Bizarre Academism and Science in Slovenia: Elements for Anthropological Study of Postsocialism and Transition

Abstract: This article addresses some of the aspects the academic sphere, science and intellectual culture under postsocialism offer for the understanding of transition issues in contemporary Slovenia. It starts with the surprise that has been caused by the bizarre commodification and domestication of anthropology in Slovenia, particularly at Slovenian universities, after 1990s, and tries to reflect social reception, institutional organization and academic status of anthropology in this country. Furthermore, through a specific case study of a violent debate which recently took place in Slovenia concerning the reasons for the absence of Slovenian universities on the notorious list of top 500 world universities, it tries to illustrate the essence of how academic spheres in transitional societies function. The conclusion presents some elements of social hypocrisy and discrepancy. It reveals certain facts that have taken place within the last few years, and thus helps us understand the contribution of the Slovenian state administration for science to the process of systematic transformation of this autonomous social domain of highly intellectual work into a turbo-neoliberal enterprise of wageworkers, academic lumpenproletarians, anti-intellectual jobbers, profiteers and money-spinners.
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Anthropology in Non-Anthropologists’ Hands: Postsocialism of Anthropology

Massive changes have taken place in the former socialist countries in the last twenty years. According to the Slovenian social anthropologist Irena Šumi, the political singularities, such as the creation of numerous new nation-states, the emergence of thousands of kilometres of new international borders, and radical changes of political systems within the newly created and delineated state formations, no doubt held promise of exceptional social situations which offered unique and unprecedented insights into human sociality (Šumi 2004: 76). Namely, in the wake of the collapse of the former Soviet bloc, the socialist states from Eastern Europe and the Balkans have introduced a variety of novel policies and political arrangements indicating radical social, cultural and economic changes. However, as postsocialist and late-socialist states implemented new political values and social initiatives, they acted upon complex social and cultural systems that responded in quite different, also unpredictable ways and unexpected reversals (Phillips 2005: 437-438). This often happened because Western political elites, supported by their globally dominant disciplines of economics, political science, transitivity or other kind, promoted models for the postsocialist countries that bear little connection to the social realities of their own countries (for more about this aspect of Eastern transition see Anderson & Pine).

1 This contribution has been made on the basis of my research project “Problems Faced by Science, Education and Intellectual Culture in Post-Socialist Societies: The Slovenian Case”, carried out in 2007 at the Institute for Anthropolocial Research in Ljubljana. For more information about this project see Outline of Anthropological Projects. Bulletin IAR 1 edited by Martin Žužek Kres.
1995, Boreman 1998, Bridger & Pine 1998, Buchowski 2001, Hann 1993: 1-26, Stark & Bruszt 1998). Westernization of Eastern societies was among the most crucial emancipatory political paroles of Western as well as Eastern political and academic elites and, thus, well known to all of us who lived in ex-socialist places. However, the everyday moral communities of socialism, such as excessive political control, confiscations, absence of consumption and markets, limited freedom of public speech, have been undermined after 1990s but replaced with new "epidemic societal diseases", such as postsocialist corruption, criminality, new social inequalities.  

Many academic disciplines have addressed these changes, and in some cases, notably that of economics and political science, disciplinary paradigms have been utilized not merely to explain what has been unfolding but also to make changes happen in a particular way. Yet, after more than a decade, many deficits remain in social science understandings of the "transition". As Chris Hann points out anthropology can provide the necessary corrective to the deficits of "transiology", and, furthermore, the anthropological discipline can profit from attention to the emerging studies of postsocialism (Hann 2002: 1). The entire field of postsocialism studies is, according to Šumi, today organized "around the idea that the times of global flourishing of (very diverse) absolutist regimes commonly denominated as socialist, and their rather thespian demise in Europe after 1989 represent social turbulences of such magnitude that they must have had profound, easily discernible, and mutually comparable imp-

\[\text{pact on the societies in question}^\text{"} \] (Šumi: 2004: 76). Maybe anthropologists were not prominent in the study of these major processes that have taken place, in some cases quite dramatically and brutally, in socialist and post-socialist societies of Eastern Europe and the Balkans, but recently they have started contributing significantly to this field. Some of the reasons for this hesitation or neglect probably derived, as Hann presumes, "from the discipline's origins and its overriding concern with 'exotic' tribal societies in regions colonized by European powers" (Hann 2002: 2). No doubt the sphere of science and academic culture was, among many other social domains, strongly marked by these socio-economic and geopolitical changes that caused a break of socialism and the rise of a new social order, imported from the West into this culturally diverse but geographically contiguous area (Halpern & Kideckel 1983: 377). Ethnographies and anthropological studies of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union published in the last decade have been shaped at least by three major societal circumstances: by the political upheavals of November 1989 in Eastern Europe, more precisely in Eastern Germany, and of August 1991 in the Soviet Union, and by dramatic disintegration of Yugoslavia in the early 1990s. The anthropology of postsocialism and the anthropology of Eastern Europe, two subfields of anthropological study of recent changes on the European continent, have in the past decade experienced significant growth. Although Daphne Berdahl (2000: 1-13), in her introduction to the edited volume entitled Altering States. Ethnographies of Transition in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union, writes that the "ethnographic corpus of postsocialist transitions is sparingly small", it seems that there is a growing number of anthropologically informed accounts of events and lives in the postsocialist areas. Anthropological or anthropologically related descriptions of postsocialist societies that explore the terrain of
everyday life in general or specific social domains in order to make claims about the nature, process and essence of postsocialist and “transitional” social, cultural and economical transformations continue to grow. Some writings, among them particularly those of Hann (1994: 229-249), Hann & Humphrey & Verdery (2002: 1-28), Wolfe (2000: 195-216) and Phillips (2005: 437-442), have also provided useful readings of the anthropological literature on Eastern Europe that appeared in the decade after the demise of socialism. This literature has grown sufficiently in recent years to generate a number of useful surveys, reviews (Ziker 2004: 163-175), and reflections on the subfield of postsocialist anthropology. Here, I limit myself to only a small number of recent anthropological and related studies on postsocialism and transition, as the majority of them is, implicitly or explicitly, committed to the methodology of ethnographic fieldwork, which is usually seen as an imperative of an "anthropological" work still generating a unique and valuable form of knowledge. However, although the heterogeneity of this subfield stays remarkable, there are vast areas of social domains which still need to be investigated more systematically and meticulously. One, among many, is a critical reflection on postsocialist academic spheres, their scientific policies and practices, as well as on research agendas and ideologies that have taken place in newly established “transitional” realities.

