

Sixth International Conference
Sarajevo and the world
Pandemic Perspectives
April/May, 2020.

Šesta internacionalna konferencija
Sarajevo i svijet
U pandemijskim vidicima
april/maj, 2020.

REFLECTIONS

OSVRTI

CONTENTS / SADRŽAJ

PREFACE	7
PREDGOVOR	8
GENERAL REFLECTIONS / OPĆI OSVRTI	9
Miloš Lazin	9
Suada Kapić	9
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	10
The first panel / Prvi panel	
PLURALITY AND SOLIDARITY IN A TIME OF EMERGENCY/ PLURALNOST I SOLIDARNOST U VANREDNIM OKOLNOSTIMA	11
Paul Ballanfat, CONFINÉS AVEC LE VIRUS / ZATOČENI VIRUSOM	11
Desmond Maurer	11
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	12
Yazid Said, GLOBAL CRISIS AND GLOBAL JUSTICE: SOME THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS / GLOBALNA KRIZA I GLOBALNA PRAVDA: NEKE TEOLOŠKE REFLEKSIJE	12
Ivo Marković	12
Keith Doubt.....	14
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	14
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić	14
Nerin Dizdar.....	15
Mohammed Rustom, ON LISTENING: HEARING GOD’S VOICE IN THE FACE OF SUFFERING / O SLUŠANJU: ČUJUĆI BOŽIJI GLAS U SUOČENJU S PATNJOM	17
Yazid Said.....	17
Asim Zubčević.....	18
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	19
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić	19
Adis Lukač, PANDEMIC MISFORTUNE AS OPPORTUNITY FOR REFORM OF BEING / NEPRILIKA (PANDEMIJA) KAO PRILIKA ZA REFORMU BIĆA.....	21
Esnefa Smajlović-Muhić.....	21
Desmond Maurer, CRACKS IN THE COSMODICY: CORONAVIRUS, LISBON, AND THE SUBLIME AS SEEN FROM SARAJEVO / PUKOTINE U KOSMODICEJI: KORONA VIRUS, LISABON I UZVIŠENO VIĐENI IZ SARAJEVA.....	22
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	22
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić	22
Rusmir Šadić, FEAR – THE FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTERISTIC IN THE EXPERIENCE OF THE AGE / STRAH – TEMELJNA OZNAKA ZA ISKUSTVO EPOHE.....	24
Esnefa Smajlović-Muhić.....	24

Safet HadžiMuhamedović	25
Miloš Lazin, NOTES SUR LE MONDE A L'ARRET / ZAPISI IZ ZAUSTAVLJENOG SVETA	25
Almir Bašović	25
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	26
Emir Habul, GLOBAL SOLUTIONS TO GLOBAL PROBLEMS / GLOBALNA RJEŠENJA ZA GLOBALNE PROBLEME	27
Neven Anđelić	27
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	28
Senadin Lavić, SCIENCE, NEOLIBERALISM, AND EDUCATION DURING THE PANDEMIC AGE / ZNANOST, NEOLIBERALIZAM I OBRAZOVANJE U PANDEMIJSKOM VREMENU.....	28
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	28
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić	28
Asim Zubčević.....	29
The second panel / Drugi panel	
THE CRISIS AND ITS IMPACT ON SOCIETY AND CULTURE / KRIZA I NJEZINI UTJECAJI NA DRUŠTVO I KULTURU	30
Almir Bašović, STAND UP TRAGEDY: SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE PANDEMIC FROM ISOLATION IN SARAJEVO / STAND UP TRAGEDIJA: NEKOLIKO REFLEKSIJA O PANDEMIJI IZ SARAJEVSKE IZOLACIJE	30
Desmond Maurer	30
Amra Hadžimuhamedović, ON THE KUMRA DOVE, SARAJEVO TOWN HALL, AND SEEKING THE SIMURGH: CULTURAL HERITAGE DURING THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC / O PTICI KUMRI, SARAJEVSKOJ VIJEĆNICI I TRAŽENJU SIMURGA: KULTURNO NASLIJEĐE U VRIJEME PANDEMIJE COVID-19	31
Mirsad Kunić.....	31
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	32
Ivo Marković, SARAJEVO AND THE ROLE OF CULTURE IN SOCIAL CHANGE CAUSED BY THE PANDEMIC / SARAJEVO U KONTEKSTU ULOGE KULTURE U DRUŠTVENIM PROMJENAMA IZAZVANIM PANDEMIJOM	32
Desmond Maurer	32
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	34
Mile Babić.....	36
Mirsad Kunić, THE EXPERIENCE OF PAIN AND DEATH IN BOSNIAK ORAL POETRY / ISKUSTVO BOLI I SMRTI U BOŠNJAČKOJ USMENOJ POEZIJI	36
Esnefa Smajlović-Muhić.....	36
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić	37
Mehmed Agović, USING CORONAVIRUS AGAINST CIVIL RIGHTS AND MEDIA FREEDOM / VIRUS(OM) KORONA PROTIV GRAĐANSKIH PRAVA I MEDIJSKIH SLOBODA	37
Nerin Dizdar.....	37

Mustafa Sefo and Fahira Fejzić Čengiđ, COMMUNICATION AND THE CORONA VIRUS / KOMUNIKACIJA U PANDEMIJSKOM VREMENU	38
Neven Anđelić	38
The third panel / Treći panel	
REIMAGINING UNIVERSAL POLITICAL, CULTURAL, AND ECONOMIC PARADIGMS LOCALLY/ REIMAGINACIJA UNIVERZALNIH POLITIČKIH, KULTURNIH I EKONOMSKIH PARADIGMI U LOKALNIM OKVIRIMA	40
Žarko Papić, THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE COVID 19 PANDEMIC: VIEWED FROM THE SARAJEVO LOCKDOWN / SOCIJALNE POSLJEDICE COVID-19 PANDEMIJE: U VIDICIMA SARAJEVSKOG ZATOČENJA	40
Mirsad Kunić	40
Kadrija Hodžić	40
Fikret Čaušević, THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK FOR BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA DURING THE COVID 19 GLOBAL CRISIS / EKONOMSKE PERSPEKTIVE BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE TOKOM GLOBALNE KORONA KRIZE	41
Žarko Papić	41
Kadrija Hodžić	41
Adnan Salkić	42
Kadrija Hodžić and Izudin Kešetović, THE AGE OF THE CORONA ECONOMY IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA / VRIJEME KORONA EKONOMIJE U BOSNI I HERCEGOVINI	42
Žarko Papić	42
Hamdija Hadžihasanović, THE PANDEMIC AND BOSNIAN DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES / PANDEMIJA I BOSANSKI RAZVOJNI IZAZOVI	43
Izudin Kešetović	43
Rasim Gačanović	43
Rasim Gačanović, ON TWO SIEGES OF SARAJEVO / O DVJEMA OPSADAMA SARAJEVA	44
Neven Anđelić	44
Vahid Tanović, FUTURE ENERGY SOURCES FOR HEATING BUILDINGS IN B&H AND AROUND THE WORLD GIVEN THE FIGHT AGAINST CLIMATE CHANGE / BORBA PROTIV KLIMATSKIH PROMJENA I BUDUĆI IZVORI ENERGIJE ZA GRIJANJE ZGRADA	46
Rasim Gačanović	46
Anes Podić, MINI HYDROPOWER PLANTS – DANGEROUS SCAMS WITH LONG-TERM DAMAGES / MALE HIDROELEKTRANE – OPASNE PREVARE S DALEKOROČNIM ŠTETAMA	47
Rasim Gačanović	47
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	48
Keith Doubt, THE SPIRIT OF CAPITALISM IN THE FACE OF THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC / DUH KAPITALIZMA U SUOČENJU S PANDEMIJOM VIRUSA KORONA	48
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić	48
Nerin Dizdar	49

Sonja Biserko, THE CORONAVIRUS ENIGMA AND THE BALKANS / BALKAN I ENIGMA KORONE.....	49
Desmond Maurer	50
Kadrija Hodžić	51
Mile Babić	51
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić	51
The fourth panel / Četvrti panel	
CITY AND STATE UNDER CRISIS CONDITIONS / GRAD I DRŽAVA U VREMENIMA KRIZE	52
Neven Anđelić, BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA: STATE-POWER AND SOCIETY / BOSNA I HERCEGOVINA: DRŽAVA, MOĆ I DRUŠTVO	52
Desmond Maurer	52
Suada Kapić	54
Asim Zubčević	56
Suada Kapić, THEN-NOW-TOMORROW / ONDA-SADA-SUTRA.....	57
Almir Bašović	57
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić	58
Gojko Berić, TWO SIEGES, TWO EXPERIENCES / DVIJE OPSADE, DVA ISKUSTVA.....	58
Mirsad Kunić.....	58
Keith Doubt.....	59
Neven Anđelić	60
Jovan Divjak, WHITE IMAGE OF THE SARAJEVO PANDEMIC / BELA/BIJELA SLIKA SARAJEVSKE PANDEMIJE	60
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić	60
Nataša Tabori, SARAJEVO IN A TIME OF PANDEMIC ON THE PERIPHERY OF EUROPE'S NEO- MEDIAEVAL EMPIRE / SARAJEVO U VRIJEME PANDEMIJE, NA PERIFERIJ I EVROPSKE NEO- MEDIJEVALNE IMPERIJE	61
Amra Hadžimuhamedović	62
Azra Dobardžić, SENIORS AS A RISK GROUP DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC – A CASE STUDY OF ONE CITY IN THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA, USA / STARIJI LJUDI SKUPINA KAO UGROŽENA COVID-19 PANDEMIJOM: SLUČAJ PROUČAVAN U JEDNOM GRADU WAŠINGTONSKE METROPOLE, SAD	64
Bakir Nakaš.....	64
Marko-Antonio Brkić, SARAJEVO – FROM BIRTHPLACE OF INTEGRAL HUMANISM TO UNIVERSALIST DESERT OF MIND / SARAJEVO – OD RODNOG MJESTA CJELOVITOG HUMANIZMA DO UNIVERZALISTIČKE PUSTINJE DUHA.....	65
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	66
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić	67
Safet HadžiMuhamedović, LOCATING PANDEMIC GRIEF IN SARAJEVO: GEORGIC NOTES AGAINST SELF-ISOLATING REGIMES / SMJEŠTAJUĆ I PANDEMIJSKU ŽALOST U SARAJEVO: JURJEVSKE BILJEŠKE PROTIV REŽIMA SAMOIZOLACIJE	68

Desmond Maurer	68
Asim Zubčević.....	70
Asim Zubčević, SARAJEVO AND NEW DELHI DURING PANDEMIC: SOME REFLECTIONS	71
Desmond Maurer	71
The fifth panel / Peti panel	
HEALTH, THE INDIVIDUAL, AND POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY / ZDRAVLJE, NEPOVREDIVOST POJEDINCA, I POLITIČKA ODGOVORNOST	72
Elizabeth Alexandrin, MEDICINAL GARDENS, HEALING TRAILS, AND OUR PANDEMIC BODIES	72
Asim Zubčević.....	72
Sonja Dujmović, HEALTH AND RESPONSIBILITY: THE EXPERIENCE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA UP TO 1941 / ZDRAVLJE I ODGOVORNOST: ISKUSTVO BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE DO 1941.GODINE..	73
Azra Dobardžić.....	73
Midhat Jašić.....	74
Mile Babić	74
Mile Babić, JURAJ DRAGIŠIĆ: DEFENDER OF REFUGEES AND EXILES / JURAJ DRAGIŠIĆ: BRANITELJ IZBJEGLICA I PROGONJENIH	75
Desmond Maurer	75
Senadin Lavić.....	75
Ali Lakhani, IN QUARANTINE / U KARANTENI	76
Mohammed Rustom.....	76
Ivo Marković	77
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić	78
Asim Zubčević.....	78
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić, THE SELF AND THE WORLD: VIOLATING THE RIGHTS OF THE BAT / POJEDINAČNO JASTVO I SVA OBZORJA: O POVRIJEĐENOM PRAVU ŠIŠMIŠA.....	79
Almir Bašović	79
Safet HadžiMuhamedović	79
Asim Zubčević.....	80
Mehmedalija Hadžić.....	80
Nerin Dizdar, RESTRICTIONS AND REPRESSION: ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC APPROACH AND IMPLEMENTATION OF SOCIAL MEASURES IN THE TIME OF THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC	81
Desmond Maurer	81
Asim Zubčević.....	81
Midhat Jašić, NUTRITION AND CORONA VIRUS / PREHRANA I VIRUS KORONA	82
Azra Dobardžić.....	82
Samir Beglerović and Kerim Sušić, THE GLOBAL WORLD AFTER THE PANDEMIC: THE NOTION OF A POST-VIRUS WORLD AS CONCEIVED BY IMRAN HOSEIN AND ALEKSANDR DUGIN / GLOBALNI SVIJET	

NAKON PANDEMIJE: POJAM POSTVIRUSNOG SVIJETA KOD IMRANA HOSEINA I ALEKSANDRA DUGINA	82
Desmond Maurer	83
Neven Anđelić	83
Asim Zubčević.....	86
Mehmedalija Hadžić.....	87
ABOUT THE AUTHORS / O AUTORIMA.....	88

PREFACE

After the conference papers were circulated to all the participants at the Sixth International Conference on *Sarajevo and the World, Pandemic Perspectives* (available at: <http://www.forumbosna.org/announcement-to-members-and-friends-of-the-international-forum-bosnia>), 27 participants provided 91 responses. These responses are given below, organised by the title of the paper to which they refer, with the name of the author of the reflection indicated, again following the order by which the authors' own papers appear in the conference.

