s Petrićevim gledištima. Pitanje je to više aktualno razmotri li se neizravno upućivanje na Petrićevo djelo, koje se može pronaći u raspravi *Conatum pansophicorum dilucidatio*, koju je Komenský napisao nekoliko godina prije puta u London, gdje se, prema sadašnjem stanju filozofske historiografije, upoznao sa sadržajem Petrićeve *Nove sveopće filozofije*.

Očigledno, s pravom se smije razmotriti je li Johann Heinrich Alsted, učitelj Komenskoga u Herbornu, bio posrednikom Petrićeva djela Komenskom. Analiza Alstedovih izričitih upućivanja na Petrića i usporedba teorijskih sadržaja djela Alsteda i Komenskoga pokazala je da se pretpostavljena Alstedova posrednička uloga u odnosu Petrića i Komenskoga može odbaciti s velikom vjerojatnošću: Alstedov interes usredotočen je prvotno na angelološke, geografske i kozmološke probleme, dok se Komenský u prvom redu oslanja na Petrićeve metafizičke i epistemološke zamisli, koje nisu zastupljene u djelima enciklopedista iz Herborna. Stoga na pitanje o tom kako se Komenský susreo s Petrićevim filozofskim gledištima tek treba odgovoriti.

Ključne riječi: Frane Petrić, Johann Heinrich Alsted, Jan Amos Komenský; metafizika svjetla, *panaugia*, trijadizam, enciklopedizam

ĆIRIL ČOH

*Prva gimnazija Varaždin, Hrvatska /
First Gymnasium, Varaždin, Croatia*

PETRIĆEVO RAZUMIJEVANJE PLATONOVA περιαγωγή τῆς ψυχῆς (Resp. 521.C.5–8)

U četvrtoj knjizi trećega sveska *Peripatetičkih rasprava* (1581) Petrić ukazuje na Aristotelovo nerazumijevanje Platonove dijalektike. Ono proizlazi iz Aristotelova krivog shvaćanja ljudske duše i njezine djelatnosti. Njezina moć nije samo *dianoia*, ispravna upotreba razuma, već i *dijalektika*, umijeće *okretanja duše* (περιαγωγή τῆς ψυχῆς, *reductio animae*) k sebi i prvom bespretpostavnom počelu. Za Platona ovo *periagoge* je *istinska filozofija* (ἀληθινή

φιλοσοφία), a možda i sva filozofija (Farandos, Wyller). Slično vrijedi i za Petrića. Naime, sažimajući svrhu svoje *Nove sveopće filozofije* (1591) u posveti papi Grguru XIV, Petrić kaže da je ta svrha u tome da nauči ljude »kojim se načinima ljudske duše vraćaju (redeant) Bogu Stvoritelju«.

Umijeće okretanja (περιαγωγή, *reductio*) nije puko prevrtanje, poput onog u dječjoj igri kada se glinena pločica s oznakama *dan* i *noć* okreće s jedne strane na drugu. Takvo puko prevrtanje prisutno je u prve tri primjene dijalektike koju i Aristotel i Platon zovu *dianoia*. Pri tom misle na raspravu na osnovi već prihvaćenih mnijenja gdje je cilj nadvladati protivnika ili barem ne biti nadvladan. Obojica se njome obilato služe, ali Platon joj poznaje doseg i vidi potrebu i mogućnost nadilaženja u četvrtoj, najvišoj primjeni dijalektike. To je razgovor u kojem se lažna mnijenja uistinu prevladavaju, a duša se čisti i iscjeljuje, iz lažnog dana okreće se u onaj istinski.

Ključne riječi: Petrić, Platon, kritika Aristotela, okretanje duše, puko prevrtanje, *dianoia* i *noesis*, geometrijska i dijalektička metoda, istinska filozofija

PETRIĆ'S UNDERSTANDING OF PLATO'S περιαγωγή τῆς ψυχῆς (Resp. 521C.5–8)

In Volume III, Book 4 of his *Discussiones peripateticæ* (1581), Petrić draws attention to Aristotle's misunderstanding of Plato's dialectics. The misunderstanding arises from Aristotle's incorrect comprehension of human soul and its actions. Soul's potential lies not only within *dianoia*, the ability of proper reasoning, but also within *dialectics*, the art of soul turning (περιαγωγή τῆς ψυχῆς, *reductio animæ*) to itself and the first unconditioned principle. This *periagoge* is for Plato a *true philosophy* (ἀληθινὴ φιλοσοφία), and maybe even a whole philosophy (Farandos, Wyller). A similar theme takes place in Petrić. More specifically, when summarizing the aim of his *Nova de universis philosophia* (1591) in a dedication to Pope Gregory XIV, Petrić wrote that the aim was to educate people and teach them "the ways in which human souls return (*redeant*) to God the Creator".

The art of turning (περιαγωγή, *reductio*) is not a mere turning-over, like the one in children's game of turning over clay plates with designations *day* and *night* from one side to another. That kind of turning-over takes place in the first three applications of dialectics, which both Aristotle and Plato call *dianoia*. By that they refer to an argument based on common knowledge, whose goal is to outwit the opponent, or at least not to be outwitted by him. Both of them use it abundantly, but Plato knows its scope and sees a need and capacity to transcend it in the fourth, the highest application of dialectics. It is a dia-

logue in which false beliefs are truly overcome, and the soul is being purged and healed; from a deceptive day it turns into a true one.

Key words: Petrić, Plato, critique of Aristotle, soul turning, mere turning, *dianoia* and *noesis*, geometrical and dialectical method, true philosophy

ANTICA-NADA ČEPULIĆ

*Nadbiskupska klasična gimnazija, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Archbishopric Classical Gymnasium, Zagreb, Croatia*

TRANSLITERACIJA GRČKOG RUKOPISA (PSEUDO-)FILOPONOVA KOMENTARA ARISTOTELOVE METAFIZIKE

U izlaganju iznosimo spoznaje stečene tijekom postupka transliteracije bečkog rukopisa Cod. Phil. gr. 189 koji sadržava grčki izvornik (Pseudo-)Filoponova *Komentara* Aristotelove *Metafizike*. Iz već objavljenih kataloških podataka o tom rukopisu (Herbert Hunger, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek 1: Codices historici, codices philologici et philologici*, Beč 1961.), doznajemo da je rukopis nastao polovicom 16. st. (prije 1562. godine), da je pisan na papiru dimenzija 216/218×155/157 mm. Broj redaka u rukopisu kreće se između 22 i 29. Rukopis je nepotpun. Od 213 listova nedostaju listovi 1-25. Taj je dio danas pronađen kao zaseban rukopis iz iste zbirke, Phil. gr. 156, koji sadržava tekst Platonova *Fedra*.

Na listovima 26r-125r nalazi se tekst Aristotelove *Metafizike*. Od 26r do 46v proteže se tekst 1. knjige (A). U kataloškom opisu navodi se da ispred f. 32 nedostaje jedan list, ali bez gubitka teksta. Zatim se navodi da ispred f. 47 nedostaje jedan list na kojem je izgubljen tekst, ali se ne daje identifikacija. Smatramo da iz oskudnih ostataka otrgnutog lista možemo identificirati izgubljeni tekst i s priličnom sigurnošću zaključiti da se radi o početku 5. knjige Aristotelove *Metafizike* (E). Od 47r do 49v nalazi se Aristotelova knjiga α' ἔλαττον, 6. knjiga (Z) počinje na 50r, 7. knjiga (H) na 71r, 8. knjiga (Θ) na 74v, 9. knjiga (I) na 80v, 10. knjiga (K) na 87v, 11. knjiga (Α) na 98r, 12. knjiga (Μ) na 107r i naposljetku 13. knjiga (Ν) počinje na listu 118r i proteže se do 125r.

Od 125v do 129v u katalogu je identificiran Komentar Aristotelova djela *De lineis insecabilibus* Georgija Pakimera. Na listovima od 130r do 213v nalazi se Komentar na Aristotelovu *Metafiziku* Ivana Filopona naslovljen Ἐξηγήσις τῶν μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ Ἀριστοτέλους. Opis rukopisa u katalogu donosi početne

i završne riječi cjelokupnog Filoponova teksta, bez navođenja na kojim se listovima nalaze počeci komentara na pojedine knjige. Nakon uvida u rukopis možemo definirati raspored (Pseudo-)Filoponovih komentara. Komentar na 1. knjigu (A) nalazimo na listovima 130r-131r. Uspoređujući grčki tekst rukopisa s tiskanim Petrićevim prijevodom vidimo da je grčki tekst te knjige djelomičan. Izostavljeni su zatim komentari na α' $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$, kao i komentari na 2. (B), 3. (Γ), 4. (Δ) i 5. knjigu (E) Aristotelove *Metafizike*.

Rukopis se na 131v-140r, dakle očito bez gubitka teksta, nastavlja (Pseudo-)Filoponovim komentarom na 6. knjigu (Z) *Metafizike*. Taj smo dio teksta (130r-140r) transliterirali u cijelosti. Na 141r nalazimo zatim (Pseudo-)Filoponov komentar na 7. knjigu (H), na 146r počinje komentar na 8. knjigu (Θ), na 154r na 9. knjigu (I), na 166v na 10. knjigu (K), na 174r na 11. knjigu (Λ), na 183v na 12. knjigu (M) te na 201v na 13. knjigu (N) Aristotelove *Metafizike*. Prenosimo kataloške podatke o vodenim žigovima, važnim za datiranje i lociranje rukopisa, te osnovne podatke o pisaru Matuzali Makiru ($\text{Μαθουσάλας Μαχειρος}$), iz čijeg su pera nastali i neki drugi bečki rukopisi. Pisar je u rukopisu opisao i okolnosti u kojima je pisao i dovršavao svoj rad.

Usporedbom grčkoga teksta rukopisa Cod. Phil. gr. 189 s Petrićevim prijevodom, objavljenim u djelu *Ioannis Philoponi enarratio in omnes Aristotelis libros, quos Metaphysica appellant. Eam Franciscus Patricius de Graeca, Latinam fecerat* (Ferrariae: Ex Typographia Dominici Mammarelli, 1583), utvrdili smo da je grčki tekst djelomičan. Usporedba transliteriranoga teksta iz bečkoga rukopisa s izdanjem Petrićeva latinskog prijevoda otkrila je pojedine razlike između grčkoga rukopisa i objavljenoga latinskog teksta. One su u nekim slučajevima očito posljedica pogrešno pročitano rukopisa Petrićeva latinskog prijevoda koji je slagaru poslužio kao predložak za tiskano izdanje. U nekim drugim slučajevima te su razlike uzrokovane tradicijom grčkog teksta, to jest razlikama između ovog transliteriranog rukopisa i onog rukopisa koji je Petriću poslužio kao predložak za njegov prijevod na latinski.

Napominjemo da je transliteracija ovoga grčkog rukopisa bila izvanredno iskustvo. Danas se nažalost rijetko poseže za grčkim rukopisima i rijetko se dobiva prilika za obavljanje takvog posla. Ovaj je rukopis zbog obilja tihografskih znakova bio poseban izazov. Naravno da nam je od neprocijenjive važnosti u počecima bio Petrićev tiskani latinski prijevod, koji je do kraja rada na rukopisu ostao važan čimbenik kontrole.

Ključne riječi: Cod. Phil. gr. 189, Aristotelova *Metafizika*, (Pseudo-)Filoponov Komentar *Metafizike*, pisar Matuzala Makir ($\text{Μαθουσάλας Μαχειρος}$), transliteracija, grčka minuskula 16. stoljeća

THE transliteration of the Greek Manuscript of
Commentary on Aristotle's Metaphysics
by Pseudo-Philoponus

The paper highlights the findings discovered during the process of the transliteration of the Vienna manuscript Cod. Phil. gr. 189, which contains the Greek original of (Pseudo-)Philoponus's *Commentary on Aristotle's Metaphysics*. From the already published catalogue data on this manuscript (Herbert Hunger, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek 1: Codices historici, codices philosophici et philologici*, Vienna 1961), we learn that it dates from the middle of the sixteenth century (before 1562), it was written on paper, 216/218×155/157 mm. The number of lines in the manuscript varies between 22 and 29. The manuscript is incomplete. Out of 213, the leaves 1-25 are missing. That part has also survived until the present as a separate manuscript from the same collection, Phil. gr. 156, which contains the text of Plato's *Phaedrus*.

The leaves 26r-125r contain the text of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. The text of Book 1 (A) runs from 26r to 46v. According to the catalogue, the leaf preceding f. 32 is missing, but not the text. Further, the leaf preceding f. 47 is missing together with the text, no identification being given. We believe that on the basis of the scarce fragments of the torn out leaf we will be able identify the missing text and conclude with fair exactitude that it is the beginning of Book 5 (E) of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. From 47r to 49v runs Aristotle's book α' ἔλαττων, Book 6 (Z) starts on 50r, Book 7 (H) on 71r, Book 8 (Θ) on 74v, Book 9 (I) on 80v, Book 10 (K) on 87v, Book 11 (Λ) on 98r, Book 12 (M) on 107r and finally, Book 13 (N) starts on the leaf 118r and runs until 125r.

From 125v to 129v the catalogue identifies the Commentary of Aristotle's work *De lineis insecabilibus* by George Pachymeres. The leaves 130r to 213v contain the Commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* by John Philoponus entitled Ἐξήγησις τῶν μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ Ἀριστοτέλους. The catalogue description includes the introductory and closing words of Philoponus's entire text, failing to cite the leaves which contain the openings to the commentaries on the particular books. Having obtained an insight into the manuscript, we are able to define the order of (Pseudo-)Philoponus's commentaries. The commentary on Book 1 (A) has been found on the leaves 130r-131r. By comparing the Greek text of the manuscript with Petric's printed translation, we realise that the Greek text of this book is partial. Further omitted are the commentaries on α' ἔλαττων, as well as the commentaries on Book 2 (B), 3 (Γ), 4 (Δ) and Book 5 (E) of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.

On 131v-140r the manuscript, evidently with no text omitted, continues with (Pseudo-)Philoponus's commentary on Book 6 (Z) of the *Metaphysics*. This part of the text (130r-140r) we have transliterated in full. On 141r we find (Pseudo-)Philoponus's commentary on Book 7 (H), on 146r starts the commentary on Book 8 (Θ), on 154r on Book 9 (I), on 166v on Book 10 (K), on 174r on Book 11 (Λ), on 183v on Book 12 (M), and on 201v on Book 13 (N) of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. We also provide the catalogue data on the watermarks, important for establishing the date and location of the manuscript, in addition to some basic information on the scribe Matuzala Makir (Μαθουσάλας Μαχειρος), who is known to have penned some other Vienna manuscripts. In the manuscript the scribe also described the circumstances in which he copied and completed his work.

By comparing the Greek text of the manuscript Cod. Phil. gr. 189 with Petrić's translation, published in the work *Ioannis Philoponi enarratio in omnes Aristotelis libros, quos Metaphysica appellant. Eam Franciscus Patricius de Graeca, Latinam fecerat* (Ferrariae: Ex Typographia Dominici Mammarelli, 1583), we have established that the Greek text is partial. A comparison between the transliterated text of the Vienna manuscript and the edition of Petrić's Latin translation has revealed certain discrepancies between the Greek manuscript and the published Latin text. At some points they are evidently the result of the misreading of the manuscript of Petrić's Latin translation, which the typographer used as basis for the printed edition. At some other points these discrepancies may be ascribed to the tradition of the Greek text—that is, differences between this transliterated manuscript and the manuscript that Petrić used as basis for his translation into Latin.

It should be noted that the transliteration of this Greek manuscript has been an invaluable experience. Regrettably, today Greek manuscripts rarely come into scholarly focus and rarely may one be given a chance similar to this. The fact that this manuscript abounds in tachygraphic marks has been a challenge itself. Indeed, Petrić's printed translation in Latin has been equally invaluable throughout our work on the manuscript as an important standard of comparison.

Key words: Cod. Phil. gr. 189, Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, (Pseudo-)Philoponus's *Commentary on Metaphysics*, scribe Matuzala Makir (Μαθουσάλας Μαχειρος), transliteration, Greek minuscule of the 16th century

BRUNO ĆURKO

*Institut za filozofiju, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Institute of Philosophy, Zagreb, Croatia*

PRISUTNOST FRANE PETRIĆA U DIGITALNOM SVIJETU

Istraživanje prisutnosti hrvatskih renesansnih filozofa u digitalnom svijetu nezaobilazno obuhvaća najvažnijeg i najproučavanijeg hrvatskog renesansnog umnika – Franu Petrića. Istraživanje zahtijeva nekoliko razina. Prva razina odnosi se na pronalaženje originalnih Petrićevih djela te njihovih transkripcija i prijevoda.

Druga razina utvrđuje u koliko se ozbiljnih digitalnih izdanja od šesnaestog do dvadesetog stoljeća mogu pronaći poglavlja, natuknice i tekstovi u kojima je naš renesansni filozof obrađivan, bez obzira na kontekst u kojem se spominje.

Treća razina istražuje recentnu digitaliziranu svjetsku literaturu u kojoj se spominje Frane Petrić.

Završna razina usredotočuje se na istraživanja lika i djela Frane Petrića u Republici Hrvatskoj u posljednjih petnaestak godina, što je olakšano postojanjem Hrčka, Portala znanstvenih časopisa Republike Hrvatske. Posebnu pozornost zaslužuju digitalizirani brojevi časopisa *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* i *Filozofska istraživanja*. Napokon, najnovija istraživanja o creskom filozofu mogu se statistički potkrijepiti podacima iz *Hrvatske znanstvene bibliografije* CROSBİ.

Ključne riječi: Frane Petrić, digitalna knjižnica, digitalna literatura; Hrvatska znanstvena bibliografija CROSBİ, Hrčak

THE PRESENCE OF FRANE PETRIĆ IN THE DIGITAL WORLD

The research of the presence of the Croatian Renaissance philosophers in the digital world cannot but include the most significant and most studied Croatian Renaissance thinker – Frane Petrić. The research requires several stages. The first stage should focus on the finding of Petrić's original works as well as their transcriptions and translations.

The second stage should establish the number of authoritative digital editions from the sixteenth to the twentieth century containing chapters, entries and texts which deal with Frane Petrić, regardless of the context in which he is mentioned.

The third stage researches the recent digitalised world literature in which Frane Petrić is being mentioned.

The final stage centres on the study of the life and work of Frane Petrić in the Republic of Croatia over the last fifteen years, which is facilitated by Hrčak, Portal of Scientific Journals of Croatia. Special attention should be paid to the digitalised volumes of the journals *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* and *Filozofska istraživanja*. Lastly, the most recent research on the philosopher of Cres may be statistically supported by the data obtained from the Croatian Scientific Bibliography CROSBİ.

Key words: Frane Petrić, digital library, digital sources; Croatian Scientific Bibliography CROSBİ, Portal of Scientific Journals of Croatia HRČAK

HEDA FESTINI

*Rijeka, Hrvatska /
Rijeka, Croazia*

PETRIĆEVA *LA DECA SEMISACRA* KAO MOGUĆE KODIFICIRANJE MORALA

Petrićev utilitarizam (H. Festini, 2003, 2004) prevaga je nad etikom vrline (Platon) preko svojih dviju komponenata – psihičke (*philautia* u *L'amorosa filosofia*, 1577) i socijalne (*con altri huomini in comune* u *Della historia diece dialoghi*, 1560) i uspostavlja jednu vrstu modela naturalizirane etike (W. A. Rottschäfer, 1998).

Petrićeva filozofija morala od učenja kroz moralno iskustvo (moralno pjesništvo u: *Della poetica, La deca semisacra*, 1588) i uvježbavanja dobrih zakona u pravednoj državi (»dobar život« u *La città felice*, 1553) ukazuje na prirodni put razvoja morala.

Ključne riječi: Frane Petrić, moralno pjesništvo, utilitarizam, naturalizirana etika

LA DECA SEMISACRA DI PETRIĆ COME POSSIBILE CODIFICAZIONE DELLA MORALE

L'utilitarismo di Petrić (H. Festini, 2003, 2004) va al di là dell'etica della virtù (Platone) grazie alle sue due componenti – quella psichica (*philautia* dell'*Amorosa filosofia*, 1577) e quella sociale (*con altri huomini in comune* in

Della historia diece dialoghi, 1560) costituendo una specie di modello di etica naturalizzata (W. A. Rottschäfer, 1998).

La filosofia della morale di Petrić, sin dall'apprendimento attraverso un'esperienza morale (la poesia moraleggiante in *Della poetica, La deca semisacra*, 1588) e dalla prassi delle buone leggi nello Stato giusto (*ben essere nella Città felice*, 1553) implica che lo sviluppo morale segua un percorso naturale.

Parole chiave: Frane Petrić, poesia moraleggiante, utilitarismo, etica naturalizzata

MIHAELA GIRARDI-KARŠULIN

*Institut za filozofiju, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Institute of Philosophy, Zagreb, Croatia*

PETRIĆ I (PSEUDO-)FILOPON

U seriji *Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca* ne postoji Filoponov komentar *Metafizike*. Smatra se da je izgubljen. Petrić je na latinski preveo i izdao *Komentare Metafizike* za koje se danas smatra da nisu autentično Filoponovo djelo, nego se njihov autor u literaturi naziva (Pseudo-)Filoponom. Petrić ih, međutim, smatra autentično Filoponovim.

Postoje dva rukopisa za koje se drži da su mogući predlošci za Petrićev prijevod (Pseudo-)Filoponovih *Komentara Metafizike*. Jedan se čuva u Austrijskoj nacionalnoj biblioteci u Beču, drugi u Vatikanskoj biblioteci. Niti jedan od tih rukopisa do sada nije transliteriran i objavljen, iako je već Hans Reiner napisao da će se tek nakon transliteracije tih rukopisa moći zaključiti je li Petrićev prijevod *Komentara Metafizike* Filopon ili (Pseudo-)Filopon.

Sada je u Institutu za filozofiju započeo rad na transkripciji bečkoga rukopisa. Rad je u odmakloj početnoj fazi, a tekst transliterira Antica-Nada Čepulić.

U referatu se izlaže i tumači Petrićeva recepcija (Pseudo-)Filopona na osnovi dvaju citata iz Petrićeva prijevoda Filoponovih *Komentara Metafizike*, na temelju jednog citata Filopona iz trećeg sveska *Peripatetičkih rasprava* Frane Petrića i jednog citata iz transliteriranog teksta bečkoga rukopisa. Ključna riječ koje se ponavlja u tim citatima je prilog »simbolički« (*symbolice*). Tom riječju (Pseudo-)Filopon izlaže da su pitagorovci na simbolički način govorili o brojevima kao početima stvari. U članku se pokazuje da se takav stav o pitagorovcima može naći i u djelima koja se pripisuju autentičnom Filoponu.

Ključne riječi: Petrić, (Pseudo-)Filopon, pitagorovci, simbolički

PETRIĆ AND (PSEUDO-)PHILOPONUS

Philoponus's commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* is not to be found in the series *Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca*, as it is presumed to have been lost. Petrić translated into Latin and published the *Commentaries on Metaphysics*, today generally regarded not to be Philoponus's authentic work, the author of which is in literature referred to as (Pseudo-)Philoponus. Petrić, however, has no doubt about its authenticity.

There are two manuscripts which are assumed to be the basis for Petrić's translation of (Pseudo-)Philoponus's *Commentaries on Metaphysics*. One manuscript is kept in the Austrian National Library in Vienna and the other in the Vatican Library. Neither of the manuscripts has been transliterated nor published to date, despite Hans Reiner's statement that once transliterated, these manuscripts will help reveal whether Petrić's translation of the *Commentaries on Metaphysics* is Philoponus or (Pseudo-)Philoponus.

The Institute of Philosophy in Zagreb has embarked upon the transliteration of the Vienna manuscript. The work is well under way, the text being transliterated by Antica-Nada Čepulić.

The paper examines and interprets Petrić's reception of (Pseudo-)Philoponus on the basis of two quotations from Petrić's translation of Philoponus's *Commentaries on Metaphysics*, on the basis of one quotation of Philoponus from the third volume of Petrić's *Discussiones peripateticae*, and one quotation from the transliterated text of the Vienna manuscript. The key word that repeats in these quotations is adverb "symbolically" (*symbolice*). By using this word, (Pseudo-)Philoponus expounds that the Pythagoreans in a symbolic way spoke of numbers as the principles of things. The paper shows that a similar position on Pythagoreans may also be found in the works attributed to the authentic Philoponus.

Key words: Petrić, (Pseudo-)Philoponus, Pythagoreans, symbolically

SNJEŽANA HUSIĆ

Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska /
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

KNJIŽEVNOST I NEZNANJE: FUNKCIJE LIKA LICIDE U BOŠKOVIĆEVIM DIJALOZIMA O SJEVERNOJ ZORI

U pet *Dijaloga o sjevernoj zori* (*Dialogi sull'aurora boreale*), što ih je Ruđer Bošković objavio 1748. u rimskom časopisu *Giornale de' Letterati*, pojavljuju se četiri imenovana lika: dva spomenuta i dva dramska lica. U svome uvodu u *Dijaloge* Bošković međutim provodi drukčiju kategorizaciju i ističe da je samo jedno od ta četiri »izmišljeno ime« (*un nome finto*) – Licida, s kojim razgovara Numenio, Boškovićev literarni *alter ego*.

Za razliku od ostale trojice, koji su znanstvenici i također stvarne osobe onkraj teksta, fiktivni Licida prikazan je kao pastir neuk u pitanjima novih znanstvenih teorija i postignuća. Stoga se isprva može činiti da se Licida ne uklapa posve u tako učeno društvo, no on se pokazuje ključnim za oblikovanje Boškovićeva diskurza o sjevernoj zori, i to na najmanje dva načina: on je nužna poveznica na pastoralnu književnost i upravo svojim neznanjem pruža motivaciju za razgovor. Analiza postupaka primijenjenih u Boškovićevu tekstu te njegova intertekstualnog pozicioniranja nudi također uporišta za razmatranje daljnje specijalizacije različitih vrsta diskurza – književnog i znanstvenog – koja se zbila u 18. stoljeću.

Ključne riječi: Ruđer Bošković, pastoralna književnost, funkcija lika, motivacija diskurza, intertekstualnost

LITERATURE AND IGNORANCE: FUNCTIONS OF LYCIDAS IN THE *DIALOGI SULL' AURORA BOREALE* BY RUĐER BOŠKOVIĆ

Five *Dialogues on the aurora borealis* (*Dialogi sull'aurora boreale*) that Ruđer Bošković published in 1748 on the pages of the Roman *Giornale de' Letterati* involve four named characters, of which two mentioned and two *dramatis personae*. In his introduction to the *Dialogues*, Bošković follows though another type of categorization and stresses that only one of the four is “a fictional name” (*un nome finto*) – Lycidas, who converses with Bošković's literary *alter ego* Numenio.