Let me begin with a specific case revealing bizarre domestication and neoliberal commodification of anthropology that has taken place in postsocialist Slovenia. The field of social sciences and humanities in Slovenia, especially in its part supposedly rela-

3 A hyper-production of different kinds of academic literature on these issues speaks for this argument; for example, Bercik & Bunc & Lampard 2000, Burawoy & Verdery 1999, Humphrey & Mandel 2002, Svašek 2006, Verdery 1996, Hann 2002, etc.

4 The Slovenian sociologist Drago Braco Rotar was one of the first to apply his efforts to the "return of anthropology" to Slovenia (Rotar 1991: 67-70).
social "scientific activity" was being fought. She considers the goal of such action to be understandable and banal: it was about the appropriation of institutions, educational programs, career positions, etc. It is interesting to notice that an important part of discussions within the framework of this academic battle concerning the entire field of social sciences and humanities in the end of the 1980s and in the first half of the 1990s were actually directly related to "anthropology" and have been, since then, also often developed on its shoulders. On one hand, this "newly discovered" social and humanistic discipline appeared as an alternative to, for example, ethnology, a part of academic sociology, human biology, etc., while, on the other hand, it seemed a suitable "coat" covering a whole range of specialised thematic fields and mostly imported disciplinary and problem denominations which were not firmly established in the Slovenian academic hierarchy of that period. These transitional pseudo-scientific domestications of anthropology and its disciplinary body, which were imported into the Slovenian university circles as a carrier of new scientific dreams for many intellectually badly formed or completely disoriented humanistic and social scientists who were simultaneously careerist enough to consider them as a good opportunity to get launched among national scientific stars, are, from time to another, so naive and ambitious that they can even provoke a certain amount of pathos. A detailed description of the course of many battles will have to wait for another occasion, while we can state right away that the consequences of this activity are more than bizarre. The current situation is as follows: on one hand, Slovenia has faced the proliferation of "anthropological institutions". I hope not to make an error in counting when claiming that, since the collapse of socialism, Slovenia has obtained at least two university (undergraduate) programs of (social/cultural) anthropology and at least three postgraduate programs in this field; a private postgradu-
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ate faculty with specialised anthropological programs; two or three national associations of anthropologists and at least one or two additional ones with anthropologists as their members; some five or six research institutes, departments or centres established by the state and containing the word "anthropology" in their name or program; a private research institute specialised in anthropology in the broadest sense of the term; some academic periodicals containing the word "anthropology" in their title or activity description; and a whole range of under- and postgraduate courses which are, in one way or another, supposed to transmit a kind of specialised anthropological knowledge. But Irena Šumi, who has been so far the first and only person to write about these specific institutional domestications of anthropology in Slovenia, notices that, despite multiplication of institutional bodies in the field of anthropology, no synergy ever appears which could lead to reformation or extension of the existing institutions; on the contrary, it is obvious that only one possible way exists in the Slovenian academic province, i.e. continuous establishing of new institutions to form temporary unions of a small number of people sharing the same views. Another structural characteristic set out by Šumi is related to the fact that hardly any of these "anthropological institutions" has not experienced in its lifetime a sort of dissolution of its "anthropological collective" resulting into the already predictable "circulation" of personnel and the formation of new institutional coalitions.5 However, it should be pointed out that the "cyclic

5 I mainly owe this chapter to the observations made by Irena Šumi (2004: 61). I would only like to add to her analysis above another structural element which has recently become a key reflex in the process of establishing new institutions and research collectives. Nowadays, the situation in many academic environments is as follows: when young people receive their PhD, they are overnight, and almost as a rule, left witho-
calendar of transitional births and collapses of research centres is not characteristic only for the Slovenian anthropology. One can notice the same instincts to produce institutions instead of actual contents also in other fields of the academic scene (if we only mention the fashion of establishing new universities and higher education institutions in the last five or ten years) as well as in a broader context. However, the transitional appropriations of anthropology in Slovenia have reached such extremes that anthropology has been transformed into a sort of "reservoir" for anything. Thus it has happened that the new "anthropological" departments and centres of the Slovenian universities and national scientific institutions, especially the new ones established on the base of new social needs and economic interests of transition and which have been stimulated by the state, have extensively filled up with people whose professional formations, scientific/research orientations and epistemologies have not much to do with either the most basic anthropological education or the epistemological paradigms and practices of anthropology, and who have been chosen on the basis of some bizarre personnel choices and non- or semi-transparent social circumstances. During a conversation on this topic, a colleague, geographer, unconsciously provided me with an exemplary and typical reproduction of the transitional "constitution" of anthropology:

Among us, geographers, it is perfectly clear who is geographer, what is geography and which contents are geographical, while as for you, anthropologists, it seems that anthropology is like floating in the air, it is somewhat vague, like a sort of disciplinary umbrella which can cover everything that cannot be classified under any other discipline.

The transitional constitution of anthropology on the level of university programs and scientific institutions, which has been, from many aspects in a completely unprofessional way, supported by the most vulgar neoliberalism and clientelistic realisation of survival strategies, has consequently lead to declassified receptions of anthropology presuming that this discipline can be simultaneously understood as everything or nothing. The background of this destructive process can be explained by the following dilletante logic: what cannot be "squeezed" into history, philosophy, geography or any other traditionally recognized and homogenised discipline in the Slovenian space, can be classified under anthropology. As an anthropologist by education, I had myself opportunity to observe this process of disfiguration and abolition of anthropological discipline in one of the Slovenian scientific institutions. Thus in many Slovenian higher education institutions which, in ambitious and "innovative" way, try to promote a certain "anthropological character" in their educational programs, anthropology has been falling through a steep cascade...
down to the level of an empty etiquette of conjuncture. To facilitate the understanding of the problems related to the social reception of anthropology, we have to examine in a more detailed way the background of the transitional constitution of the academic anthropology within the Slovenian university programs offering anthropological education. My sample consists of four Slovenian faculties of social sciences and humanities carrying out educational programs in anthropology either on undergraduate or postgraduate level. The selected faculties mainly cover the education of anthropologists and the production of anthropological profiles in Slovenia. For analytical reasons, I will not mention the names of the selected institutions, but even a quick glimpse into the structure of the pedagogical personnel employed in their anthropological departments or programs in the study years 2005/06, 2006/07 and 2007/08 is not only pretty indicative but probably even shocking from the viewpoint of anthropological departments formed according to standards of foreign universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty No. 1: Graduate Education in Anthropology (2006-07)</th>
<th>Faculty No. 2: Post-graduate Education in Anthropology (2006-07)</th>
<th>Faculty No. 3: Graduate Education in Anthropology (2005-06)</th>
<th>Faculty No. 4: Post-graduate Education in Anthropology (2007-08)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Anthropologists</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Non-Antropologists</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Percentage of university teachers-anthropologists within educational programs in anthropology carried out by Slovenian faculties.