Authors are kindly asked to provide their responses, if any, to these comments and reflections by July 15, 2020. Once the Editorial Committee has received all the final responses, a final version of the conference papers will be prepared and circulated.

It is the intention of International Forum Bosnia and the Editorial Committee, once the active work of the conference has been completed:

- To provide an introduction to the Conference Proceedings what will describe the conference process and present the papers, incorporating the authors' responses and final versions.
- To publish selected texts from the conference after peer review in two special issues of *Forum Bosnae*, one in Bosnian (or the other languages of the region) and the other in English/French/German.

Authors are therefore asked to provide final versions of their papers to the Editorial Committee by July 31, 2020, for review and publication.

As noted, this document contains the comments and reflections on the conference papers organised by panel. Most of the reflections relate to specific papers, while three are general comments on the conference as a whole.

Based on the process so far and the high level of participation by so many authors, members and friends of International Forum Bosnia, we are pleased to say that in our view the conference has achieved its goal with a considerable degree of success. We are grateful to everyone who has contributed to this success. We would also like to take this opportunity to reiterate our gratitude not just to the authors of the conference papers but also to the members and friends of International Forum Bosnia without whose support the organisation would not be able to function.

PREDGOVOR

Nakon što su autorski prilozi dostavljeni svim sudionicima Šeste internacionalne konferencije *Sarajevo i svijet: U pandemijskim vidicima* (dostupni na: <http://www.forumbosna.org/saopcenje-za-clanove-i-prijatelje-medjunarodnog-foruma-bosna>), 27 autora napisalo je 91 osvrta na te priloge. U ovom dokumentu su dani naslovi i njihovi prilozi, uz navođenje imena autora osvrta.

Od autora priloga očekujemo da do 15. jula 2020. godine dostave svoje odgovore na osvrte. Nakon što Urednički odbor Zbornika Šeste internacionalne konferencije *Sarajevo i svijet: U pandemijskim vidicima* primi odgovore, bit će uobličena konačna verzija Zbornika i učinjena dostupnom svim sudionicima konferencije.

Uprava Međunarodnog foruma Bosna i Uredništvo Zbornika planiraju da, nakon što Konferencija bude završena:

- Bude napisan uvod Zbornika Konferencije u kojem će biti opisni tok Konferencije i predstavljeni radovi, uključujući odgovore autora i konačne verzije tekstova.
- Odabrani konferencijski radovi budu objavljeni u dva posebna broja časopisa *Forum Bosnae*, nakon njihovog stručnog recenziranja – jedan broj na bosanskom ili drugim jezicima južnoslavenskog područja, i drugi na engleskom/francuskom/njemačkom jeziku.

Autori priloga u Zborniku mogu, u skladu s osvrtima i naknadno stečenim uvidima u predmet svojih radova, napraviti dopunjene verzije i poslati ih Uredništvu časopisa *Forum Bosnae*, najkasnije do 31. jula 2020. godine.

U ovome dokumentu dani su osvrta uz konferencijske priloge onim redom u koji ih je Uredništvo razvrstalo. Većina osvrta, njih 88, napisana je u odnosu na konkretne priloge. Tri su općeniti osvrta na cijelu konferenciju.

Na osnovi do sada postignutog, uz sudjelovanje velikog broja autora, članova i prijatelja Međunarodnog foruma Bosna, sa zadovoljstvom možemo zaključiti da je Konferencija uspješno vođena prema zadanom cilju. Zahvalni smo svima koji su tome doprinijeli. Uz autore konferencijskih priloga, naročito priznanje zaslužuju, uvjereni smo, oni članovi i prijatelji Međunarodnog foruma Bosna koji svojim potporama omogućuju rad ove organizacije.

GENERAL REFLECTIONS / OPĆI OSVRTI

Miloš Lazin

Kao povremeni učesnik međunarodnih konferencija u okviru različitih disciplina, bio sam zapanjen tematskom i kritičkom usaglašenošću ovde sakupljenih izlaganja. Dominiraju jedna tema, pandemija, i gotovo jedinstven pristup, sociološki, koji, svesno ili nesvesno, planetarnu sanitarnu blokadu dovodi u vezu s planetarnom nehumanom ustrojbom finansijskog kapitalizma. S pravom su i tema i pristup analizirani najčešće na primeru Bosne i Sarajeva te je asocijativno vezivanje sadašnje sanitarne blokade s periodom četvorogodišnje agresije 1992-1995. bilo neizbežno.

U svemu tome zasmetao mi je, priznajem, dah nemoći kojim odišu visprene analize (takvom “slabošću” odiše i moj prilog). Možemo li si kao profesionalci promišljanja dozvoliti da budemo “zapisničari” tiha i spora, gotovo beskonačna, propadanja?! Stoga bih predložio da se sledeća, sedma konferencija “Sarajevo i svijet” posveti raspravi o *merama* izlaska iz sadašnje svetske finansijske, ekonomske, društvene, političke i sanitarne krize. Sarajevo jeste istorijsko, kulturno, intelektualno i simbolično središte, sposobno da pokrene debatu i povede je ka pronalaženju *konkretnih mera*, a ljudi od promišljanja su dužni da se poduhvate i politike kada se političari ponašaju neogovorno, čak neprofesionalno, i kada se ne ukazuje druga snaga koja bi se u neophodni poduhvat upustila. Zašto sledećeg maja u Sarajevu ne bi razmatrali najkonkretnija *rešenja* izlaska iz bosanskohercegovačkog državnog, ekonomskog i socijalnog bezizlaza, koji traje već tri decenije, a izgleda nam večnim (predlozi su rasejani i u ovogodišnjim priložima)? Ovde ne mislim na utopijske vizije “o večnom miru i ljubavi” već *mogućim*, konkretnim državnim, političkim, društvenim, socijalnim, kulturnim *rešenjima* i njihovom *usaglašavanju* u sadašnjem lokalnom, regionalnom, evropskom i svetskom kontekstu. Uveren sam da su moguća, koliko god da živimo, kako je još Držić konstatovao, u “zlu vremenu”.

Suada Kapić

Prošavši kroz poglavlja i njima pripadajuće teme, ovu kolekciju tekstova bih okvalifikovala kao jako važan antropološko-sociološko-individualni dokument o jednom vremenu (kalendarski kratkom) kada je cijela planeta stala i zaključala milionske gradove, kad je strah ispraznio ulice. Jednog dana u budućnosti će se ova kolekcija, ako bude smještena na pravom mjestu, izučavati kao svjedočanstvo o tome da je UM postao Artefakt, jer su neki ljudi pozvali druge da u toj totalnoj blokadi razmišljaju, razmatraju, gledaju i izvedu zaključke. Smatram ovako uokvirenu

kolekciju, smještenu na online platformu, skupom dokaza o vremenu (januar, februar, mart, april, maj 2020) i čovjeku koji nije zarobio svoj um i pustio ga da sagleda grad i svijet iz svoje lične perspektive. Stoga ne bih dirala niti jedan tekst svojim viđenjem ili tumačenjem. Stvorena je tematski velika slika perioda pandemije korona virusa i svačiji doprinos je dragocjen, jer je UM Artefakt ovog puta.

Moje čestitke uredništvu, moramo poštovati ono što je osvojeno.

Safet HadžiMuhamedović

The sudden shift, in the first paragraph of the Foreword, from the origins of the IFB into the “45 years of ... Yugoslav Communist Regime” reads as random and confusing. The second paragraph continues in a similar vein. Such an eclectic collection of essays hardly seems to justify the first page of the introductory remarks. I suggest that the foreword be rewritten to reflect the concerns of the specific conference topic (‘pandemic perspectives’) and the submitted papers. On the other hand, considerations of the political realities of socialist Yugoslavia require some ethnographic and historical nuance, to avoid the trap of the dominant nationalist tropes in post-Yugoslav polities, which often justify themselves as awakenings after the ‘communist repressive regime’.

I also suggest avoiding the gendering of the nation (Bosnia: ‘she, her’) and using ‘it, its’. There are multiple reasons for this. Such gendered tropes (for example, ‘Mother Russia’) suggest not only the femininity of the homely/domestic territory, but also a fixed kinship of the territorialised groups. Likewise, the word ‘midwifing’ in the sentence that reads ‘midwifing new philosophical and political approaches to Bosnian plurality’ should be changed to something else, perhaps ‘assisting the critical production of new philosophical and political approaches...’

The Foreword also notes that ‘more than 45 researchers and academics... have responded’. There must be an exact number of respondents. Overall, the foreword is fine, but, again, it would be good to reflect a bit on the topic of the conference – ‘pandemic perspectives’ – if not also on the submitted papers.

PLURALITY AND SOLIDARITY IN A TIME OF EMERGENCY/ PLURALNOST
I SOLIDARNOST U VANREDNIM OKOLNOSTIMA

Paul Ballanfat, CONFINÉS AVEC LE VIRUS / ZATOČENI VIRUSOM

Desmond Maurer

A text as dense, allusive, and rich in imagery as this defies commentary. The reader is called upon not just to read and reflect but to reread, trace out connections, inversions, and, of course, traps. The text is not merely thought-full but play-full, and any commentary directed at the author will almost certainly commit the double sin of taking him too seriously and not seriously enough, while commentary in the more classical sense of explication is probably best kept to oneself, as an aid to one's engagement with the text, rather than an attempt to impose oneself between the text and others, who must be responsible for their own misunderstandings. I have experienced the text as essentially an exercise in exploration of the constitutive imaginary, particularly at the points where the body (always already an imaginary category) and the social and the political are most fully implicated in each other. As the author puts it, sneakily transforming Heidegger after the image of a far truer post-anti-humanism, this is the God we have not been waiting for, but still the only God that can save us now, not because of its microbiological functioning, so much as because of its ability to refashion the social and the political, a refashioning he sees as counterbalanced by the virus' non-agental role in stimulating new this-worldly chiliasms and fantasies of radical social transformation. The virus appears to be tightening the noose at the same time as it suggests fantasies of slipping it altogether. The double helix as double bind. At another point, he provokes us into considering how globalisation is viral Europeanisation in a quite literal sense, insofar as viruses work by self-replication in foreign bodies, transforming the foreign body in the process, but not after its own image. A virus is a parasite, potentially a symbiote. Failed viruses kill their hosts, rather than turning them into environments for their propagation and further replication. What is more, viruses do this mindlessly. A virus is objectively rational, but not strictly living. What could be closer to the Weberian diagnosis of the contagion of modernity? Or maybe he means something quite different, and this is just what I'm able to take from his discourse. Which raises a question

(the question?), as to what degree the reading of the text has as its goal understanding or stimulation. Perhaps we owe most to those we have not understood and, ultimately, never could.

Safet HadžiMuhamedović

As all other articles are in English or translated to English, this one should be translated as well. From my limited French, it reads as a very interesting think piece, but I would love to understand it more fully.