Unlike the other three characters, who are scientists and also real persons beyond the text, the fictional Lycidas is represented as a shepherd unfamiliar with recent scientific theories and achievements. Therefore, he might seem at first somewhat misplaced in such a learned fellowship, but Lycidas proves to be crucial to the shaping of Bošković's discourse on northern lights, and in two senses at least: he is a necessary link to pastoral literature, and he motivates the conversation by his very ignorance. Analysis of procedures employed in Bošković's text, and of its intertextual positioning, also offers clues to the consideration of further specialization of different types of discourse – literary and scientific – that took place in eighteenth century.

Keywords: Ruđer Bošković, pastoral literature, character function, discourse motivation, intertextuality

BLANKA JERGOVIĆ¹, IVICA MARTINOVIĆ²

¹ *Hrvatski studiji, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska /
Studia Croatica, University of Zagreb, Croatia*

² *Institut za filozofiju, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Institute of Philosophy, Zagreb, Croatia*

BOŠKOVIĆEVI MOTIVI ZA PRIOPĆAVANJE NEWTONOVIH OTKRIĆA U OPTICI: ANALIZA ŠESTOGA PJEVANJA BOŠKOVIĆEVA EPA *DE SOLIS AC LUNAE DEFECTIBUS*

Sámu istražujmo prirodu i što nam izlaže ona
Svoje kad prolazi staze. Budni, i noću i danju,
Motrimo, nek nam se napregnu oči, ustrajni bud'mo
Kad nam je duge provoditi sate. Nije to dosta:
Vještom se služimo desnicom da bi umijećima raznim
Prirodu krotili s tisuću sprava, često joj rane
Nanijevši. Nastojmo neka kroz muku svoje oglasi
Zakone tajne i otkrije daleke uzroke stvar'ma.

(VI, 206–213, preveo Ivica Martinović)

Šesto i posljednje pjevanje Boškovićeve didaktičkog epa *O pomrčinama Sunca i Mjeseca* »pjesnička je apoteoza« Isaaca Newtona, čija djela, napose *Principia* i *Opticks*, jesu »kao neka proročišta koja daju istinite odgovore«, ističe znameniti Dubrovčanin (n. 19) i zato pjeva: »Ti ćeš mi, Newtone, veće božanstvo biti« (*Tu maius mihi numen eris, Newtone*, VI,10), podrazumijeva

se, veće od onih iz mitologije starih. Razlog Boškovićeve pjevanja nije samo slavljenje Newtonova djela u stihovima i proznim bilješkama, nego i podroban opis Newtonovih doprinosa optici, prije svega ključnoga eksperimenta s prizmama (nn. 49-57).

Uz to, Bošković se jasno određuje i prema Newtonovoj filozofiji znanosti i nudi svoju vlastitu kao »metodu ispravnoga filozofiranja« (*methodus recte philosophandi*, n. 28): »Priroda se istražuje motrenjima i pokusima«, pri čem se motrenja koriste u astronomiji i prirodopisu, a pokusi u eksperimentalnoj fizici i kemiji. Na tragu čuvene Newtonove izreke »Hipoteze ne izmišljam« (*Hypotheses non fingo*), i Bošković je protiv uporabe »posve proizvoljnih hipoteza« (*hypotheses penitus arbitrariae*). Za Dubrovčanina put do prave teorije u fizici nije pravocrtan napredak, nego se on zbiva »i kroz mnoge zablude« (*per errores etiam plurimos*).

Shvativši za boravka u Londonu da njegova znanstvena djela nisu doprla do Britanskoga otočja, Bošković se u bilješkama trudi upoznati britansku znanstvenu sredinu s kontinuitetom i raznovrsnošću svoga znanstvenoga rada. Posve očekivano, on više puta upućuje na svoju važnu raspravu *De lumine* (1748) (nn. 16, 28, 45), kao i na istoimenu raspravu Carla Benvenutija, koji je slijedio i provjeravao Boškovićeve zamisli (nn. 16, 46, 59). Opisuje svoje sudjelovanje na natječaju Akademije znanosti u Parizu 1752. o perturbacijama Jupitra i Saturna (n. 5). Upozorava na svoj najvažniji doprinos geofizici: oblik je Zemlje »posve nepravilan«, kako je to teorijski obrazložio u petom dijelu svoga geodetskoga izvješća *De litteraria expeditione per Pontificiam ditionem* (1755) (n. 8). Dvapat spominje i dostignuća svoje teorije silā i djelo *Philosophiae naturalis theoria* (1758) tiskano u Beču (nn. 45, 49). Štoviše, podsjeća na svoju hipotezu iz 1748. godine da lom svjetlosti ovisi o množini i rasporedu točaka koje sastavljaju česticu svjetlosti (n. 23).

Bošković se poziva i na »Notae ad iridem« (1747), svoje bilješke uz poemu svoga profesora Carla Nocetija, jer je ondje pisao o uporabi prizme u optičkim istraživanjima (n. 29). Sažeto prikazuje glavne doprinose u svojim dopunama uz ep *Philosophia recentior* Benedikta Staya: u prvom svesku (1755) izlagao je o općim svojstvima tijelā i o sili inercije, u drugom (1760) je ponudio pregled cijele astronomije (n. 28). Napokon, dopunjujući bilješke u pariškom izdanju svoga epa 1779. godine, Bošković upućuje na knjigu koja je njegov glavni doprinos usponu 'nove optike': *Dissertationes quinque ad dioptricam pertinentes* (1767) (nn. 50, 56).

Šesto pjevanje Boškovićeve epa *De Solis ac Lunae defectibus* poslužilo nam je kao građa za analizu komunikacijskih modela i postupaka kojima se o znanosti komunicira. Naš je zaključak da Boškovićeve pjesničke teme i

popratna obrazloženja u znanstvenim i povijesnim bilješkama uključuju razmišljanja o publici i obilježjima sadržaja. Osim Newtona, po kojem se Bošković na poseban način obraća londonskoj znanstvenoj sredini i Royal Society, stihovi imaju još dva važna adresata, dva protagonista ‘nove optike’ – Johna Dollonda i Leonharda Eulera (n. 39). Brojnim autoreferencijama Bošković znanstvenik samosvjesno predočuje svoje doprinose optici, geofizici, astronomiji i prirodnoj filozofiji.

Na razvedeni dizajn Boškovićeve komunikacijskog modela ukazuju i neki drugi momenti, primjerice spomen Algarottijevih dijaloga *Il Neutonianismo per le dame* (1737) s razmišljanjima o dostupnosti znanstvenih sadržaja različitim vrstama publike, tj. o prednostima i ograničenjima, kako bismo to današnjim rječnikom rekli, ‘popularne znanosti’ (n. 12). U završnoj epizodi šestoga pjevanja nudi Bošković jednu zapletenu alegoriju o Suncu, Mjesecu i Zemlji, a u bilješci (n. 78) ispisuje njezinu poruku s pomoću kontrasta: Zemlja, promotrena s Mjeseca, jest »crna, zamagljena i prljava«, a Mjesečevi su učinci nešto što je »vrlo opće i vrlo poznato« (*communissima et notissima*), koristeći se tako ključnim riječima kojima bismo i danas mogli opisati prisutnost znanosti u javnosti.

Ključne riječi: modeli komuniciranja znanosti, popularizacija znanosti, autoreferencije znanstvenika; Ruđer Bošković, Isaac Newton

BOŠKOVIĆ’S MOTIFS FOR COMMUNICATING NEWTON’S DISCOVERIES IN OPTICS: CASE ANALYSIS OF THE SIXTH CANTO OF BOŠKOVIĆ’S EPIC *DE SOLIS AC LUNAE DEFECTIBUS*

We scrutinise the nature herself and what she exhibits
While treading along her own paths. Night and day we observe
Vigilantly, attentively with both our eyes, persistent
In observation long hours we spend. Nor is that enough:
Governed by various arts our right hand masters
Thousands of instruments, taming her injured
With dense wounds. By torturing her we try to publish
Secret laws and discover remote causes of things.

(VI, 206–213, translated by Vesna Baće)

The sixth and last canto of Bošković’s didactic epic *De Solis ac Lunae defectibus* is a “poetic apotheosis” of Isaac Newton, whose works, notably *Principia* and *Opticks*, are “like some kind of oracles that give true answers,”

the famous Ragusan states (n. 19) and hence sings: “You, Newton, shall be my greater deity” (*Tu maius mihi numen eris, Newton, VI,10*), understandably, than those from the mythology of the ancients. Underlying Bošković’s epic is not merely the celebration of Newton’s work in verses and notes, but also exhaustive description of Newton’s contributions to optics, primarily the key experiment with the prisms (nn. 49–57).

In addition, Bošković clearly defines his views on Newton’s philosophy of science and offers his own as a “method of right philosophizing” (*methodus recte philosophandi*, n. 28): “Nature is researched by observations and experiments,” in which observations are applied in astronomy and natural history, and experiments in experimental physics and chemistry. Following in the footsteps of Newton and his famous dictum *Hypotheses non fingo*, Bošković too is against the application of the “entirely arbitrary hypotheses” (*hypotheses penitus arbitrariae*). He does not envisage the path to genuine theory in physics as linear progress, but it also passes “through many errors” (*per errores etiam plurimos*).

Having acknowledged in London that his scientific works had not reached the British Isles, in the notes Bošković attempts to introduce the British scholarly milieu to the continuity and diversity of his scientific work. Quite expectedly, he recurrently refers to his important treatise *De lumine* (1748), as well as to Carlo Benvenuti’s treatise under the same title, who followed and proved Bošković’s ideas (n. 16). He describes his participation in the 1752 competition of the Académie des Sciences in Paris about the perturbations of Jupiter and Saturn (n. 5). He draws attention to his most significant contribution to geophysics: the shape of the Earth is “completely irregular,” as he expounded in the fifth part of his geodetic report *De litteraria expeditione per Pontificiam ditionem* (1755) (n. 8). He makes two references to the achievements of his theory of forces and the work *Philosophiae naturalis theoria* (1758) printed in Vienna (nn. 45, 49). Moreover, he brings to mind his hypothesis from 1748, by which the refraction of light depends on the multitude and distribution of points which compose the particle of light (n. 23).

Bošković also refers to “Notae ad iridem” (1747), his notes accompanying the poem of his professor Carlo Noceti, in which he wrote about the application of prism in optical research (n. 29). He outlines the major contributions in his *Supplementa* to the epic *Philosophia recentior* by Benedikt Stay: in the first volume (1755) he expounded on the general properties of bodies and the force of inertia, and in the second (1760) he provided a comprehensive survey of astronomy (n. 28). Finally, in his revision of the notes in the Paris edition of his epic in 1779, Bošković draws attention to the book which is his main contribu-

tion to the emergence of ‘new optics’: *Dissertationes quinque ad dioptricam pertinentes* (1767) (n. 50, 56).

On the basis of the sixth canto of Bošković’s epic *De Solis ac Lunae defectibus* we have analysed the models of science communication and procedures by which science is communicated. We conclude that Bošković’s poetic themes and the accompanying comments in the scientific and historical notes include his ideas on public and the features of the content. Apart from Newton, through whom Bošković in a specific kind of way communicates to the London scholarly milieu and the Royal Society, the verses have another two important addressees, two protagonists of the ‘new optics’ – John Dollond and Leonhard Euler. Thus through numerous self-references Bošković the scholar confidently presents his contributions to optics, geophysics, astronomy, and natural philosophy.

Some other elements also point to an elaborate design of Bošković’s model of science communication, e.g. the mention of Algarotti’s dialogues *Il Neutonianismo per le dame* (1737) with the views of the accessibility of scientific content to various types of the public, i.e., of the advantages and limitations of the ‘popular science’ as currently termed (n. 12). In the closing episode of the sixth canto, Bošković affords a complicated allegory of the Sun, Moon and Earth, while in a note (n. 78) he describes its message by means of contrast: The Earth, as observed from the Moon, is “black, misty and dirty” (n. 78), but the Moon’s effects are “the most common and the most known” (*communissima et notissima*), using thus the key words which we today could also use if we wished to describe the presence of science in public.

Key words: models of science communication, popularization of science, self-references of the scientist; Ruder Bošković, Isaac Newton

MONIKA JURIĆ

*Hrvatsko narodno kazalište, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Croatian National Theatre, Zagreb, Croatia*

GLAZBA I METAFIZIKA: NEOPLATONIČKE IDEJE O GLAZBI U DJELU *DIALOGO DELLA BELLEZZA* (1581) NIKOLE VITOVA GUČETIĆA

Jedan od najistaknutijih filozofa kasnorenesansnog Dubrovnika – Nikola Vitov Gučetić (Niccolò Vito di Gozze) – glazbom se bavio u trima svojim

djelima: *Dialogo della bellezza* (1581), *Governo della famiglia* (1589) i *Dello stato delle repubbliche* (1591). Svoja stajališta o glazbi Gučetić je utemeljio na postavkama Platona i Aristotela, što je vidljivo iz njegova pristupa problematiki glazbe, jer o njoj raspravlja s aspekta *paideie*, odnosno njezine odgojno-obrazovne uloge.

Platonov utjecaj osobito je vidljiv upravo u Gučetićevo djelu *Dialogo della bellezza*, u čijem podnaslovu on izriječno i tvrdi kako je dijalog pisan »u Platonovu duhu«. Ovdje se Gučetić glazbom bavi s pozicija svoje mladenačke neoplatoničke metafizike, u kojoj glazba predstavlja jedan od načina na koji se duša uzdiže do ljepote. On spaja Aristotelovo poimanje glazbe kao užitka s Platonovim uzdizanjem glazbe iznad drugih znanosti te je upravo u ovom djelu najočitiije koliko je Gučetić cijenio glazbu: »Čak je bolje reći da je prava ljepota ona što, privodeći nas tim trima umijećima, to jest um filozofijom, oko ljubavlju, uho glazbom, uzdiže doista našu dušu k svojem uživanju; jer nijednim drugim osjetilom do sluhom naša se duša ne može zanijeti glazbom; i samo uho ni u čemu ne uživa koliko u harmoniji glazbe. Kao što buka, što u sebi nosi strah, nagoni plašljivce u bijeg, tako sklad zvukova nagoni naše duše na užitek ljepote. Zbog toga valja vjerovati da je umijeće glazbe sišlo iz zbora blaženih anđela, jer se uz njezin zvuk naša duša zanosi ne toliko svjetovnom koliko božanskom ljepotom; odatle Platon vjeruje da našu dušu čini stanovita harmonija brojeva; pa zato dobro reče u dijalogu zvanom *Sofist*, da naš život zahtijeva stanovito suglasje brojeva i da učenje glazbe valja pretpostaviti svim ostalim učenjima.« [Gučetić, *Dijalog o ljubavi* (Zagreb: PEN Centre, 1995), pp. 83, 85]

Osim toga, s glazbenim se odgojem, odnosno s Platonovim poimanjem *paideie*, ovdje može povezati i onaj problem koji se danas naziva ‘ženskim pitanjem’, jer se Gučetić zalaže za to da i ženama bude dopušteno učiti glazbu. Naime, kroz raspravu o glazbi on se osvrnuo na položaj žene u društvu.

ključne riječi: Nikola Vitov Gučetić, Platon, Aristotel, glazba, *paideia*, harmonija brojeva, ‘žensko pitanje’

MUSIC AND METAPHYSICS: NEOPLATONIC IDEAS ON MUSIC IN *DIALOGO DELLA BELLEZZA* (1581) BY NIKOLA VITOV GUČETIĆ

One of the foremost philosophers of Late Renaissance Dubrovnik – Nikola Vitov Gučetić (Niccolò Vito di Gozze) – dealt with music in three of his works: *Dialogo della bellezza* (1581), *Governo della famiglia* (1589) and *Dello stato delle repubbliche* (1591). His thoughts on music were mostly founded on the

assertions of Plato and Aristotle, which is evident from his approach to music problems, discussing them primarily from the standpoint of *paideia*, i.e. the music's educational role.

Plato's influence is particularly evident in Gučetić's *Dialogo della bellezza*, written "in Plato's spirit", as explicitly stated in the dialogue's subtitle. Here Gučetić discusses music from the position of his juvenile Neo-Platonic metaphysics, where music represents one of the ways by which soul rises towards beauty. He actually combines Aristotle's understanding of music as pleasure with Plato's elevation of music above all other knowledge, and it is this particular work that best illustrates Gučetić's profound appreciation of music: "It is even better to say that true beauty is that which—by bringing us to these three skills, i.e. mind by philosophy, eye by love, and ear by music—truly elevates our soul into pleasure; because by no other sense but by hearing can our soul be captivated by music, and the ear itself enjoys in no other thing as much as in the harmony of music. As noise, bringing fear in itself, urges the fearsome to flight, so the harmony of sounds urges our souls to the pleasure of beauty. Because of this one should believe that the art of music descended from the choir of blessed angels, for by its sounding our soul is captivated not so much with worldly but more with divine beauty; hence Plato believed that our soul is made of a certain harmony of numbers; so he rightly said in his dialogue called *The Sophist* that our life demands a certain harmony of numbers and that learning music should be given priority to all other teaching." (translated by Stanislav Tuksar)

Another interesting issue which could also be connected with the educational role of music, i.e. with Plato's notion of *paideia*, is what we today call 'female issue', because Gučetić pleads for women to be allowed to study music. Through a discussion on music, he states his views of the position of women in the society.

Key words: Nikola Vitov Gučetić, Plato, Aristotle, music, *paideia*, harmony of numbers, 'female issue'

MIJO KORADE

*Hrvatski studiji, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska /
Studia Croatica, University of Zagreb, Croatia*

KRŠĆANSKI IDEAL SREĆE U *SRETANOM GRADU* FRANE PETRIĆA U KONTEKSTU EUROPSKE I HRVATSKE MISLI 16. I 17. STOLJEĆA

Polazeći od Aristotela i antičke misli, Frane Petrić u svom djelu *Sretan grad* (1553) postavlja sreću za konačni cilj pojedinca ili zajednice. Petrić tom cilju, sreći, daje posve kršćansko obilježje u sljedećim elementima:

1. Bog je izvor jednako pojedincu kao i državi (odnosno njezinim zakonima);
2. put k sreći na zemlji vodi kroz sticanje vrлина, odnosno poštivanje zakona i savjesno obavljanje svojih dužnosti, umijeća i zanata;
3. konačni cilj se sastoji u »punini dobrote« tj. u Bogu.

Jednako koncipiran ideal sreće nalazimo u djelima europskih mislilaca, tamo sve od Dantea i Marsilija Padovanskog do Erazma Roterdamskog i Thomasa Morea. Dodirne točke s Petrićevim razumijevanjem sreće kao konačnog cilja možemo također naći u hrvatskih mislilaca i pisaca, kao što su Polikarp Severitan, Nikola Gučetić i Benedikt Rogačić. Od osobite je važnosti slična obrada ljudske sreće u Polikarpovu, Petrićevu i Rogačićevu djelu.

Ključne riječi: Frane Petrić, etika, politika, sreća; renesansa, barok, kršćanstvo

CHRISTIAN IDEAL OF HAPPINESS IN FRANE PETRIĆ'S *LA CITTÀ FELICE* WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF EUROPEAN AND CROATIAN THOUGHT OF THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Drawing on Aristotle and ancient Greek philosophy, Frane Petrić in his work *La città felice* (1553) places happiness as the final goal of an individual or community. To this goal Petrić gives an essentially Christian meaning, distinguished in the following elements:

1. God is equally a source to both individual and the state (i.e. its laws);
2. The path to happiness on earth leads through the attainment of virtues, i.e. respect of law and responsible performance of one's duties, arts or crafts;
3. The final goal resides in the "fullness of the good", i.e. in God.

The same concept of happiness appears in the works of the European thinkers, from as early as Dante and Marsilius of Padua to Erasmus of Rotterdam and Thomas More. Analogies with Petrić's understanding of happiness as a final goal may be found in the works of the Croatian thinkers and writers, such as Polikarp Severitan, Nikola Gučetić and Benedikt Rogačić. It is noteworthy that a similar treatment of human happiness may be observed in the works of Polikarp, Petrić and Rogačić.

Key words: Frane Petrić, ethics, politics, happiness; Renaissance, Baroque, Christianity

PERSIDA LAZAREVIĆ DI GIACOMO

Dipartimento di Lingue Letterature e Culture Moderne, Facoltà di Lingue e Letterature Straniere, Università degli Studi "G. d'Annunzio", Chieti-Pescara, Italia / Odsjek za moderne jezike, književnosti i kulture, Fakultet za strane jezike i književnosti, Sveučilište »G. d'Annunzio«, Chieti-Pescara, Italia

OD MJESECA DO 'MJESEČARĀ': PUTANJA RUĐERA BOŠKOVIĆA KROZ ENGLLESKE INTELEKTUALNE KLUBOVE

Ovaj rad razmatra boravak Ruđera Boškovića u Engleskoj i njegove dodire s Englezima kroz prizmu tipično engleskog fenomena 'klubovanja' u 18. stoljeću. Boškovićev dolazak u London 1760. godine obilježen je objavljivanjem epa *De Solis ac Lunae defectibus* koji je Dubrovčanin posvetio Kraljevskom društvu čiji je kasnije postao član. A godinama nakon odlaska iz Engleske Bošković je bio u dodiru s engleskim poznanicima, kao naprimjer s Josephom Priestleyem iz »Društva Mjesečarā« u Birminghamu (J. Uglow 2002). Radi se o društvu koje su sačinjavali filozofi, znanstvenici, industrijalci i intelektualci (J. Watt, J. Roebuck), i čija je djelatnost započela nešto prije Boškovićeva dolaska u Englesku.

Boškovićev ep o pomrčinama Sunca i Mjeseca i »Mjesečari« čine okvir unutar kojeg je moguće sastaviti neku vrstu 'mape klubovanja' Boškovićevih engleskih znanaca: ti klubovi, društva i kružoci imali su veću praktičnu važnost u odnosu na službena znanstvena društva koja su donosila prestiž (R. E. Schofield 1957). Pripadanje jednom društvu, klubu ili kružoku nije isključivalo pripadanje drugom, te je dolazilo do plodonosnih križanja mišljenja i stavova (K. Olsen 1999; P. Clark 2000). Tako je, primjerice, Samuel Johnson imao svoj kružok, ali je istovremeno bio u dodiru s predstavnicima škotskog prosvjetiteljstva koji su imali svoje sasvim osobite stavove o duhu doba prosvjetiteljstva (M. Goldie 1991; A. Broadie 2002).

U okviru grupnih biografija engleskih društava prosvjetitelja pretpostavlja se ovom prigodom da su neki od nesporazuma između Boškovića i članova tih društava (npr. Josepha Priestleya) mogli nastati kao posljedica različitog razumijevanja značajnog prosvjetiteljskog pojma znanosti.

Ključne riječi: Ruder Bošković, britanski klubovi i društva, »Društvo Mjesečara«, znanost

FROM LUNA TO 'LUNAR MEN': RUDER BOŠKOVIĆ'S PATH THROUGH ENGLISH INTELLECTUAL CLUBS

In this paper Ruder Bošković's stay in England and his contacts with the English will be considered through the prism of the typical English phenomenon of "clubbing" in the eighteenth century. Bošković's arrival in London in 1760 was marked by the publication of his poem *De Solis ac Lunae defectibus* that he dedicated to the Royal Society, of which he later became a member. Years after his departure from England Bošković was still in contact with his English friends, particularly with Joseph Priestley of the "Lunar Men" from Birmingham (J. Uglow 2002). The Lunar Society consisted of philosophers, scientists, industrialists and intellectuals (J. Watt, J. Roebuck), and their activity began shortly before Bošković's arrival in England.

Bošković's poem about solar and lunar eclipses and the "Lunar Men" provides a framework within which it is possible to map the clubs of Bošković's English acquaintances: these clubs, societies and circles had greater practical importance than the official scientific societies that represented prestige (R. E. Schofield 1957). Belonging to a society/club/circle did not exclude one from belonging to another, and membership in them oftentimes led to a fruitful exchange of opinions and attitudes (K. Olsen 1999; P. Clark 2000). Thus, for example, Samuel Johnson had his own circle, but was also in contact with representatives of the Scottish Enlightenment, who had their own very specific views on the spirit of the Age of Enlightenment (M. Goldie 1991; A. Broadie 2002).

Based on group biographies of the British clubs and societies, it is assumed that some of the misunderstandings that arose between Bošković and the members of various intellectual societies (Joseph Priestley, for example) could have been the consequence of different understandings of the Enlightenment notion of science.