The data cover an overview of pedagogical capacities, i.e. university teachers who form the backbone of educational programs in anthropology by covering the basic or obligatory subjects/core modules within the chosen programs. My classification of teachers into the categories of those who can/cannot be described as anthropologists is based on the following objective biographic and content criteria: field of scientific publication and activity (bibliography) as the most relevant, then academic formation (PhD in anthropology), and field of the achieved academic qualification (habilitation) as less relevant, because it can be performed as formally obtained label but cannot necessarily fit the reality of the work. I consider the afore-cited indicators as possibly reliable enough to be used as a barometer to judge the scientific competences of people in question. Furthermore, it has to be pointed out that all of the four faculties carry out programs in the field of socio-anthropological or cultural-anthropological branch of the anthropological discipline. Statistical data show that three out of four educational programs in anthropology are only to a very small extent carried out by university teachers who have specialised in social/cultural anthropology or anthropology in general. Such pedagogical constitution of academic anthropology is undoubtedly a challenge to Western models of constitution and organisation of anthropological courses and departments. Moreover, it also raises the question of quality of these programs, as well as the question of competences, especially when taking into account that some particular anthropological programs have been "inhabited" by experts who lack the most basic anthropological education as well as bibliography which could prove their scientific/research activity within this discipline, and, as we suppose, also do not possess sufficient knowledge and know-how needed for understanding of anthropological epistemology and effective use of anthropological fi-
eld methods. These non-anthropologists who have suddenly, in a transitional way, additionally become experts in anthropology, are actually people with certain academic formation: they in fact do carry out researches, but in other fields of humanities, from the pretty cognate ones, like sociology, ethnology, archaeology or philosophy, to the more remote ones, like theology, religiolo- 

gy, kinesiology, political and defence science, etc. According to their bibliographies, they are not connected by any clear epistemology and elaborated methodology, which are the condition and the essence of any pertinent practising of anthropology. I have been following the situation in this field for years and I have been continuously haunted by the feeling that the academic anthropology in Slovenia actually consists of an undefined sandpit which can be used by any "coincident" passer-by who can have some fun playing in it, while no-one points out any competences and consequences of such “playing” with a discipline which has been actually formulated and based on the ability of systematic reflection on achievements and mistakes within the discipline itself and other cognate disciplines. Many people still do not realise that modern anthropology is neither an undefined pile of confused theories deriving from various disciplines nor a broad landscape which could suck up all sorts of products of human imagination, but a serious discipline in the field of humanities and, from time to another, social sciences, with its own clearly defined scientific principles, rigorous reflective epistemology, and, above all, specific methodology based on fieldwork and elaboration of ethnography as "tickets" to enter the world of creation of the theory and scientific judgements concerning the subject matter.

The most eloquent is the proportion between university teachers with anthropological formation and those without it employed at the faculty N°2: the proportion of university teachers who do not have much to do with practising anthropology employed at this faculty is as high as 78%. This discovery becomes even more shocking if taking into account that this faculty is carrying out a postgraduate program and that in such cases one could expect (without much modesty) that the discipline will be conducted by real experts and not only occasionally inspired or in any other way "anthropologised" dilettantes. Even those who do not think that such commodification and domestication of anthropological science on the Slovenian universities is very problematic might have some problems imagining similar situations in some other areas, e.g. departments of geography lead by anthropologists or philosophers, programs in physics occupied by chemists or biologists, etc. Let me add right away that my pleading for anthropology in this article does not tend to create a “pure discipline” – such action would be an unacceptable academic purism – but is about raising the question of disciplinary pertinence which can only be provided by application of suitable competence, criteria, standards, and, last but not least, scientififfic sensibility when elaborating educational programs. As a matter of facts, the phenomenon described here is so kitschy that it calls for at least the very basic academic hygiene – if not a more profound scientific scrutiny.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity of Employer</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research in Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity of Employer</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research in Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let me add another significant specification to illustrate this university "anthropological" kitsch which has been put together with a certain lack of sensibility: the table below shows the total number of demands for the profile of anthropologist with a PhD formulated by universities and scientific research institutions in Slovenia in the last few years.

The table above, which contains the data on the actually reported (openly published) vacancies for anthropologists with a PhD on the part of employers covering the field of humanities and university education in Slovenia, lead us to two conclusions. Firstly, despite an increasing number of new anthropological, or at least "anthropologically commenting", university programs in Slovenia, the reported demand for anthropological profile on the part of university institutions is almost negligible. Besides, the eight vacancies in the field of university teaching of anthropology in the years 2003-2007 also reveal a pretty bad fluctuation of personnel. All these observations significantly complete our data from the Table 1 which indicates that anthropological programs mainly employ non-anthropologists. And even more surprisingly, in all the cases where vacancies were published by university employers only fixed-term employments were offered. Such situation could be more easily explained within the category of research in the humanities (where most of vacancies depend on individual state projects) than in the category of creation of new employments in the field of university pedagogy. Moreover, the table below (if compared to the one above) also indicates a negligible participation of academically educated anthropologists outside the academic world, e.g. in state administration, economy, media, non-governmental organisations and similar, where their knowledge could no doubt be useful and, above all, it could constitute an important analytical mirror.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type of Employment</th>
<th>Number of Vacancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Temporarily</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Temporarily</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Temporarily</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Temporarily</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Temporarily</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Temporarily</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported vacancies for anthropologists with a PhD (Source: Analytical Office of the Employment Service of Slovenia, June 2007).