Yazid Said, GLOBAL CRISIS AND GLOBAL JUSTICE: SOME THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS / GLOBALNA KRIZA I GLOBALNA PRAVDA: NEKE TEOLOŠKE REFLEKSIJE

Ivo Marković

Nothing can stir or sober humanity like catastrophe. This is one of the fundamental lessons of experiencing the encounter with Transcendence in the sacred texts of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. The coronavirus plague has certainly proven such a sacred catastrophe. Its sacrality is due to its reorienting people towards encounter with the Sacred. Thanks to the sobering effect of the coronavirus plague, liberal capitalism is now revealed to us in all its awfulness, in its use of greed as the basic idolatrous orientation for human societies. For liberal capitalism, profit is the goal of life, a selfishness that subordinates society as a whole to its avarice – “profit is privatised, debt nationalised, risk socialised.” This results in a reduction of social order to the struggle for survival in which fear provides the predominant context of life, and it produces a pervasive dehumanisation of society and people. Power blinds the rich and privileged elites, and we have hitherto relied on democracy as historically the most effective means of controlling power within society. This is why liberal capitalism first targets our freedoms, because they are the ground on which democracy stands. Under the dehumanised conditions of liberal capitalist forms of life, we forget what it is to be a human being and the point of human life, which is to be healthy and happy.

The expressions *being in the world* but *not being of the world* have an important place in the theology of the apostle John (John 15, 18-19). By nature, the world is a darwinian struggle for survival and power. Its logic results in exploitation, hatred, meaninglessness, and ultimately death. Such a worldly environment offers no windows for the discovery of meaning, to

transcendentalise our situation. From a social and political perspective, one should talk of practical transcendence, i.e. of a diametrically opposite orientation to life where love, benevolence, the power of the weak, and meaning take the place of selfishness, greed, hatred, and exploitation. This is a literally practical transcendence in which believers and atheists may both participate together, in which atheists can be mystics of meaning, because they participate in that transcendence. Believers are a particular leaven to the world in this regard, because they break through the wall of transcendence as they disclose eternity through their conflict with the world, while atheists find themselves advancing towards and even attaining personal Transcendence. This is the proper basis of political theology, which liberal capitalism has obscured.

Samo katastrofe mogu probuditi i otriježniti čovječanstvo. To je jedna od temeljnih poruka iskustva susreta s Transcendencijom u svetim knjigama judaizma, kršćanstva i islama. Kuga korona virusa nesporno je takva sveta katastrofa. Sveta je zato što vraća ljude u susret sa Svetim. Liberalni kapitalizam se iz otriježnjenja kugom korona virusa otkriva u svoj svojoj grozoti, jer uređuje ljudsko društvo na pohlepi kao temeljnoj idolatrijskoj odrednici. Cilj života u liberalnom kapitalizmu je profit, sebičnost koja sve društvo podlaže svojoj pohlepi – “profit je privatiziran, dug nacionaliziran, rizik podruštvljen”. Rezultat takvog društvenog uređenja je borba za opstanak, gdje je osnovni ambijent života strah, a daljnja posljedica je posvemašnja dehumanizacija društva i ljudi. Bogate privilegirane elite zasljepljuje moć, a do sada u povijesti čovječanstva najsnažnije sredstvo kontrole moći u društvu je demokracija. Zato liberalni kapitalizam guši prije svega slobodu ljudi, jer se na njoj zasniva demokracija. U tako liberalno-kapitalističkom dehumaniziranom životu zaboravlja se tko je čovjek i što je cilj ljudskoga života – da bude zdrav i sretan.

U teologiji Ivana apostola važni izričaji su “biti u svijetu” i “ne biti od svijeta” (Iv 15, 18-19). Svijet po svojoj naravi je darvinistička borba za opstanak i moć. Rezultat logike svijeta je porobljavanje, mržnja, besmisao, na kraju smrt. Iz takvoga ambijenta svijeta nema prozora da bi se otkrio smisao, da bi se transcendiralo takvo stanje. U društveno-političkom smislu trebalo bi se govoriti o praktičnoj transcendenciji, tj. o dijametralno suprotnom smjeru života u kojemu su na mjestu sebičnosti, pohlepe, mržnje i porobljavanja nesebična ljubav, dobrotu, moć nemoći, smisao. To je doslovce praktična transcendencija u kojoj zajedno mogu sudjelovati vjernici i ateisti, u kojoj ateisti mogu biti mistici smisla, jer sudjeluju u toj transcendenciji. Vjernici su iz toga smjera osobito obogaćenje svijetu, jer probijaju zid transcendencije kada iz sukoba sa svijetom otkrivaju vječnost, a ateisti su na putu da se također približe ili susretnu

osobnu Transcendenciju. To je zapravo osnova političke teologije koju je zamračio liberalni kapitalizam.

Keith Doubt

Yazid Said raises the important question of how Christian theology addresses the pandemic in a way that reflects Christian theology. There is a passage in the Gospel of Matthew where Jesus says, "And he that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." Most of us are losing the life we had found and the life we had known as a consequence of the corona virus. Our lives are lost, and in all likelihood they will not be recovered. In the United States, many are dying, and still more will die. This is a devastating psychological, social, economic, and spiritual tragedy, which we are not able yet to grasp. The passage in the Gospel of Matthew, however, may shed a light, a non-pessimistic light, on the situation the pandemic has created. As we are losing the lives we knew, we may find a life we did not know.

Safet HadžiMuhamedović

I enjoyed this paper, particularly the points made about the potential of the coronavirus-19 to rethink human limitations, the human-nonhuman entangled worldings and silence. I am not sure I understand what is meant by the 'habits of traditional social cohesion, around our various communities, our families and our understanding of ourselves as part of these larger social units'. Crucially, I don't understand who 'we' are in this sentence. Similarly, the author notes: 'What is good for human beings in the UK can't be different from what is good for those living in Africa or China'. Perhaps this can be changed to avoid the missionary flavour of the statement, especially with the gospel invoked in the next sentence.

Rusmir Mahmutćehajić

This masterfully crafted text directs the reader's opinion in various ways. At times it seems convergent, at others divergent. The author nonetheless constantly returns the reader to the issues of justice and of speaking and showing the truth. There are as many instances of such speech as there are people, now, previously, and to come. But every such speaking of the Truth is itself but a conditional representation of and so never quite equivalent to the Truth. The individual connects with Truth by a path or rite, which is to say, with all due caution, religion. There are many paths, rituals, and religions. How shall we determine our affiliation to our

chosen path or religion?! The only way is through humility, generosity, and doing what we do in the most beautiful way. But humility may seem weakness, fragility, and mortality, incompatible with the required generosity. How can a weak, fragile, mortal man be generous?! The dominant view sees such an acceptance of weakness, fragility, and mortality as cutting us off from what that view projects as beauty and seeks to entrench in its creation, no matter than the beautiful cannot be entrenched. Said Yazid reminds us that human beings are creatures of faith, which is to say autonomous and therefore connected to God, the All-Faithful, through belief or faith. We are reminded of this relationship by the current denial of weakness, fragility, and mortality in the face of the pandemic, and it is in this context that the author points to the powerlessness inherent in our preoccupation with the will to power and greed and our turn away from the fundamental human question: how are we to find meaning in weakness and mortality, based on rejection of their reduction to the measurable world?!

Ovim majstorski uobličnim tekstom čitateljevo mišljenje je usmjeravano u različitim pravicima. Može se činiti čas konvergentnim, čas divergentnim. Autor ipak stalno vraća čitatelja prema pitanju pravde, govorenja i pokazivanja istine. Tih govorenja je onoliko koliko i ljudi, i sada, i prije, i poslije. Ali svako govorenje je uvjetno pokazanje Istine, nikad poistovjetljivo s Njome. Pojedinačnog čovjeka s Istinom povezuje put, obred ili, da se tako kaže uz sav oprez, religija. Obreda, puteva i religija je mnogo. Kako potvrđivati pripadanje odabranom putu, odnosno religiji?! Nema drugog načina osim poniznošću, darežljivošću i činjenjem svega na najljepši način. Ali poniznost se čini slabošću, krhkošću i smrtnošću. Čini se neuskladivom sa zahtijevanom darežljivošću. Kako slab, krhak i smrtan čovjek može biti darežljiv?! U pristajanju na slabost, krhkost i smrtnost čovjek je, u vladajućim vidicima, odvojen od tog što projektira lijepim i što želi učvrstiti u svom djelu, iako je lijepo neučvrstivo. Said Yazid podsjeća na čovjekovo bivanje vjerujućim, što suštinski znači na bivanje svojim, a tako i vjerovanjem povezanim s Bogom, posve Vjerujućim. U toj uzajamnosti, na koju podsjeća poricana nemoć, krhkost i smrtnost naspram pandemije, autor ovog priloga ukazuje na nemoć vladajućih obuzetosti voljom za moći, s pohlepama i okretanjima od temeljnog ljudskog pitanja: Kako naći smisao u slabosti i smrtnosti, ne pristajući na njihovu zatvorenost u mjerljivi svijet?!

Nerin Dizdar

In his text Yazid Said analyses the thoughts on society and global currents in the time of pandemic of, on the one hand, a philosopher of “atheist mysticism”, John Gray, and the

Christian philosophers James Noyes and Adrian Pabst on the other. Asking himself and the reader what makes us human and our societies what they are in terms of quality, purpose and meaning, Said is clearly more inclined to the theological approach, which has recourse to what it posits as genuine human traits, than to Gray's more formalist, rationalist and pragmatic approach, which presupposes interventionism by formal authorities or the state, global organizations and corporations.

Said emphasises the problem of naming phenomena and the view that the contemporary use of terminology to denominate global events generally lacks any sense of the deeper and implicit meaning or etymological foundation of the terms, which are all elements that enable a clearer perspective on and understanding of reality and global trends.

Although Said does recognize the symbolical value of the language and words used to designate reality within the Muslim tradition, he sees no such approach or relevance of speech and language within the Christian tradition, which is somewhat surprising. Recognizing the spoken word as action, within Muslim tradition, Said nonetheless concludes that in Christianity "it does not matter if God can say 'never mind'". He doesn't refer to the biblical testimony that "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God", relying instead on the theological reflections of St. Anselm and Archbishop Rowan William. He concludes that virtues such as trustworthiness, patience, and humility offer greater potential for social renewal than formal actions and measures taken within existing systems that are characterized by numerous weaknesses.

Yazid Said u svom tekstu analizira razmišljanja o društvu i globalnim tokovima u vrijeme pandemije "filozofa ateističke mistike" Johna Graya, s jedne, odnosno kršćanskih filozofa Jamesa Noyesa i Adriana Pabsta, s druge strane. Postavljajući sebi i čitatelju pitanja: šta nas čini ljudima i šta naša društva čini onime što ona po svom sadržaju, svrsi i značenju jesu, Said pokazuje naklonost teološkom pristupu koji se oslanja na povratak onome šta oni smatraju iskonskim ljudskim odlikama, za razliku od Grayevog formalističkog, racionalističkog, pragmatičnog pristupa, koji podrazumijeva intervencionizam formalnih autoriteta, odnosno države, globalnih organizacija i korporacija.

Said ističe problem imenovanja pojava u svijetu, iznoseći stav da je savremena upotreba terminologije za opise društvenih fenomena uglavnom lišena svijesti o dubljem impliciranom značenju ili etimološkom porijeklu pojmova, što su elementi koji omogućavaju jasnije poimanje razumijevanje zbilje i društvenih kretanja. Iako Said prepoznaje simboličku vrijednost jezika i riječi kojim se imenuje realnost unutar muslimanske tradicije, ne prepoznaje

takav pristup i značaj govora, odnosno jezika unutar kršćanske tradicije, što je donekle iznenađujuće. Prepoznajući riječ kao čin, odnosno u muslimanskoj tradiciji, Said zaključuje da u kršćanstvu “nije važno može li Bog reći ‘nema veze’”. Said se ne osvrće na novozavjetno svjedočenje da “u početku bijaše Riječ, i Riječ bijaše u Boga, i Riječ bijaše Bog”, nego se oslanja na teološka promišljanja Svetog Anselma i biskupa Rowana Williama. Zaključuje da vrline poput povjerenja, strpljenja i poniznosti imaju veći potencijal da doprinesu obnovi društva od formalnih postupaka i mjera unutar kreiranih sistema koje karakteriziraju brojne slabosti.