Key words: Ruder Bošković, British clubbing, "Lunar Society", science

IVICA MARTINOVIĆ, MARIN MARTINIĆ JERČIĆ

Institut za filozofiju, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Institute of Philosophy, Zagreb, Croatia

OD PRIESTLEYA DO FARADAYA: KAKO JE DIGITALIZIRANA RANA RECEPCIJA BOŠKOVIĆEVE PRIRODNE FILOZOFIJE NA BRITANSKOM OTOČJU (1772–1855)

U najutjecajniju ranu recepciju Boškovićeve prirodne filozofije na Britanskom otočju treba uvrstiti ove knjige i članke, popisane u kronološkom poretku njihova objavljivanja:

1. Joseph Priestley, *The history and present state of discoveries relating to vision, light, and colours* (London: Printed for J. Johnson, 1772), s poglavljem o Boškoviću: »Chapter III. Of the extreme subtilty and momentum of light, and M. Boscovich's general hypothesis«, pp. 383–394;
2. Joseph Priestley, *Disquisitions relating to matter and the spirit* (London: Printed for J. Johnson, 1777), u: »Section II. Of impenetrability, as ascribed to matter«, pp. 11–23, s velikim navodom o Boškoviću na pp. 19–23, preuzetim iz prethodne knjige;
3. John Robison, »On the motion of light, as affected by refracting and reflecting substances, which are also in motion«, *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* 2 (1790), pp. 83–111, figg. 1–4, s nadnevkom čitanja »Read by Mr Playfair, April 7, 1788«, koji sadržava i divljenje Boškovićevoj *Teoriji* i kritiku dviju Boškovićevih optičkih rasprava tiskanih 1785. godine;
4. Dugald Stewart, *Elements of the philosophy of the human mind*, the second edition, corrected. (London: Printed by A. Strahan, Printers-Street; for T. Cadell Jun. and W. Davies, in the Strand; and W. Creech, Edinburgh, 1802), o Boškovićevu sustavu ili teoriji na pp. 86–87, 90, 400; o Boškovićevoj analogiji prostora i vremena na p. 350;
5. Thomas Thomson, *System of chemistry in four volumes*, Vol. I. (Edinburgh: Printed by John Brown, 1802), u poglavlju »Chap. VI. Of simple bodies in general«, pp. 380–386, o Boškovićevoj teoriji na p. 386;
6. John Leslie, *Experimental inquiry into the nature, and propagation, of heat* (Edinburgh: Printed for J. Mawman, 1804), u: »Note XI. p. 125«, pp. 515–516, s opisom i crtežom Boškovićeve krivulje silā, te u Chapter VIII., pp. 115–136, u kojem Leslie želi otkriti princip koji »zajedno povezuje ove zanimljive činjenice«, na pp. 118–129;

7. Humphry Davy, *Elements of chemical philosophy*, Part I. Vol. I. (Philadelphia / New York: Published by Bradford and Inskeep, 1812), u: »On the analogies between the undecomposed substances; ideas respecting their nature.«, pp. 273–287, o Boškoviću na p. 279; neizravno o Boškoviću u poglavlju »Cohesion«, pp. 38–39, na p. 38;
8. John Playfair, *Outlines of natural philosophy* (Edinburgh: Printed by A. Neill & Co., 1812), u uvodu, u odsječku »Properties of matter«, na p. 7 s jednom jedinom uputnicom na Boškovićevu *Teoriju*;
9. Dugald Stewart, *Elements of the philosophy of the human mind*, Volume first (Boston: Printed and published by Wells and Lilly, 1814), o Boškovićevu sustavu ili teoriji na pp. 75 i 78; o Boškovićevoj analogiji prostora i vremena na p. 293;
10. John Leslie, »On heat and climate« [1793], *Annals of Philosophy* 14 (London, July 1819), pp. 5–27, s povijesnom bilješkom na p. 5 da je ranija inačica članka bila čitana u Royal Society of London u veljači ili ožujku 1793. godine, ali nije prihvaćena za objavljivanje u *Philosophical Transactions*; o Boškovićevoj teoriji na pp. 10–11;
11. John Robison, *A system of mechanical philosophy*, with notes by David Brewster, Vol. I. (Edinburgh: Printed for John Murray, 1822), u raspravama, ujedno i natuknicama za *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: »Boscovich's Theoria.«, pp. 267–368; »Strength of materials.«, pp. 369–495, na pp. 379, 381–382, 391, 478;
12. John Robison, *A system of mechanical philosophy*, with notes by David Brewster, Vol. II. (Edinburgh: Printed for John Murray, 1822), u: »Resistance of fluids«, pp. 261–368, o Boškoviću na p. 269;
13. John Playfair, »Dissertation, exhibiting a general view of the progress of mathematical and physical science, since the revival of letters in Europe«, rasprava napisana za *Supplement to the Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1819), u: *The works of John Playfair*, Vol. II. (Edinburgh: Printed for Archibald Constable & Co., 1822), na pp. 247 i 386;
14. *The works of John Playfair*, Vol. IV. (Edinburgh: Printed for Archibald Constable & Co., 1822), u sljedećim tekstovima:
 »Biographical account of the late James Hutton, M. D.« [1805], pp. 33–118, na pp. 82, 86–88 o sličnosti između Huttonove i Boškovićeve teorije;
 »Biographical account of the late John Robison, LL. D.« [1815], pp. 119–178, na pp. 151–153, 156;
 »Review of Baron De Zach, Attraction des Montagnes« [1816], pp. 467–497, na pp. 476–477;
 »Review of Kater on the pendulum« [1818], pp. 501–535, na pp. 518–520;

15. Thomas Thomson, *An attempt to establish the first principles of chemistry by experiment*, Vol. I. (London: Printed for Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy, 1825), u: »Chapter II. Of the atomic theory.«, pp. 29–49, o Boškovićevoj teoriji na pp. 30–31;
16. Dugald Stewart, »Dissertation, exhibiting a general view of the progress of metaphysical, ethical, and political philosophy, since the revival of letters in Europe«, rasprava napisana za *Supplement to the Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1821), u: *The works of Dugald Stewart in seven volumes*, Vol. VI. (Cambridge: Published by Hilliard and Brown, 1829), o Boškoviću na pp. 383 i 462;
17. Humphry Davy, »Consolation in travel; or the last days of a philosopher«, pp. 207–388, u: *The collected works of Sir Humphry Davy*, edited by his brother John Davy, Vol. IX. (London: Smith, Elder and Co. Cornhill, 1840); o Boškoviću u posljednjem, nedovršenom, prvi put objavljenom dijalogu: »Dialogue the seventh. On the chemical elements«, pp. 383–388, na pp. 387–388;
18. Michael Faraday, *Experimental researches in electricity*, Vol. II. (London: Richard and John Edward Taylor, 1844), u članku: »A speculation touching electric conduction and the nature of matter«, s nadnevkom prvoga objavljivanja »Royal Institution, January 25, 1844«, pp. 284–293, o Boškovićevu razumijevanju tvari na pp. 289–291;
19. Michael Faraday, *Experimental researches in electricity*, Vol. III. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1855), u članku »Thoughts on ray-vibrations«, s nadnevkom prvoga objavljivanja »Royal Institution, April 15, 1846«, pp. 447–452, o Boškoviću na p. 448. (IM)

Izuzevši prvo djelo, Priestleyevu povijest optike, svi se izvori nalaze u najbogatijoj digitalnoj knjižnici *Google Books* na mreži, s glavnim sustavnim nedostatkom – bez cjelovito digitaliziranih crteža na kraju knjige, što je na primjeru Robisonova članka iz 1790., Robisonove rasprave »Boscovich's theoria« (1803) i Lesliejeve knjige *Experimental inquiry into the nature and propagation of heat* (1804) – nenadoknativ manjak. Priestleyevo djelo *The history and present state of discoveries relating to vision, light, and colours* (1772) digitalizirano je u sklopu pomno osmišljenoga europskoga projekta *European Cultural Heritage Online* (ECHO), koji vodi Max-Planck-Gesellschaft u Münchenu u tijesnoj suradnji s Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte u Berlinu i njegovom knjižnicom. Takva zavidna dostupnost izvora potpuno je promijenila uvjete za proučavanje rane recepcije Boškovićeve prirodne filozofije na Britan-

skom otočju, ali ipak ponekad treba prethodno znati bibliografsku jedinicu koju tražite da biste je i pronašli u digitalnim knjižnicama. (MMJ)

Ključne riječi: modeli digitalizacije rijetke knjige; Google Books, ECHO; Joseph Priestley, Humphry Davy, Michael Faraday; škotsko prosvjetiteljstvo, John Robison, Dugald Stewart, Thomas Thomson, John Leslie, John Playfair

FROM PRIESTLEY TO FARADAY: DIGITISATION OF THE EARLY RECEPTION OF BOŠKOVIĆ'S NATURAL PHILOSOPHY ON THE BRITISH ISLES (1772–1855)

The most influential early reception of Bošković's natural philosophy on the British Isles should include the following books and papers, compiled chronologically according to publication:

1. Joseph Priestley, *The history and present state of discoveries relating to vision, light, and colours* (London: Printed for J. Johnson, 1772), with chapter on Bošković: "Chapter III. Of the extreme subtilty and momentum of light, and M. Boscovich's general hypothesis," pp. 383–394;
2. Joseph Priestley, *Disquisitions relating to matter and the spirit* (London: Printed for J. Johnson, 1777), in "Section II. Of impenetrability, as ascribed to matter," pp. 11–23, with extensive quotation on Bošković on pp. 19–23, borrowed from the previous book;
3. John Robison, "On the motion of light, as affected by refracting and reflecting substances, which are also in motion," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* 2 (1790), pp. 83–111, figg. 1–4, with the datation of the reading "Read by Mr Playfair, April 7, 1788," which contains also the admiration for Bošković's *Theory* and the criticism of Bošković's two optical papers printed in 1785;
4. Dugald Stewart, *Elements of the philosophy of the human mind*, the second edition, corrected. (London: Printed by A. Strahan, Printers-Street; for T. Cadell Jun. and W. Davies, in the Strand; and W. Creech, Edinburgh, 1802), on Bošković's system or theory on pp. 86–87, 90, 400; on Bošković's analogy of space and time on p. 350;
5. Thomas Thomson, *System of chemistry in four volumes*, Vol. I. (Edinburgh: Printed by John Brown, 1802), in "Chap. VI. Of simple bodies in general," pp. 380–386, on Bošković's theory on p. 386;
6. John Leslie, *Experimental inquiry into the nature, and propagation, of heat* (Edinburgh: Printed for J. Mawman, 1804), in "Note XI. p. 125,"

- pp. 515–516, with the description and drawing of Bošković’s curve of forces, and in Chapter VIII., pp. 115–136, in which Leslie aims to reveal the principle that “will connect together those curious facts,” on pp. 118–129;
7. Humphry Davy, *Elements of chemical philosophy*, Part I. Vol. I. (Philadelphia / New York: Published by Bradford and Inskip, 1812), in “On the analogies between the undecomposed substances; ideas respecting their nature,” pp. 273–287, on Bošković on p. 279; implicitly on Bošković in the chapter “Cohesion,” pp. 38–39, on p. 38;
 8. John Playfair, *Outlines of natural philosophy* (Edinburgh: Printed by A. Neill & Co., 1812), in introduction, in the section “Properties of matter,” on p. 7 with a single reference to Bošković’s *Theory*;
 9. Dugald Stewart, *Elements of the philosophy of the human mind*, Volume first (Boston: Printed and published by Wells and Lilly, 1814), on Bošković’s system or theory on pp. 75 and 78; on Bošković’s analogy of space and time on p. 293;
 10. John Leslie, “On heat and climate” [1793], *Annals of Philosophy* 14 (London, July 1819), pp. 5–27, with historical note on p. 5 explaining that an earlier copy of the paper had been read at the Royal Society of London in February or March 1793, but was not accepted for publication in *Philosophical Transactions*; on Bošković’s theory on pp. 10–11;
 11. John Robison, *A system of mechanical philosophy*, with notes by David Brewster, Vol. I. (Edinburgh: Printed for John Murray, 1822), in treatises, i.e., entries for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: “Boscovich’s Theoria,” pp. 267–368; “Strength of materials,” pp. 369–495, on pp. 379, 381–382, 391, 478;
 12. John Robison, *A system of mechanical philosophy*, with notes by David Brewster, Vol. II. (Edinburgh: Printed for John Murray, 1822), in “Resistance of fluids,” pp. 261–368, on Bošković on p. 269;
 13. John Playfair, “Dissertation, exhibiting a general view of the progress of mathematical and physical science, since the revival of letters in Europe,” dissertation written for the *Supplement to the Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1819), in *The works of John Playfair*, Vol. II. (Edinburgh: Printed for Archibald Constable & Co., 1822), on pp. 247 and 386.
 14. *The works of John Playfair*, Vol. IV. (Edinburgh: Printed for Archibald Constable & Co., 1822), in the following texts: “Biographical account of the late James Hutton, M. D.” [1805], pp. 33–118, on pp. 82, 86–88 on the affinity between Hutton’s and Bošković’s theory;

- “Biographical account of the late John Robison, LL. D.” [1815], pp. 119–178, on pp. 151–153, 156;
- “Review of Baron De Zach, *Attraction des Montagnes*” [1816], pp. 467–497, on pp. 476–477;
- “Review of Kater on the pendulum” [1818], pp. 501–535, on pp. 518–520;
15. Thomas Thomson, *An attempt to establish the first principles of chemistry by experiment*, Vol. I. (London: Printed for Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy, 1825), in “Chapter II. Of the atomic theory,” pp. 29–49, on Bošković’s theory on pp. 30–31;
 16. Dugald Stewart, “Dissertation, exhibiting a general view of the progress of metaphysical, ethical, and political philosophy, since the revival of letters in Europe,” dissertation written for the *Supplement to the Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1821), in *The works of Dugald Stewart in seven volumes*, Vol. VI. (Cambridge: Published by Hilliard and Brown, 1829), on Bošković on pp. 383 and 462;
 17. Humphry Davy, “Consolation in travel; or the last days of a philosopher,” pp. 207–388, in *The collected works of Sir Humphry Davy*, edited by his brother John Davy, Vol. IX. (London: Smith, Elder and Co. Cornhill, 1840); on Bošković in the last, unfinished, first time published dialogue: “Dialogue the seventh. On the chemical elements,” pp. 383–388, on pp. 387–388;
 18. Michael Faraday, *Experimental researches in electricity*, Vol. II. (London: Richard and John Edward Taylor, 1844), in the paper “A speculation touching electric conduction and the nature of matter,” with the datation of the first publication “Royal Institution, January 25, 1844,” pp. 284–293, on Bošković’s understanding of matter on pp. 289–291;
 19. Michael Faraday, *Experimental researches in electricity*, Vol. III. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1855), in the paper “Thoughts on ray-vibrations,” with the datation of the first publication “Royal Institution, April 15, 1846,” pp. 447–452, on Bošković on p. 448. (IM)

With the exception of the first work, Priestley’s history of optics, all the sources may be found in the richest digital *Google Books* online library, with a major systematic drawback – absence of a full reproduction of the drawings at the end of the book, which on the example of Robison’s paper from 1790, Robison’s treatise “Boscovich’s theoria” (1803), and Leslie’s book *Experimental inquiry into the nature and propagation of heat* (1804) – represents an irreparable flaw. Priestley’s work *The history and present state of discoveries relating to vision, light, and colours* (1772) has been digitised within a carefully designed European project *European Cultural Heritage Online* (ECHO), conducted by Max-Planck-Gesellschaft in Munich in close collaboration with the Max-Planck-

Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte in Berlin and its library. Such admirable accessibility of the sources had a profound effect on the conditions for the research of the early reception of Bošković's natural philosophy on the British Isles, although it is still sometimes necessary to be equipped with the bibliographic item you are looking for in order to find it in the digital libraries. (MMJ)

Key words: models of digitisation of rare book; Google Books, ECHO; Joseph Priestley, Humphry Davy, Michael Faraday; Scottish Enlightenment, John Robison, Dugald Stewart, Thomas Thomson, John Leslie, John Playfair

IVICA MARTINOVIĆ

*Institut za filozofiju, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Institute of Philosophy, Zagreb, Croatia*

RECEPCIJA BOŠKOVIĆEVE PRIRODNE FILOZOFIJE U TEZARIJIMA LEOPOLDA BIWALDA, PÁLA MAKÓA I IVANA KRSTITELJA HORVATHA (1765–1777)

Osim sveučilišnih udžbenika, istaknuti boškovićevci, koji su imali katedre na sveučilištima u Srednjoj Europi, priređivali su i tiskali ispitne tezarije na kraju akademske godine. Ne samo udžbenici, nego i tezariji svjedoče o različitim oblicima njihova prihvaćanja Boškovićeve prirodne filozofije.

Kad je 1765. godine Leopold Biwald pripremio *Assertiones ex universa philosophia ... in alma ac celeberrima Universitate Graecensi*, a za defenda oadao senjskoga plemića Maksimilijana Čolića, čak 40 od 50 teza odnosilo se na opću i posebnu fiziku. U tom tezariju profesor na Sveučilištu u Grazu nije prihvatio Boškovićev nauk o točkama tvari: »Počela tijelā neke su najmanje molekule, obdarene različitim silama na različitim međusobnim udaljenostima, kojima se molekule uzajamno ili privlače ili odbijaju.« (th. XI) Ali je usvojio njegov nauk o privlačnim i odbojnim silama, koje se ravnaju po »jedininstvenom zakonu prirode« (th. XII). Nakon trinaeste tvrdnje »Ovaj zakon silā prikladno prikazuje jedinstvena neprekinuta krivulja (*curva unica continua*).«, Biwald je podrobno uputio na prirodne fenomene koji dokazuju da u prirodi djeluju privlačne i odbojne sile i da se događaju »izmjene silā« (*virium alternationes*) od privlačne u odbojnu i obratno. Uz to, slijedio je i Boškovićevu tvrdnju o naravi svjetlosti: »najsuptilniji izljev svjetlećega tijela« (*effluvium subtilissimum corporis lucentis*, th. XLII). Isti je tezarij Biwald tiskao i sljedeće godine.

Godine 1766. tiskane su u Beču opširne *Assertiones ex physica*. Branio ih je barun Joseph Penckler, a bile su uvrštene u za tu prigodu tiskano izda-

nje Boškovićevih i Benvenutijevih rasprava objavljenih pod zajedničkim naslovom *Dissertationes physicae tres*. Protivno pravilima žanra, teze nisu bile obročene niti je izrijekom naveden profesor koji ih je sastavio. Autora otkriva podatak da je tezarij bio branjen na Kraljevskom kolegiju Theresianumu (*in Collegio Regio Theresiano*), a u razdoblju 1763.–1773. profesor matematike i filozofije na Theresianumu bio je upravo Pál Makó.

Assertiones ex physica razdijeljene su u 15 subtezarija. Već su prva dva jasno dokumentirala Boškovićev utjecaj. U prvom subtezariju »De lege virium in natura existentium« Makó je izložio Boškovićev nauku o privlačnim i odbojnim silama, uključivši i podroban opis Boškovićeve krivulje sila. U posljednjoj rečenici poslužio se prvi put ključnim Boškovićevim nazivkom *materiae puncta*, a da ga prethodno nije uveo. Dotad se služio nazivkom *elementa corporum*. U drugom subtezariju »De praecipuis corporum proprietatibus« bečki je profesor s pomoću Boškovićeve zakona sila prvo razjasnio svojstvo fizičkih tijela koje je nazvao »čvrstoća ili neproničnost, također fizički neprekinuta protežnost« (*soliditas seu impenetrabilitas, extensio item physice continua*). U tom je subtezariju još obradio tri opća svojstva tijela: djeljivost, koheziju i elastičnost. Zaključno je Makó upozorio na »različitost čestica« (*varietas particularum*), što omogućuje da se lako mogu razumjeti kemijske promjene kao što su »vrenja, otapanja, taloženja tijela« (*corporum fermentationes, solutiones, praecipitationes*).

U sedmom subtezariju »De universali materiae gravitate« Makó je razjasnio kako djeluje gravitacija za različite slučajeve, počevši od najjednostavnijeg, kao točka tvari smještena izvan sferne homogene plohe djeluje na pojedine točke te plohe. Dok je u prvom subtezariju oklijevao, ovdje se otpočetak služio Boškovićevim nazivkom *punctum materiae*. U osmom subtezariju »De astronomia physica« prihvatio je Boškovićevu modifikaciju Newtonova zakona opće gravitacije: periodično gibanje planeta i kometa slijedi »što približnije« (*quam proxime*), a ne točno (*accurate*) Newtonov zakon.

Deseti subtezarij »De lumine, coloribus et igne« otvorila je tvrdnja o naravi svjetlosti: »Svjetlost se sastoji od vrlo finih čestica svjetlećih tijela.« Makó je u tom pitanju bio Boškovićevim istomišljenikom. U posljednji, petnaesti subtezarij uvrstio je i tvrdnju o naravi okusa, vrlo blizak Boškovićevu opisu. Isti je Makóov tezarij tiskan i na kraju 1767. i 1768., u zasebnim knjižicama, ali pod naslovom *Materia tentaminis publici* uobičajenim tada na Theresianumu.

Godine 1777. Ivan Krstitelj Horvath, profesor fizike na Sveučilištu u Trnavi (*Regia Universitas Tyrnaviensis*), objavio je svoj tezarij *Tentamen publicum ex praelectionibus physicis*. Branio ga je mladi pavlin Valentin Salaj 26. travnja 1777., i to u nazočnosti direktora Filozofskog fakulteta Mihovila Šoretića, ujedno profesora patologije i medicinske prakse, i dekana Filozofskoga fakulteta Josipa Mitterpachera, profesora više matematike.

Prvi subtezarij »De principiis et communibus corporum proprietatibus« Horvath je sastavio pod izričitim utjecajem Boškovićeve teorije silā. Prvo je izložio Boškovićeve nauk o privlačnim i odbojnim silama: pojam sile kao *determinatio*, krivulja silā, granice kohezije u njezinim nul-točkama, tumačenje fluidnosti i elastičnosti tijelā s pomoću silā; kemijska svojstva ovisna o uzajamnim silama među molekulama. Slijedio je i Boškovićevu sentenciju o sili inercije: »Sila, uzeta kao određenje mirovanja ili jednolikoga gibanja po pravcu, posve pristaje ne samo pojedinačnim elementima, nego i tijelima.«

S druge strane, Horvath o naravi elemenata tvari nije izrekao nijednu tezu niti se poslužio Boškovićevim nazivkom *materiae punctum*. U subtezariju »De viribus centralibus et gravitate universalibus« Horvath nije prihvatio Boškovićeve modifikaciju Newtonova zakona opće gravitacije. Subtezariji »Ex mechanica« i »Ex astronomia physica« također ne očituju Boškovićeve utjecaj.

Tezariji Leopolda Biwalda i Pála Makóa iz fizike, prvi tiskan 1765. u Grazu, a drugi 1766. u Beču, zrcale snažan utjecaj Boškovićeve prirodne filozofije na austrijskim sveučilištima prije ukinuća Družbe Isusove u dvama različitim oblicima. A tezarij Ivana Krstitelja Horvatha, bivšega isusovca, potvrđuje da se Boškovićeve utjecaj nastavio i u novim društvenim i školskim okolnostima na državnom Sveučilištu u Trnavi. Ipak, sva tri profesora ne usvajaju u potpunosti Boškovićeve nauk o strukturi tvari, najvjerojatnije pod pritiskom jakih prigovora koji su javno bili upućeni Boškovićeve točkama tvari (Scarella).

Ključne riječi: Ruder Bošković, Leopold Biwald, Pál Makó, Ivan Krstitelj Horvath; točke tvari, zakon silā, krivulja silā, granice kohezije; opća svojstva tijelā, gravitacija, kemijske operacije, svjetlost, okus

THE RECEPTION OF BOŠKOVIĆ'S NATURAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE THESAURI OF LEOPOLD BIWALD, PÁL MAKÓ, AND IVAN KRSTITELJ HORVATH (1765–1777)

Apart from the university textbooks, distinguished Boscovichians who held chairs at the universities of Central Europe prepared and printed the thesauri at the end of the academic year. Their thesauri also bear witness to a diversity in the reception of Bošković's natural philosophy.

When in 1765 Leopold Biwald prepared the *Assertiones ex universa philosophia ... in alma ac celeberrima Universitate Graecensi*, and chose Maksimilijan Čolić, nobleman of Senj, to defend them, as many as forty out of fifty theses pertained to general and particular physics. In this thesaurus the professor of the University of Graz failed to adopt Bošković's doctrine on the points of matter: "The principles of bodies are some smallest molecules, en-

dowed by various forces at the various distances, by which the molecules are mutually attracted or repulsed.” (th. XI) But he adopted Bošković’s doctrine on the attractive and repulsive forces, which are governed by the “unique law of nature” (th. XII). Following the thirteenth thesis “This law of forces is aptly shown by a unique continuous curve (*curva unica continua*),” Biwald made a most thorough examination of the natural phenomena which prove the action of the attractive and repulsive forces in nature and the “alternations of forces” (*virium alternationes*) from attractive to repulsive and vice versa. Moreover, he followed Bošković’s thesis on the nature of light (*effluvium subtilissimum corporis lucentis*, th. XLII). Next year Biwald reprinted this thesaurus.

In 1766 extensive *Assertiones ex physica* were printed in Vienna. They were defended by Baron Joseph Penckler and accompanied the edition of Bošković’s and Benvenuti’s treatises published under the title *Dissertationes physicae tres*. Contrary to the genre standards, the theses were not numbered, nor was the name of the professor who wrote them explicitly cited. The information that the thesaurus was defended at the *Collegium Regium Theresianum* helps trace the author, as in the period 1763–1773 mathematics and philosophy were lectured at the *Theresianum* by no other than Pál Makó.

Assertiones ex physica are divided into fifteen chapters. Bošković’s influence clearly reverberates as early as the first two chapters. In the first chapter “De lege virium in natura existentium,” Makó expounded Bošković’s doctrine on the attractive and repulsive forces, having included a detailed description of Bošković’s curve of forces. In the last sentence he used for the first time Bošković’s key term *materiae puncta*, without formerly introducing it. Until then he had used the term *elementa corporum*. In the second chapter “De praecipuis corporum proprietatibus,” by means of Bošković’s law of forces the Viennese professor first explained the property of physical bodies which he termed “solidity or impenetrability, also physically continuous extension” (*soliditas seu impenetrabilitas, extensio item physice continua*). In this chapter he discussed the three general properties of bodies: divisibility, cohesion and elasticity. In conclusion, Makó pointed to the “variety of particles” (*varietas particularum*), which helps the understanding of the chemical changes such as “fermentations, solutions, precipitations of the bodies” (*corporum fermentationes, solutiones, praecipitationes*).

In the seventh chapter “De universali materiae gravitate,” Makó has explained the force of gravitation in different cases, starting with the simplest, when the point of matter situated outside the spherical surface acts on the particular points of that surface. Although still hesitant in the first chapter, here from the very start he used Bošković’s term *punctum materiae*. In the eighth

chapter “De astronomia physica,” he accepted Bošković’s modification of Newton’s law of universal gravitation: periodical motion of the planets and comets follows “more approximately” (*quam proxime*) and not accurately (*accurate*) Newton’s law.

The tenth chapter “De lumine, coloribus et igne” opens with a thesis on the nature of light: “Light is composed of most tenuous particles of the illuminant bodies.” Makó shared Bošković’s view on this problem. In the last, fifteenth chapter he also included a thesis on the nature of taste, very close to Bošković’s description. The mentioned Makó’s thesaurus was also printed at the end of 1767 and 1768, as a separate volume but under the title *Materia tentaminis publici*, commonly used at the Theresianum at the time.

In 1777 Ivan Krstitelj Horvath, professor of physics at the University of Tyrnau (*Regia Universitas Tyrnaviensis*), published his thesaurus *Tentamen publicum ex praelectionibus physicis*. It was defended by a young Paulin Valentin Salaj on 26 April 1777, before Mihovil Šoretić, director of the Faculty of Philosophy and professor of pathology and medical practice, and Josip Mitterpacher, dean of the Faculty of Philosophy and professor of higher mathematics.

The first chapter “De principiis et communibus corporum proprietatibus” Horvath composed under direct influence of Bošković’s theory of forces. He first exposed Bošković’s doctrine on the attractive and repulsive forces: notion of force as *determinatio*, curve of forces, limits of cohesion in its null-points, interpretation of fluidity and elasticity of bodies by means of forces; chemical properties depending on mutual forces between the molecules. He also followed Bošković’s sentence on the force of inertia: “Force, considered as determination of being at rest or of moving uniformly in straight line, may be attributed not only to the individual elements, but also to the bodies.”