Let us add another particularity of the Slovenian space into the bargain: anthropology is being implemented as a sort of fas-
hionable caprice which brings a taste of novelty, difference and exoticism (I perceive the latter as a fascinating interiorisation of the colonial approach which was in the past embodied by traditional anthropology). From time to another, certain non-anthropologists thus decorate their study subjects or researches with the popular expression "anthropology" (just as if it was an arbitrary denomination) although they may offer the contents which are miles away from any kind of anthropology. Consequently, we can claim that the Slovenian post-socialist academic ivory tower practices and understands the well-known holistic principle of anthropology in a very literal and, above all, incorrect way.

Slovenian Academic Yearnings for the List of Top 500 World Universities: Academic Sphere in Transition

The dominant focus in transition studies to date has been more on economic and political factors through analyses generally conducted at the national or international level, while a closer look at what has been happening in everyday life in urban contexts of post-socialist societies has not been brought up very often. It is actually anthropologists who, by using ethnographic methods, make visible problems and challenges that have until now been obscured, tabooed, or taken for granted; from synagogue restoration in Eastern Europe to gay sex tourism in Prague, or, to the politics of rock music in Hungary (Berdahl & Bunzl & Lampland 2000). All these anthropologically informed accounts have shown that specific issues and local topics can lead researchers to confront complex questions of individual agency and collective practices in the move away from socialism. The field of transitional science and academic arenas also gets more and more visible position in postsocialism studies. Amy Ninetto, for example, has examined the shifting and contradictory role of the post-Soviet state in science and in the lives of scientists. Her research has been concerned with the ever-changing boundary between the laboratory and society as well as with the movement of migrating scientists and the meanings attached to such academic mobility (2000: 37-41). Her exploration of intersections of the state and the market within contemporary Russian sciences challenges the common view that Russian scientists are overly "nostalgic" for the glories of Soviet science past. Instead, Ninetto demonstrates how scientists and scientific institutions creatively forge a range of relationships with state and market structures in order to adapt to the low levels of state funding available to them in the 1990s. In fact, Ninetto argues, the privatization of Russian science in the Siberian science city of Akademgorodok requires the active participation of state actors. In this inquiry she highlights the power relations that move knowledge production to the supposedly "non-ideological" sphere of science. In her examination of postsocialist forms of governmentality, she argues that, in transforming "structures that were available under socialism into hybrid state-private ventures", scientists have "reconfigured, and in some cases even strengthened, the relationship between state power and the production of knowledge. Seeing 'the state' as it is constituted in Russian scientists' discourse challenges Western models of the autonomy of science." (Ninotto 2005: 443). Ninetto’s research maybe reveals the unexpected or less expected results of market reforms in arenas such as science and academia from Western point of view. Certainly, this is not something what would really surprise, as many Eastern researchers have been watching, from a "native" point of view, similar process of the transitional reconfiguration and even decomposition of science that has taken place in many postsocialist countries in the last fifteen
years. Thus, the Russian example is maybe notorious due to the central role this country had played for the entire Eastern bloc, but is certainly not an isolated island where such transitional processes have restructured numerous domains of scientific life and work. Ironically, the very social processes that were supposed to remove or displace state control over science have invited the state back into science in different and, predominantly, not transparent ways in many East-European countries and their academic arenas.

Due to this, it is not surprising that postsocialist governances, formal democracy, capitalism, neoliberalism, international alliances and formations (European Union, NATO, etc.) and common European projects (such as the Bologna reform and Lisbon strategy) do not give quite so much credence to the unique social, political, formal, and ideological reconfiguration of transitional European societies. In many postsocialist countries, certain fields like academic arenas, scientific policies, practices of scientists, and the role of intellectuals are hardly a topic carried out in any manner by any public or serious research agenda; same goes for social sciences and humanities in Slovenia. Among several research projects in social science and humanities that the national ministry in charge of financing research has backed in the last decade, not a single one has specific "transitional problems of science" in its title. In Slovenia, constant politically and ideologically most urgent problem faced by young researchers, i.e. their possibilities for a professional career and development after completing their postgraduate studies. On the contrary, it only concentrated on the study of intersubjective relations and micro-social networks during the period when they were still formally a part of research groups. I think it is necessary to stress this point because one of the declared goals of this research was to study elements which exerted an influence on the academic success of young researchers. I am not sure if the research explained the reasons why more and more young researchers in Slovenia have to register at the Employment Service after having received their master or doctoral degree, and thus interrupt formal contacts with their research organisation. They have to look for new possibilities for employment from the position of unemployed persons which significantly weakens their position in negotiations. This fact was pointed out by an unemployed person with a PhD during the conversation with journalist Ksenja Haborina: "Companies do not publish offers for employment. They prefer waiting for a person with the right profile to register at the Employment Service. In this way the candidate's starting point for negotiations are significantly worse. He almost must accept the employment offered regardless to the conditions set by employer. " (Haborina 2006).
logical setting” which serves exclusively to the needs of the local political “despots” and their academic and scientific adherents and souffleurs, as well as their protected and submissive protagonists - were during the last fifteen years of the Slovenian “transition period” imported to Slovenia very successfully and without any critical reflection from the United States, while the EU scientific policies remained ignorant of this politically inspired neoliberal academic “instruction”. Let us limit ourselves to only one such phenomenon pointed out by the anthropologist Irena Šumí:

The fact that the librarian service offered by a private and very profit-oriented company from the USA Thompson ISI (with high charges for its services also in Slovenia) could have become the alpha and omega of the Slovenian national system of evaluating scientific production is screaming for a sociological analysis of the Slovenian provincialism. Nevertheless, from the practical viewpoint, such decision in our country is mainly a consequence of pressure exerted by the so-called “hard”, “natural” science. The objections formulated by experts proving that the production of knowledge within most of these sciences is, by its essence, technological and not epistemic (the latter should be understood as a paradigmatic and theoretically based and accomplished procedure while the first one consists of writing reports on actually experimental laboratory procedures “directly” from the work bench which are mainly shorter than an average article published in daily press...), while the production of knowledge in social sciences and humanities is, by its nature, reflexive [...] and it vitally depends on theoretical production (since laboratory methods are inaccessible in this domain and would be no doubt unethical). (Šumí 2003/04: 154-155)