Mohammed Rustom, ON LISTENING: HEARING GOD’S VOICE IN THE FACE OF SUFFERING / O SLUŠANJU: ČUJUĆI BOŽIJI GLAS U SUOČENJU S PATNJOM

Yazid Said

My impression is that the opening remarks about philosophy of religion and its global nature need a bit more nuance. I have not read Knepper’s book. But there are a couple of things to say about the general point raised in the paper. First, I am supportive of the approach that philosophy of religion should not uncritically take for granted a certain version of monotheism. However, I would not necessarily agree that the existing focus on monotheism is specifically Christian. There is a complex history here: ‘theism’ seems to emerge as a concept as we get into the post-early modern/enlightenment period, and it seems to consist of an abstracted version of Christianity, minus any specific doctrine. In that respect, it is a highly artificial construct which reflects a certain impoverishment of Christianity (let alone reflecting Jewish and Islamic traditions). Nicholas Lash is often good on this, as is Michael Buckley, *At the Origins of Modern Atheism*.

Of course, this ‘theism’ is not entirely without precedent; there remains common questions raised on the premises of monotheism between the Abrahamic traditions: questions about metaphysics, theodicy and human nature, questions they grapple with about faith and reason and the existence and nature of God. However, modern philosophy of religion has tended to bracket out much of the richness of this engagement via an overly rationalistic approach. These are the real issues here rather than as the paper suggests being confined to Christianity.

The focus on a certain version of theism tends to push out other possibilities from the outset – mystical/esoteric/pantheist traditions in the West and the diversity of approaches we find globally. So, while there is validity in taking questions raised by monotheism as a guiding thread in one approach to philosophy of religion, it can assume a narrow version of ‘theism’, and it begs the question to assume that is the only coherent, valid or interesting way to engage with the discipline. One of my colleagues here works on how African traditions speak to this.

This means that various traditions should NOT be seen on ‘their own terms’ as the paper suggests. They need to be in conversation. If we need to be more concerned to state what the Christian question or challenge is to other faiths (which I tried to raise in my paper in a very brief way), we need to be more alert in hearing the corresponding questions addressed to us as Christian – the crucial Buddhist challenge about the effects of believing in the solidity of an ego bound up in appetite, spiritual as well as physical, for example, or the Muslim anxiety about the fragmentation of religious language without an essentially unitary concept of God and God’s will. And this is true vice versa.

The other important issue raised in the paper about suffering and the response of silence is how do we move away from a mere explanation? Explanation of suffering is an attempt to forget it as suffering and so a quest for untruthfulness (which is what psychologists claimed religion to be...a mere theory based on texts. This is the sort of thing that I tried to critique in my paper as well); giving explanation is a failure in attention to suffering that is itself a moral deficiency, a fearful self-protection. It is just this that fuels the fantasy that we can choose how the world and myself shall be. Perhaps the author can share some more as to how does the Islamic tradition engage with this question too.

Asim Zubčević

One of the memorable experiences of the pandemic for me personally was the quietness, the silence of Sarajevo’s streets at the height of the lockdown and of how life generally became much slower. In saying this I do not mean to belittle or demean the difficult and painful experiences of those who suffered as a result of the pandemic. But, it seems that, among other things, the pandemic has exposed the extent to which we have become accustomed to the sheer noise and the dizzying pace of modern life.

I find Mohammed Rustom’s essay a beautiful reflection on the significance and meaning of silence and the need to rediscover it, i.e. human silence, not God’s for, as he reminds us, God

always speaks, even when He is seemingly silent. Pandemic, then, has become an opportunity to free ourselves at least temporarily from the ‘internal chatter’ as a precondition for hearing God’s voice. Wonderful.

Safet HadžiMuhamedović

The notion that ‘Islamic philosophy’ (if there is indeed one such thing) is a ‘non- European philosophical tradition’ is an error in history and geography. I am not quite sure why the references to Ibn Sina are followed by the sentence: “‘Evils’ are therefore...”. Is Ibn Sina some undeniable authority? Why are his words so persuasive without analysis? The author uses these passages to argue:

‘Essential evils are rather different. They amount to a thing’s not being realized in a particular substrate which by nature ought to have that thing in question realized in it. Avicenna gives us the well-known case of blindness. It is an instance of essential evil because it entails the lack or privation of sight in a receptacle—the ocular faculty—which itself exists in order for the end of sight to be realized with in.’

This recourse to disability to essentialise some *form* of evil is highly problematic. I would imagine that another corresponding argument would then be ‘wombs that do not give birth are evil’. So, how is the author positioned in relation to the references they provide?

Rusmir Mahmutćehajić

This skilfully articulated meditation is situated within a framework of “Islamic philosophy,” “the universe of Islamic metaphysics,” the Islamic metaphysicians,” “Islamic thought,” “Islamic tradition,” “the Islamic intellectual tradition,” “Islamic psychology,” “Muslim philosophers,” and “Muslim sages.” The use of the epithets *Islamic* and *Muslim* is generally accepted as transparent and so apparently unproblematic. Under the currently dominant ways of conceptualising the world, they tend to be imbued with a spatial and temporal specificity within a particular global representation, as existing after a particular historical watershed, but not before it. This carefully delimited understanding is caught up in modern modular discourse with its plastic words, which makes it all the more important, not least if we are to honour our debt towards these terms of sacred discourse, that we constantly and critically reappraise how they are actually used. For example, that there is no god but God is the surest form of knowledge we have as human beings. The first element, “that there is no god,” refers to what is contingent, several, and componible. Nothing contingent is or can be God, Who is One, Impartible, and Incomponible (i.e. God cannot be divided into parts or incorporated as a part in something

else). What is contingent cannot be its own principle. All the laws of physics, of the microcosmos and the macrocosm, can be expressed in mathematical equations, equations of three parts, that is with a left and a right-hand side related by the existential copula, *It Is*. The elements to left and right are contingent, several, and composable and so manifest in space and time. *It is* can neither be synthesised into a greater whole nor analysed into components. This is what makes it not the third of three but the third of two. The fact that there is not and cannot be anything contingent that is at the same time absolutely grounded and consequently transcendent of space and time refutes the supposed equation of the left and the right sides. Everything contingent, which is to say dual, necessarily involves asymmetry, of truth and falsehood, good and evil, beauty and ugliness, the constituent elements in all the pairs that make up the contingent manifestation of the Unconditioned *It Is*.

The *It Is*, the Third of two – remembering always that everything created is at the same time duality – is absolutely present, and the pairs that make up the contingent are mere signs of It, signs through which It is manifest in the flux of coming into and going out of existence and so the outflow and recurrence of everything contingent from and back to It. The contingent constantly reveals the One Which has neither break nor distinction. All we can be or know is contingent. Our being and knowledge are accordingly mere signs of the absolutely present *It Is*, without Which there is no contingency. Accordingly, to be *muslim* is the form of being of all existent and contingent things, gathered within the particularity of a human self and related through *Islam* with God as *Peace*. These three words play a crucial role in our understanding of everything the epithets used in the text do and can designate. So long as they are understood within the context of their native semantic chain, which is present in all languages, the author's presentation has considerably greater scope, and the right attained by listening (or reading) will inspire us to seek the light of the unsaid and unwritten, the silence from which all things come and to which all things return.

Vješto artikulirano izlaganje Mohammeda Rustoma je postavljeno u okvir “islamske filozofije”, “univerzuma islamske metafizike”, “islamskog metafizičara”, “islamskog mišljenja”, “islamske tradicije”, “islamske intelektualne tradicije”, “islamskog psihologa”, “muslimanskih filozofa”, “muslimanskih mudraca”. Uobičajeno je korištene pridjeve islamski i muslimanski prihvaćati posve jasnim te zato i prividno neupitnim. U vladajućim predstavama o svijetu oni su uglavnom prostorno-vremenski omeđeni u jednu od mogućih slika svijeta. Ima ih nakon nekog historijskog početka, ali ne i prije. Takvo njihovo ograničeno shvatanje

zavodljivo je u modernom modularnome govoru s mnogo plastičnih riječi. U ispunjavanju duga prema tim riječima svetog govora važno je, smatram, neprestano preispitivati sve njihove upotrebe. Evo jednog prijedloga za to. Znanje da nema boga do Boga najpouzdanije je od svih koje čovjek ima. Prvi dio tog, “nema boga”, odnosi se na sve uvjetno, djeljivo i sastavljivo. Ništa uvjetno nije i ne može biti Bog, Jedan, Nedjeljiv i Nesastavljiv. Što je uvjetno nije i ne može biti počelo sebi. Svi zakoni fizike, i mikro i makro svijeta, opisivi su matematičkim jednadžbama, izrazom s tri dijela, lijevom i desnom stranom i *Jest*. Sve na lijevoj i desnoj strani je uvjetno, djeljivo i sastavljivo, te zato u prostorno-vremenskom pokazanju. *Jest* nije ni sastavljivo ni rastavljivo. Zato nije treće od troje, već je Treće od dvoje. Činjenica da nema i ne može biti nečeg uvjetnog, apsolutno učvrstivog te zato izvan prostora i vremena poriče privid da su lijeva i desna strana jednake. Nužna nesimetrija svega uvjetnog, a to znači udvojenog, čini istinito i lažno, dobro i zlo te lijepo i ružno dvojinama uvjetnog pokazanja Neuvjetnog, *Jest*.

To *Jest*, Treće od dvoje – a nema ničeg stvorenog, a da nije dvojina –posve je prisutno, a dvojine svega uvjetnog samo su Njegovi znakovi preko kojih Se *Jest* obznanjuje Sebi u nastajanju i nestajanju te dolaženju svega uvjetnog od Njeg i vraćanja Njemu. Sve uvjetno stalno obznanjuje Jednog Koji je bez opreke i razlučenosti. Sve što čovjek može biti i znati uvjetno je. Njegovo bivanje i znanje je, prema tome, samo znak tog apsolutno prisutnog *Jest* bez Kojeg nema uvjetnosti. U skladu s time, *muslim* je način bivanja svega postojećeg, svega uvjetnog, sabranog u ljudskoj pojedinačnosti, povezanoj islamom s Bogom, Selamom. Ako te tri riječi, ključne za razumijevanje svega što određuju i mogu određivati pridjevi korišteni u tekstu na koji se osvrćem, budu shvaćane u semantičkoj uzajamnosti u svakom od mogućih jezika, autorovo izlaganje dobija znatno veći obuhvat, a pravo, stečeno slušanjem (ili čitanjem), podstiče na traganje za svjetlošću nerečenog i nenapisanog, za šutnjom iz koje sve dolazi i kojoj se vraća.

Adis Lukač, PANDEMIC MISFORTUNE AS OPPORTUNITY FOR REFORM OF BEING / NEPRILIKA (PANDEMIJA) KAO PRILIKA ZA REFORMU BIĆA

Esnefa Smajlović-Muhić

Veoma su mi se dopali definicija koju je Lukač naveo (od Andreja Trajkovskog) i njegovo viđenje: “Svrha umjetnosti nije, kako se obično misli, prenošenje ideja, propagiranje misli.

Svrha umjetnosti je pripremiti čovjeka za smrt, preorati mu, uznemiriti dušu, čineći je tako sposobnom da se okrene dobru.' I politički i ekonomski prohtjevi, kao i osnovne ljudske potrebe, bit će zadovoljeni. Ono što treba očuvati je duhovna dimenzija bića. Konzumerizam je čovjeka pretvorio u roba materiji, koja ili mu ne treba ili je uzima previše, pa se stanje pandemije, koje je cijeli svijet stavilo na kratko čekanje, možda može shvatiti kao opomena.”

Slazem se da moramo učiniti totalnu reformu u svojim životima. Veli Lukač: “Pročišćenje samog sebe, odnosa s drugim, odnosa prema prirodi, prema domovini i sl. zasigurno će dovesti do balansa između materijalnog i duhovnog, koji je evidentno poremećen, i u tom slučaju udar najavljenih globalnih promjena mogao bi se ublažiti. Glad za materijalnim ponekad baca sjenu i na duh Sarajeva, a napunjena nutrina materijom oslabi čula kojim se osjeti miris grada, simfonija satkana od ezana i zvona, inspiracija koja se razlije dužinom grada, ne bi li pronašla bar malo mjesta da se ulije u nečija prsa...” Ovakav opis duha Sarajeva podsjeća me na moju Srebrenicu.