On the other hand, on the nature of the elements of matter Horvath did not put forward a single thesis nor did he attempt to use Bošković’s term *materiae punctum*. In the chapter “De viribus centralibus et gravitate universali,” Horvath did not accept Bošković’s modification of Newton’s law of universal gravitation. Nor can Bošković’s influence be traced in the chapters “Ex mechanica” and “Ex astronomia physica”.

The physics thesauri of Leopold Biwald and Pál Makó, the former’s published in Graz in 1765 and the latter’s in Vienna in 1766, mirror a strong influence of Bošković’s natural philosophy at the Austrian universities prior to the suppression of the Society of Jesus in two different forms. However, the thesaurus of Ivan Krstitelj Horvath, former Jesuit, confirms the continuity of Bošković’s influence in the new social and educational circumstances at the state university in Tyrnau. Apparently, Bošković’s doctrine on the structure of

matter was not fully adopted by the three professors, most probably because of the strong objections publicly raised to Bošković's points of matter (Scarella).

Key words: Ruđer Bošković, Leopold Biwald, Pál Makó, Ivan Krstitelj Horvath; points of matter, law of forces, curve of forces, limits of cohesion; general properties of bodies, gravitation, chemical operations, light, taste

SNJEŽANA PAUŠEK-BAŽDAR

*Zavod za povijest i filozofiju znanosti HAZU, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Institute of the History and Philosophy of Science, Croatian Academy of Sciences
and Arts, Zagreb, Croatia*

SLIČNOSTI I RAZLIKE IZMEĐU PETRIĆEVIH I DE DOMINISOVIH POGLEDA O STRUKTURI TVARI

Poznato je da su Frane Petrić i Marko Antun de Dominis djelovali u okviru oprečnih prirodnofilozofijskih sustava, prvi u okviru platoničkoga odnosno novoplatoničkoga, a drugi u okviru peripatetičkoga. No, oni su o strukturi tvari izložili slična gledišta.

Kad u *Pancosmia* (1591) izlaže o krutim anorganskim tvarima, Petrić tvrdi da su one građene od čestica koje su nastale kontrakcijom od četvrtoga Petrićeva počela – fluida (*fluor*). Svojstva i raznolikosti krutih tvari ovise o omjeru tih čestica prema trećem Petrićevu počelu – toplini (*calor*). Tako je svaka tvar određena odnosom fluida i topline. Pri tome se fluid u tekućim i krutim tvarima pojavljuje u obliku nedjeljivih čestica. Te su čestice međusobno spojene tzv. ljepilom (*gluten*). U cijeloj povijesti znanosti Petrićev *gluten* prvi je začetak ideje o postojanju kemijske veze između čestica tvari. Danas znamo da je kemijska veza utemeljena na principu energije, a Petrić je gluten u 16. stoljeću uveo s pomoću principa topline.

U svom posljednjem tiskanom djelu *Euripus* (1624) de Dominis ne koristi nazive *atomos* i *corpuscula atoma*, nego govori o čestici (*particula*) i kuglici (*globula*). Oblik čestice uspoređuje sa zrnom graška ili leće. Oko okrugle čestice koja je smještena u središtu svijeta kružno se slažu ostale čestice zemlje, a potom vode. One zbog svoje okrugloće neće moći biti priljubljene jedna uz drugu, pa prema Dominis to ne zaključuje, slijedi da između njih postoje mala područja praznog prostora. Stoga se de Dominisovo gledište o okruglim česticama tvari kosi s peripatetičkim naukom o nepostojanju praznog prostora.

Premda je Frane Petrić bio 31 godinu stariji od de Dominisa, gledišta filozofa iz Cresa o strukturi tvari su znatno inovativnija zato što on prvi put spo-

minje postojanje »nečega« između čestica tvari, što će se u kasnijem razvitku znanosti nazvati kemijskom vezom.

Ključne riječi: Frane Petrić, Marko Antun de Dominis; platonička prirodna filozofija, peripatetička prirodna filozofija; fluid, toplina, gluten, kemijska veza

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PETRIĆ'S VIEWS OF THE STRUCTURE OF MATTER AND THOSE OF DE DOMINIS

Frane Petrić and Marko Antun de Dominis belonged to two contrasted systems of natural philosophy, the former's being that of Platonism and Neoplatonism, and the latter's constructed within the frame of the Peripatetic. But on the structure of matter they expounded similar views.

In his exposition on solid inorganic matters in *Pancosmia* (1591), Petrić states that they are composed of particles formed by contraction of Petrić's fourth principle of fluid (*fluor*). The properties and diversities of the solid matters depend on the ratio of these particles to Petrić's third principle of heat (*calor*). Thus every matter is determined by the relationship between fluid and heat. In doing so, the fluid in the liquid and solid matters appears in the form of indivisible particles. These particles are mutually bonded with the so-called glue (*gluten*). In the whole history of science Petrić's *gluten* may be said to have represented the embryo of an idea of the existence of a chemical bond between the particles of matter. Today we know that a chemical bond is based on the principle of energy, whereas in the sixteenth century Petrić introduced gluten by means of the principle of heat.

In his last published work, *Euripus* (1624), de Dominis does not use the terms *atomos* and *corpuscula atoma*, but speaks of particle (*particula*) and small globe (*globula*). He compares the form of the particle with a pea or lentil seed. Around the round particle in the centre of the world come the other earth particles, and then the water particles. Their roundness prevents them from adhering to each other, and although de Dominis makes no such conclusion, it follows that between them there remain small areas of void space. Therefore de Dominis's view of the round particles of matter is contradictory to the Peripatetic doctrine on the nonexistence of void space.

Although Frane Petrić was thirty-one years older than de Dominis, the views of the Cres philosopher on the structure of matter prove more innovative, because he is the first to mention the existence of »something« between

the particles of matter, which in the later development of science came to be recognised as chemical bond.

Key words: Frane Petrić, Marko Antun de Dominis; Platonic natural philosophy, Peripatetic natural philosophy; fluid, heat, gluten, chemical bond

OLGA PERIĆ

*Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska /
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia*

ODNOS GLAGOLSKIH OBLIKA GRČKOG I LATINSKOG JEZIKA U PETRIĆEVU PRIJEVODU IZ *DISCUSSIONES PERIPATETICAE*

Prevodeći brojne grčke citate u djelu *Discussiones peripateticae*, Petrić se opredijelio za tehniku doslovnog prevođenja, što je razumljivo kad je u pitanju filozofski diskurs. Smatrao je da tako postiže najveću moguću ekvivalenciju, tj. da odgovara na temeljni zadatak prevođenja: ostaviti na čitatelja učinak što sličniji učinku izvornog teksta originala na izvorne čitatelje.

Petrić to nastoji postići ne samo sadržajem nego i izrazom: identičnim redom riječi, izborom jednakih gramatičkih oblika i sl. Međutim, grčki je glagolski sistem bogatiji od latinskoga i Petrić se morao snalaziti u mogućnostima latinskoga jezika. Upravo se u takvim detaljima dokazao kao dobar znalac klasičnih jezika.

Gljučne riječi: *Discussiones peripateticae*, filozofski diskurs, doslovno prevođenje

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GREEK AND LATIN VERB FORMS IN *DISCUSSIONES PERIPATETICAE* OF FRANCISCUS PATRICIUS

In translating Greek philosopher quotes into Latin, Franciscus Patricius used the literal, 'word-for-word' translation technique according to the philosophical discourse of his work *Discussiones peripateticae*. Patricius was convinced that such a strategy was the most efficient in achieving the highest degree of equivalence in translation.

In order to accomplish the primary goals of translation—accuracy and the maximum conformity to the original text—Patricius chooses the same grammatical forms, introduces identical word order etc. Due to the complexity of

the Greek verb system he encountered difficulties in the translation of Greek verb forms into Latin. However, Patricius successfully solved the problem within the possibilities of the Latin language and therefore proved himself an expert in both ancient languages.

Key words: *Discussiones peripateticae*, philosophical discourse, 'word-for-word' translation

IVANA SKUHALA KARASMAN

*Institut za filozofiju, Zagreb, Hrvatska /
Institute of Philosophy, Zagreb, Croatia*

USPOREDBA PICOVA I SKALIĆEVA RAZUMIJEVANJA KRŠĆANSKE KABALE

Osnivačem učenja koje će biti poznato pod nazivom 'kršćanska kabala' smatra se renesansni filozof Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463.–1494.). On je napisao 72 kabalističke konkluzije koje su sastavni dio njegovih *900 konkluzija*, a koje je 1486. godine objavio u Rimu.

Kršćansku kabalu u svom *Epistemonu* tematizira i hrvatski filozof, polihistor i pustolov Pavao Skalić (1534.–1575.). Skalićevo djelo *Epistemon* prvi je put objavljeno u njegovom protestantskom razdoblju života u Baselu 1559., a drugi put u povratničkom katoličkom u Kölnu 1571. godine.

U radu ću iznijeti Picovo i Skalićevo razumijevanje kršćanske kabale te pokazati koje sličnosti, a koje razlike postoje u njihovim shvaćanjima kabale, osobito zato jer Skalić među prvima nakon Pica tematizira kabalu kao kršćansku kabalu.

Ključne riječi: kršćanska kabala, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Pavao Skalić

THE COMPARISON OF PICO'S AND SKALIĆ'S UNDERSTANDING OF CHRISTIAN CABALA

Renaissance philosopher Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463–1494) is generally considered to be the founder of a doctrine which later became known as Christian Cabala. His seventy-two Cabalistic Conclusions are an integral part of his *Conclusiones sive Theses DCCCC* published in Rome in 1486.

Pavao Skalić, a Croatian philosopher, polymath and adventurer (1534–1575), also wrote about Christian Cabala. Skalić's *Epistemon* was first published in

his Protestant days in Basel in 1559, and republished in 1571 during his Catholic period in Cologne.

In this paper I will discuss the main points of Pico's and Skalić's interpretation of Christian Cabala, and also draw special attention to the similarities and differences in their views, since Skalić is one of the first authors who discussed Christian Cabala after Pico's introduction of Christian interpretation of Jewish mysticism.

Key words: Christian Cabala, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Pavao Skalić

FRANJO SOKOLIĆ

*Prirodoslovno-matematički fakultet, Sveučilište u Splitu, Hrvatska /
Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, University of Split, Croatia*

RUDER BOŠKOVIĆ IZMEĐU NEWTONA I LEIBNIZA

Isaac Newton (1642.–1727.) i Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646.–1716.) spadaju među značajne figure novovjekovne znanosti i filozofije. Isaac Newton smatra se utemeljiteljem klasične mehanike, a Leibniz je danas poznat uglavnom kao filozof. U standardnim udžbenicima fizike njegovo se ime ne spominje, iako je on posvetio puno energije osmišljavanju svoje filozofije prirode. U povijesti fizike on je značajan po svojoj polemici sa Samuelom Clarkeom (1675.–1729.) oko Newtonove mehanike. U toj polemici, smatra se, Clarke je zastupao Newtonovo mišljenje. Među razmatranim problemima izuzetno važno bilo je pitanje o naravi prostora i vremena. Leibniz je zastupao stanovište da postoje prostorni i vremenski odnosi među tijelima, a ne prostor i vrijeme sami po sebi.

Ruder Bošković (1711.–1787.) pokušao je pomiriti te dvije koncepcije realnosti. U vezi s time mogu se postaviti dva fundamentalna pitanja.

1. Kakvu koncepciju ima fizika o sebi i o svome razvoju?

Naime, Newtonova mehanika se i danas smatra 'važecom', uz ograničenja koja joj postavljaju teorija relativnosti i kvantna mehanika. S druge strane, Leibnizova kritika sigurno je pomogla daljnjem razvoju fizike – realizaciji Einsteinove sinteze mehanike i elektrodinamike u teoriju relativnosti.

2. Koji je Boškovićev doprinos? Je li njegov doprinos važan za razvoj fizike?

Glavni Boškovićev doprinos je zamisao da je tvar građena od »neprotežnih točaka tvari obdarenih privlačnim i odbojnim silama i silom inercije« koji

su u 19. stoljeću nazvani »točkastim atomima«. Konceptualno, Boškovićeve točke tvari nalaze se između Newtonovih atoma u vakuumu i Leibnizovih monada te predstavljaju korak prema pojmu polja, koji je od izuzetnog značenja za suvremenu fiziku.

Cljučne riječi: Bošković, Newton, Leibniz, povijest fizike

RUĐER BOŠKOVIĆ BETWEEN NEWTON AND LEIBNIZ

Isaac Newton (1642–1727) and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1716) represent major figures of the early modern science and philosophy. Isaac Newton is considered to be the founder of classical mechanics, while Leibniz is now mostly known as a philosopher. In standard textbooks of physics Leibniz's name is not mentioned, although he dedicated a lot of time to forge his philosophy of nature. In the history of physics he is well known for his polemics with Samuel Clarke (1675–1729) on Newton's mechanics, in which Clarke is generally held to have defended Newton's opinions. Among the problems considered, one of the most important was the one concerning the nature of space and time. Leibniz argued that there are only spatial and temporal relations between bodies, and not space and time by themselves.

Ruđer Bošković (1711–1787) tried to combine these two conceptions of reality. This raises two fundamental questions.

1. What conception does physics have of itself and its history?

Namely, Newton's mechanics is still considered as a 'valid theory', taking into account the constraints of the relativity theory and quantum mechanics. On the other side, the Leibniz critique of Newton was essential for Einstein's synthesis of mechanics and electrodynamics in the theory of relativity.

2. What is Bošković's contribution? Is it essential for the development of physics?

Bošković's most important contribution is his concept of matter which consists of "non-extended points of matter endowed with attractive and repulsive forces, and with the force of inertia," which were called 'punctual atoms' in the 19th century. Conceptually, they are between Newton's atoms in vacuum and Leibniz's monads, and represent a step toward the notion of field, which is one of the most fundamental concepts of modern physics.

Key words: Bošković, Newton, Leibniz, history of physics

ERIKA ZLATKOV

Fakulteta za humanistične študije, Univerza na Primorskem, Koper, Slovenija / Faculty of Humanities, University of Primorska, Koper, Slovenia

PETRIĆEV ODNOS PREMA PRIRODI U GRADU IZ PERSPEKTIVE NJEGOVA DJELA *LA CITTÀ FELICE*

Referat je pokušaj i jedan od mogućih prijedloga obrade Petrićeva odnosa prema prirodi u gradu iz perspektive njegova djela *La città felice* (1553). Po uzoru na Veneciju, Petrić postavlja aristokratski ideal života, u koji implementira ideale renesansnog razdoblja, između ostalog i nizom zanimljivih aktualnih pitanja: upute za izgradnju, geografski smještaj, urbanističko planiranje, klimatska i druga obilježja.

Postavlja se pitanje zašto Petrić nije postavio vrt u grad. Naime, Venecijanci su svoju važnost pokazivali i kroz jezik ukroćene prirode. Tipologija venecijanskih vrtova šesnaestoga stoljeća, koja je vrlo jasno izražena npr. uz kanal Giudecca, postala je temeljno pravilo za određivanje urbanističkog koncepta grada. Premda ekološki uvjeti lagune nisu bili prikladni za utemeljenje vrtova, oni su postali neizbježnim dijelom izgleda grada.

Tako je Venecija, što se tiče postavljanja 'druge' prirode u grad, zapravo antipol Petrićeva *Sretnog grada*. Pristup bitnim elementima življenja i idealne harmonije vodi Petrića do negiranja nekih sastavnica življenja, kao što je vrt, koji je od antike nadalje bio namijenjen prije svega izabranicima za koje Petrić i utemeljuje svoj sretan grad.

Ključne riječi: Petrić, grad, vrt, priroda, Venecija, vizualna poruka

PETRIĆ'S ATTITUDE TO NATURE IN THE CITY FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF HIS *LA CITTÀ FELICE*

The paper attempts to outline Petrić's attitude to nature in a city as described in his work *La città felice*. Modelling on Venice, Petrić sets an aristocratic ideal of life which is strongly permeated by the ideals of the Renaissance, introducing his views on a series of current topics: instructions for construction, geographical position, urban planning, climate and other features.

A dilemma arises as to why Petrić did not place a garden in the city. The Venetians, however, demonstrated their importance through the language of domesticated nature. The typology of Venetian gardens of the sixteenth century, most clearly expressed, for instance, along the Giudecca Canal, became a

fundamental rule of defining the urban layout. Although the ecological conditions of the lagoon were hostile for the purpose of setting up gardens, the latter have become an inescapable element of the city's image.

With regard to introducing 'the other' nature into a city, Venice is thus counterpointed with Petrić's *La città felice*. Petrić's statement of the essential elements of living and ideal coexistence consistently leads the author to negate certain components of living, such as a garden, which from the classical times on was primarily reserved for the elite, for whom Petrić designs his happy city.

Key words: Petrić, city, garden, nature, Venice, visual message

21. DANI FRANE PETRIĆA

Adresar izlagača



21st DAYS OF FRANE PETRIĆ

Addresses of the speakers

**Međunarodni simpozij
IDEJA SVEUČILIŠTA**

**International Symposium
THE IDEA OF THE UNIVERSITY**

Krešimir Babel

Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Ivana Lučića 3
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: kresimirbabel@gmail.com

Pavo Barišić

Institut za filozofiju
Ulica grada Vukovara 54
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: pavo@ifzg.hr

Meriç Bilgiç

Kocaeli Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat fakültesi
B blok, Felsefe Z14A
TR–Umuttepe, 41380 Kocaeli
Turkey
e-mail: mericbilgic@gmail.com

Jadranka Božić

Bulevar oslobođenja 60
RS–11000 Beograd
Serbia
e-mail: jadranka.bozic@nb.rs

Hasan Bülent Gözkan

Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi
Bomonti Yerleşkesi
Cumhuriyet Mah. Silahşör Cad. No:89
TR–Bomonti – İstanbul
Turkey
e-mail: bulent.gozkan@msgsu.edu.tr
bulentgoz@hotmail.com

Nenad Cekić

Filozofski fakultet
Univerzitet u Beogradu
Čika Ljubina 18–20
RS–11000 Beograd
Serbia
e-mail: n.cekic@sezampro.rs
ncekic@f.bg.ac.rs
crveni@sezampro.rs

Krešimir Cerovac

Našička 2
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: kresimir.cerovac@xnet.hr

Corneliu Constantineanu

Institutul Teologic Pentecostal
B-dul Uverturii, nr. 210–220
RO–060946 Sect. 6, București
Romania
e-mail: rector@itpbucuresti.ro
corneliu_c@yahoo.com

Igor Čatić

Fakultet strojarstva i brodogradnje
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Ivana Lučića 5, p.p. 102
HR–10002 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: igor.catic@fsb.hr

Ante Čović

Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Ivana Lučića 3
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: ante.covic1@zg.t-com.hr

Dragan Čalović

Pavleka Miškine 16
RS–21000 Novi Sad
Serbia
e-mail: calovic_dragan@yahoo.com

Bruno Ćurko

Andrije Hebranga 10e
HR–23000 Zadar
Croatia
e-mail: bcurko@ifzg.hr

Dijana Ćurković

Ulica Republike Austrije 16
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: dcurkov@ihjj.hr
dijana.curkovic@gmail.com

Borislav Dadić

Odjel za filozofiju
Sveučilište u Zadru
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV, br. 2
HR–23000 Zadar
Croatia
e-mail: bdadic@gmail.com

Nenad Daković

Ratnih vojnih invalida 54
RS–11211 Beograd
Serbia
e-mail: hrcaknena@yahoo.com

Zlatan Delić

Filozofski fakultet
Univerzitet u Tuzli
Dr. Tihomila Markovića 1
BA–75000 Tuzla
Bosnia and Herzegovina
e-mail: zlatan.delic@untz.ba

Zoran Dimić

Partizanska 13/2
RS–17500 Vranje
Serbia
e-mail: zoran.dimic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

Aleksandar Dobrijević

Filozofski fakultet
Univerzitet u Beogradu
Čika Ljubina 18–20
RS–11000 Beograd
Serbia
e-mail: dobrijevic.aleksandar@gmail.com

Igor Eterović

Katedra za društvene i
humanističke znanosti u medicini
Medicinski fakultet
Sveučilište u Rijeci
Braće Branchetta 20
HR–51000 Rijeka
Croatia
e-mail: igor.eterovic@medri.hr

Srećko Gajović

Croatian Medical Journal
Medicinski fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Šalata 3
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: srecko.gajovic@cmj.hr

Richard F. Gombrich

Balliol College
Broad Street
GB–OX1 3BJ Oxford
United Kingdom
e-mail: richard.gombrich@balliol.ox.ac.uk

Irfan Hošić

Tehnički fakultet
Univerzitet u Bihaću
Irfana Ljubijankića bb
BA–77000 Bihać
Bosnia and Herzegovina
e-mail: i.hosic@tfb.ba

Hajrudin Hromadžić

Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilište u Rijeci
Slavka Krautzeka bb
HR–51000 Rijeka
Croatia
e-mail: hhromadzic@ffri.hr

Luka Ilić

Klarastr. 23
DE–55116 Mainz
Germany
e-mail: ilic@ieg-mainz.de
lukailic@yahoo.com

Amina Isanović

Filozofski fakultet
Univerzitet u Sarajevu
Franje Račkog 1
BA–71000 Sarajevo
Bosnia and Herzegovina
e-mail: amina.isanovic@gmail.com

Nusret Isanović

Hasana Kikića 15
BA–71000 Sarajevo
Bosnia and Herzegovina
e-mail: nusret.isanovic@gmail.com

Mislav Ježić

Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Ivana Lučića 3
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: mjezic@ffzg.hr

Hrvoje Jurić

Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Ivana Lučića 3
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: hjuric@ffzg.hr

Valentina Kaneva

Faculty of Philosophy
“St. Kliment Ohridski”
University of Sofia
15, Tzar Osvoboditel Blvd.
BG–1504 Sofia
Bulgaria
e-mail: v.kaneva@scfg.uni-sofia.bg
v.kaneva@abv.bg

Ivana Knežić

Odjel za filozofiju
Sveučilište u Zadru
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV, br. 2
HR–23000 Zadar
Croatia
e-mail: iknezic@unizd.hr

Tonći Kokić

Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilište u Splitu
Sinjska 2
HR–21000 Split
Croatia
e-mail: tkocic@ffst.hr

Filip Kovačević

Fakultet političkih nauka
Univerzitet Crne Gore
13. jula 2
ME-81000 Podgorica
Montenegro
e-mail: filip@ac.me

Spahija Kozlić

Pravni fakultet
Univerzitet u Zenici
Fakultetska 3
BA-72000 Zenica
Bosnia and Herzegovina
e-mail: spahija@gmail.com

Lev Krefť

Zelena pot 26
SI-1000 Ljubljana
Slovenia
e-mail: lev.krefť@guest.arnes.si

Predrag Krstić

Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju
Kraljice Natalije 45
RS-11000 Beograd
Serbia
e-mail: prekrst66@gmail.com

Tomislav Krznar

Učiteljski fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Savska cesta 77
HR-10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: tomlslav.krznar@ufzg.hr

Gottfried Kuenzlen

Fakultät SOWI
Universität der Bundeswehr München
DE-85577 Neubiberg
Germany
e-mail: gottfried.kuenzlen@unibw.de

Damir Kukić

Pedagoški fakultet
Univerzitet u Zenici
Zmaja od Bosne 56
BA-72000 Zenica
Bosnia and Herzegovina
e-mail: damirkukic@yahoo.com

Mislav Kukoć

Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilište u Splitu
Sinjska 2
HR-21000 Split
Croatia
e-mail: mkukoc@ffst.hr

Marija Lamot

Srednja škola – Gimnazija Krapina
Hrvatskog narodnog preporoda 6
HR-49000 Krapina
Croatia
e-mail: marija.lamot@gmail.com

Anita Lunić

Put kruga 34
Mali rat
HR-21315 Dugi Rat
Croatia
e-mail: anitalunic@yahoo.com

Marcel V. Mäcelaru

Evandeoski teološki fakultet
Cvjetkova 32
HR-31103 Osijek
Croatia
e-mail: marcel.macelaru@evtos.hr

Aleksandra Maksić

Cara Dušana 139
RS-23000 Zrenjanin
Serbia
e-mail: filozofesa@hotmail.com

Nenad Malović

Katolički bogoslovni fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Vlaška 38, p.p. 432
HR–10001 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: nenad.malovic@vz.t-com.hr

Luka Matić

Gornjodravska obala 93
HR–31000 Osijek
Croatia
e-mail: matic.luka.os@gmail.com

Nediljko Matić

Ulica Pavla Hatza 28
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: clementia@hck.hr

Béla Mester

Institute of Philosophy
Research Centre for Humanities
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Úri u. 53
HU–1014 Budapest
Hungary
e-mail: mester.bela@btk.mta.hu

Matko Meštrović

Ekonomski institut
Trg J. F Kennedyja 7
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: mmestrovic@eizg.hr

Anton Mlinar

Znanstveno-raziskovalno središče
Univerza na Primorskem
Garibaldijeva 1
SI–6000 Koper
Slovenia
e-mail: anton.mlinar@guest.arnes.si

Jurica Mlinarec

Hum na Sutli 155
HR–49231 Hum na Sutli
Croatia
e-mail: jurica.mlinarec@gmail.com

Rastko Močnik

Filozofska fakulteta
Univerza v Ljubljani
Aškerčeva 2
SI–1000 Ljubljana
Slovenia
e-mail: josip.mocnik@guest.arnes.si

Josip Oslić

Katolički bogoslovni fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Vlaška 38, p.p. 432
HR–10001 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: ured@theo.kbf.hr

Vladimir Paar

Prirodoslovno-matematički fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Bijenička c. 32, p.p. 331
HR–10002 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: paar@hazu.hr

Ivan Peklić

Matije Gupca 42
HR–48260 Križevci
Croatia
e-mail: ivan.peklic@kc.t-com.hr

Tomislav Petković

Zavod za primijenjenu fiziku
Fakultet elektrotehnike i računarstva
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Unska 3
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: tomislav.petkovic@fer.hr

Estella Petrić-Bajlo

Odjel za anglistiku
Sveučilište u Zadru
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV, br. 2
HR–23000 Zadar
Croatia
e-mail: estella.petric-bajlo@zadar.net

Maja Poljak

Odjel za filozofiju
Sveučilište u Zadru
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV, br. 2
HR–23000 Zadar
Croatia
e-mail: mpoljak@unizd.hr

Marina Pražetina

Limska 10
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: marinaprazetina@yahoo.co.uk

Sandra Radenović

Katedra humanističkih nauka
Medicinski fakultet
Univerzitet u Beogradu
Dr Subotića 8
RS–11000 Beograd
Serbia
e-mail: sandra.radenovic@mfub.bg.ac.rs

Ivana Ramić

Velebítska 61
HR–23244 Starigrad – Paklenica
Croatia
e-mail: ivramic@gmail.com

Vani Roščić

Odjel za filozofiju
Sveučilište u Zadru
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV, br. 2
HR–23000 Zadar
Croatia
e-mail: vroscic@unizd.hr

Hariz Šarić

Filozofski fakultet
Univerzitet u Tuzli
Dr. Tihomila Markovića 1
BA–75000 Tuzla
Bosnia and Herzegovina
e-mail: hariz.saric@untz.ba

Filip Šipoš

Ulica 30. svibnja 26
HR–10370 Gračec (Dugo Selo)
Croatia
e-mail: fsipos@ffzg.hr

Željko Škuljević

Filozofski fakultet
Univerzitet u Zenici
Zmaja od Bosne 56
BA–72000 Zenica
Bosnia and Herzegovina
e-mail: zeljko.skuljevic@pf.unze.ba

Fulvio Šuran

Odjel za studij na talijanskom jeziku
Sveučilište Jurja Dobrile u Puli
I. M. Ronjgova 1/1
HR–52100 Pula
Croatia
e-mail: fsuran@unipu.hr

Rajka Švrljuga

Kalca 41
HR–51226 Hreljin
Croatia
e-mail: rajka.svrljuga@gmail.com

Alen Tafra

Divkovićeveva 2
HR–52100 Pula
Croatia
e-mail: a.tafra09@gmail.com

Iris Tićac

Odjel za filozofiju
Sveučilište u Zadru
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV, br. 2
HR–23000 Zadar
Croatia
e-mail: iticac@unizd.hr

Martina Topalović

Prespa 43
HR–43000 Bjelovar
Croatia
e-mail: martina.topalovic91@gmail.com

Karel Turza

Medicinski fakultet
Univerzitet u Beogradu
Dr. Subotića 8
RS–11000 Beograd
Serbia
e-mail: turza@med.bg.ac.rs

Vesna Ukić Košta

Put Pudarice 13f
HR–23000 Zadar
Croatia
e-mail: vesna.ukic@zd.t-com.hr
vukic@unizd.hr

Nebojša Vasić

Reisa Čauševića 12
BA–72000 Zenica
Bosnia and Herzegovina
e-mail: neb.vasic@gmail.com

Lino Veljak

Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Ivana Lučića 3
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: lveljak@ffzg.hr

Nenad Vertovšek

Stomorica 7
HR–23000 Zadar
Croatia
e-mail: nenad.vertovsek@gmail.com

Dafne Vidanec

Visoka škola za poslovanje i upravljanje
»Baltazar Adam Krčelić«
Vladimira Novaka 23
HR–10290 Zaprešić
Croatia
e-mail: dafne.vidanec@gmail.com

Radomir Videnović

Mokranjčeva 80
RS–18000 Niš
Serbia
e-mail: ravi.nissin@sbb.rs

Janez Vodičar

Ob Ljubljani 34
SI–1000 Ljubljana
Slovenia
e-mail: janez.vodicar@guest.arnes.si

Budislav Vukas, ml.