Although transferring Western institutions (democracy, markets, consumerism, profitable science, etc.) to non-Western settings is a constant topic in political and economic discourses, it still offers a fascinating ground to analyze. Most anthropologists, as Hann points out, have been critical of policies based on the transfer of Western models, which overlook institutional contexts and the strong threads of continuity that mark even the most dramatic of social ruptures (Hann 2002: 5). However, economists, politicians and other local specialists who have tended to dismiss such points have also forgotten to ask themselves how expectations of transition, which have consistently not been fulfilled all over Eastern zone, have been produced in the wake of state socialism and how they have been intensively reproduced after it. Peggy Watson puts forward an argument to show how an idea of the West and of liberal freedom is at stake in the interpretation of the events of postcommunism (Watson 2000: 185). Namely, an idea of how to transfer achievements of Western societies, such as western freedom, in itself presupposes that identities and cultures under democratic and communist regimes are the same - what, later on, have underpinned many tensions in West-East communication. Let me add only another observation concerning the conceptual and probably even "confessional" bases of the whole evaluation system used for scientific production in Slovenia - the latter being practically fully absorbed into the state administrative system. It is impossible to work as a scientist or researcher outside the academic network put forward by state institutions which should only "administrate" science, but it seems that they create suitable circumstances for the monopoly of the "hard", "real" science over the "soft", "unnecessary" science. In Slovenia, this "totalitarianization" to which, under influence of "hard" sciences, are submitted not only social sciences and humanities but also the whole academic sphere, is not perceived as a problem. No matter how hard the Slovenian scientific policy tries to domesticate the greatest possible number of neoliberal administrative "innovations" from the American academic enterprise, the last years constantly served us with an annual "shock" for the Slovenian academic and media sphere: we are talking about the
list of top 500 world universities and the persistent absence of all of the Slovenian universities from this list. Once again in the beginning of July 2006, the publication of this list brought trouble into the local academic circles. All of the national and commercial media, even the most tabloid ones, jumped on this news from abroad. The interest of a broader audience was even more stimulated by the titles and commentaries in newspapers, on TV stations and in Internet media, announcing in a sensationalist style: "In the last few days, a cold shower not only for the minister for science Mr. Zupan but also for our universities", "Annual lists of top 500 world universities disappointed our academia once again this year", "Our universities absent from the most renowned lists of top 500 world universities, like those established in Shanghai and Madrid or the one published by the British newspaper Times". Journalists rushed to see the minister and the rectors of the Slovenian universities to get further explanations on this topic: why the Slovenian universities are absent from this list? The more or less unsure statements made by the competent spokesmen when asked about this list all revealed a sort of dejection and disappointment. Thus the media reported that the absence of the Slovenian universities from the "top list" was especially disappointing for Andreja Kocijančič, rector of the biggest Slovenian university, University of Ljubljana, since, as a candidate for this post, she had promised the return of the University of Ljubljana on the top list. According to media reports, the same disappointment was shown by minister Zupan who believed that at least the biggest Slovenian university should be included on the top list, especially as the state gave it an opportunity to cooperate with excellent foreign experts within the research groups formed at our universities. On the other hand, Jože Mencinger, the former rector of the University of Ljubljana, suggested in the interview for the Slovenian newspaper Mladina (November 10, 2006) – when the

journalist asked him about the absence of the University of Ljubljana from "that miserable list of top 500 world universities" – the following "hocus pocus solution" of the problem:

I myself would not make too much fuss about that list established in China although, of course, I would prefer to be ranked 100th. With regard to the criteria used for establishing the list, the problem could be resolved in a relatively easy way: let's buy a retired professor who has won the Nobel Prize.

The obsession with this kind of lists which are used more for the promotion of particular academic elites and clienteles with an already established global reputation than for proving the quality of scientific research could not leave indifferent even the Slovenian expert council for science and technology. Its annual reports and the last years' minutes (e.g. the one from October 14, 2005) reveal an increased attention devoted to "the research criteria as well as the quality of research at the Slovenian universities (in relation to the list of top 500 world universities)." (p. 3-4). Furthermore, the selected sages to whom the trying navigation between Scylla and Charybdis towards the desperately longed-for high seas of globally renowned media lists had been entrusted gave their blessing to the suggestion formulated by their captain Tomaz Pisanski, the Number One among those with the same yearnings, that "the expert council for science and technology, in cooperation with the expert council for high school education, should establish a common working body which would formulate some directives to raise the quality level of research at the universities ... with the purpose that one or another of our universities could be, after a certain period, included on the list of top 500 world universities."
vian faculties; any of the faculties figuring on the list of 200 European universities from the list of the top 500 could, for example, choose 20 comparable European faculties it wishes to be compared with. The results of such comparisons could then show the quality of each university through the quality of its individual members (its smaller units)." (p. 4). Regardless to the confusion in verbalisation of the vision itself, it is even more interesting to observe the fact that people proposing these measures only strive for inclusion on that "magic" list which is obviously supposed to resolve all the problems of the Slovenian science, while they do not mention the striking need for a thorough institutional and expert review of the Slovenian scientific institutions necessary to improve the conditions of work and study on the Slovenian universities and, consequently, also the possibilities for employment of their graduates. The directives elaborated by the above-mentioned state organ lead us to a very surprising conclusion, i.e. that the changes of the Slovenian academic sphere are necessary because of an overly mediatisized list, and not because of the actual circumstances which are far from being enviable. This indicator is probably reliable enough to convince us that the academic "elite" confirmed by the state has not yet overgrown all the transitional diseases, especially those related to the "enthronement" of appearance over contents, to the monopolie of declared and fictive reality over the actual one, and to the provincial formal elements.