Desmond Maurer, [CRACKS IN THE COSMODICY: CORONAVIRUS, LISBON, AND THE SUBLIME AS SEEN FROM SARAJEVO / PUKOTINE U KOSMODICEJI: KORONA VIRUS, LISABON I UZVIŠENO VIĐENI IZ SARAJEVA](#)

Safet HadžiMuhamedović

This is wonderful, carefully written paper. It suggests that the current spread of coronavirus might also be read through the death of Nature as a cosmic-political frame. Yet Nature, like Man or God, can only die where it has – as such – had some cosmic and political life to begin with. The problematised collectivity (the ‘we’ and ‘us’ of this paper) might be hegemonic, but it was never fully victorious (as attested, for example, by pockets of Amazonian ‘perspectivism’ and ‘multinaturalism’ surviving against colonising ontologies). In that sense, the choices appearing through what the author calls ‘cracks in cosmodicy’ are more diverse, and, implicitly, ‘the Abyss’ could be ripe with potential reorientations.

Rusmir Mahmutćehajić

Stimulating and thoughtful texts tend to arise, one may suppose, as a result of dramatic encounters between a thinking being and silence and the refuge that the dominion of silence

offers speech. Surely this text is an example of this! History as a whole, with all its raising up and casting down, is reflected in the present as a sort of crown that expresses the symbolic legitimation and delegitimation of human authority. Whether that diadem and so that authority belongs properly to Pharaoh or a Saint it may always be reduced symbolically to the circle. A single centre may have any number of circles, which necessarily all refer to the same centre, essentially invisible, eternal and never, everywhere and nowhere. The author's presentation suggests at least one simple conclusion: Our usual ways of thinking about our place and role on earth lead us to forget that we are not and cannot be master or ruler, that whatever we have or can have is but a contingent manifestation of the unconditioned, because, on this contingent stage, true power and authority belong to the unconditioned. What we do to ourselves and the world when we forget our creaturely nature and that we have entered this world to be a stranger and a wayfarer, that is the true pandemic. Nothing could be crueller to us or the world than we are ourselves. How fitting the name we have given this invisible viral army of insignificant living matter, crowned with such authority that the governments of the world and all their armies and arms stand powerless before it! The divinised powers of humanity seek their scapegoats amongst the weak, but the coronavirus has triumphed over our imaginations precisely through its weakness. Bosnia and her people were long ago sentenced to disappear as a plural society that included Muslims and subjected to a deadly siege prosecuted and maintained by an army that defied description. But they survived, to the amazement of all those who took the denial of their future as the most obvious of things. The world will survive this siege too, but it remains to be seen how the political authorities and their witchdoctors will fare. Reality and the apparent fracture of the anthropo-cosmological whole cannot remain unhealed, however. This is because neither we nor the cosmos serve as our own ground. May we not then conclude from the author's philosophical reflections that what the world calls the Covid-19 pandemic is no more than a manifestation of the pandemic of our own self-deception?

Podsticajni i značenjski obuhvatni tekstovi nastaju, vjerovatno, jedino u dramatičnim odnosima mislioca s tišinom i njenim utočišnim svladavanjem svakog govora. Nije li ovaj tekst dokaz tog?! Cijela povijest, ogledana u sadašnjosti, uzdizanje i zbacivanje je kruna, simboličkog legitimiranja i delegitimiranja ljudske vlasti. Bilo da je riječ o Faraonskoj ili svetačkoj kruni, a zapravo vlasti, njen simbol je svediv na krug. Jednom središtu pripada neizbrojivo krugova. Ali svi oni obznajuju jedno središte, suštinski nevidljivo te zato i vazda i nikad, i svugdje i nigdje. Iz izlaganja Desmonda Maurera izvediv je jednostavan zaključak: U uobičajenim poimanjima

svog mjesta i uloge na zemlji čovjek zaboravlja da tu nije i da tu ne može biti ni gospodar ni vladar, da sve što ima i može imati nije ništa drugo do uvjetna obznana neuvjetnog. Na toj pozornici uvjetnog, neuvjetnome pripadaju i moć i vlast. To što, zaboravljajući svoju stvorenost i izvedenost u svijet da u njemu bude stranac i putnik, čini sebi i svijetu jest pandemija. Od čovjeka nema ničeg okrutnijeg prema sebi i svijetu. Nije li uzbudljivo ime nevidljive vojske virusa, neznatne žive tvari, okrunjene takvom vlašću da joj gotovo ništa ne mogu državni sistemi sa svim svojim vojskama i oružjima?! Za te obogovljene ljudske moći krivce je moguće jednostavno naći među slabima. Ali virus korona je nadmoćan nad ljudskim imaginacijama upravo svojom slabošću. Bosna i njen narod, kojima je davno presuđeno da kao pluralno društvo s muslimanima nestanu, protiv kojih je teško opisivom vojnom moći podignuta, održavana i korištena opsada smrću, preživjeli su, uz čuđenje pred tom očitošću i njeno poricanje. I svijet će preživjeti ovu opsadu, ali ostaje da se vidi kako će iz nje izaći političke vlasti i njihovi žreci. Zbilja i prividi rascijepljenosti antropokozmičke cjeline ne mogu ostati nezacijeljeni. Ne mogu jer ni čovjek ni kozmos nisu korijen sebi. Je li iz filozofskih razmatranja Desmonda Maurera moguće zaključiti da to što svijet danas zove pandemijom Covid-19 nije ništa drugo do obznana pandemije čovjekove prevare sebe samog.

Rusmir Šadić, FEAR – THE FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTERISTIC IN THE EXPERIENCE OF THE AGE / STRAH – TEMELJNA OZNAKA ZA ISKUSTVO EPOHE

Esnefa Smajlović-Muhić

Mi, Srebreničani, koji tako dobro poznajemo strah, očaj, beznade, osjećaj napuštenosti, odlično razumijemo strah koji je definirao gospodin Šadić: “Najopasniji strah je onaj koji je disperziran, neuhvatljiv, fluidan. Strah je ime za neizvjesnost s kojom se suočavamo, naročito onda kada nepoznajemo niti izvor a niti metodu borbe protiv opasnosti. Nema sumnje da čovjek dijeli strah sa životinjama, ali jedino čovjek ima svijest o strahu. Iako nas je Heidegger podučio da je temeljna oznaka tubitka to da je bitak u svijetu, što će reći uvijek tu, otvoren i isporučen svijetu kao takvom, nasuprot monadama koje su zatvorene u sebe i samodovoljne, ipak ta otvorenost u isto vrijeme znači i “izloženost opasnosti” ili ranjivost te nam svijest o toj činjenici također proizvodi strah. Strah narasta usljed spoznaje o mogućnosti da Titanik našeg društva udari o neki novi ledeni brijeg koji će biti uzrok potopa i posljednje balade koju ćemo čuti. Živjeti u magli znači uvijek iznova slutiti da se pored finansijskog, ekonomskog, socijalnog, ekološkog

ili pandemijskog ledenog brijega možemo susresti licem u lice s nekim novim ledenim brijegom koji se pomalja iz magle, a za koji nismo ni znali da je tu.” Niko od stanovnika Bosne i Hercegovine nije vjerovao da će agresiju nad njom učiniti komšije.

Nagledali su se smrti Srebreničani, ali i ostali stanovnici Bosne. Lijepo je kazao učesnik konferencije: “Strah na svojoj najvišoj razini je vezan za događaj koji je neizbježan, neopoziv i apsolutno nepoznat. Ime za taj događaj je smrt. Smrt nam je nepoznata, jer za razliku od svega drugoga ona nema ni prošlost niti budućnost. Oko nje nema pregovora niti se najavljuje onome koga posjećuje.” Opasnost od korone nas je jako podsjetila na opasnost od smrti u ratu.

Safet HadžiMuhamedović

This paper takes the coronavirus-19 as a starting point for a discussion of ‘evil’ and ‘fear’, always revealed together and in forms of Othering. It considers the pervasive nationalist mythologies in Bosnia, including their recent Sarajevo iteration in the ‘Bleiburg mass’. The author notes:

“Čini nam se da je tako i sa Sarajevom, čemu još treba pridodati da su određeni politički krugovi računali na protivljenje građana, nakon čega bi se Sarajevo i Bosna ponovo mogli označiti kao mjesto na kome se ugrožavaju prava drugih, osobito pripadnika jednog naroda, pa čak i pravo na vjerski obred.”

Not contradicting this reading of existing political intentions by way of the ‘mass for Bleiburg’, it seems to me that fear and othering in this paper are portrayed as somehow always produced from the outside of Sarajevo (or Bosnia). The rights and dignity of others, however, are actively denied from the inside of Sarajevo and ‘for the sake of’ it – to Roma people, to LGBTIQ people, to refugees, to people with disabilities, and so on. Always only focusing on the production of violence by the co-orchestrated Serbian and Croatian nationalist programmes tends to obscure these forms of discrimination.

Miloš Lazin, NOTES SUR LE MONDE A L'ARRET / ZAPISI IZ ZAUSTAVLJENOG SVETA

Almir Bašović

Moram reći da mi se jako dopao tekst kolege Miloša Lazina. Da kojim slučajem ne znam kako je on pozorišni čovjek i reditelj, iz ovog njegovog teksta bi se to dalo naslutiti. Jer, u njegovom tekstu postoji nekoliko stvari koje razotkrivaju svijet kao jednu vrstu pozornice na kojoj se

odvija pandemija Covid-19. Kada se ponašanje lika na pozornici želi motivirati, to nužno znači uvođenje vremenskog okvira šireg od sadašnjosti, a upravo je to ono što Lazin uvodi u raspravu o našem sadašnjem trenutku. On naglu promjenu uslova tretira kao vraćanje na prethodnu reformu društva, pokazujući težnju kapitalističkog svijeta za “apsolutizacijom sadašnjeg trenutka”. Njegov primjer o samoposluzi, jedinom mogućem mjestu susreta potencijalnih ljubavnika, dokaz je koliko izbor prostora određuje doživljaj čovjeka, i u životu i na pozornici. U ovom slučaju se pokazuje da potrošačko društvo i tokom izolacije briše mogućnost intimnog prostora, prevodeći sve u teror javnosti. To nije grčki trg kao temeljni kronotop grčke kulture, već prostor koji potvrđuje da se prije pandemije, kako kaže Lazin, finansijski poredak predstavljao kao stvarnost sama. Mislim da iz ovog teksta svi možemo naučiti ponešto o krizi kao potencijalno dramskom fenomenu, koji je u slučaju pandemije samo razotkrio ono što je do te krize dovelo. Ubistvo na raskrsnici koja vodi prema Korintu ili važnost banaka; trovanje kralja u vrtu ili nedostatak socijalne pravde; leš u utorbri broda kao metafora za ono što se u porodicama gura pod tepih, ili naličje mondijalizacije... Lazin nam je svojim tekstom ponudio da za sebe izaberemo temu “mišolovke” u koju nas je pandemija ulovila, zaustavljajući naš svijet.

Safet HadžiMuhamedović

This is a wonderful essay, pondering the postpandemic world, and it should be translated to English as well. Given that some of the thoughts seem to be *from* France, it would be interesting to read about the difference of affective responses to the ‘face-covering veils’ and the ‘corona mask’. The former were banned, the latter prescribed in France. The author notes:

“Les masques dissimulent les visages des passants fortuits mais pour autant soulignent dans leurs yeux un jet d'aver- sion: la personne (assez rare) rencontrée par hasard comme incarnation potentielle du virus! Car lui, ce virus, est aussi inconnu, invisible, que péremptoirement imprévisible; lorsque la réalité nous devient méconnaissable – la peur en dispose.”

“Maske skrivaju lica slučajnih prolaznika, ali zato ističu iz očiju im izbijajući zazor: mimoilazeći kao potencijalno otelotvorenje virusa! Jer on, taj virus, koliko je nepoznat, nevidljiv, toliko je i ubedljivo nepredvidiv; kad nam stvarnost postane neprepoznat- ljiva – konstituiše je strah.”