Katedra za povijest prava i države
Pravni fakultet
Sveučilište u Rijeci
Hahlić 6
HR–51000 Rijeka
Croatia
e-mail: bvukas@pravri.hr

Divna Vuksanović

Fakultet dramskih umetnosti
Univerzitet umetnosti u Beogradu
Bulevar dr. Zorana Đinđića 26/13
RS–11070 Novi Beograd
Serbia
e-mail: divnavuk@eunet.rs

Ivana Zagorac

Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Ivana Lučića 3
HR-10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: izagorac@ffzg.hr

Enis Zebić

Kralja Zvonimira 119
HR-10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: enis.zebic@gmail.com

Ivan Zelić

HR-21209 Mravince, Split
Croatia
e-mail: ivan.zelic3@st.t-com.hr

Bojan Žalec

Teološka fakulteta
Univerza v Ljubljani
Poljanska c. 4
SI-1000 Ljubljana
Slovenia
e-mail: bojan.zalec@teof.uni-lj.si

19. simpozij
OD PETRIĆA DO BOŠKOVIĆA:
HRVATSKI FILOZOFI U EUROPSKOM KONTEKSTU

19th Symposium
FROM PETRIĆ TO BOŠKOVIĆ:
CROATIAN PHILOSOPHERS IN THE EUROPEAN CONTEXT

Erna Banić-Pajnić

Institut za filozofiju
Ulica grada Vukovara 54
HR-10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: erna@ifzg.hr

Jan Čížek

Department of Philosophy
Faculty of Arts
Palacký University in Olomouc
Křížkovského 12
CZ-771 80 Olomouc
Czech Republic
e-mail: hon.cizek@gmail.com

Ćiril Čoh

Prva gimnazija Varaždin
Široke ledine 14
HR-42000 Varaždin
Croatia
e-mail: ciril.coh@vz.t-com.hr

Antica-Nada Čepulić

Kačićeva 15a
HR-10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: antica-nada.cepulic@zg.t-com.hr

Bruno Ćurko

Institut za filozofiju
Ulica grada Vukovara 54
HR-10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: bcurko@ifzg.hr

Andrije Hebranga 10e
HR-23000 Zadar
Croatia

Heda Festini

Tizianova 35
HR-51000 Rijeka
Croatia
e-mail: heda.festini@ri.t-com.hr

Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin

Institut za filozofiju
Ulica grada Vukovara 54
HR-10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: mihaela.girardi-karsulin@zg.t-com.hr

Snježana Husić

Odsjek za klasičnu filologiju
Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Ivana Lučića 3
HR-10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: shusic@ffzg.hr

Blanka Jergović

Hrvatski radio
Hrvatska radiotelevizija
Prisavlje 3
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: blanka.jergovic@hrt.hr

Monika Jurić

Pašmanska 24
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: monika8@gmail.com

Mijo Korade

Hrvatski studiji
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Borongajska 83d
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: mkorade@hrstud.hr

Persida Lazarević Di Giacomo

Dipartimento di Studi Comparati e
Comunicazione Interculturale
Facoltà di Lingue e Letterature Straniere
Università degli Studi »G. d'Annunzio«
Chieti-Pescara
Viale Pindaro, 42
IT–65127 Pescara
Italia
e-mail: p.lazarevic@unich.it

Marin Martinić Jerčić

Institut za filozofiju
Ulica grada Vukovara 54
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: marin@ifzg.hr

Ivica Martinović

Institut za filozofiju
Ulica grada Vukovara 54
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: ivica@ifzg.hr

Snježana Paušek-Baždar

Zavod za povijest i filozofiju znanosti
HAZU
Ante Kovačića 5
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: spbazdar@hazu.hr

Olga Perić

Grškovićeve 36
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: olga.peric@zg.t-com.hr

Ivana Skuhala Karasman

Institut za filozofiju
Ulica grada Vukovara 54
HR–10000 Zagreb
Croatia
e-mail: ivana_skuhala@net.hr

Franjo Sokolić

Odjel za fiziku
Prirodoslovno-matematički fakultet
Sveučilište u Splitu
Teslina 12
HR–21000 Split
Croatia
e-mail: franjo.sokolic@pmfst.hr

Erika Zlatkov

Ul. bratov Učakar 44
SI–1000 Ljubljana
Slovenia
e-mail: erika.zlatkov@gmail.com

DODATAK: POPRATNI TEKSTOVI UZ SIMPOZIJ

Ideja sveučilišta



APPENDIX: SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS OF THE SYMPOSIUM

The Idea of the University

- **Richard Francis Gombrich**, British Higher Education Policy in the last Twenty Years: The Murder of a Profession (INDOLOGY: Resources for Indological Scholarship, <http://indology.info/papers/gombrich/>)
- **Richard Francis Gombrich**, Why Has British Education Gone So Wrong, and Why Can't We Stop the Rot? Popper's Nightmare (*Hurly-Burly /Intl. Lacanian Jnl of Psychoanalysis/*, /1/ Mai 2009, pp. 185–192)
- **Konrad Paul Liessmann**, Akademische Bildung. Ein Leitfaden für neue Eliten (*Recherche – Zeitung für Wissenschaft*, <http://www.recherche-online.net/liessmann-akademische-bildung.html>)

RICHARD F. GOMBRICH

Faculty of Oriental Studies & Balliol College, University of Oxford, United Kingdom

British Higher Education Policy in the last Twenty Years: The Murder of a Profession

Preamble

This is the text of a lecture I gave on 7 January 2000 in Tokyo at the Graduate Institute of Policy Studies (GRIPS). The title – not the subtitle – had been assigned to me. I was asked to speak for an hour, which explains the rather unsatisfactory division of material between the main text on the one hand and the footnotes and appendices on the other. The lecture was simultaneously translated into Japanese. I have only added to the text as I delivered it a very few words of clarification.

In introducing me, Professor Aoki Tamotsu made it clear, at my request, that I was adhering strictly to the topic assigned, and it would be quite wrong to deduce that I saw no good in British higher education. Had I been asked to talk of that in general, I would have given a different lecture.

I also made it clear in answering questions that I had not the slightest wish to impugn the value of training people in special skills and equipping them for the job market. On the contrary, I recognise that every country has an obligation to do this for its citizens as well as it can. I do however see a crucial difference between education and training, and it is this which concerns me in the lecture.

British higher education policy over the last twenty years has been an unmitigated catastrophe.

When a stranger from a distant place pronounces so uncompromising a message of doom, the natural and sensible reaction must be to suspect exaggeration, maybe even hysteria or paranoia. Over the next hour I have two tasks. The easy one, alas, will be to justify my words.¹ The more difficult one will be to fit into the short time available enough facts, analysis and argument to do justice to the gravity of my topic. Most lecturers are megalomaniac: they think they are so worth listening to that they should be allowed to harangue the audience forever. So what is special about my talk today? I wish well to Japan in general and to Japanese universities in particular. I hear that you are in danger of repeating some of our mistakes. I fervently hope that I can prevent you from imitating a nation that has recently destroyed what I think **were** widely

¹ Before coming to Japan I told quite a few academic friends and colleagues of how I proposed to start this lecture. Not a single one demurred.

regarded as some of the world's best universities. To do so, I feel that I must not merely analyse what has been happening but also explain the fundamental reasons why we have gone so wrong. I think we have not even been asking the right questions about higher education, let alone giving good answers. So in the last part of this lecture I shall explain my own starting point, and talk about three interrelated themes which I regard as crucial: about **truth** in human society, about **education** as a human activity, and about **professionalism**, or what it is to be a professional. On my way, I shall be illustrating the dehumanizing illusion of quantification, negative egalitarianism (also known as jealousy), and the arrogance of power.

So what should I do in my allotted hour? My first draft was far too long, so, for better or for worse, I have made two decisions. I have decided that my top priority must be to make clear the main lines of my argument; and that to convey to you a picture of what has happened I should not deny myself the use of what some call "anecdotal evidence", with the implication that such evidence is arbitrary and selective. Both decisions make the lecture more personal. I have made them because the statistics and many other data are easily obtainable from published sources, and because the fact that my text is being circulated allows me to do what I normally avoid and provide extra material, including some remarks I think important, in footnotes and appendices which are only in the written version.

The most important published source is known as the Dearing Report.² In 1996 the government appointed a commission under the chairmanship of Sir Ron Dearing, who had recently re-organized the Post Office. Its remit was to consider how higher education in the UK should develop over the next twenty years. Its seventeen members were drawn mainly from higher education and from business and industry. Neither the British Academy nor the Royal Society (the organizations which embody our leading scholars in the humanities³ and science respectively) was represented, nor, so far as I know, were either museums or libraries. The committee was appointed with bipartisan support, so it hardly matters that it began under a Conservative government and reported, 14 months later, to a Labour one. The report has 466 pages and makes 93 recommendations. It was welcomed by the government and most of it is likely to be implemented. It begins by making the right noises: the chairman's introductory comment ends with an elevating quotation from a British Poet Laureate, John

² The National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, *Higher Education in the learning society*, HMSO 1997.

³ The traditional British term is 'arts', but I take it that 'humanities' is more familiar in Japan. Like many other features of American education, it is also becoming familiar in Britain.

Masefield, about the pursuit of truth and “the dignity of thought and learning”. These topics disappear after Chapter One, and the bulk of the report shows that the committee, if it ever kept these ideals in mind, was unable to find any link between them and the pragmatics of making policy. Thus, while the committee has lots to say about topics that government policy had already brought to the fore, notably quality control, access (who is to attend university) and finance, in my eyes it massively misses the point.⁴

1) Make-believe as government policy

In 1992 John Major’s government passed a Further and Higher Education Act which brought dramatic change to higher education. Since 1965, British higher education had been organized on what was called the “binary system”, binary because divided between universities and other institutions, mainly polytechnics and teachers’ training colleges. The degrees awarded by the latter institutions were validated by the Council for National Academic Awards;⁵ they had a strong bias towards vocational and applied subjects, and their teaching staff were not expected to publish research, though they were certainly not prohibited from doing so. The universities received block grants from the government through a small body of academics called the University Grants Committee (UGC);⁶ the UGC had considerable autonomy and the universities had a great measure of discretion how to spend their grants, which until the late 1970s were given for five years at a time. Polytechnics, like state schools, were under local governments, which also gave them a more local character.⁷

In 1992 the binary system was abolished and the former polytechnics etc mostly became universities, with corresponding changes in other areas of nomenclature, so that their executive heads became Vice-chancellors or Principals and most senior teachers became professors. (In Britain the title of Professor is reserved for those who in America are called “full professor”, and a

⁴ The most recent official source on our topic is the debate on higher education held in the House of Lords in the week before Christmas. In my eyes it is not so woefully inadequate as the Dearing Report, but still fails to focus on the fundamental questions. For some details, see Appendix 1 below.

⁵ I served as a member of its Theology and Religious Studies Board 1983-90.

⁶ In 1988 under Mrs Thatcher, this was superseded by the University Funding Council (UFC), which was directly under government control.

⁷ The only private university in Britain, Buckingham, was founded in the late 1970s and is of no importance; nor has it escaped the bureaucratic control described below. At Oxford and Cambridge the colleges are private educational foundations, legally autonomous and with their own resources, but indirectly, through student fees etc., they are financially quite dependent on the state.

professorship is the same as a chair.) There are now 132 members of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP), and all the institutions they head answer to a huge new bureaucracy called the Higher Education Funding Council for England and Wales (HEFCE).⁸ HEFCE and the CVCP jointly finance another body called the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA). Money for research also comes to the universities through the Research Councils, and, for science, from contracts with government and industry. It is significant that the science research councils come under the government Dept of Trade and Industry and are formally required “to distribute their funds in such a way as to facilitate the creation of wealth (...); they have businessmen as chairmen and a substantial lay membership.”⁹

Since 1992, all universities compete for funds on an equal footing; all must follow the same rules and apply the same standards. Officially all degrees are equal. I doubt if there is anyone who believes this, but it is one of the lies we now have to tell. By nearly doubling overnight the number of university students,¹⁰ teachers and vice-chancellors the government cannot possibly have preserved standards in any of those bodies, but it is virtually tabu to say that this is government by make-believe and that the emperor has no clothes. The emasculation of the CVCP is particularly serious. This body never had much power but it would stand up for the universities. Now numbering 132, it is far too unwieldy to be effective, and not only includes many men (of course, hardly any women) who are not academics at all, but plenty of yes-men¹¹ and careerists – some of whom make excellent use of their devolved power to determine their own salaries.

2) The quantitative story

In 1961, 5% of young people in Britain received higher education; in 1997 the percentage was 34,¹² and the government’s declared policy is to raise it to 50. Over the last twenty years the number of students has more than doubled,

⁸ Scotland and Northern Ireland have their parallel controlling bureaucracies.

⁹ Quotation from Sir Keith Thomas’s Presidential Address to the British Academy, 1997, ms, p. 2.

¹⁰ The number of students in higher education was of course unaffected by this move, but was expanding rapidly in any case.

¹¹ At times the CVCP even goes over to the enemy. “We were alarmed to see that the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals has recently called for ‘a national policy’ for the humanities, urging that a Research Council for the Humanities and Arts should identify ‘national aspirations, needs [and] objectives’ . . . We are sceptical about so dirigiste an approach.” Sir Keith Thomas, *loc.cit.* in fn.8.

¹² Figures in this paragraph have been supplied by the AUT; some of those in the Dearing Report are slightly different. For more statistics on the expansion, see Appendix 1.

while the unit of funding per student (known as the “unit of resource”) has fallen by 40% and is still falling: the government has announced plans to cut it by 0.8% in the current year and 0.9% in each of the next two years. Between 1980 and 1997 alone, the staff-student ratio almost doubled, from 9:1 to 17.1.

In 1994–5 university expenditure on books and periodicals had fallen to less than one and a half volumes per student per year. As for the academic staff, a report commissioned by the government¹³ recently showed that salaries since 1981 alone have fallen by 30% compared with the average earnings of all other non-manual employees. Perhaps even more shocking, by 1997–8 42% of academic staff were on fixed-term contracts, and if the present trend continues over 50% will be thus casualized by 2003–4. Even at Oxford, an increasing proportion of the teaching is being done by staff on short-term and part-time contracts, who are of course cheaper to employ. Such casual workers do not get benefits such as pension rights.

3) Mrs Thatcher’s assault

Despite the steady increase in student numbers, Mrs Thatcher made savage cuts in higher education funding. In the years after she was first elected Prime Minister in 1979, there was much play with such clichés as “trimming the fat” and “cutting out the dead wood”. Her idea seemed to be that universities with their staff were like barrels of apples, which could be picked over and the rotten ones rejected, and that she was the first person ever to get this done. So far as I know no attempt has since been made to show that the proportion of dead wood or rotten apples was decreased by all the upheaval, or indeed that it achieved anything positive.

Perhaps I should pause to emphasize this point, since I understand that you may face a similar danger in Japan. When the government wants to seize power over education it calls it “reform”, but never explains what requires reform, what the universities have been doing wrong, beyond perhaps some meaningless phrase like “failure to modernize”, or connecting us with some unsatisfactory condition which is nothing to do with us.¹⁴ This is because if they were

¹³ The Betts Report. There is no sign that it will be acted upon.

¹⁴ In an open letter to the Secretary of State for Education in 1986, Oxford’s Vice-Chancellor wrote: “It is true that the economic performance of the country has been disappointing. It is also true that the universities contribute to the nation’s economic performance. But to infer, from a linking of these two statements, that higher education has been ineffective is neither logical nor just. It would be truer to say that an economic performance widely recognized to have been outstandingly bad has occurred in spite of the contribution of a higher education system which is widely recognized to be outstandingly good, and that in those circumstances the causes of the poor economic performance must be sought elsewhere.” (*Oxford University Gazette*)

told what correction was wanted, the universities could make it themselves without outside interference, whereas the real purpose of the “reform” is to make them impotent. Similarly, since the aim of the “reform” is so vague, it will never be possible to test whether the changes were justified by success.

Let me record two memories of those days of Thatcher cuts. Our Professor of Hebrew was retiring and we had to convince the authorities that the Chair should be maintained and a successor appointed. It is a Regius Chair, which means that the Prime Minister makes the appointment on behalf of the monarch – though these days it is customary for the Prime Minister to ascertain the wishes of the faculty rather than exercise personal preference. However, Mrs Thatcher was never one reluctant to put herself forward, so we thought it wise to consult someone who had just moved to Oxford from a high civil service post, in which he had come to understand the Prime Minister’s thinking. We showed him our draft, which began, “The Regius Professorship of Hebrew at Oxford was founded by Henry the Eighth.” “Cut that,” said our advisor, “Her response will be ‘Then isn’t it time for a change?’” So much for the tradition of the humanities.¹⁵

But the scientists fared even worse. We had as a visitor at Balliol College the Harvard Dean Professor Don Price, who had advised the Kennedy administration on science policy. Sitting next to him at dinner one evening, I found him in a state of shock. That afternoon our Secretary of State for Education, Sir Keith Joseph, had visited Oxford off the record to address our assembled scientists. “If you want to do research,” he had said to them, “my advice to you is to emigrate.”

This background explains how it came about that when in January 1985 it was proposed to bestow an honorary degree on the Prime Minister, an Oxford graduate, the proposal was defeated in Congregation, the dons’ analogue to Parliament, by 738 votes to 319, the largest margin ever recorded. In thus snubbing the Prime Minister, the dons knew they were taking a political risk, but it was their one chance to record a protest which would be heard by the media. Professor Denis Noble, FRS, an eminent cardiac physiologist and founder

¹⁵ Let me here make a point of substance. It escapes rulers of academia who are not academics that the most important difference between science and the humanities is not that science is more expensive. It is that they have a different primary purpose. Science does indeed progress by novelty, by finding new facts and interpretations. The humanities, with a few exceptions like archaeology, rarely make true discoveries. Their purpose is rather to preserve traditions of learning and understanding, and to convey (mainly by teaching and example) insight into a wide range of human experience. To make “research productivity” a measure of success in the humanities is thus pointless, even harmful.

of the organization Save British Science, made the most telling speech. He described the government's education policies as

“... absolutely fundamental to the central purpose for which we and other educational institutions exist and to be producing possibly irreparable damage to those institutions. ... [S]he knows and has been warned that virtually everyone who knows what is happening in the science laboratories of this country is extremely alarmed... Sir Keith Joseph in a [recent] speech ... said, ‘Too many of our university laboratories are full of equipment that belongs in museums of industrial archaeology.’ Yet, in Parliament, six days later, he announced a [huge] cut in the equipment grant.”¹⁶

Professor Noble reported that the President of the Royal Society had recently predicted that if things went on like this, “the contribution made by Britain to world science will be severely reduced.” Sadly, that prediction has been fulfilled. Just a month ago Prof. Noble published an article¹⁷ about the steep fall in Britain's share of Nobel prizes and other major international science prizes; he convincingly predicts that unless salaries rise dramatically, the decline will be irreversible.¹⁸

What laboratories are to science, libraries are to the humanities – though the libraries cost less. While expenditure on books and periodicals for university libraries was cut to the bone and beyond, government policy initiated in the Thatcher years and continued since has been to minimize the public subsidy of culture. Museums and libraries have been hit very hard. Even the British Library had its funds so cut that it had to curtail its purchase of foreign books to the point at which buying in some languages has stopped altogether. It may be believed that the Internet makes books redundant, but the very books the library is missing are most unlikely ever to be recorded electronically. Once such gaps in acquisition have gone on for a couple of years the lost ground cannot be recovered and the collection will never again be satisfactory. This means

¹⁶ Professor Noble's speech in Congregation on 29 January 1985 was released to the Press. He prepared a copy of it with invaluable footnotes; it will be deposited in the GRIPS library.

¹⁷ Denis Noble, “A Future for Science”, *Oxford Magazine* 172, Eighth Week Michaelmas term 1999, pp.1–5.

¹⁸ There was little remission in the decline of funding for science over the period. For example, much damning information appeared in a short article by the Science Editor of the *Independent* newspaper entitled “Science chiefs' budget attacks were suppressed”. (*Independent*, 10 September 1992, p. 6) The government had grossly falsified the figures by double-counting some allocations, and had suppressed publication of a warning letter sent them in May 1990 by the Advisory Board for the Research Councils. Its chairman had written: “On present government plans, the proportion of the nation's wealth deployed through the science budget will have declined by 15% between 1981 and 1994.”

that in certain fields British scholars will have to rely on libraries abroad, probably the library of Congress.

4) The motives for the assault

On 8 June 1984 *The Times Higher Education Supplement* published a long and densely argued editorial entitled “Popper’s nightmare”. Karl Popper, I am sure you know, was a philosopher famous for his attacks on totalitarianism and his warnings against allowing too much power to the state. The editorial discusses the “grand political irony” that “No previous government has so successfully aggrandized the power of the state while simultaneously and loudly proclaiming its deepest wish to roll back its frontiers.” The editor says (disingenuously, in my opinion) that all governments would like to “centralize the power to take decisions”, but “the early 1980s will be regarded in the future as a decisive episode in the creation of a tightly coordinated system of higher education under strict national direction. ... Sir Keith Joseph ... is the first secretary of state with the power to set a national policy.” He acquired this power through the cuts, and “the stick is mightily more effective than the carrot.” After commending Sir Keith for thus acquiring the power to “make education more relevant to the conditions of modern society”, and reassuring the reader, rather unconvincingly,¹⁹ that he would not abuse his power, the editorial quotes Karl Popper:

“The holistic planner overlooks the fact that it is easy to centralize power but impossible to centralize all knowledge which is distributed over many individual minds, and whose centralization would be necessary for the wise wielding of centralized power. But this fact has far-reaching consequences. Unable to ascertain what is in the minds of many individuals, he must try to control and stereotype interests and beliefs by education and propaganda. But this attempt to exercise power over minds must destroy the last possibility of finding out what people really think, for it is clearly incompatible with the free expression of thought, especially of critical thought. Ultimately it must destroy knowledge; and the greater the gain in power, the greater will be the loss of knowledge.”²⁰

The editor concludes that “perhaps there may be some substance to fears of a Tory offensive against intellectual dissent. For what from the top of the system can appear nothing more than a sensible administrative policy may

¹⁹ The editor goes so far as to admit that in “some recent decisions” he had “confused his constitutional authority with his private prejudices”, and mentions his “hostile scepticism about social science”. In conversation with a Balliol colleague of mine, Sir Keith said that the social sciences were “inherently left-wing”.

²⁰ For current evidence of this, see Appendix 5.

seem at the bottom a deadly ideological assault. So we arrive at Popper’s nightmare.”

Mrs Thatcher made her name as a free marketeer, believing that the economy did best if economic agents were allowed autonomy. In particular, the state should not try to “second guess” the decisions of businessmen. By contrast, she was the greatest centralizer of power Britain has known in modern times²¹ and energetically promoted the state’s “second guessing” the decisions of local government and the professions – in fact, of everyone except businessmen. I shall discuss to what extent her policies for higher education, and those of subsequent governments, have followed mercantilist and to what extent they have rather followed dirigiste principles. First, however, I must try to explain the thinking – or, more accurately, the attitudes – which underlie this approach to educational policy.

In this period, the early 1980s, Enoch Powell²² published an article in *The Times* in which he protested that economic growth should have the purpose of promoting education, not *vice versa*. Nothing could be more alien to Mrs Thatcher’s mind set. While many have noted her hostility to the professions, few seem to have understood its roots.