And to end this chapter, the story takes a fresh turn: at the very moment when I was finishing this article, on August 17, 2007, the leadership of the University of Ljubljana published the news on its website and in the national media that the first Slovenian university "has been ranked once again among the top 500 world universities also according to the 'Shanghai' list, which is, beside the 'Times's' THES list which ranks the

University of Ljubljana 362nd, the most recognized way of ranking universities in the world. The Shanghai 'judges' have estimated that the University of Ljubljana is to be ranked 402nd to 508th for its quality." The Slovenian media have not forgotten to add to this joyous news that Slovenia is the smallest country with its university on this list. In sum: all is well that ends well – at least for a year or until the following list is published. And thus the Slovenian and the global academic caravan roll on, while some of the problems described in this as well as in other articles most probably remain intact.

Minister's "Over-Educated Science": Intellectualism in Danger

It was, among other, the work of Julia Kristeva, a Bulgarian theorist living in France, that importantly and with a fine intellectual power challenged the question, definitely still actual in these days, "to what purpose serve the intellectuals", scientists, researchers, scholars, etc. (see Kristeva 1977: 20-26). Familiarised with the contexts of life in a real-socialist Balkan country, she knew perfectly how it was to live as intellectual in an environment of continuous and constant fight and risky personal engagements against the power and the terror of anti-intellectualism and anti-academism as well as against human regression of all kinds. Furthermore, there is a newly installed (under the guise of "democratic" and "modern" political vocabulary) pathological resistance, on the institutional level, against the two profiles of citizen, namely against critical intellectual and engaged scientist in almost all postsocialist East-European and Balkan countries.

Consequently, the real intellectual work and scientific reflexivity seem to become more and more difficult; even more, the
rise of a new conservatism and "neoliberal newspeak" (according to Bourdieu and Wacquant 2001: 6-7) triumphing and dominating all spheres of contemporary societal life evokes in these newly installed European "democracies" a sophisticated risk and danger for all those who would like to practice serious, reflexive and responsible intellectual as well as socially engaged scientific work. No doubt, this social fact is in great contradiction with the political vocabulary represented by common EU projects and scientific policies (among them, particularly the Bologna and Lisbon reforms). Ironically, this internationally homogenised ideological vocabulary is directly opposed to the real social situation in science, research and intellectual activity in postsocialist milieus. Apparently, this trans-nationally homogenising European ideological discourse of "neoliberal newspeak" dominating all contemporary sciences, has nothing to do with the reality; but it has – through its more and more powerful and aggressive mechanisms of cultural, economical, political, social and symbolic domination – a lot to do with fabrication and deformation of the reality. The Slovenian case is an excellent and probably a paradigmatic example of this mental terror that urges mystification and transformation of the real conditions in postsocialist science, intellectualism, university habits, and education agendas. What seems to be characteristic for many postsocialist European societies (inside or outside the EU) is the following: there exists a process of dilettantism of all sorts, a deep

7 For more about the practices and ideologies, illusions and delusions of the Slovenian transitional scientific policy see Komnik 2005: 67-92.
8 Recently, two Slovenian scientists, sociologist Drago Braco Rotar and historical anthropologist Taja Kramberger, have given some reflexive and critical accounts of problems in the realm of Slovenian scientific provincialism: Kramberger 2001: 21, 2003: 77-95; Rotar 1997: 34, 2004: 15-37.

9 For better understanding of the recent transitional academic anti-intellectualism and anti-academia in Slovenia I recommend a comprehensive and ground-breaking anthropological study revealing the shocking and brutal disintegration of scientific community at Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis – Ljubljana Graduate School of Humanities where the author of this article was employed for certain period of time. This book entitled Monografija o ISH. Neposredna zgodovina dogodka na ISH. Elementi za refleksijo [Monograph about ISH. Immediate History: Events at ISH. Elements for a Reflexive Study], and supported by rich ethnographic material, identifies certain aspects of human force that took place at the above-mentioned anthropological faculty during the first half of 2004 with elements of violent anti-intellectualism, irrationalism, and primitivism.
stential strategies of intellectuals and scholars which are re-
main curiously under-communicated or even entirely tabooed.

After redundant political negotiating about the "role" and the
"importance" of national science and academia for postsocial-
alist societies' future in changing Europe – as it was an intensi-
vely communicated topos of political attention in the 1990s –
the majority of discussions taking place recently not only in
Slovenia but in the EU in general have, not surprisingly, turned
toward an absolute neoliberal trivialisation of the intellectual
work and an applicative banalisation of science.

Thus, we are facing an unconcealable fall and a highly con-
testable decrease of social value of the real intellectual work
and of the serious analytical science as well as an enormous
lack of social responsibility in science and research. The neo-
liberal and commercial reduction of the scientists' work to the
condition of temporary employees running from project to pro-
ject, appears as normal, accepted and totally unproblematic "so-
cial norm". To paraphrase Bourdieu (1998: 3), this exploitation
without limits is exactly the essence of contemporary academic
neoliberalism. The situation is even more problematic if scient-
ists, scholars and researchers themselves perceive this exploi-
tive "norms" and social processes as the naturally given histori-
cal necessity and as something what needs to be done for "their
vision of making and contributing to "better world".

Indeed, in Slovenia as well as in comparable postsocialist co-
tries, it still seems difficult to work as a researcher outside
traditional academic institutions – the socialist academic masto-
dons determining the whole scientific and intellectual habitus.10

10 For the provincial intellectualism and anti-intellectualism in the Slo-
venian academic sphere see Irena Sumi's fruitful article "Intelektualno delo
v provinci, kaj je to?" [Intellectual Work in the Province, What is this?].
by their senior colleagues, the most vital and agile force in the work process, have instead found themselves deprived of basic means for survival and have to look for employment outside the research (and generally scientific) sphere, while more and more frequently also outside Slovenia – thus obviously devaluing the financial investment of the state to form their "scientific capital". The whole story about the success of the Slovenian "knowledge-based society" is ridiculed by young experts with scientific degrees vegetating at employment services as they cannot find a suitable employment. And this is not all: the situation is getting such catastrophic dimensions that employment services are not at all prepared to the more and more massive arrival of personnel with more than average education, specialist qualifications and scientific degrees, which is especially the case of profiles in the domain of social sciences and humanities. It actually seems that the latter would do best if they stopped existing, the sooner the better: they are socially weak, which is the more obvious the more profiled and critical is their discourse and the more scientific and intellectual is their thought. The last fact is related to the following bizarre situation: this personnel with highly-developed intellectual potential and rich symbolic capital is becoming bigger and bigger problem for the Slovenian society and state since it is almost impossible for these people to find suitable employment because they are supposedly over-educated and thus less and less "useful" and wanted on the part of the Slovenian employers who can be, in a great majority, characterized by mediocre intelligence, clientele social connections, blindness concerning their own interests and a lack of suitable epistemological tools for social reflection and reflection of their own acts (Kotnik 2004: 18). A counsellor for first-time job seekers at the Employment Service of Slovenia has described the devaluation of education, which is a consequence of the most vulgar and degenerated capitalism in transition, as follows:

---
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The holders of MSc degrees do not enter their master degree into their employment booklet anymore because they believe this could reduce their employment possibilities (Hahonina 2006).