If one were to replace the word ‘mask’ with the word ‘burqa’ in this paragraph, would it substantially change the author’s argument?

Neven Anđelić

Početak teksta navodi čitaoca da pogrešno zaključi kako je ono što slijedi jedna refleksivna proza memoarističkog žanra. Međutim, to je samo uvod koji nam otkriva mentalno i prirodno okruženje autora tokom pandemije, jer nastavak je pun književnih i istorijskih primjera koji uspješno pozicioniraju trenutnu situaciju te samog autora.

Veliki broj izvora je citiran u ovom radu, što sami rad čini budućim bogatim izvorom. Na jednom mjestu se navodi podatak da “dnevno je umiralo i do 300 soba”, što ostavlja pitanje da li je u pitanju štamparska greška i da se radi o 300 osoba ili, ako je stilska figura starog doba, pitanje je koliko bi to značilo osoba?

Zanimljivo bi bilo saznati koliko je Sarajevo imalo stanovnika i kakva je bila opšta društvena i ekonomska situacija u gradu nakon dvije epidemije u kratkom roku od desetak godina. Citirajući Bašeskiju, autor navodi da je u valu prve epidemije stradalo 15.000 ljudi, što je bila polovina stanovništva Sarajeva, a deset godina kasnije oko 8.000. Znači da je Sarajevo spalo u vrlo kratkom roku na oko četvrtinu originalnih stanovnika. Naravno da su se u međuperiodu desile migracije u grad, ali zaista bi bilo zanimljivo saznati nešto više o tom periodu, kako između dvaju talasa epidemije tako i nakon dviju katastrofalnih faza. Da li su “sušne godine”, koje navodi autor, bile upravo u tom periodu?

Zanimljivo je da “španska groznica” kao ni “variola” nisu spomenute u tekstu koji obiluje primjerima iz dalje prošlosti, ali nam ne pruža na uvid prirodne nedaće dvadesetog stoljeća, već samo onu (ne)čovjekovu iz devedesetih.

Potom autor mijena fokus rada i uspješno poentira, poredeći odnos vlasti u savremenim uslovima te mjestimičnim poređenjima s katastrofalnom opsadom Sarajeva devedesetih godina prošlog stoljeća. Iako su dvije situacije bitno različite, autorova konstatacija da je devedesetih Sarajevo bilo centar svijeta dok je danas nebitno u opštoj krizi ključno ga vodi ka mikro-poređenju i međuljudskoj solidarnosti koja je bila opšteprisutna u Sarajevu devedesetih a danas je, uz svesrdnu pomoć i utjecaj korumpirane vlasti, nema.

Nisam siguran koliko stoji teza da je Jugoslavija formirana u Versaju, pošto je ona nastala 1. decembra 1918. prije početka pariskih pregovora, tokom prvih šest mjeseci 1919. godine, dok je 28. juna u Versaju samo potvrđeno njeno postojanje. Na kraju, ovaj doajen bosanskohercegovačkog novinarstva odlično zaključuje, dovodeći u vezu globalne procese, dejtonsku Bosnu i Hercegovinu te pandemiju. Zaista je užitek bio čitati ovaj rad

Safet HadžiMuhamedović

I enjoyed the first part of this paper, in which the author considers some present-day and historical narratives about crises and the retreat into the countryside. Reading a more sustained treatment on this topic would be great.

Senadin Lavić, SCIENCE, NEOLIBERALISM, AND EDUCATION DURING THE PANDEMIC AGE / ZNANOST, NEOLIBERALIZAM I OBRAZOVANJE U PANDEMIJSKOM VREMENU

Safet HadžiMuhamedović

I found some parts of this paper quite interesting. For example, the author notes that ‘populist leaders have used the state of emergency to monopolise every form of authority’. It would be good to understand in more detail how the populist political programmes utilise crisis in Bosnia. For the author, the coronavirus seems to demonstrate the ‘importance of the nation-state’ (and, particularly, the Bosnian nation-state). The reinforcement of national boundaries (whether excused through a virus, the ‘migrants’ or otherwise) is, however, another method of populist politics. In fact, all of the violence in Bosnia with which the author is concerned, was and continues to be part of nation-state bordering projects. How can another such project be the appropriate response?

Rusmir Mahmutćehajić

Senadin Lavić ustrajava na kritičkom dekonstruiranju i rekonstruiranju vladajuće slike svijeta. I jedno i drugo moguće je uz pretpostavku da postoje dovoljno jasni uvidi u konstruiranost te slike. Način na koji Senadin Lavić upućuje svog sablesjednika na uvjetnost svih oblika konstruiranosti kojima se bavi omogućuje filozofski razgovor u kojem sudionici dolaze, a zapravo moraju doći do priznanja da ne znaju izlaz iz egzistencijske drame u kojoj preovlađuju

strahovi i patnja. Njegova pitanja o obrazovanju i znanosti te zdravlju i politici samo se prividno uspoređuju s onim što je bilo, pa iznevjereno. U svoju obuhvatnu sliku ljudskosti, a to znači ukupnosti postojanja, sabrana u nepovredivost najuzvišeniye ljudske mogućnosti, Senadin Lavić uključuje pretpostavljanje neodvojivosti bosanskog ideala od svih iznevjerenja otvorenosti čovjeka sebi, a tako i svijet. Zato u ovome osvrtnu želi podsjetiti na to što je u modernoj znanosti imenovano antropičkim principom, tvrdnjom da je ukupnost postojanja usredištena na pojedinačnog čovjeka, i kao izvora i kao ušća svega. Ali kada je i smatran sumom sveg stvaranja, čovjek nije i ne može biti apsolutno počelo. Nije, jer ne može nadići bivanje uvjetnim. U filozofiji naturalizma, vladajućoj u svim destruktivnim ideologijama, pretpostavljeno je da uvjetno može biti razlog i svrha sebi. Iz toga slijedi zaboravljanje da obrazovni, zdravstveni, politički i drugi sistemi ne samo da gube smisao čim im izmakne ili bude otet cilj, a to je “obrazujući pojedinac”, “ozdravljajući pojedinac” i “policizirajući pojedinac”, ti sistemi postaju sebi dovoljnim bogovi mimo Boga te posljedično i sredstva tirana utjelovljenih u vođama, menadžerima, predsjednicima i slično. Ni znanje ni zdravlje nisu ciljevi. Oni su veza ozdravljajućeg čovjeka s idealom bivanja zdravim, saznavajućeg čovjeka s idealom saznatljivog. Nikakvo postignuće ne može dokinuti put prema tome idealu. Zato je i svako govorenje o Bosni, bosanstvu i bosanskoj naciji podsjećanje na taj ideal.

Asim Zubčević

In his article, Senadin Lavić states the following: “In poor societies, science, unfortunately, appears to be a place where religion confirms its dominance and ruthlessly excludes scholarship from any description of social and historical phenomena or bio-medical processes, reducing everything to a simple quasi-theological explanation for the superstitious and uneducated. Scholarship (and science) are forced into a relationship of vassaldom and thoroughly undermined in comparison to the ‘guardians of the sacred mysteries’ and the hand kissers of prominent priests.”¹ Would he also argue that the phenomenon of science parading as pseudo-religion, with priests and all, is no less harmful?

¹ In Bosnian: “Znanost se, nažalost, pokazuje u siromašnom društvu kao mjesto preko kojeg se religija potvrđuje kao dominantna. Ona bez imalo milosti isključuje nauku iz svakog opisa povijesno-društvenih pojava ili biomedicinskih procesa, svodeći sve na jednostavna kvaziteološka objašnjenja za sujevjerne i neobrazovane. Nauka se gura u vazalni odnos i postaje obesmišljena u odnosu na “znance svetih tajni” i rukoljupce uglednih sveštenika.” (127, 128).

The second panel / Drugi panel

THE CRISIS AND ITS IMPACT ON SOCIETY AND CULTURE / KRIZA I NJEZINI UTJECAJI NA DRUŠTVO I KULTURU

Almir Bašović, STAND UP TRAGEDY: SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE PANDEMIC FROM ISOLATION IN SARAJEVO / STAND UP TRAGEDIJA: NEKOLIKO REFLEKSIJA O PANDEMIJI IZ SARAJEVSKJE IZOLACIJE

Desmond Maurer

Prof Bašović's text uses the device of commentary on three plays to reflect on epidemic, sovereignty, isolation, utopia, the role of knowledge for autonomy, and solidarity in the face of the future. None of the topics is treated in all three, which is part of what gives the essay a sense of progression, as a riff on George Steiner's (unreferenced) *Death of Tragedy*. Prof Bašović links this impossibility with the shift in our understanding of human autonomy and our place in what remains of cosmic thinking. Human autonomy necessarily stands in opposition to the cosmic vision not least because it is always associated with some form of beatific vision and project for its implementation.

This progression suggests an answer to Prof Bašović's final question, "Shall we start wearing masks again?" In the performance of Greek tragedy the mask facilitated two things – the projection of the voice and the universalisation of the character. The mask is the truth. The *Tempest* is also a drama of masks, literally a masque, where every character uses deception and self-mis-representation to tease out the truths of the other and bring underlying motivations to the surface. At the end, all the masks fall. In the *White Plague*, the difference that has grown up in the period from the inception of modernity to its fulfilment means the masks have been internalised and the roles developed as our essence, so that we stand less as an inverted than as an inside-out version of Tragedy. We must create a cosmic order in an indifferent universe, and we must inevitably fail, but fail trying.

The mask is what enables our project and is in fact more integral to our sense of self than the face, which is increasingly understood as a form of mask (whence our discomfort with

the veil). This is reflected in the etymology of the person, which is originally the mask, through which the sound is projected, but which becomes with time the intimate, that which is built up behind the face as front – the true self. It was WB Yeats' version of the Oedipus Rex that reintroduced the use of the mask into performance, and for Yeats the mask creates the poet as a seer inhabited by a project. It allows him to standardise and project (pun intended) his voice and so have a presence in the world that he cannot attain as a private person. By forcing us to obscure our faces behind masks, the pandemic may remind us that our faces have in fact become a covering behind which we work on the internalised mask of our intimate projects of personhood within a world where we increasingly assume the responsibility of cosmic principle. The ambiguity of the concept of mask thus makes it, and its cognate concepts of the person, persona, and personality, a *pharmakon*.

[Amra Hadžimuhamedović, ON THE KUMRA DOVE, SARAJEVO TOWN HALL, AND SEEKING THE SIMURGH: CULTURAL HERITAGE DURING THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC / O PTICI KUMRI, SARAJEVSKOJ VIJEĆNICI I TRAŽENJU SIMURGA: KULTURNO NASLIJEĐE U VRIJEME PANDEMIJE COVID-19](#)

Mirsad Kunić

“Ptica kumra u ovom tekstu nije predstavljena kao slučaj, nego kao oznaka pojave koja upućuje na potreban zaokret u poimanju naslijeđa, mjesta i uloge baštinske zajednice i pojedinca.“ (Hadžimuhamedović, 174)

U eseju *Iz smaragda Une* Skender Kulenović piše da su “kumrija i lastavica pod strehom opomena od grehote”. Od kakve grehote, pitam se? Od svog babe sam znao čuti da su golubovi najveći ‘gotovani’, od njih nikakve koristi, samo prljaju dvorište i balkon svojim izmetom. Zaista, o kakvom grijehu je riječ? U širim okvirima stvorenoga svijeta, posebno prirode, kumrija je jedno od bezbroj stvorenih živih bića koje ima svoje mjesto u prirodnom poretku, u stvorenom svijetu, čija svrhovitost nije vidljiva na prvi pogled. Od nje nema vidljive koristi kao što ima od drugih životinja (konja, ovce, krave), ali ima one nevidljive, a što se gnomski očituje u narodnom vjerovanju da je ona tu da opominje i da je grijeh dirati je, iako donosi samo ‘štetu’. Stoga, ovu riječ u tekstu Amre Hadžimuhamedović čitam kao metaforu za naslijeđe, ono nešto što mora imati svoje mjesto, gnijezdo, pod strehom svake pojedinačne pa i one zajedničke kuće. A da ipak nije tako, nažalost, opominje i Husaga Čišić u knjizi o Mostaru: “Sada više ne vjeruje

ljudima i ne gnijezdi se po krovovima, nego se skriva u grane čempresa”. Ko će nas onda više opominjati na grehotu? Samo hodže i samo knjige? Ili je na nama da vratimo ovoga opominjača pod naše strehe?