Lawyers, doctors and teachers are “professionals” in the sense that they profess a “calling”, analogous to a religious calling, to promote a general good, be it justice, health or education. To carry out their work requires both expertise and an ethical commitment.²³ They get paid for their work, but it is virtually impossible for outsiders to evaluate it, so one of their commitments is not to overcharge. They take **responsibility** for exercising their **judgment** in the interest of their clients. The public, though suspicious of lawyers, has generally been inclined to **trust** the professions and to allow them to regulate their own affairs through professional councils.

For Thatcherism, this is all cant and hogwash. The professions are interest groups, just like other interest groups, and interest means only one thing, economic interest. If doctors want money to be spent on health, that is just because they want to get richer. Words like responsibility, judgment and trust

²¹ It is only fair to point out that the subsequent governments headed by John Major and Tony Blair have been happy to inherit this centralized control. Blair has granted considerable autonomy to Scotland and Wales and allowed London once again to have its own unitary local government, but has done nothing whatever to restore power to the professions.

²² He had been a minister in an earlier Conservative government, in the days when the name “Conservative” still meant that, rather than “right radical”. Earlier he had been a Professor of Greek. Though I abhorred some of his views, for he was an extreme British nationalist, no one could deny his intelligence or his independence of thought.

²³ For doctors this is embodied in the Hippocratic oath.

are just a smokescreen. Just as the government must act in the economy to see that business interests have what is nowadays called “a level playing field”, it must unmask the pretensions of these so-called “professional” interest groups and level the playing field to ensure that doctors have no more privileges than, say, butchers.

In her belief that only the economy is real, the rest is just rationalization, Mrs Thatcher echoed Marx’s distinction between base and superstructure. The irony goes far deeper than that identified by the *Times* leader: Britain’s most right-wing Prime Minister was also the most Marxist. Les extremes se touchent.

This belief that in the end only money counts has led our rulers into a logical fallacy which explains many of the disasters that have befallen our education system. If the economy is all that is real, everything has its price, which means that everything, or at least everything that matters, can be quantified. Moreover, only quantity can be accurately measured and hence evaluated by bureaucrats. If something cannot be measured, it is literally of no account.

Marxism was not the only major influence on Mrs Thatcher. She came from a cultural background of Protestant non-conformism.²⁴ The oldest strain of such non-conformism is Calvinist, Puritan. Puritanism is at the same time both pro-wealth and anti-luxury. The Calvinists have always believed that the righteous are marked out by achieving worldly wealth, a sign of God’s favour. So getting rich is not just pleasant, but even morally desirable. Luxury, however, is an impediment to wealth; gratification is to be postponed to the afterlife. When Mrs Thatcher visited her Oxford college and was told that a girl student to whom she was being introduced studied mediaeval history, she exclaimed, “What a luxury!” That was not an approving remark.

The non-conformist movement that had the most influence in Britain was the Methodism of John Wesley. Wesley was suspicious of the intellect. The Protestant tradition since Luther has held that salvation comes about through faith alone, and the intellect is generally more an enemy than a friend to faith. It tends to make people think they know better and thus to indulge in the sin of pride. British culture has a horror of “showing off”. Even in schools, teachers will reprimand children who get too many answers right too fast: “Be careful, bighead, not to bump your head on the wall.”

English may thus be the only language in the world where the word “clever” is not necessarily a term of praise – though you cannot learn this from a dictionary. It is fine for a dog to be clever, as shown by its catching a ball, and it is

²⁴ I do not know whether she is personally religious, though I doubt it, but that is not relevant.

all right to be clever at a specific task, or even to be clever with your hands. So “clever” is a term of praise when it means skilful or well trained. But for a person to be described as clever in the sense of intelligent, of having general potential rather than a specific accomplishment, carries a strong overtone of moral dubiousness. This has enormous, and in my view disastrous, consequences for the British view of the relation of education to training. It also helps to explain Mrs Thatcher’s distrust (if that is not too weak a word) of academics and intellectuals.

5) The main strands of policy: mercantilism and dirigisme

By “mercantilism” I here mean belief in the value of a free market. We have not yet seen much of that in higher education, for all the rhetoric.

The famous example of a higher education system based on free market principles is that of the United States. Admiration for that system must presumably explain why in recent years British universities have been forced to follow the American model in certain respects, even though those changes have nothing to do with a free market. All English universities except Oxford and Cambridge have switched from our traditional three-term academic year to the American system of two semesters. They have also abandoned the traditional one-subject or two-subject BA degree courses, intended to promote depth, in favour of the American “modular system”, in which students take courses which mostly last only one semester. Since each course is examined, there is far more examining than under the old system, in which exams were confined to the end of the academic year.²⁵ Examining, like all evaluation, is a form of administration and takes time away from what used to be considered the essential duties of university teachers: teaching and research. At some of our universities there is now hardly any teaching between the Easter break and the summer holidays: the teachers are examining full-time.

Twenty years after Thatcher’s arrival, there is no free market in British higher education, for the simple reason that universities are not even free to set their own prices. It is the government that sets the level of fees. There is a debate nowadays about how much students should pay and how, but as it is unresolved I shall not discuss it except to say that universities are so desperately poor that what matters most is for them to get some more money, however it

²⁵ Oxford, an extreme case, examines even less: there are no formal exams in the second year of the 3-year BA course. There is plenty of informal feedback from tutors, but the idea is, or used to be, that students should take some responsibility for pacing themselves and monitoring their own progress, rather than being nannied like small children.

may come.²⁶ If a university is to be modelled on a commercial enterprise, it is also wholly unclear who the customers are: the students or the taxpayers. The model vacillates. It is also unclear what the product is: sometimes it appears to be student qualifications, at other times national wealth. With such muddle and ambiguity in the policies which are supposed to guide them, it is no wonder that the universities are easy targets for criticism, which then is used to justify ever greater control.

Rhetoric tends to place the student as customer; John Major's government was especially fond of this switch in perception. But only the stupidest customer buys a pig in a poke, so the student must be able to see what she is buying. Education used to mean placing yourself in the hands of a teacher whom you trusted to give you what you needed. To some extent this model still works for doctors, since few people feel competent to judge their own medical requirements; accordingly, doctors have not wholly lost their professional status. One of the words most heard in higher education nowadays is "transparency". You must lay out your wares for the customer to see while considering purchase. This means far more than advertising on the Internet what subjects a course will cover. It is not enough to promise your pupil to exercise your professional judgment on her behalf; that is considered "subjective" and hence undesirable. The bureaucrat requires allegedly "objective", quantitative criteria.²⁷ The word 'education' etymologically contains the Latin root meaning 'to lead', but a vendor cannot lead his customer, only mislead her. "The customer is always right" is the basic mercantilist adage.

In fact, of course, most students have more sense than to behave like commercial customers. The client we really have to try to satisfy is the government. The government says it is only acting as agent for the taxpayer, but we can hardly treat the taxpayer as a customer, since it is hopeless to try selling to a customer from whom you can have no feedback. Here too there is no market. In free markets some businesses fail and others succeed, even predominate. But on the one hand, our government does not want any university to fail and go bankrupt, as this would waste the public money already invested. On the other hand, no university must be too commercially successful either. When recently a Vice-Chancellor asked "that state funds should be made available to match money which has been raised by universities' own efforts," a member of

²⁶ "Only about one third of the total income of the University of Oxford is now derived from the Higher Education Funding Council." Lord Butler, Master of University College, Oxford, quoted in the report of the House of Lords debate (see footnote 4). In the same source, the parallel figure for the London School of Economics is only 26%.

²⁷ We have even been warned about the use of qualitative judgments in testimonials: we should "stick to the facts".

the Commons Education Select Committee killed the proposal by merely saying: “My worry is that ... that will lead to universities like Oxford and Cambridge simply getting a lot of money.”²⁸ We shall see more of this very British form of egalitarianism. What is on view here is not mere jealousy. It is also the confusion between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome (“all shall have prizes”), especially common in the Labour Party, that bedevilled the introduction of comprehensive secondary schools in the 1960s and ‘70s.²⁹

Markets do imply competition, but about that too we have much talk and little action.³⁰

While there is really no market in British higher education, I suppose that begging is a kind of commerce. We call it fundraising. It is an established feature of the American scene, in which universities all employ beavies of professional fundraisers and there is what they call a “culture of giving”; even in the income tax system there is a presupposition that one will make donations to charities. In Britain people think that their taxes support cultural institutions, including universities, and resent the idea that they should give extra. Now, however, any university teacher who cares for his subject had better raise money for it if he wishes it to survive. I know that when I retire there will be no Buddhist studies at Oxford unless the money has been raised from private sources. I do not enjoy fundraising and have not been trained in it, so am probably not good at it; but there is no real choice.

Dependence on fundraising has its drawbacks for institutions concerned with the truth. Is advertising the most veridical form of human communication? For all its good qualities, we know, alas, that American universities are riddled with hype, exaggeration beyond all reason. Americans seeking a reference from a British academic usually feel the need to remind us that we cannot write for their market as we would write at home. No one there will get a job unless he is a “mega-star” at least, and the very word ‘average’, in any context, is the kiss of death. When we raise money, it is hard not to bend the truth. Most money comes from businessmen, and they naturally prefer to give money for subjects they regard as useful. I believe that management studies is the only field at Oxford which is not short of funds.³¹ It is hard to raise money for economics or sociology, much easier for an applied field like marketing;

²⁸ Quoted in Jasper Griffin, “A Don’s Dilemma”, *The Spectator*, 25 September 1999, pp. 20–21.

²⁹ We shall meet this again in Appendix 4, where we discuss access (equality of opportunity) and dropout rates (equality of outcome).

³⁰ See Appendix 3 for a discussion.

³¹ I am sure they would deny this; but appetites are great, and management is not the most modest of subjects.

so the academic is likely to face the choice between pretending he is doing what he is not, which is dishonest, or doing just what he is paid to do, which is prostitution. The choice is somewhat humiliating.

We are about to have more commercialism at Oxford. Budgets will be devolved to individual faculties, which will be called “cost centres”, and there will be considerable financial autonomy. Instead of paying the salary of a professor of Sanskrit, the faculty will be able to use that money for teaching Turkish, equipping a new common room, or giving everyone a new computer. I can see a positive side to this, but it will also mean that we spend even less time on teaching and research. But who cares about that except an academic?

The recent trend for us to raise our own money and maybe even decide how to spend it is the only mercantilist strand in British higher education policy, which is overwhelmingly dirigiste. We are bureaucratized beyond belief. I have connections with a new university and helped them to set up some courses in Indian studies. For this I had to wait around all day to be interviewed by two committees. While I was waiting I talked to a history professor who was being interviewed with me and he told me he had to attend so many meetings that he had time to lecture for only one hour a week. After the meeting I had to fill in a three-page form, with questions on my opinion of the room in which I had been interviewed. This is called “quality control”. It is Orwellian Nuspeak, for it really denotes controlling quality only in the sense of pest control, i.e. keeping it down.

The central plank of the ideological platform of our “quality control” is the concept of “value added”, which of course comes straight from Marx.³² This is “value added per student”. To calculate this figure, you take the value of the student when she enters the university, her value when she leaves (typically 3 years later, with a first degree), and deduct the former figure from the latter; you then take the average for the students who have passed through in the period under consideration. Marx wrote of the alienation of treating people as objects, but I doubt that even he envisaged that students could be so commoditized. It is hard for Oxford or Cambridge to score well for “value added” because we take students who are already “valuable”, i.e., well qualified; so this calculation works somewhat like the English schoolteacher’s reprimand and warns us not to get bigheaded.

Above all, “Quality control” is a means of denying academics the right to act as professionals. On a recent inspection of Oxford teaching, the inspector sat in on a history tutorial. The student read an essay, the teacher discussed it with him. In the course of the discussion the teacher rose and pulled a book

³² The German term is *Mehrwert*.

out of his bookcase to show it to the student. The inspector asked if it was on the syllabus. It was not, so the teacher was officially criticized for introducing an element into his teaching which had not been previously announced. Spontaneous interaction with a student and the exercise of judgment are both frowned on.

The model for the university is now the factory. The factory mass-produces qualified students, thus adding value to the raw material. The academics, the workers on the shop floor, are there merely to operate the mechanical procedures which have been approved by the management and checked by the inspectorate. Since they are mere operatives, they can of course be paid accordingly. Recent job advertisements show that a secretary in the university and a young lecturer get the same salary – something over sixteen thousand pounds a year. In Oxford you cannot buy even a tiny house, or raise a family, on that money.

Our rulers claim, of course, that they are not controlling what we do, only how we do it. This claim is either stupid or disingenuous, for the two cannot be separated – as was realised by the editorial I have quoted. So how are we now regulated? I could tell you of the horrors of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and the Teaching Quality Assessment (TQA), but those come only every 4 or 5 years. I have chosen instead to take examples which impinge on my life almost daily.

6) Removing professional responsibility

My first example concerns something that we have imposed on ourselves at Oxford, but it is in accordance with the ubiquitous principles of “quality control”. These are now so pervasive that probably few people would understand what I am complaining about.

The career of a research student at Oxford is organized broadly as follows. On admission by the graduate studies committee of the appropriate faculty, she is assigned to a supervisor. The supervisor writes termly reports three times a year on the student’s progress; they are read by the chairman of the graduate studies committee and by the student’s personal advisor at her college, either of whom can intervene if anything seems amiss. The student can change supervisor at the request of either party – though such requests are infrequent. When the student submits her thesis, it is examined by two people not the supervisor, who are chosen by the graduate studies committee, often on the supervisor’s advice and always with the student’s consent, in the sense that the student has the right to object to a particular nomination. One of the examiners is usually from outside Oxford; both may be. The supervisor is rigidly excluded from the

examining process. The career of a doctoral student between admission and submission is formally divided into three stages; to proceed from one stage to the next she has to submit written work and the supervisor recommends the promotion on a form.

Within the last decade, this progression has been greatly elaborated. At both the intermediate stages, the student's written work must now be assessed by two people not the supervisor; they also interview the student and send written reports to the graduate studies committee.

Any supervisor worth his salt will advise a student to consult specialist colleagues when appropriate; there has never been any bar to this. Moreover, there are few matters in life on which it is not worth having a second opinion. Here, however, we have bureaucratic overkill. The present system has four drawbacks, two for the student and two for the teachers.

Firstly, students see themselves as undergoing three examinations instead of one, and so suffer more nervous tension. Second, there are few topics on which five or more academics will entirely agree, so that the student often receives conflicting advice.

For the teachers, the amount of examining everyone has to do is multiplied, whereas – I repeat – examining is a form of administration and so should be minimized to leave time and energy for teaching and research. But the last drawback is the worst. The traditional relationship between teacher and pupil is replaced by an impersonal mechanism. The teacher's responsibility for the student is removed; in fact, no individual now takes responsibility: if anything goes wrong it is just system failure and nobody takes the blame. Nor, if all goes well, does anyone deserve credit: why should a student be grateful to a supervisor who is just doing his job along prescribed lines?

The supervisor has even effectively lost the power to decide when a thesis is ready for submission. For this it is the higher powers, the agencies of government, who are responsible. To their undying shame, the British Academy, which for a while acted like a research council (though an exceptionally poor one) for the humanities, decided³³ in 1991 to recommend to the government, which of course accepted,³⁴ that students should finish their doctorates in three or at most four years of graduate study. The motive behind this was power, not saving money. Scientists, who begin their research careers in a far more tightly controlled environment, are normally set a piece of work for the doctorate,

³³ Strictly, the proposal came from a Joint Working Group of the British Academy and the CVCP.

³⁴ In 1988 the government had proposed a target for theses to be submitted in 4 years.

which is completed in three years. Humanities research students were taking far longer, though less long than their American counterparts.

If one is lucky enough to be among the very few students who get a state grant to pursue research in the humanities, that grant is given for three, or in very few cases for four years of study. If the student studies for longer, it is entirely at her own expense: she costs the State nothing, and the marginal cost of her presence at the university is incalculably small. Nevertheless, any department in the humanities or social sciences in which students are taking over four years to complete their doctorates is penalized by no longer being allowed to take research students who are on state funding. The reason for delay is irrelevant: whether the student was ill, employed, or fulfilling family responsibilities makes no difference to the operation of the policy.³⁵

To earn a doctorate, a thesis used to have to be judged “an original contribution to knowledge”. This wording has been changed to “a significant and substantial contribution”, which is thus glossed in the regulations: “Examiners shall bear in mind that their judgment of the substantial significance of the work should take into account what may reasonably be expected of a capable and diligent student after three or at most four years of full-time study.”

The British Academy document actually says (in paragraph 8) that “the standards set by some scholars and institutions for doctoral theses in the humanities, although commendable, are too high.” In February 1992 Balliol College wrote a letter of reasoned protest to the President of the British Academy,³⁶ but of course it had no effect. The new policy would mean, wrote Balliol, that “the theses produced in British universities would cease to be serious works of scholarship comparable with the theses produced in any other European university.”

Some supervisors are still taking the risk of maintaining standards, though this means being badgered with inquiries from the authorities, and may lead to the blacklisting of their departments. Their replies may have to bend the truth, but at least they avoid the far worse lie of pretending that an Oxford doctorate is still what it used to be and conniving in the policy of make-believe.

³⁵ One of the first departments to be hit was economics at Cambridge. This is, or certainly was, the most distinguished economics department in Britain. Its research students tended to be employed, before finishing their doctorates, at such prestigious institutions as the World bank and IMF. So the department’s four-year completion rate was poor, and soon it found itself with only foreign research students, plus perhaps the rare British student rich enough to pay the fees from his own pocket.

³⁶ This was A.J.P. Kenny, who had been Master of the college. He was subsequently knighted by John Major’s government.

7) The modern consensus: universities as instruments of social and economic policy

Early last month the Prime Minister, Tony Blair, lectured in Oxford on education. Of higher education he had only two things to say: that it should take more young people from the working class³⁷ and that it should keep Britain internationally competitive (in economic terms).³⁸ The promotion of social equality and economic growth are indeed the main two topics nowadays when universities are discussed. I wholeheartedly support both these aims of government. But are universities the instruments which can realize them?

Universities can draw a small percentage of young people from the working class into the middle class, but nothing like enough to make a great impact on society.

Besides, the less the university they join is like a real university, the less it can do for its students. The problems of class division require remedial action on many fronts, and those remedies need to reach the child long before he or she is old enough to attend a university. The biggest problem of all is parental ambitions, and to change these could well take a whole generation.

The main contribution of universities to economic growth must be through applied science. That will not flourish if we neglect fundamental scientific research, nor can any science flourish at universities if there is no money to pay for salaries or laboratories. British science has been starved of funds for years, and with so little input it is again sheer make-believe to expect much output.

If our universities maintain a good reputation abroad, they can earn by attracting foreign students – and they have indeed been doing so. To continue to do so, however, they must maintain the value of British degrees. There is alas the plainest of evidence that the lure of short-term gain is killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. The substitution of something called “quality control” for the true quality of professionalism is make-believe of Orwellian dimensions.

8) A fundamentally different view of universities

Our Prime Minister apparently thinks that the purpose of universities is to promote social engineering and economic progress. I would like to put forward, as briefly as I can, an alternative view.

Institutions work best if they have clear goals and are designed to achieve those goals. Hospitals are for care of the sick, orchestras for playing music,

³⁷ The technical term for this issue is access. See Appendix 4.

³⁸ On this see footnote 14 above.

and they should be used for those goals, entrusted to the professionals who understand them, and only judged by how well they fulfil them. Universities are for truth: to promote its pursuit (curiosity) and encourage its use under all circumstances.

Two questions arise. Do we need to pursue truth? And are universities the only institution to do that? To take the second question first: religious bodies may claim to, but they are only interested in a few issues and perfectly indifferent to most of the questions asked in academia; moreover, they are not prepared to question absolutely anything or to follow the truth wherever it leads them. It is academic scientists who are, they say, on the verge of creating life in a laboratory. They are probably wise to ask the churches what they think of this, but the churches would never have made the discoveries, nor are the scientists bound to heed their advice.

But do we need institutions committed to truth? Just think of the many places where there have been or are none, the countries ruled by Hitler and Stalin. Britain gave to the world, through its Parliament, the concept of Her Majesty's loyal opposition. It is very odd and very sad that our politicians today cannot see why the country should need a permanent and flourishing loyal opposition, trained to question and not to accept shoddy answers. Worse, academics are being forced to lie and to connive at half-truths. But truth matters everywhere, not just in politics. Think of how little has been achieved intellectually under Hitler, Stalin, or any totalitarian regime. Truth can more than pay for its keep pragmatically. But it has a more than pragmatic value.

This brings me to education. I suppose that society requires from government four things: security, justice, health and education. Health and education, full use of one's body and mind, are surely analogous. Unfortunately, they are viewed differently, at least in Britain. Sickness of body is regarded as exceptional, requiring remedial action, full health as normal, the default mode. The mind is regarded in the opposite way: untutored ignorance is thought of as natural, and any interference with that ignorance is a kind of bonus or, as Mrs Thatcher would say, a luxury. Can poor Britain afford such luxuries? Well, in the eighties someone had the bright idea of printing a button for people like me to wear; it said: "If you think education is expensive, try ignorance."

As I have indicated, the English are afraid and ashamed of "cleverness". That is a major reason why universities are justified as places of training for the job market, and not for the education they provide. The latter squeezes in, in today's vocabulary, as "transferable skills": ability to reason or to express oneself fluently can enhance performance in any job and so can be justified in pragmatic terms. So perhaps can some of the subtler dispositions which education can enhance, such as curiosity, critical acumen, a sense of responsibility,

a catholic range of sympathy, aesthetic sensitivity, an independent spirit. Incidentally, my scientific colleagues agree with me that these can be enhanced by, and are certainly needed by, the study of the sciences as much as that of the humanities. But their ultimate justification is not pragmatic. They are the qualities which make us fully human. As Dante has Ulysses say: "We were not made to live like brutes, but to pursue virtue and knowledge."³⁹

What our rulers have wholly failed to realize is that education is a **human** activity.⁴⁰ It has to be human in its methods as well as its results, for the two are not entirely separable. Getting programmed information from a computer is valuable in its place, but it is training, not education. If we think back to our own education, most of us will remember very little of the specific things we were taught; what we remember is our teachers. It is our good teachers who have influenced us and to whom we feel grateful long after the examinable content of what they taught has been forgotten.

The reason for the success of Oxford and Cambridge is terribly simple: the students are taught individually. More than that, the college system breaks up the large numbers of a modern university into communities small enough for us all to know each other individually, and as we meet in all kinds of activities, not only at lessons or lectures, we see each other as whole people. That is why my students are my friends and keep in touch for years after they have left Oxford. This is an expensive system, but even so I think it gives value for money, and if society decides it can no longer be afforded, something special will have been lost. Diamonds are indeed expensive; but who cares about the price of fake diamonds?

Education occurs in human relationships, not only between teacher and pupil but also between fellow-students and between colleagues. That is why we need academic communities. These communities will be as full of failings as human beings always are. What should be special about them is that they should know and admit it. The good academic very often says, "I don't know" and "I am not sure"; he also says what one might do to find out, or explains why certainty will never be possible.

This intellectual honesty is being systematically destroyed. Like trust, judgment and responsibility, intellectual honesty is thought to have no cash

³⁹ *Fatti non fummo per viver come bruti Ma per seguir virtute e conoscenza.*

⁴⁰ Given that Thatcher, Blair, and several of the Ministers of Education have themselves been to Oxford, their blindness to educational values is, I must admit, a serious indictment of the education we have been providing. They simply do not realize what it is they have received. I think Oxford should make much more systematic and explicit efforts to eradicate anti-intellectualism among its students. How deeply ingrained such attitudes are!

value and thus to be worthless. In the kind of society we now inhabit, pay is an accurate index of esteem.⁴¹

In 1993, Conrad Russell published a book called *Academic Freedom*.⁴² Most of it had been written in 1991, but there is a despairing “Epilogue (April 1992)”, written in the light of the Further and Higher Education Act of that year. I only wish I could read to you the whole of that epilogue, for it describes the demise of the academic profession more elegantly and forcefully than I ever could – but it is too long. Let me however quote just one paragraph:

“[T]he idea of academic freedom must involve some sphere of autonomous professional judgment. There must be some things recognized as academic questions, to be decided by academics according to academic standards. It is this sphere which is now being whittled away to nothing. . . . If we cannot decide how to teach, what the standard of the degree should be, what its justification and purpose are, or whether students are good enough to be admitted, what academic freedom do we have left? Professionals must have standards: without them, both grounds of self-respect and utility to society disappear. If, one after another, every one of these standards must be sacrificed on the altar of ‘efficiency’, what sort of professionals do we have left when the job is done? Almost everything academics are now asked to do, most of them believe to be wrong. Even if they are in error in that belief (and the possibility must be admitted), so long as they hold it, in conscience they ought to act on it. If they do not, their claim to society’s respect, and indeed to their own, is forfeit. No one who has lost his professional self-respect can long remain good at his job.”⁴³

The academic profession, as some still call it, has been demoralized, pauperized and humiliated. The best a young academic can hope for is to take Sir Keith Joseph’s advice and emigrate to America.⁴⁴ Was my opening sentence an exaggeration?

Tokyo, January 2000

A) Appendix 1: Academic Recruitment Today

The House of Lords debate mainly interests me for what it said about academic recruitment. I rely on the report published in *The Times* by William

⁴¹ I am accordingly astonished and grateful that anyone who earns as little as I do should be thought worth listening to!

⁴² Routledge, London and New York. Conrad Russell (Lord Russell), son of the philosopher Bertrand Russell, is a Professor of History at the University of London. He is also now the Liberal Democrat Party spokesman on higher education.

⁴³ Russell, op.cit., p. 109.

⁴⁴ “[A]lready people are leaving Oxford and Cambridge for the USA in order to recover the opportunity to do research.” Russell, 1993, loc.cit.

Rees-Mogg, who edited that newspaper before it was bought by Rupert Murdoch. He summarizes:

“There was a general consensus that British universities are underfunded for the work they have to do, and our best universities are handicapped against those of the United States; that salaries are too low – well below those of the Civil Service; too much energy is taken up responding to bureaucracy; dropout rates are too high; students are accumulating large debts; and recruitment to academic posts is inadequate, particularly in science.”

He then quotes a statement that a quarter of all chairs in surgery are vacant and so are 74 clinical chairs in medicine, of which half have been vacant for more than a year.