When I was talking to another counsellor at the Employment Service, she added the following:

I had some cases when young holders of a PhD admitted that they did not tell anything about their doctor's degree at a job interview because they believed that would deteriorate their position in negotiations with the employer.

As we can see, the process of "turbo-neoliberal" logic has already firmly established in this area and has defined the fate of many individuals. Let us check the data concerning the unemployment of anthropologists with a scientific degree in Slovenia in the past few years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waiting period</th>
<th>Dec. 2</th>
<th>Dec. 03</th>
<th>Dec. 04</th>
<th>Dec. 05</th>
<th>Dec. 06</th>
<th>Dec. 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 8 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average waiting period</th>
<th>No data</th>
<th>1 y</th>
<th>1 y</th>
<th>2 y</th>
<th>2 y</th>
<th>2 y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 m</td>
<td>2 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 d</td>
<td>21 d</td>
<td>18 d</td>
<td>3 d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of registered unemployed anthropologists with a PhD on December 31, sorted by years (Source: Analytical Office of the Employment Service of Slovenia, June 2007)
In Slovenia, where anthropology has a very marginal position in academic enterprise and is practically completely unrecognized and unknown science outside this circle, any unemployed anthropologist is a great shame. Statistically speaking, the data gathered in the table above which show the number of unemployed anthropologists with a PhD are certainly not that significant, especially if taking into account the production of this profile and the level of its specialization. On the contrary, analytically speaking, the data concerning the waiting period between the moments when an anthropologist loses his job and finds a new employment are very significant. These data show that the waiting period for individuals has been prolonging in the past years. The fact that highly qualified experts and even holders of scientific degrees cannot find a job for two years and more is no doubt alarming.

The Slovenian scientific policy of transition has brought the administration of science to some incredible absurdities which create institutional discrimination and unjust segregation of academic personnel. Thus in Slovenia, the unemployed or temporarily unemployed, as well as freelance scientists and researchers (among them also those excluded from the academic establishment or from institutions in general), cannot stand as candidates for national projects since only registered research organisations can apply for them. Due to such organisation, the state actually uses a systematic approach to favour the already employed university pedagogues who are also the only ones to enjoy social security provided by the state and to whom the possibility to stand as candidates for these projects is only an additional dollop of cream on the top of their full pedagogic engagement. Both, university teachers and researchers, have to go through comparable cyclic controls and periodic requests for promotion within the system of pedagogic and scientific titles, but, contrarily to pedagogues, researchers are being continuously forced into competition for projects which usually represent their basic means for survival and, furthermore, into a frenetic race for foreign (especially EU) project funds which, when they finally get them, actually do not represent for them any increased social security but only an increased work load. In practice this means that all the time of a fully employed researcher is actually divided between applying for projects and writing reports about them. When, in 2004, I was conducting ethnography about this phenomenon, some of Slovenian scientists working in the fields of social sciences and humanities, as well as technical and natural sciences, encouraged me to contact the then minister for science, education and sport in the previous left government of the Republic of Slovenia Slavko Gaber and ask him if he was familiar with this problem. Since I was not allowed to meet him in person, I called him by telephone and drew his attention to the guarantees of discrimination provided by the system itself when fixing conditions to apply for state projects, I described him to which extent the way the existing administrative nomenclature functions actually effects the professional work of researchers, and asked him if it was in any way possible to suppress these anomalies. I was a bit surprised when I noticed that the minister’s explanations could not in any way change my estimation concerning the described state discrimination: instead of this, our conversation confirmed what I have already established. The minister could not hide his private conviction that concerning these affairs, the instinct of self-preservation is much stronger than the real readiness for suppression of the discriminatory standards. No doubt the changes necessary to abolish the inequalities and the existing disproportions in the field of competition for projects are very likely to provoke strong pressures on the part of those who are, due to these disproporti-
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ons, now a-priori attributed a privileged position at the distribution of public funds. But nonetheless, sooner or later it is still the responsibility of the minister to react. What shocked me even more than the minister’s unconvincing excuses for such system discriminations was his advice that, if we were not satisfied in Slovenia, we should “go ahead and go abroad”. “Go-ahead-and-go-abroad”-type demagoggy is undoubtedly cynical arrogance trying to draw attention from the responsibility for non-action and mistaken actions of the political elites and to conceal the non-readiness of these same elites to face the real situation and especially the consequences of their activity for the national community as a whole. In sum, this conversation only proved to me that in Slovenia there exist scientists and researchers who are, due to the “decrees” issued by the state administration for science, additionally “punished” for their unequal social situation in science, unprivileged from the institutional point of view, and socially stigmatised. Not even the acquired academic and administrative statuses conferred by the state administration itself in order to systemise the state register of researchers can resolve this situation. If, for one reason or another, a scientist loses his job or if he finds himself outside any institution which could cover his activities, the state behaves as if he simply ceased being a scientist, as if he lost his competences overnight. I consider such paradoxes (frequently encountered in Slovenia and in other countries) as typical “bizarries” of transitional societies with badly formed and differentiated social systems.