Safet Hadži Muhamedović

This is a wonderful paper, in which the argument gradually becomes apparent to the reader. I would suggest that the central points be made clearer in the introduction for those less patient. These points, as I read them, are the critique of the ‘people-centred’ – or anthropocentric – approach to heritage. In the second part of the paper, considering the contemporary uses of the Sarajevo Town Hall – we are offered a connected critique of the ‘monument-centred’ approach to heritage. The author should also foreground their argument that, during the virus lockdown, the ‘silence’ of habitual anthropogenic noise allows for the natural-cultural landscapes to voice themselves. In that sense, I think that the title could be simplified. The various considerations will become apparent during reading, but the main argument, on the need to shift the heritage paradigm by travel beyond human control, or by ‘listening to the birds’, should be clear in the title and the intro. Or, as the author notes, the main question is about ‘the need for a revolution in how we think about heritage and the heritage community and the individual’s place and role’.

Ivo Marković, SARAJEVO AND THE ROLE OF CULTURE IN SOCIAL CHANGE CAUSED BY THE PANDEMIC / SARAJEVO U KONTEKSTU ULOGE KULTURE U DRUŠTVENIM PROMJENAMA IZAZVANIM PANDEMIJOM

Desmond Maurer

This is a concentrated text in which the fruits of a lifetime of pastoral reflection are presented in a coherent progression. The comments on contemporary capitalism, globalisation, populism, environmental irresponsibility and the turn towards totalitarianism are pithily astringent, but the comments on the “New Normal” in social relations and roles – feminism and attitudes towards homosexuality – are perhaps more revealing, not least because they relate to one of the fundamental lines of conflict in contemporary societies and one of the most fertile areas of misunderstanding and demonisation – by both sides of the debate. The author praises these social changes, and especially the dismantling of discrimination against homosexuals, as part of the welcome growth of liberation and mutual regard within society. The author’s views are

thus on the liberal side of public opinion in Bosnia and the Balkans more generally with regard to the broader issue, but his comments on the “homosexual agenda” are indicative of the continued weight given in society here to forms of analysis that scapegoat certain symbolic manifestations rather than concentrating on the generative causes of fundamental social change. Even in the Balkans, however, there is a considerable and ongoing shifting of the tectonic plates which is tending to create rifts between generations as well as between more and less conservative social groups.

In my view, the increasingly global call for the social and political recognition and even ritual confirmation of homosexual marriage is a symbolic crystallisation of change rather than a motor of it. Consequently, opposition to it is on a symbolic basis as well, which is why it is so often out of all proportion to any realistic “threat”. It is only to be expected that, as a Catholic priest, the author should build his critique of contemporary social ills on the basis of a positive vision of society as founded upon the generative family unit as the locus of flourishing and so as providing an enabling environment for children to develop against the background of healthy and loving marital and parental relations grounded in the sacrament of progenerative sex (which serves to deepen the marital bond). This is, for example, the view associated with the natural rights philosopher John Finnis. *Per se*, it is hardly an oppressive vision, but it is equally wrong to suppose that homosexual marriage and adoption threaten it. The inscription of individualism, atomisation, and transactionalism into every form of interpersonal relationship, including the marital and parental, regardless of gender and sexuality, may do, but, again, we are passing through a period of such profound social change based upon the divinisation of the absolutized individual and the apparent and ongoing transformation of all family, kinship, and social relations that we simply cannot tell what forms will result and how they will be given social solidity. This has significant implications for the author's hope that the coronavirus crisis may be a turning point and that *play* may help in this regard, as play too easily resolves into narcissism. The infamous anonymisation promoted by online forms of interaction, present in the transactional transformation of sex and the fragmentation of intimacy into fetish within our app-driven sexual culture, but equally worryingly in forms of symbolic interaction (social media, chatrooms and fora for the exchange of views, the growth of online abuse and of the proliferation of echo chambers – all forms of escalating interaction which lack the moderating feedback mechanisms of real-life or face-to-face interaction) are more likely to reinforce our growing sense of the unreality of others than solidarity with them. The shift of education online and the subsequent undermining of its socialisation function and role in creating

intersubjectivity are crucial in this regard. A more appropriate response to this might be through a eucharistic theology of the body and the bodily presence and an inclusive sacrificial redemption of community. In any case, I can think of few contemporary topics more deserving of calm and disinterested discussion that allows the expression of the full range of views and so an opportunity to develop our understanding of the grounds on which they are built and of the passion they induce in discussants.

Safet HadžiMuhamedović

This contribution offers a tedious moralising lecture about humanity, civilisation and their challenges. It speaks, from a God's-eye perspective, about the world before and after the pandemic. I have read its concerns for a range of issues - from fossil fuels through unemployment to digital communications - as a gimmick. Somehow, it tackles everything whilst engaging with nothing. The missionary inclusion of 'humanity, civilisation and the world' into these grand statements, provides the author with a springboard for violent generalisations, such as the following:

“An impoverished world gives birth to lots of children [...] the result is these countries can't offer proper life chances to so many people, creating a need for their populations to migrate.”

“[The feminist movement] has inspired the LBTQI movement to pluck various forms of homosexual out of their despised position and integrate them as accepted members of humanity. The movement has gone from strength to strength, is well organised, and has achieved great social power, transcending standard social boundaries, and has succeeded in its fight for the recognition of homosexual marriage, which has however negatively affected the family's status as the central reproductive unit of society, as well as for the adoption of children without fully weighing what is best for the child, and have even began to form their own culture and mould various aspects of social life to accord with it. This rapid penetration of conservative societies and more particularly of the traditional religions by homosexual culture has provoked a defensive reaction and a powerful counterpunch of stigmatisation of the LBTQI movement as a form of civilisational decline and decadence. Closed populist ideologies have embraced this reaction enthusiastically, indulging in the demonisation of all forms of homosexuality and reinforcing social divisions and distrust.”

“In Islamic countries, social theocracy dominates, more or less equating the state and the religious authorities, which places other religions and worldviews in a subordinate, unequal, and not infrequently persecuted status.”

“It is therefore important that European civilisation not lose its necessary influence on shaping our world if we are to avoid a repeat of such catastrophic experiences as fascism and communism.”

There are various dimensions of ignorance in these homilies, and I will unfortunately not be able to engage with any of them fully. If I were to try, I would firstly point out that the link between poverty and increased natality is one of the most persistent racist tropes, appearing in Nazi imaginations of Jews, in Balkan narratives on Roma people, in Serbian imagination of Kosovar and Bosnian Muslims, and so on. Secondly, the LGBTIQ+ movements have not achieved the desired equality for gender and sexually diverse people in most parts of the world, certainly not in Bosnia. Even less have these movements for human rights and dignity achieved state recognition of marriage and adoption of children, as the author notes. Where exactly does the author live? Where do his thoughts reside? These lines sound like the author is imagining a world to which he has never travelled. Such rights, even in those few geographic spaces where they were legally procured, are recent and fraught with political resistance. Furthermore, what is the 'homosexual culture' for the author? It would be fascinating to hear the elaboration. Is it a culture of being harassed in public and private spaces, or is it rather some bar called 'Sodom and Gomorrah' located somewhere along the highway in his imaginative geographies of the 'perverse West'? His narrative about family as 'the central reproductive unit of society' is another immense obstacle. If I were to attempt an explanation, I would suggest to the author that the notion of family is neither equally constructed around the world nor universal as such (the latter argument is at least fifty years old in anthropological literature). Kinship has been variously historically imagined, in Europe like elsewhere. Even in Bosnia, it may still include cross-religious ritual ties (*kumstvo, pobratimstvo/posestrinstvo*, etc.). One could, of course, add to this, the myriad of 'new technologies' (although, not really so new anymore), which make possible for one person to have more than two (yes, 'biological') parents, for people's genetic material to be used in processes of reproduction after their death, and so on. Has the author ever read about in vitro fertilization-embryo transfer, gamete intrafallopian transfer, zygote intrafallopian transfer, or frozen embryo transfer? They do sound like blasphemous words. Anathema!

Thirdly, what exactly constitutes an 'Islamic country'? Where are we to find one? Perhaps the author is imagining some essential sacropolitical darkness of Iran, Pakistan or Saudi Arabia? The state and religious authorities are also bound together in Russia, Israel, eSwatini, Bosnia, Thailand, etc. An abstract statement on some 'Islamic countries' particularises Islam and reifies forms of violence on religious grounds.

Fourthly, the author would like to see a continued influence of what he calls the 'European civilisation' on the shaping of the world. Could he be thinking of the most successful

European export, colonial regimes of governance and various forms of slavery and subordination excused through Christian morality? Or, is he, in equating ‘communism’ to ‘fascism’, forgetting the second most successful product of the European civilising sweep, the Holocaust?

I find it impossible to reply to these and other reductive and essentialising lines in the paper without much more effort, which takes time. Instead, I notice that the problem, as Marilyn Strathern once wrote, is not in the difference of perspectives; the problem begins when we start writing descriptions of the world as such. I suggest that the author’s contribution should wait until it is better informed, and that, in its present form – as violence of its own kind – it should not be published.

Mile Babić

U svom tekstu Ivo Marković pokazuje što sve ugrožava današnjega čovjeka i današnje čovječanstvo. Izgleda da je volja za moću i profitom jača od volje za istinom i dobrim životom. Kulturna politika u Sarajevu nakon pandemije treba nastaviti onu stvaralačku tradiciju koja se temeljila na susretu različitih. Grad se, naime, brani kulturom, a kultura usavršava odnosno uzdiže život na višu razinu. Sloboda stvaranja se očituje u raznolikosti i neponovljivosti.

Mirsad Kunić, THE EXPERIENCE OF PAIN AND DEATH IN BOSNIAK ORAL POETRY / ISKUSTVO BOLI I SMRTI U BOŠNJAČKOJ USMENOJ POEZIJI

Esnefa Smajlović-Muhić

Bio mi je interesantan pogled na tri vrste boli o kojima gospodin Kunić veli: “Iskustvo boli, a sljedbeno tome i smrti, rodno je svodivo na žensku usmenu poeziju, lirsku i lirsko-epsku, mada se i u muškoj agonalnoj viziji svijeta smrt nameće kao sadržaj samo smrt, ali bez iskustva boli, jer se bol ne uklapa u agonalnu koncepciju svijeta. O temi muškog susreta sa smrću u bošnjačkoj i južnoslavenskim epikama pisano je, ali ne i dovoljno. U mnoštvu raznolikih usmenopjesničkih sadržaja koji tretiraju iskustvo boli valja staviti fokus na tri, čini se, paradigmatične motivske varijacije – bol kao čežnja, urokom i kletvom izazvana bol i bol od koje nema lijeka.” Rekla bih da osim boli, koje je nabrojao gosp. Kunić, postoji još mnogo vrsta duševnih boli, nostalgije, bol zbog izdaje, bol zbog beznada itd.

Autor je govorio i o uobličenjima boli kroz razne metafore, balade s tragičnim ishodima ili romansama i sevdalinkama, kad je riječ o vedrijim oblicima bola.

Rusmir Mahmutćehajić

Bosna i njeni ljudi su prožeti prijetnjom pandemije, u doslovnom i metaforičnom značenju tog pojma. Idealu da bude uspostavljeno, održavano i šticeo religijski pluralno društvo suprotstavljeni su obogovljene strasti i nositelji svih modernih ideologija. Je li moguće, pitam profesora Mirsada Kunića, izdvojiti jednu ili više ličnosti iz bosanskog epskog naslijeđa u kojima se stječe taj ideal protiv kojeg su gotovo svi oblici nastojanja da bude ozbiljen “raj” na zemlji?

Mehmed Agović, USING CORONAVIRUS AGAINST CIVIL RIGHTS AND MEDIA FREEDOM / VIRUS(OM) KORONA PROTIV GRAĐANSKIH PRAVA I MEDIJSKIH SLOBODA

Nerin Dizdar

In his text Mehmed Agović provides a review of the state of media freedoms and violations or suspension of the right to free speech in numerous European countries, with the authorities justifying their actions as need or necessity, an unfounded excuse. Agović clearly shows that such this approach, typical of former communist countries, is unsubstantiated, offering the counterargument of actions by countries with a higher degree of democratic development and openness, such as Finland.