It is becoming quite common in Oxford for first choices to turn down chairs, and not only in the sciences. Anyone who holds a chair abroad can hardly afford to move to Britain. I know of a recent case where the person invited to a prestigious Oxford chair would have had to take on about three times the work for a salary one third of what he currently earns. It is in the nature of things that such cases of appointments refused cannot be publicized; but they are extremely serious. At the other end of the scale, no bright young person is likely to become an academic in Britain when they could certainly earn twice as much elsewhere, and will not even have the time or opportunity to do much of the research which might attract them into academia. There are of course no statistics on brain drain, and even if there were any, they would record neither the people who have made their academic careers abroad from the beginning, nor the non-British academics who have tried a spell at a British university but decided – sometimes reluctantly – that they cannot afford to stay. The academic staff at all top universities is, after all, recruited internationally – as our rulers choose never to remember.

I come from an academic family and my own two children, now in their thirties, got excellent first class degrees at a top university, one in science and the other in humanities. It has never occurred to either of them to pursue an academic career.

Conrad Russell (see main text, fn.42) wrote in 1992: “Those who can get off the sinking ship, to America, to early retirement, or to another occupation, will presumably do so in growing numbers. This, though, gives no clue to policy for those left in charge of what remains.” We are still awaiting that clue.

B) Appendix 2: The Statistics of Expansion

The first major planned expansion of British higher education occurred as the result of the Robbins Report (1963). At that time there were 31 universities

in Britain. Since then there have been plenty of statistics published, but they are not easy to evaluate, because criteria and methods of counting have been changing. Accordingly, these statistics should only be used as giving an approximate idea. It is helpful to remember that over the period under consideration the population of Britain has hardly changed in number.

Full-time students in higher education

1960	just under 200,000
1970	just over 400,000
1980	almost the same
1990	about 650,000
1997	about 1,160,000

Figures for the number of universities vary bewilderingly. In 1997 the Dearing Report wrote: "Today there are 176 higher education institutions in the UK of which 115 are titled universities..." (para.3.83). The figure I have given for membership of the CVCP, 132, is more up to date but may slightly over-estimate the number of universities.

Chapter 3 of the Dearing Report has many statistical tables and charts, some with interesting international comparisons.

C) Appendix 3: Competition

There is no free market competition in British higher education, but disjointed fragments of policy have introduced certain competitive elements. Let me illustrate.

As part of a pay settlement for academic staff in the late '80s, it was prohibited by Mrs Thatcher's government to pay a flat rate at a given grade. Hitherto, all professors (in the British sense: the top academic grade) at Oxford and Cambridge had been paid the same salary. This peaceable arrangement saved much time, energy and emotional turmoil, and at Oxford a vote in Congregation confirmed that at least a majority preferred it. However, the government now forbade it. In the United States there is a free market in professorial salaries, so senior professors often move to more highly paid jobs, or use higher offers elsewhere to lever raises from their own universities. Since British universities cannot afford the cash to run such a system (which would also expose them even more blatantly to American competition), various compromise systems have been tried.

At Oxford there are now seven professorial salary grades. When a chair is being offered, the Vice-Chancellor has the power to negotiate the salary.

Once a professor is in post, he or she can apply when the grading is being re-considered, once every two or three years. In theory, grades are then awarded by “objective” criteria, in accordance with the principle of “transparency”; the level of excellence required in order to be classified at each grade is expressed in an official formula. In practice, however, there is a predetermined sum of money available for distribution, so that promotion cannot but be competitive. The whole process of application and award is confidential, so the system is only relatively “transparent”, and seems to me to be an unsatisfactory hybrid between our old, now forbidden, system and true competition.

The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) is nominally just that, an assessment of how good university departments have been over the past few years at producing research. But it also contains an element of competition. Let me describe the system as it operated in 1996, when I was an assessor for the second time.

Individual researchers are assessed at one of five grades, from A to E. Their departments, which submit their names and publications, are assessed at one of six grades: the top is 5*, the rest go down from 5 to 1. A complicated formula is prescribed to the assessors for converting a department’s set of individual grades into a single joint grade. The individual grades remain secret; the joint grades are published and determine the department’s level of research funding until the next RAE.

How is this calculated? The HEFCE assigns a sum of money to each joint grade from 5* to 1. Let us call these unknown figures u , v , w , x , y and z . (I suspect that z has a value of zero.) The values of these figures are not announced until the assessment is complete, nor is the total sum of money available for distribution. The money awarded to the department is then the value corresponding to its joint grade multiplied by the number of names submitted.

Let me give an example. Prof. P. heads a department of 9 academic staff, 5 of whom he knows to publish good research, even though he cannot be sure how good the assessors will think it. Another 2 of the staff have published nothing worth mentioning, so he is disinclined to submit their names at all. There are however also two who have published research in the relevant period but he finds their work undistinguished. If he submits their names, his department will probably get a lower joint grade than if he left them out. He guesses that without them his department will get a 5 and so be at level v ; with them, he expects a 4 and level w . So if their names do not go forward he expects to get $v \times 5$ pounds, with them $w \times 7$ pounds. The trouble is that he has no idea of the values of v and w , so even if he is clever (and lucky) enough to predict the ranking correctly, he cannot calculate his better tactic, but has to guess. In the end it might even turn out, to his frustration, that he should have submitted all

9 names, because even though the other two pull the joint grade down to a 3, $x \times 9$ pounds turns out to be the biggest of the three sums.

Is this a serious way of funding academic research, or a kind of sadistic party game?

One does not have to be a social Darwinist, as I think Mrs Thatcher was, to agree that competition has value in many areas of human life. Academics naturally compete to make discoveries and to impress their peers and students. It is possible (though untestable) that the British university system for a long time profited from being bicephalous: the friendly rivalry between Oxford and Cambridge is harmless and may be beneficial. However, competition for limited resources, as in both cases given above, is another matter, and in many cases seems an insane way of running the university system: co-operation would be both pleasanter and far more efficient.

Take the example of subjects with low student demand, like oriental languages. If universities co-operated, they could jointly offer a good range of options without great expense. Students would have to move (either change residence or commute), but other countries have managed that, and indeed it ought to be a benefit of the modular course system. But competition prevents a sensible solution. Funding goes with the student, so no university wants a student to emigrate. For instance, some years ago I had a research student at Oxford who needed to learn Nepali. This language is taught only at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in London. The teacher was happy for him to join the class. However, the SOAS administration said that piece rate payments would not do: if he wanted to attend a SOAS class the student would have to enroll in SOAS and pay the full fees. Since he also needed to study some things at Oxford, and had paid Oxford his fees, that was of course impossible.

Competition means that academic hospitality is officially a thing of the past. What a nasty world we live in! I do still admit casual students to my classes free of charge, because luckily no one can stop me, but in doing so I am defying government policy.

D) Appendix 4: Access

‘Access’ is the technical term employed in education policy for making the social composition of the student body more closely reflect that of the population at large. It thus deals with the recruitment of women, ethnic minorities and “mature” students (i.e., those over 25), as well as with the working class (nowadays called socio-economic groups D and E, or IV and V). But it is the working class who are the real problem; those ethnic groups, for example, who

are under-represented at university are those who identify with the working class rather than the middle class.

This problem has a peculiarly English flavour. It is no accident that Marx wrote his theory of class in England. Economic class is of course a universal phenomenon. What I think (I am no specialist) is remarkable about England is this. Certain values, such as delaying sensual gratification, which translates into trying to save money, are perhaps typical of the middle class everywhere. In England, however, not only does the middle class set itself off from the working class with a set of self-conscious values and attitudes: the working class reciprocates. Just as the middle and upper classes are permeated by snobbery, the working class responds with a reverse snobbery. Enormous numbers of working class people do not want their children to join the middle class; they have a real counter-culture.

Obviously this is a vast and complex topic. British working-class counter-culture has more or less captured pop culture and the media, so that all young people feel it obligatory to flirt with it. Young members of the upper middle class, privately educated at expensive schools, arrive at Oxford and Cambridge affecting working class accents and dress styles; some even wear tattoos – though theirs are usually washable.

By and large the working class see universities as middle class institutions – which of course they have been – and hence reject them. I see this as part of the amazing hostility of the media to universities in general, but particularly to Oxford and Cambridge. The media cater to the mass market and love to portray Oxford dons as idle rich who spend their time swilling port and sherry at the taxpayer's expense. This image of dons as a kind of decadent aristocracy provides a hate object for the working class and the puritan middle class (like Mrs Thatcher) alike, and Edward Gibbon's strictures on Oxford when he attended it in the middle of the 18th century are still quoted as if they applied today.

It was only after the Second World War that Oxford and Cambridge became anything like what most of the world today thinks of as a university. They had hardly any graduate studies – even the dons did not have doctorates – and they were quite small, sub-divided into many colleges with perhaps a couple of hundred students apiece.

Rather few aristocrats bothered to go to university. Oxford and Cambridge recruited both students and teachers mainly from the upper middle and especially the professional classes. They also knew that they were training an elite to rule not merely Britain but the British Empire.

A Balliol colleague of mine, Jasper Griffin, recently published an article which begins as follows:

“There are few things on which mankind is so well agreed as on the unfairness of admission to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. That agreement does of course disappear as soon as we ask in what way it is unfair. ... On the left, it is an article of faith that the ancient universities grossly favour the wealthy products of private education. The present government actually plans to penalise Oxford and Cambridge by reducing their grants from central funds if they do not admit more undergraduates from comprehensives. ... Opinion in the *Daily Telegraph*, however, both of columnists and of correspondents, is convinced that Oxbridge already has an indefensibly biased policy of favouring comprehensive school pupils and is determined to exclude the academically more deserving products of public schools.”⁴⁵

The fact is that while Oxford has been trying for many years to devise an entrance procedure which will not disadvantage pupils from comprehensive schools, we also feel that we should take those students who show through academic achievement and potential, including attitudes, that they will profit from what we have to offer. Proof of our success in admitting suitable candidates is that only one or two percent drop out of the course, and even the percentage of third class degrees is down to around ten – though one must also remember that if there were no Thirds, a Lower Second would change its meaning. On the other hand, whatever we do, we never get more than about 50% of our undergraduates from the state sector – and I believe that Cambridge has the same experience. There are many schools from which pupils never apply to Oxbridge. Under government threat we are spending a disproportionate time and effort on persuading them to give us a try. It is disproportionate because we are already quite meritocratic. So the bright working class pupil who has been cajoled into applying may turn out not to be quite bright enough, and returns disgruntled from his interview, muttering “I told you so.”

The problem of Oxbridge access is an acute form of the problem of access to the university sector as a whole. If one bends over backwards to recruit students whose home and school have not prepared them for it, is one doing them a real favour? Concentration on “access”, i.e. on social background, at the expense of academic prowess and inclination, cannot but lead to a high drop-out rate – unless academic standards are abandoned altogether. In other words, equality of access cannot be made to yield equality of outcome.

The way this is distorted in the media, even those media one might expect to sympathetic to universities, is extraordinary indeed. I quote almost at random from an article I saw by chance in *The Independent Education Supplement*.⁴⁶ It is headed: “New tables will lift the lid on university life. For years,

⁴⁵ See fn. 28 for reference. The *Daily Telegraph* is a Conservative newspaper.

⁴⁶ By Lucy Hodges, 29 July 1999, p. 2.

universities have successfully sidestepped government attempts to establish performance indicators for what they do, but all that is about to change.” The first paragraph explains: “New data about to spew forth from the Higher Education Funding Council will let newspapers compile ‘official’ league tables comparing universities for their drop-out rates, or how good they are at attracting students from deprived backgrounds and State schools.” Then we shall be “named and shamed.”

E) Appendix 5: Academic Misery

To have pursued this topic further in the main text might have made it monotonous, but I conclude by compiling a few more data.

Every year every academic has to fill in a form of “self-appraisal”. For two years it was my task to read those completed by the members of my faculty. The last question was: “What has given you the least satisfaction in your job this year?” Every single person answered either “Filling in forms like this one” or “Lack of time for research”.

The Dearing Report says (p.218, para.14.17): “A survey carried out among academic staff in one English institution found 25 per cent of respondents reported the reason for stress to be ‘too much work – no time to complete it’. Our survey of academic staff indicated that stress levels were a significant consideration ...” I can report that my own doctor in Oxford has told me that hardly a day passes when he is not consulted by an academic suffering from stress.

The RAE has certainly contributed to this level of stress. Each academic is invited to submit up to four publications for assessment. It is officially stated that what is assessed is not quantity but quality. Not surprisingly, this message does not filter down. To my personal knowledge, university administrations tend to tell their staff that they have to submit four publications and that if they do not they may be invited to take early retirement. Staff are well aware that they are thus being constrained to publish work prematurely, or artificially to split what should be a single publication into two. Another abuse is that since universities are credited with the research of the staff they employ at the time of the assessment, regardless of where that research was done, people with good publications are hired for the year of the assessment and then “let go”.

The TQA is even worse. Departments reckon that preparation for an assessment takes months. The documentation required beggars belief. For example, every course given has to show the inspectors not merely the syllabus and all hand-outs, bibliographies, etc., but samples of the best, the worst and the average written work produced by students on the course. I know of one

department, employing six teaching staff, which weighed its submission; it came to 45 kilos of paper.

All exam scripts written in the department over the last five years are to be shown. My department lost a mark (which is serious, as overall marking is out of 24) because on looking at an old exam script the inspectors could not find physical evidence that it had been marked by two examiners. It had, of course; but in order to ensure that the examiners judge the script independently we ask the first reader not to write on it.

Before the inspection, a department has to write a 6,000 word self-assessment along minutely prescribed lines. “Objectives” have to be keyed into “aims”, which in turn have to be keyed into the university’s “mission statement”. Since I was in charge of my faculty’s submission, I took this to my 30-year-old daughter, who is a writer and a master of parody. Her product so pleased the inspectors that it was borrowed by another university who were being inspected after us.

This illustrates that the only way to live under such a regime is by cynical opportunism. Asked to predict the results of one’s research, the only safe tactic is to put down the results one has achieved already. Genuine research, after all, may turn out to be going up a blind alley. One works out what it is that the authorities want to hear, and tells it to them. That is one reason why the centralization of authority leads to ever increasing inefficiency, as Karl Popper pointed out. It also leads to a collapse in morale.

First publication: Text is retrieved from INDOLOGY: Resources for Indological Scholarship, <http://indology.info/papers/gombrich/>, accessed: 30 August 2012. Reprinted here by kind permission of the author.

RICHARD F. GOMBRICH

Faculty of Oriental Studies & Balliol College, University of Oxford, United Kingdom

Why Has British Education Gone So Wrong, and Why Can't We Stop the Rot?

Popper's Nightmare*

At the millenium, I was invited to address the Institute of Policy Studies at Tokyo University on higher education in Britain; my title was "British Higher Education Policy in the last Twenty Years: the Murder of a Profession". That lecture was privately distributed to friends and colleagues, but never published.¹ This is not simply a shorter version of the lecture, but it does repeat some parts of it. In the lecture I talked about three interrelated themes: about **truth** in human society, about **education** as a human activity, and about **professionalism**, or what it is to be a professional. I also had things to say about the dehumanizing illusion of quantification, and about the arrogance of power. All these five themes remain relevant to this article.

Not only do I have answers to propose to the two questions in my title: I have even put into my title the answer I propose at the most basic level. But I need first to explain what Popper's nightmare is.

It is the title of a long editorial published in *The Times Higher Education Supplement* of 8 June 1984. At the time, Mrs Thatcher was Prime Minister and Sir Keith Joseph was the Secretary of State for Education. The editorial discusses the "grand political irony" that "No previous government has so successfully aggrandized the power of the state while simultaneously and loudly proclaiming its deepest wish to roll back its frontiers." The editor says that all governments would like to "centralize the power to take decisions", but "the early 1980s will be regarded in the future as a decisive episode in the creation of a tightly coordinated system of higher education under strict national direction. ... Sir Keith Joseph ... is the first secretary of state with the power to set a national policy." He acquired this power through swinging financial cuts,

*This paper was originally a speech given in London on 20 September 2008 at the "Rally of the Impossible Professions: Beyond the False Promises of Security". I was invited to speak for 30 minutes. The text has been lightly edited for this publication.

¹ However, it has since appeared on several web sites. See, for instance: indology.info/papers/gombrich/uk-higher-education.pdf.

and “the stick is mightily more effective than the carrot.” After commending Sir Keith for thus acquiring the power to “make education more relevant to the conditions of modern society”, and reassuring the reader, rather unconvincingly,² that Sir Keith would not abuse his power, the editorial quotes the philosopher Karl Popper:

“The holistic planner overlooks the fact that it is easy to centralize power but impossible to centralize all knowledge, which is distributed over many individual minds, and whose centralization would be necessary for the wise wielding of centralized power. But this fact has far-reaching consequences. Unable to ascertain what is in the minds of many individuals, he must try to control and stereotype interests and beliefs by education and propaganda. But this attempt to exercise power over minds must destroy the last possibility of finding out what people really think, for it is clearly incompatible with the free expression of thought, especially of critical thought. Ultimately it must destroy knowledge; and the greater the gain in power, the greater will be the loss of knowledge.”

The editor concludes that “perhaps there may be some substance to fears of a Tory offensive against intellectual dissent. For what from the top of the system can appear nothing more than a sensible administrative policy may seem at the bottom a deadly ideological assault. So we arrive at Popper’s nightmare.”

Mrs Thatcher made her name as a free marketeer, believing that the economy did best if economic agents were allowed autonomy. In particular, the state should not try to “second guess” the decisions of businessmen. By contrast, she was the greatest centralizer of power Britain has known in modern times, and energetically promoted the state’s “second guessing” the decisions of local government and the professions – in fact, of every group except businessmen.

I am not playing party politics. It is widely acknowledged that in all its aspects relevant to my topic, Thatcher’s successors have all fully espoused the principles of Thatcherism.

Lawyers, doctors and teachers are “professionals” in the sense that they profess a “calling”, analogous to a religious calling, to promote a general good, be it justice, health or education. To carry out their work requires both expertise and an ethical commitment. They get paid for their work, but because it is so difficult for outsiders to evaluate it, one of their commitments is not to overcharge. They take **responsibility** for exercising their **judgment** in the interest

² The editor goes so far as to admit that in “some recent decisions” he had “confused his constitutional authority with his private prejudices”, and mentions his “hostile scepticism about social science”. In conversation with a Balliol colleague of mine, Sir Keith said that the social sciences were “inherently left-wing”.

of their clients. The public, though suspicious of lawyers, has generally been inclined to **trust** the professions and to allow them to regulate their own affairs through professional councils.

For Thatcherism, this is all just cant. The professions are interest groups, just like other interest groups, and interest means only one thing: economic interest. If doctors want money to be spent on health, that is just because they want to get richer. Words like responsibility, judgment and trust are only a smokescreen. Just as the government must act in the economy to see that business interests have what is nowadays called “a level playing field”, it must unmask the pretensions of the so-called “professional” interest groups and ensure that doctors have no more privileges than, say, butchers. I repeat: Labour governments have done nothing to restore power to the professions, and Thatcher’s view of them seems to have become generally accepted, even uncontroversial. No wonder professionals feel so demoralised that they need to hold the occasional rally!

Nightmare or simply prescience, Karl Popper’s view cited in the *THES* is not merely an argument against centralisation. He argued that attempting to draw up and impose a complete blueprint was a bad way of running or reforming any institution. It is to proceed the wrong way round, because of the asymmetry between right and wrong, between perfection and imperfection. Social institutions are never perfect and that should not be our goal: we should know what they are for, and just try to adjust them to be fit for purpose. Very rarely do reformers confront a *tabula rasa*: they have to work with what is there already. Popper advocated what he called “piecemeal social engineering”. If you have the power and the wish to change an institution, you must first study it carefully to see which parts of it are working well and which badly. Then leave well alone, and mend the defects. English folk wisdom knows this well. We say, “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it”; and we talk sarcastically about “pulling it up by the roots to see how it’s growing”.

The most basic problem of our schools and universities – and indeed probably of most of our institutions – is the arrogance and vainglory of our politicians. They have their moment in the limelight: even the few most successful politicians rarely hold a particular office for more than two or three years. So they are in a great hurry to make their mark. Their term of office is hardly long enough even to inform themselves about such a complicated subject as education; but the media – probably equally uninformed – are shouting about something that seems to have gone wrong; so they are determined to rush through a drastic change, typically to promote such fashionable but vague terms as “transparency” or “accountability”, without any thought for knock-on effects on other parts of these complex systems.

Politicians are not the only ones to blame. They cannot attend to everything, so much power remains with the administrators below them in the hierarchy. Most of them, too, however, have the same ethos, and hope to be remembered for some major “reform”. Indeed, there has arisen a whole group of specialists called “educationists” who live by this ethos and can only survive in the climate that has been generated of second-guessing the true professionals: in schools the head teachers, in universities the professors.

Is there a solution? Certainly. Neither is perfection to be found on this earth, nor can you ever please everyone; but the best that can be achieved is intense and sensitive monitoring by professionals, who may propose piecemeal improvements. Such people used to exist as a very fine professional body called Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Schools. A retired Chief Inspector recently analysed for me what has gone wrong with our school system. His own subject was crafts, and I don’t think he has heard of Karl Popper or his ideas, but he spoke like Popper reincarnated, describing how with ever increasing frequency orders come down from those who have little or no experience of what is actually happening in the schools, orders of which the first effect is usually to knock down all that has been painstakingly built up.

In the interests of centralised power, the school inspectorate has been emasculated, and its members have, I believe, joined the ranks of the totally disillusioned. They now tend to choose early retirement. But inspectors with specialised and local knowledge are far the best control system – which is not to say that here should be no possibility of appeal against their decisions, for even they must have their power limited. I have never understood why universities should not be inspected, mainly through unheralded visits, just like schools; that would work far better to correct abuses than the entire mass of paperwork and regulation that now stultifies every university teacher and which seems to me to achieve nothing positive whatsoever.

There is a fashionable argument which says that since knowledge these days is changing faster than ever before, our educational institutions, which are there to impart that knowledge, must be ready to change just as fast. As it stands, this is silly. The ability to change the content of a course has few if any further implications. Yes, there are subjects which are moving so fast that at university level what is taught may constantly have to be revised. I suspect that all these subjects are scientific. Their existence does not, however, mean that the idea of mastering a body of knowledge is obsolete. Mastering a body of knowledge is akin to mastering a skill, and is an equally valuable and satisfying experience. Anyone who is not given that experience while growing up, preferably several times over, has in my view been deprived of a proper education and a chance to make full use of their mind.

Nor does this deprive only the individual most concerned. In our society common knowledge is being reduced to knowledge about sport, pop music, film stars and TV personalities. There is nothing wrong with knowing about those things, but a society in which members share knowledge about nothing else is desperately impoverished and lacks an important force for cohesion; it is on the way to not having a common language.

To illustrate the certainly unpremeditated effects of institutional change, examples abound; but here I have space for only two. For about 20 years universities have been subject periodically to a Research Assessment Exercise (RAE). Having been a judge for two of them (in different fields) as well as – like all my colleagues – a victim of four, I know these horrid rituals intimately.³ So here let me, with the utmost brevity, explain two of its effects.

There have been about 70 subject areas to be assessed, each by boards of about ten assessors. The assessors have been chosen, very reasonably, by polls of colleagues who have been asked to choose the best researchers in their field. The assessors have to evaluate every piece of work submitted, typically four publications per person, and to attend meetings and submit paperwork. The volume of reading to be done has meant that every assessor can do little else for several months. So the 700 or so people adjudged to be the best researchers in the country have been prevented from doing any research for something approaching half a year. Wonderful! How else could that have been achieved?

Moreover, everyone agrees that this pressure to publish has produced a vast crop of books and articles which should never have been published at all, or have been published prematurely to meet RAE deadlines. Many new journals and book series have been founded simply to meet this need for publication outlets. Meanwhile the libraries, their budgets cut, cannot afford to buy those books and journals, nor can they find the space to house them, a problem alleviated but by no means solved by electronic publishing. So even the great libraries can no longer aim to cover even certain fields completely. Besides, keeping up with the relevant literature in one's field is much more difficult, because one has to wade through oceans of trash; so significant contributions may be overlooked for years. I have in mind real examples in my field. It has become far harder to get discoveries noticed, because the message is lost in the noise.

I have said that reforming institutions must consist of tinkering with them to make them fit for purpose. So what is the purpose of educational institutions?

³ I gave a fuller account of the RAE in Appendix 3 of my Tokyo lecture.

I explained in my Tokyo speech that I completely agree that young people must be trained in skills so that they can find jobs and boost the economy. Let us take that as read. Therefore the education system as a whole has more than one purpose. But I shall here focus on universities.

Hospitals are for care of the sick, orchestras for playing music, and they should be used for those goals, entrusted to the professionals who understand them, and only judged by how well they fulfil them. Universities are for truth: to promote its pursuit (curiosity) and encourage its use under all circumstances.

Do we need institutions committed to truth? Just think of the many places where there have been or are none, the countries ruled by Hitler and Stalin. Britain gave to the world, through its Parliament, the concept of Her Majesty's loyal opposition. It is very odd and very sad that our politicians today cannot see why the country should need a permanent and flourishing loyal opposition, trained to question and not to accept shoddy answers. Worse, academics are being forced to lie and to connive at half-truths. But truth matters everywhere, not just in politics. Think of how little has been achieved intellectually under any totalitarian regime. Truth can more than pay for its keep pragmatically. But it has a more than pragmatic value.

Ability to reason or to express oneself fluently can enhance performance in any job and so can be justified in pragmatic terms. So perhaps can some of the subtler dispositions which education can enhance, such as curiosity, critical acumen, a sense of responsibility, a catholic range of sympathy, aesthetic sensitivity, an independent spirit. My scientific colleagues agree with me that these can be enhanced by, and are certainly needed by, the study of the sciences as much as that of the humanities. But their ultimate justification is not pragmatic. They are the qualities which make us fully human. As Dante has Ulysses say: "We were not made to live like brutes, but to pursue virtue and knowledge."⁴

What our rulers have wholly failed to realize is that education is a **human** activity. It has to be human in its methods as well as its results, for the two are not entirely separable. Getting programmed information from a computer is valuable in its place, but it is training, not education. Those who pay lots of money to attend live universities know what they are doing; those who think a machine can convey what a human presence conveys have lost the plot. If we think back to our own education, most of us will remember very little of the specific things we were taught; what we remember is our teachers. It is our good teachers who have influenced us and to whom we feel grateful long after the examinable content of what they taught has been forgotten.

⁴ "Fatti non fummo per viver come bruti Ma per seguir virtute e conoscenza."