Participation in science is today subject to serious imbalances: the gap between those who are safely installed on their regular university positions at one of the Slovenian universities, enjoying the cosiness of having a clearly defined working status which goes along with suitable social commodity and working conditions, and those to whom frenetic search for projects is the only source of social security in science, is enormous and is getting even larger. Without any doubt, the highest price of this imbalance caused by the “transitional scientific policy” is to be paid by young people who have just entered the field of science and who – without any responsibility or guilt on their part – are daily pushed by actual circumstances to inhuman humiliations, devaluations of their work and struggles for survival (Kotnik 2004: 18). Furthermore, young people are also most vulnerable in the struggle for jobs, continued work and career development since they frequently work on temporary projects. In 2006, I discussed this topic by telephone with the minister for high education, science and technology of the Republic of Slovenia Jure Zupan, but I unfortunately had to state that the new, right government does not care much more about the problems of its citizens who are expected to support it on the elections.

To present the phenomenon of unemployment among the most educated citizens, especially young doctors, a journalist of the Slovenian weekly newspaper Mladina tried to contact them: the young doctors could use their presence in the Slovenian press as a sort of self-promotion. But it turned out that the few among them who were ready to talk to the press accepted to cooperate only under condition of anonymity and strict confidentiality. A young doctor described his feeling of helplessness when he lost his job as follows (before that, he felt that by achieving a PhD he already did something in his life):

Then I registered at the Employment Service, I found myself there with other unemployed people, and I found out that I actually did nothing. I have fallen into the class of “lumpenproletariat” and I sell myself as an auxiliary worker without any status (cit. Habonima 2006).

In Slovenia, a certain number of individuals achieve their PhD every year: in 2002, this number was 318, in 2003 367, in 2004...
355, and in 2005 369. In my ethnography, I have also taken into account the experiences of people working at the Employment Service of the Republic of Slovenia where my informer, a counsellor for employment, told me that the so-called "real posts for doctors" do not exist:

People with a PhD who find themselves at the Employment Service perceive the labour market from the viewpoint of intellectual power—which is understandable since they had to go through a long and usually extremely targeted education process. This is why these people want to find a job within their professional field. Nowadays, some students continue their studies at postgraduate level only because they cannot find a job after graduating, while others mainly expect that they could find a job with their highly qualified knowledge, but it turns out that a PhD is not a "ticket for a job" like it used to be.

One cannot ignore the fact that the previously described imbalance in Slovenia results from intentional cohabitation of two situations: an absence of a plan on the part of the state system and a union of the political, bureaucratic and scientific mediocre local clientele. Nowadays, the universalised and institutionalised "egalitarian" representation of the social world of science and academic sphere actually implements the respect for the images conceived on the basis of the collective definition of inequality. This is why, again and again, we have to deal with the production of new inequalities that exclude the social agreement and abolish what has been already achieved. From this viewpoint, the Slovenian scientific policy is a perfect example of a symptomatic (re)production of new (or the "old new") inequalities and of privileging some people over others.

Unexpectedly or not, many EU regulations, administrative directives, and Europeanised political discourses about equal participation in science face or produce counter-productive effects in post-socialist societies. The research which would pursue what are the reasons for such discrepancies still needs to be done. Following this dilemma, it has to be stressed that the state multiplication of formalisms and bureaucratic decrees and ordinances in post-socialist scientific policies (usually "following" standards and trends of the most developed Western societies) is only a symptom of the lack/absence of elaborated criteria which reflects the incapability of the "transitional societies" to deal with the regimes of their own social reality and singularity.

Conclusions

This short account seems to bring us to the point where we can rather pose more new questions than give answers. The engaged intellectual and the critical scientist, do they exist in post-socialist transitional contexts? How are they possible? And why are they necessary? To what purpose therefore serve the scientists today? Is this maybe science or something else? To what purpose serve the contemporary researchers? To real research agendas or rather to the fascination over the project applying rituals? What are the intellectuals for? Why are they predominantly forced to meet social margins of all kinds in "post-modern" EU social enterprise? (Kotnik 2004: 143-151). Is the conception of Sartre's "engaged intellectual" or Gramsci's "organic intellectual" still relevant or maybe too idealised, abstract and inappropriate "personification" of today's forms of intellectualism and reflexivity? Many recent ethnographies on post-socialism offer a powerful critique of the discourse of "transition". Ethnographic perspective can provide crucial information and data which can function as profound critiques of ideology, in this case exposing the discourse of transition to both a regime of signs employed to justify the subordination of these
nations and their academic elites to the imperatives of global trade and finance, and a poorly designed and executed blueprint to bring about a new social order. Anthropological ethnographies also have the virtue of reminding us what the discourses of transition and postsocialism really are: theories which in the collective euphoria and drama between 1989 and 1991 received the force of fact (Wolfe 2000: 197-198, Berdahl 2000, Verdery 1996, De Soto & Dudwick 2000). Anthropologists are skilled to come into contact with real people, their social practices and predicaments. Although anthropological perspectives are mainly organized around and focused on specific practices at the micro level, they invariably carry wider implications, as it was intended to be shown in this writing.
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BIZARNI AKADEMIZAM I NAUKA U SLOVENIJI: ELEMENTI ANTROPOLOŠKE STUDIJE POSTSOЦIJALIZMA I TRANZICIJE

Članak se bavi nekim aspektima ponude akademskog milja, nauke in intelektualne kulture tokom postsozializma, spram razumevanja tranzicionih pitanja v savremenoj Sloveniji. Započinje sa iznadenjenjem prouzrokovanim bizarnom komodifikacijom in domestifikacijom antropologije v Sloveniji, naročito na Sloveňski univerzitetima, posle devedesetih, kao in promišljanjem društvene prihvačenosti, institucionalne organizacije in akademskim statusom antropologije v tej zemlji. Štaviše, kroz specifican cases study štoste debate koja se v skorsnje vreme odigrala v Sloveniji a ticala se odsustva Slovečkih Univerziteta sa ožiglašenje liste 500 najboljih svetkih univerziteta, pokušava se ilustravati sər' funkcionalizan akademski šfera v tranzicionih društvenih njihova protivrečja in neslaganja. Zaključek razblicita neke elemente družbenog licemera. On otkriva činjenice koje su imale značajne uloge u poslednjim godinama, i shodno nam pomaže v razumevanju uloge Slovečke državne nauke administration v procesima sistematske transformacije ove nezavisne društvene oblasti visoko naučnog rada, v turbo-neoliberalni poduvi navadna, akademskog lumpenproletetata, anti-intelektualnih dilera, profitera in špekulanata.
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