The reason for the success of Oxford and Cambridge is terribly simple: the students are taught individually.⁵ More than that, the college system breaks up the large numbers of a modern university into communities small enough for us all to know each other individually, and as we meet in all kinds of activities, not only at lessons or lectures, we see each other as whole people. That is why my students are my friends and keep in touch for years after they have left Oxford. This is an expensive system, but even so I think it gives value for money, and if society decides it can no longer be afforded, something special will have been lost. Diamonds are indeed expensive; but who cares about the price of fake diamonds?

Education occurs in human relationships, not only between teacher and pupil but also between fellow-students and between colleagues. That is why we need academic communities. These communities will be as full of failings as human beings always are. What should be special about them is that they should know and admit it. The good academic very often says, “I don’t know” and “I am not sure”; he also says what one might do to find out, or explains why certainty will never be possible.

This intellectual honesty is being systematically destroyed. Like trust, judgment and responsibility, intellectual honesty is thought to have no cash value and thus to be worthless. In the kind of society we now inhabit, pay is an accurate index of esteem.

That we know the price of everything but the value of nothing is but one example of how our lives have been taken over and our society ruined by the twin demons of quantification and competition. Let me just give a prime example of both: examining. This has increased like a pandemic disease. At the universities, this is largely because we have been made to adopt the American “modular system”, in which students take courses which mostly last only one semester. Exams used to be confined to the end of the academic year,⁶ but since each module is examined, the number of exams has been roughly doubled. At some of our universities there is now hardly any teaching between the Easter break and the summer holidays: the teachers are examining full-time. Examin-

⁵ Given that Thatcher, Blair, and several of the Ministers of Education have themselves been to Oxford, their blindness to educational values is, I must admit, a serious indictment of the education we have been providing. They simply do not realize what it is they have received. I think Oxford should make much more systematic and explicit efforts to eradicate anti-intellectualism among its students. How deeply ingrained such attitudes are!

⁶ Oxford, an extreme case, traditionally examines even less: there are no formal exams in the second year of the 3-year BA course. There is plenty of informal feedback from tutors, but the idea is, or used to be, that students should take some responsibility for pacing themselves and monitoring their own progress, rather than being nannied like small children.

ing, like all evaluation, is a form of administration and takes time away from what used to be considered the essential duties of university teachers: teaching and research.

The situation in schools is worse. In its mania for quantification – you can only administer what you can count – the government demands wide-spread testing and examining throughout the school system.

The effect on pupils is even more pernicious than that on teachers. It is deadly. The idea of studying something for its own sake, for its intrinsic interest, is obsolete. It is perfectly useless for teachers to tell their pupils that they should not be studying only for good exam results; useless, because the pupils can all see for themselves that the world does not work like that any more. And if you get poor exam results, you have nothing: insight, understanding, intellectual excitement, aesthetic joy are not quantifiable, and no one will give you any credit for them.

Testing pupils as you go along is an important pedagogic technique. Announcing results is rarely a useful part of that. More formal and public examining is an abomination which can only damage education properly understood. Employers and professional bodies must administer their own examinations, directed at the knowledge and skills they need. The examination systems we have are hated by almost everyone involved, and justly; for those who succeed are victims no less than those who fail.

My main message is that educational reform is urgent, but all reform must be done by piecemeal engineering, not by imposing some grand new theory across the board. I'd apply that even to the abolition of exams. Let us start by abolishing some of them, and monitor the effects, especially the side-effects; that will probably mean getting more professional bodies and employers to do their own examining. Should we choose this path, it is not impossible – let me try to conclude on an optimistic note – that in a generation we may restore to young people some genuine enthusiasm for learning.

London, September 2008

First publication: “Why has British education gone so wrong, and why can't we stop the rot? Popper's nightmare”, *Hurly-Burly (Intl. Lacanian Jnl of Psychoanalysis)*, (1) Mai 2009, pp. 185–192. Reprinted here by kind permission of the author.

KONRAD PAUL LIESSMANN

Fakultät für Philosophie und Bildungswissenschaft, Universität Wien, Österreich

Akademische Bildung

Ein Leitfaden für neue Eliten*

Wer immer heute ein Studium beendet, weiß nicht, was das damit verbundene Zertifikat eigentlich noch wert ist. Dies gilt für das Ansehen in der Wissenschaft ebenso wie für die Beurteilung durch die Öffentlichkeit oder die damit verbundenen oder erhofften Chancen auf dem Arbeitsmarkt. Ob man die nun nach dem Greifen der Bologna-Reform zunehmend produzierten Bachelors überhaupt als Akademiker in einem klassischen Sinn wahrnehmen wird, ist sehr zu bezweifeln, aber auch die Träger traditioneller akademischer Titel geraten zunehmend ins Zwielicht. Der Rücktritt des deutschen Verteidigungsministers Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg (CSU) aufgrund einer plagiierten Doktorarbeit hat die akademische Abschlussarbeit auch in einer breiteren Öffentlichkeit in Misskredit gebracht, und eine ganze Reihe von Diplom- und Doktorarbeiten mehr oder weniger prominenter Politiker wurden und werden mittlerweile im Internet auf eigens dafür eingerichteten Plattformen „überprüft“. Der Erfolg der Plagiatsjäger ließ nicht lange auf sich warten: Wegen diverser Abschreibübungen musste auch Silvana Koch-Mehrin (FDP) zurücktreten, die Tochter von Edmund Stoiber, Veronika Saß (CSU) verlor ihren Dokortitel, und auch der Landtagsabgeordnete Mathias Pröfrock (CDU) legte vorsorglich seinen Dokortitel wieder ab. Wegen einer plagiierten Doktorarbeit musste aber auch der ungarische Staatspräsident Pál Schmitt zurücktreten, und auch der rumänische Ministerpräsident Victor Ponta steht ebenso unter schwerem Plagiatsverdacht wie die deutsche Bildungsministerin Annette Schawan. Zu erwarten ist, dass aufgrund der technischen Möglichkeiten der Überprüfung, die sich durch die Datenbanken und Volltextrecherchemöglichkeiten des Internet ergeben, noch mit weiteren Aufdeckungen, Überführungen und Rücktritten zu rechnen sein wird.

Was bedeutet dies? Gehen wir einem Zeitalter der wissenschaftlichen Redlichkeit entgegen, oder einem, indem ein frivoles Beckmessertum triumphiert und die Wissenschaft insgesamt in Misskredit bringt? Keine Frage: Die mediale Aufmerksamkeit für die Einhaltung wissenschaftlicher Zitierregeln

* Die Rede, die ich als Vertreter des Rektors bei den Promotionsfeierlichkeiten meiner Fakultät gehalten habe und die einige grundsätzliche Fragen der „akademischen Bildung“ thematisiert.

wäre weitaus geringer, wenn nicht prominente und beliebte Polit-Stars oder umstrittene Ex-Minister in den Verdacht, es mit der Genauigkeit nicht so genau genommen zu haben, gekommen wären. Die Entdeckung, dass der örtliche Sparkassendirektor seinen nebenbei erworbenen Dokortitel vielleicht zu Unrecht trägt, hätte niemanden erschüttert, ebenso wenig die Tatsache, dass im Zeitalter von Google und Copy&Paste das Vortäuschen geistiger Leistungen zur Sache weniger Mausklicks geworden ist. Auffallend ist es aber schon, dass die bisher publik gewordenen Fälle samt und sonders jenem politischen Lager zuzurechnen sind, dass ansonsten gerne einen strengen Leistungsbegriff vertritt und, geht es zum Beispiel um das Erschleichen von Transferzahlungen, nicht empört genug sein kann.

Die bekannt gewordenen Fälle wissenschaftlichen Fehlverhaltens demonstrieren jedenfalls, dass es dabei um mehr als nur um individuelle Schwächen geht. In Deutschland wurde die Debatte heiß, als die Bundeskanzlerin versuchte, ihren Minister mit dem Hinweis zu halten, sie habe ja keine wissenschaftliche Hilfskraft, sondern einen Politiker ins Kabinett geholt. Damit wurde Augenzwinkernd festgehalten, dass die Erschleichung eines akademischen Grades keine Sache ist, die eine wie auch immer erworbene berufliche Reputation außerhalb der Wissenschaft beeinträchtigen muss. Erst der darauf einsetzende geballte Protest von Tausenden von Wissenschaftlern und Doktoranden hat den Rücktritt des Verteidigungsministers unausweichlich gemacht. Dass Betrug in der Wissenschaft ein Kavaliersdelikt sein sollte, wollte denjenigen nicht einleuchten, die wissen, dass die Entwicklung unserer Gesellschaft in hohem Maße davon abhängt, dass in der Wissenschaft nicht betrogen wird.

Dass eine höhere Bildung und ein akademischer Abschluss nicht nur erstrebenswerte Güter, sondern Voraussetzungen für ein erfolgreiches Berufsleben sind und deshalb möglichst vielen zukommen sollen, hören wir immer wieder. Universitäten, die zu wenige Abschlüsse produzieren, werden gerügt, hohe Absolventenquoten angeboten wie steigende Börsenkurse. Andererseits – und dies gehört zu den Widersprüchlichkeiten, die unsere Bildungspolitik zum Teil so schwer erträglich machen – herrscht geradezu eine panische Furcht vor zu vielen Studierenden. Es soll nicht eine größere Zahl junger Menschen die Möglichkeiten eines Studiums haben, es sollen möglichst viele möglichst rasch fertig werden. Wie man dann zu diesen gewünschten Abschlüssen, Graden und Titeln kommt – da sieht man dann vielleicht nicht mehr so genau hin. Mittlerweile haben sich im Zuge der Bologna-Reform ja nicht nur die akademischen Titel, die – je nach dem – vor oder nach dem Namen geführt werden, inflationär vermehrt, sondern auch die dazugehörigen Erwerbsmöglichkeiten, und der von manchen gerne propagierte freie Bildungsmarkt lässt hier noch einiges erwarten. Es spricht Bände, dass man, liest man etwa Artikel zur

Plagiatsaffäre im Internet, auch bei Qualitätsmedien sofort mit Werbeeinschaltungen belästigt wird, die auf Möglichkeiten entsprechender „Unterstützung“ beim Studienabschluss verweisen.

Das Problem liegt allerdings tiefer. Es geht nicht nur um die Frage, dass der Abschluss eines Studiums an einer Universität signalisieren soll, dass hier die Standards der Wissenschaft ebenso eingehalten wurden wie das Ethos der intellektuellen Redlichkeit. Aber akademische Studien werden nach der Lesart der aktuellen Politik als Berufsausbildungen definiert, und dies lässt es wenig plausibel erscheinen, der wissenschaftlichen Qualität von Abschlussarbeiten zu viel Augenmerk zu schenken. Die zukünftigen Arbeitgeber wollen ja Controller, Informatiker, Journalisten oder Lehrer einstellen, und keine wissenschaftlichen Assistenten. Wer in den letzten Jahren in kritischer Distanz zum Bologna-Prozess behauptet hatte, dass es in einem universitären Studium in erster Linie um eine wissenschaftliche Bildung, und nicht um eine berufsorientierte Ausbildung gehen sollte, wurde ausgelacht. Nun verziehen die Lacher indigniert die Mundwinkel, wenn Sie hören, dass Absolventen nicht einmal die grundlegenden wissenschaftlichen Zitierregeln beherrschen. Diese aber lernt man nicht im vielgelobten Praktikum, mit denen Studenten ab dem ersten Semester gequält werden, um nur ja nicht auf Gedanken zu kommen, die den Horizont zukünftiger Arbeitgeber sprengen könnten.

Um Missverständnisse zu vermeiden: Natürlich haben Studien auch auf einen Beruf vorzubereiten. Und der überwiegende Teil von Absolventen wird nicht in der Wissenschaft weiterarbeiten. Abschlussarbeiten, die nicht als Einstieg in eine wissenschaftliche Karriere gedacht sind, werden vielleicht nicht immer genial sein, aber sie sollen solide und korrekt gearbeitet sein und zumindest den formalen Standards des jeweiligen Faches entsprechen. Allerdings: Auch diese Standards ändern sich. Und was aber als gehaltvolle, innovative, originelle Arbeit gilt, hängt vor allem in den Geistes- und Gesellschaftswissenschaften auch von Moden und Ideologien ab, die einem raschen Wandel unterworfen sind. Auch darüber sollte man sich keine Illusionen machen.

Jenseits der einzelnen Fälle, die jetzt diskutiert werden, liegt das Problem vor allem darin: Der Wert und die Bedeutung wissenschaftlicher Arbeit ist im öffentlichen Bewusstsein in dem Maße gesunken, in dem Studien und Abschlüsse als arbeitsmarktpolitische Maßnahmen vielleicht an Bedeutung gewonnen haben. Wichtig wäre es, dass sich vor allem die Universitäten in erster Linie als Garanten einer wissenschaftlich fundierten Bildung begreifen und dabei zu Qualitätskriterien bekennen, deren Wertschätzung auch von der Öffentlichkeit und der Politik, ganz ohne Augenzwinkern, geteilt werden sollte.

Aber was ist eine wissenschaftliche fundierte Bildung? Die erschöpft sich in der Tat nicht in einer fachlichen oder beruflichen Qualifikation, so wichtig

diese auch sind. Aber an einen akademisch gebildeten Menschen darf und soll man darüber hinausgehende Ansprüche stellen. Zumindest sollte diese Bildung drei Dimensionen berühren, die nicht nur als Resultat eines Studiums, sondern auch als Aspekte zukünftigen Handelns gesehen werden müsse. Vorab, und das verstünde sich fast von selbst, wenn es nicht immer wieder in Frage gestellt wird, gehört dazu das Wissen um das Wesen von Wissenschaft überhaupt. Das Eintauchen in eine Disziplin, das Kennenlernen bestimmter Verfahren und Methoden sollte auch dazu führen, ein generelles Verständnis für diese vernunftgeleitete Form der Welterschließung zu entwickeln, die wir Wissenschaft nennen. Dazu gehört auch die Fähigkeit, dieses wissenschaftliche Wissen in ein angemessenes Verhältnis zu anderen Wissensformen – religiöses Wissen, tradiertes Wissen, Wissen indigener Kulturen etc. – zu bringen. In diesem Zusammenhang ist allerdings zu betonen – und dass dies zu betonen ist, zeigt schon, wie verschwommen unsere Vorstellung von Wissenschaft geworden ist –, dass alle nichtwissenschaftlichen Formen des Wissens zum Gegenstand der wissenschaftlichen Forschung werden können. Wenn, wie unlängst zu lesen war, radikale Muslime auch in Österreich nichtislamischen Wissenschaftlern am liebsten verbieten würden, über den Koran zu sprechen, dann widerspricht das nicht nur den Prinzipien der Wissenschaft, sondern würde uns um Jahrhunderte in jene Zeit zurückkatapultieren, als die Schriften eines Baruch Spinoza verboten wurden, weil er die biblischen Texte nicht als Offenbarung, sondern als Erzeugnisse von Menschen las und interpretierte. Selbstverständlich kann und muss auch der Koran Gegenstand einer a-religiösen historischen, philologischen, soziologischen oder philosophischen Interpretation sein. Zu dieser Erkenntnis um das Wesen und das Zuständigkeitsfeld von neuzeitlicher Wissenschaft gehört aber auch ganz entscheidend die Einsicht, dass *wissenschaftliches Wissen* immer *vorläufiges Wissen* ist, also, dass auch die essentiellsten Ergebnisse selbst Einsichten sind, die jederzeit revidiert werden können, und bereits vielfach wurden. Die Universität, jenseits aller Organisations- und Gliederungsformen, jenseits der angebotenen Studien und etablierten Forschungsrichtungen, jenseits der gerade herrschenden Reformrhetorik, sollte auch als jener Ort begriffen werden, an dem die Wissenschaft in ihrer Mannigfaltigkeit, aber auch in ihrer Unabgeschlossenheit als die zeitgemäße Form der Weltdeutung erscheint. Absolventen einer Universität sollten dieser Idee von Wissenschaft in Form intellektueller Redlichkeit, geistiger Unbestechlichkeit und argumentierender Urteilsfähigkeit auch jenseits spezialisierter Aufgabengebiete einen Platz einräumen.

Dann gehört zu dieser Form akademischer Bildung ein geschärftes historisches Bewusstsein. Dieses setzt die Bereitschaft voraus, einen historischen Sinn zu entwickeln für „Gewordenheiten“, sowie für die Zufälligkeit und da-

mit Offenheit dessen, was geworden ist. Es gilt also ein Sensorium dafür zu entwickeln, dass das, was geworden ist, auch anders hätte werden können. Das schützt auch vor einer gewissen Hybris gegenüber den Errungenschaften der eigenen Kultur. Dazu kommt die Fähigkeit, in großen Zusammenhängen und Zeitdimensionen zu denken und nicht das gegenwärtige Erleben zum Nonplus-ultra zu erklären und zu glauben, nur weil etwas jetzt für den letzten Schrei gehalten wird, wird es in alle Ewigkeit bestehen. In der Geschichte müssen wir mit anderen Zeiten rechnen als mit jenen Quartalen, mit denen wir aktuell so gerne kalkulieren. Dazu gehört auch die Einsicht in die Vorläufigkeit und Vergänglichkeit alles Seienden. Der historische Sinn kann auch eine Übung in Bescheidenheit sein. Es ist auch ein Zeichen von Unbildung zu glauben, dass die Gegenwart der Vergangenheit in allen Belangen überlegen ist. Dieser Punkt muss vielleicht auch deshalb besonders betont werden, als die historischen Kenntnisse auch bei Meinungsführern und den wirtschaftlichen Eliten in einem atemberaubenden Ausmaß verschwinden. Anstelle des historischen Sinnes ist die plakative, moralisierende Instrumentalisierung der Vergangenheit getreten.

Und drittens gehört zu dieser akademischen Bildung die Entwicklung ästhetischer und moralischer Sensibilitäten, durchaus das, was man altmodisch Persönlichkeitsbildung genannt hat. Hier geht es um Sprache und Sprechen, um die Fähigkeiten, sich auszudrücken, auch um Stil und Rhetorik, um Sprachbewusstsein und Sprachbeherrschung. Es geht aber auch um das Erkennen, wie Denken und Kommunikation überhaupt funktioniert. Da Bildung immer auch ein Prozess der Kultivierung begriffen werden kann, muss es nicht nur um die Beherrschung von Kompetenzen, sondern auch darum, unser Empfindungs- und Urteilsvermögen, auch unsere Emotionen zu verfeinern und zu gestalten. Früher hat man in diesem Zusammenhang zum Beispiel von einem „Schönheitssinn“ gesprochen, der ausgebildet werden muss, damit der Mensch imstande ist, überhaupt ästhetisch differenziert und damit auch mit Genuss wahrzunehmen. Dieser Sinn ist allerdings nicht nur eine Freizeitkompetenz, sondern unabdingbar, um Dinge in ihrem Eigenwert, jenseits von Nutzen und Rentabilitäten überhaupt wahrnehmen zu können. Analog dazu kann man, wie in der englischen philosophischen Tradition, auch von einem moralischen Sinn, einem Sinn für Gerechtigkeit etwa sprechen, oder auch von einem Gespür für das, was einer Situation oder einem Menschen angemessen ist, also von dem, was man früher mit „Taktgefühl“ beschrieben hat. Gerade dieser Sinn für das Angemessene, für Proportionen, für die richtigen Worte, für das, was dringlich und das, was nur Ausdruck einer medialen Hysterie ist, schein gegenwärtig ziemlich unterentwickelt zu sein.

Diese Bildung, diese Sensibilitäten, die Fähigkeit des angemessenen Urteils, lassen sich kaum in einer didaktisierten, curricular organisierten Form vermitteln oder erwerben. Es handelt sich auch um keine Kompetenzen, die man bei einem Test ermitteln könnte, schon gar nicht geht es dabei um Bildungsstandards welcher Art auch immer. Im Gegenteil: Hier kommt es auf jene Dimensionen von Bildungsprozessen an, wo Individualität, Zufälle, Erlebnisse und Erfahrungen und Begegnungen eine entscheidende Rolle spielen können. Auch und gerade an Univeritäten geht es nicht nur um die technische Vermittlung von Wissen, sondern auch darum, dass Lehrer und Professoren eine Haltung, einen Habitus, einen Gestus zeigen, was oft größere Wirkung hat und mehr vermittelt als die eine oder andere Power-Point Präsentation. Absolventen einer Universität, die diesen Namen noch verdient, sollten neben einer gediegenen wissenschaftlichen Qualifikation, neben einer erfolversprechenden berufsorientierten Ausbildung auch etwas von jener Bildung erfahren, die es ihnen nicht nur ermöglicht, ihre Persönlichkeit zu entwickeln, sondern auch kraft einer geschulten Urteilskraft erlaubt, in und für diese Welt, wo immer ihr weiterer beruflicher Werdegang sie führen mag, in angemessener Form jene Verantwortung zu übernehmen, die so viele Mitglieder unserer sogenannten Eliten zur Zeit vermissen lassen.

First publication: Konrad Paul Liessmann, „Akademische Bildung. Ein Leitfaden für neue Eliten“, *Recherche – Zeitung für Wissenschaft*, <http://www.recherche-online.net/liessmann-akademische-bildung.html>, accessed: 30 August 2012. Reprinted here by kind permission of the author.

DONATORI
21. DANA FRANE PETRIĆA



DONORS OF
THE 21st DAYS OF FRANE PETRIĆ

**STALNI DONATORI *DANA FRANE PETRIĆA* /
REGULAR DONORS OF THE *DAYS OF FRANE PETRIĆ***

**Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i sporta Republike Hrvatske /
Ministry of Science, Education and Sports of the Republic of Croatia**

**Ministarstvo kulture Republike Hrvatske /
Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia**

**Grad Cres /
Town of Cres**

**DONATORI 21. *DANA FRANE PETRIĆA* /
DONORS OF THE 21st *DAYS OF FRANE PETRIĆ***

**Zaklada Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti /
The Foundation of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts**

**Hrvatska turistička zajednica /
Croatian National Tourist Board**

Cresanka d.d.

Vipnet

DANI FRANE PETRIĆA

Kronologija
1992.–2012.



THE DAYS OF FRANE PETRIĆ

Chronology
1992–2012

- 1992** ○ Suvremena filozofska gibanja u Hrvatskoj, Sloveniji i Herceg-Bosni / Contemporary Philosophical Movements in Croatia, Slovenia and Bosnia and Herzegovina
- 1993** ○ Platon i platonizam / Plato and Platonism
 ○ Jezik i mišljenje, književnost i filozofija / Language and Thought, Literature and Philosophy
 Stručni skup nastavnika filozofije i logike / Meeting of Lecturers of Philosophy and Logic
- 1994** ○ Platon – platonizam – Petrić / Plato – Platonism – Petrić
 ○ Filozofija prirode / Philosophy of Nature
- 1995** ○ Platon – platonizam – Petrić / Plato – Platonism – Petrić
 ○ Ekologija / Ecology
- 1996** ○ Platon – platonizam – Petrić / Plato – Platonism – Petrić
 ○ Lijepo u prirodi i umjetnosti / The Beautiful in Nature and the Fine Arts
- 1997** ○ 400. obljetnica smrti Frane Petrića / 400th Anniversary of the Death of Frane Petrić
- 1998** ○ Platon – platonizam – Petrić / Plato – Platonism – Petrić
 ○ Izazovi bioetike / The Challenges of Bioethics
- 1999** ○ Petrić – platonizam – aristotelizam / Petrić – Platonism – Aristotelianism
 ○ Teorija kaosa / Theory of Chaos
- 2000** ○ Petrić – platonizam – aristotelizam / Petrić – Platonism – Aristotelianism
 ○ Filozofija vremena / Philosophy of Time
- 2001** ○ Petrić – platonizam – aristotelizam / Petrić – Platonism – Aristotelianism
 ○ Bioetika i znanost u novoj epohi / Bioethics and Science in the New Epoch
- 2002** ○ Petrić – platonizam – aristotelizam / Petrić – Platonism – Aristotelianism
 ○ Filozofija i tehnika / Philosophy and Technology
- 2003** ○ Petrić – platonizam – aristotelizam / Petrić – Platonism – Aristotelianism
 ○ Demokracija i etika / Democracy and Ethics

- 2004** ○ Petrić i renesansne filozofske tradicije / Petrić and Renaissance Philosophical Traditions
- Filozofija i odgoj u suvremenom društvu / Philosophy and Education in Contemporary Society
- 2005** ○ Petrić i renesansne filozofske tradicije / Petrić and Renaissance Philosophical Traditions
- Teorija relativnosti i filozofija: Povodom 100. obljetnice Einsteino-ve Specijalne teorije relativnosti / Theory of Relativity and Philosophy: In Celebration of the 100th Anniversary of Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity
- 2006** ○ Petrić i renesansne filozofske tradicije / Petrić and Renaissance Philosophical Traditions
- Filozofija, znanost, religija: kompleksnost odnosa i granice dijaloga / Philosophy, Science, Religion: Complexity of Relations and Limits of Dialogue
- 2007** ○ Petrić i renesansne filozofske tradicije / Petrić and Renaissance Philosophical Traditions
- Čovjek i kultura / Human and Culture
- 2008** ○ Petrić i renesansne filozofske tradicije / Petrić and Renaissance Philosophical Traditions
- Filozofija i globalizacija / Philosophy and Globalization
- 2009** ○ Petrić i renesansne filozofske tradicije / Petrić and Renaissance Philosophical Traditions
- Filozofija i mediji / Philosophy and Media
- 2010** ○ Petrić i renesansne filozofske tradicije / Petrić and Renaissance Philosophical Traditions
- Pitanja identiteta / Questions of Identity
- 2011** ○ Od Petrića do Boškovića: Mijene u filozofiji prirode / Petrić to Bošković: Changes in the Natural Philosophy
- Filozofska gibanja na jugoistoku Europe / Philosophical Trends in Southeast Europe
- 2012** ○ Od Petrića do Boškovića: Hrvatski filozofi u europskom kontekstu / From Petrić to Bošković: Croatian Philosophers in the European Context
- Ideja sveučilišta / The Idea of the University

IZDAVAČ: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo, Zagreb

BIBLIOTEKA: Filozofski glasnik

NIZ: Libellus 20

ISSN: 1848-2236

ZA IZDAVAČA: Nada Gosić

UREDNICI: Ivana Zagorac, Ivica Martinović

POSLOVNA TAJNICA: Mira Matijević

PRIJEVODI: Krešimir Babel, Vesna Baće, Ivica Martinović,
Ivana Zagorac i autori

KOREKTURA: Krešimir Babel, Ivica Martinović, Ivana Zagorac

PRIJELOM TEKSTA: OCEAN GRAF, Zagreb

TISAK: GRAFOMARK, Zagreb

NAKLADA: 500 primjeraka