While identifying autocratic methods applied by the authorities to the general population in former communist countries, Agović also recognizes another worrying accompanying trend, which is the public’s tendency to uncritically accept these repressive measures, especially when the authorities rely in applying them on manipulating the predominant fears of contemporary society, including the fear of death and disease. Accepting the illusion that they face an inevitable choice of health and privacy or freedom, citizens readily sacrifice their rights, convinced that by doing so they are protecting their health. Agović elaborates why such choice is a false one, noting that critical thinking, flow of information and education, and not tabooing them and imposing a totalitarian uniformity of behaviour and thought, are the key tools for facing certain threats.

U svom tekstu “Virus(om) korona protiv građanskih prava i medijskih sloboda” Mehmed Agović daje presjek stanja medijskih sloboda i narušavanja ili ukidanja prava na slobodu govora u brojnim evropskim državama, uz opravdanje vladajućih struktura, odnosno njihov izgovor da je takvo postupanje potreba ili nužda. Agović jasno pokazuje da takav pristup, uglavnom karakterističan za države koje su bile pod upravom komunističkih režima, nije osnovan, koristeći kao protivargument postupanja država koje njeguju visok stepen demokratičnosti i otvorenosti, poput Finske.

Uz identificirane autokratske metode u odnošenju vladajućih struktura prema javnosti u bivšim komunističkim državama, Agović prepoznaje još jedan zabrinjavajući trend, a to je sklonost građanstva da uglavnom bespogovorno prihvati nametnute represivne mjere, naročito ako se u njihovoj primjeni vlasti oslanjaju na manipuliranje temeljnim strahovima savremenog društva, poput straha od smrti ili bolesti. Prihvatajući iluziju da su stavljeni pred neizbježnim izborom između zdravlja i privatnosti ili slobode, građani spremno žrtvuju svoja prava, uvjereni da tako štite svoje zdravlje. Agović kaže da se radi o lažnom izboru, naglašavajući da je propitkivanje, informiranost, educiranost i znanje ključno sredstvo za suočavanje s određenom ugrozom, a ne njeno tabuiziranje i nametanje totalitarističke uniformnosti ponašanja i mišljenja.

Mustafa Sefo and Fahira Fejzić Čengić, COMMUNICATION AND THE CORONA VIRUS / KOMUNIKACIJA U PANDEMIJSKOM VREMENU

Neven Anđelić

Ovaj rad na temu komunikacija otvara mogućnosti novih uvida u polje medija i tehnologije te, također, izaziva i moguće nesuglasje s nekim stavovima. Dok je masovna komunikacija slijedila niz revolucija, poglavito industrijskih, ipak se ne bih složio da je 21. vijek također period kada “masovni listovi, novine i časopisi, letci, oglasi su opća odlika”. Novine se gase, uvode se novi načini kategorizacije popularnosti časopisa i novina, koji su samo manjim dijelom refleksija štampanih i prodanih primjeraka. Veliki broj naslova se ili ugasio ili potpuno prešao u digitalne oblike. Stoga to nije odlika ovog perioda.

Tri velike tehnološke (digitalne) revolucije su se odigrale tokom kraja dvadesetog i početka 21. vijeka: internet, mobilne medijske platforme i društvene mreže. Tako stručna literatura postavlja razvoj komunikacije. Smatram da je taj element triju tehnoloških revolucija relevantniji za promišljanje o komunikaciji tokom pandemije nego distantne revolucije i izumi štamparske prese, radija te televizije. Te vremenski udaljene tehnološke promjene, uzmemo li primjer koji autorica i autor navode, omogućile su vjerske obrede tokom pandemije, ali to je pogled iz sarajevske vizure i ograničen upravo tom vizurom. U znatnom dijelu svijeta upravo su te tri tehnološke revolucije tokom posljednje tri decenije korištene za pristup vjerskim obredima ali i, mnogo važnije, za omogućavanje obrazovnih procesa. Pitanje je kako bi se obrazovanje odvijalo bez najnovijih tehnoloških dostignuća.

Također bih sugerisao da se tema “društvenog narcisizma” ne ostavi za drugu priliku, jer bi rasprava tog aspekta u kontekstu tehnološkog dostignuća i uloge komunikacije tokom pandemijske izolacije dodatno doprinijela kvaliteti rada. Ukoliko je potreban dodatni prostor, možda dio koji opisuje početak pandemije i njeno širenje može biti izbačen, pošto je to opštepoznata materija i ne nudi nikakav novi doprinos.

Također, moguće je osporiti tezu da su svi masovni mediji prvobitno korišteni u ratne svrhe, pa tek onda bili pacificirani. Možda su prvobitno testirani u vojne svrhe tokom mira, mada mobilne telefonije i društvene mreže kao masovni mediji slabe ovu tezu. Hitler i Roosevelt su uveliko koristili radio kao medij tokom mira, prvi da mobilizira naciju za rat, a drugi da dobije demokratsku legitimaciju. Sve je to rađeno tokom mirnog perioda. Radio je komercijalizacijsku ekspanziju doživio između dva rata bez skoro ikakve primjene prije i tokom Prvog svjetskog rata.

Konačno, argument o agresivnim potrošačkim reklamama nije održiv, jer su zapravo one znatno smanjene u obimu tokom pandemije. Kompanije koje su se ranije oglašavale, suočene s problemima druge vrste, smanjile su budžete iz finansijskih razloga, nemogućnosti plasmana proizvoda na tržište te ne želeći da im proizvod bude asociran s ljudskom tragedijom, a to su periodi s vijestima, kada su elektronski mediji najgledaniji tokom pandemije. Autorske intervencije u ovim segmentima bi, po mojem sudu, značajno doprinijele kvaliteti rada uz neophodno referenciranje jer, osim pozivanja na neimenovani rad Foucaulta, nema drugih referenci. Jedno dodatno istraživanje, kada već govorimo o “agresivnim potrošačkim reklamama”, moglo bi provjeriti samu tezu na osnovu egzaktnih pokazatelja koliko je uloženo u reklamiranje tokom pandemije.

The third panel / Treći panel

REIMAGINING UNIVERSAL POLITICAL, CULTURAL, AND ECONOMIC PARADIGMS LOCALLY/ REIMAGINACIJA UNIVERZALNIH POLITIČKIH, KULTURNIH I EKONOMSKIH PARADIGMI U LOKALNIM OKVIRIMA

Žarko Papić, THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE COVID 19 PANDEMIC: VIEWED FROM THE SARAJEVO LOCKDOWN / SOCIJALNE POSLJEDICE COVID-19 PANDEMIJE: U VIDICIMA SARAJEVSKOG ZATOČENJA

Mirsad Kunić

“Hoće li trajno loša ekonomska i socijalna situacija, detonirana koronom, postati dovoljno vidljiva da probudi novu energiju građana za promjene? Iskustvo kaže da neće. Isto iskustvo pokazuje da će eventualno buđenje građana biti gušeno autoritativnim procesima u Republici Srpskoj i turbo-patriotizmom u Federaciji Bosne i Hercegovine. U velikom broju definicija ‘istine’ izgleda da je najbolja ona koja glasi ‘istina je ono što niko ne želi da čuje.’” (Papić, 278)

Trajno loša situacija. A šta je rješenje za trajno lošu situaciju?

Kadrija Hodžić

Žarko Papić skreće pažnju na tešku socijalno-ekonomsku situaciju Bosni i Hercegovini, kao problemu koji, s jedne strane, ostaje u sjeni postdejtonskih političkih i nacionalnih sukoba, a s druge, koji s pandemijom ima tendenciju znatnog pogoršavanja. Pri tome Papić, gotovo usamljen među bosanskim socijalnim analitičarima, skreće pažnju na pogrešno primjenjivanu metodologiju procjenjivanja relativnog siromaštva, po kojoj se u vrijeme globalne recesije 2008. očekivalo da Bosna i Hercegovina prođe bolje od Evropske unije. Stvarni tok događaja pokazao je da je Bosna i Hercegovina prošla znatno gore, pa je za oporavak trebalo punih pet godina. Temeljem ovakvog analitičkog promišljanja, Papić upozorava na mogućnost ponovljene greške, argumentovano dokazujući da se može očekivati veći pad BDP-a i veće socijalne posljedice od gubitaka u razvijenim zemljama i Evropskoj uniji. Papić upozorava da

će pad BDP-a izazvati ogromne socijalne posljedice, do razine do koje sistemi socijalne sigurnosti neće moći izdržati, što će otvoriti put jačanja desnog autoritarizma i nacionalističkog izolacionizma. Autor zbog toga upućuje na nove politike borbe protiv siromaštva, koje moraju biti među prioritetima vlade i parlamenta.

Fikret Čaušević, THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK FOR BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA DURING THE COVID 19 GLOBAL CRISIS / EKONOMSKE PERSPEKTIVE BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE TOKOM GLOBALNE KORONA KRIZE

Žarko Papić

Tekst F. Čauševića je veoma ozbiljna analiza ekonomskih i socijalnih posljedica krize izazvane COVID-19 pandemijom. Pri tome se daje pregled procjena negativnih posljedica u zemljama regiona.

Za razliku od rutinskih procjena niza domaćih institucija koje, slijedeći inerciju te neshvatajući stvarni karakter krize, daju nerealno optimistične procjene. F. Čaušević jasno kaže “Drugim riječima, strategija djelovanja najviših državnih organa vlasti treba biti pripremljena i za scenarije koji podrazumjevaju pad BDP-a između 15% i 20%.” Mislim da je ta procjena, nažalost, realna.

Preporučujem tekst F. Čauševića za objavljivanje u Zborniku “Sarajevo i svijet”.

Kadrija Hodžić

Iscrpan prilog Fikreta Čauševića zaokružuje tri tematske cjeline, dovoljno prostrane za sagledavanje ekonomskih perspektiva Bosne i Hercegovine tokom korona krize. Prvo se predstavljaju stanje opadajućeg ekonomskog rasta prije korona krize te pozicija Bosna i Hercegovine u razmjerama korona krize s karakterističnim nesnalaženjem entitetskih vlada u prikazivanju posljedica ekonomskog šoka. Drugi dio je ispunjen pažljivim elaboriranjem intenziteta i razmjera globalnog ekonomskog poremećaja, kao i autorovoj originalnoj procjeni o nerealnim projekcijama oporavka globalne ekonomije. U trećem dijelu se predstavljaju mogućnosti i limitiranje anticikličnog djelovanja u Bosni i Hercegovini, koje Čaušević sagledava kroz finansijske izvori s rokovima dospjeća od minimalno 10-20 godina. Za dugoročno finansiranje strateških razvojnih projekata (u koje ubraja zdravstvo, green

energetiku, soft-infrastrukture bazirane na ekonomiji znanja i informacionim tehnologijama te projekat osavremenjavanja Državne granične službe) predlaže emisiju dugoročnih obveznica, koje bi garantovale međunarodne institucije, a koje bi ostvarile tri cilja: (su)finansiranje ovih strateških projekata, uspješnije upravljanje novčanim tokovima na državnom i entitetskim nivoima te povećanje finansijske stabilnosti. Emitovane državne obveznice bi postale prvoklasna finansijska imovina s kojom bi se otvorila ekonomska perspektiva Bosne i Hercegovine tokom korona krize.

Adnan Salkić

A digital transformation same like COV-19 today is everywhere.

COV-19 in digital transformative world we are living today is a set of opportunities with doing things differently by transforming the core of activities and doing different things redefining BH economy vision to become very clear.

BH economy in the era of digital transformation and the pandemic environment will have two options, to innovatively disrupt and get a clear strategy of organic growth or will continuously be disrupted on the way to the collapse.

We can summarize, Cov-19 is an irrelevant disrupting factor in the process of driving the Bosnian digital economy if we look at it as a set of opportunities enables by digital transformation through connections between people and machines.

Kadrija Hodžić and Izudin Kešetović, THE AGE OF THE CORONA ECONOMY IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA / VRIJEME KORONA EKONOMIJE U BOSNI I HERCEGOVINI

Žarko Papić

Tekst K. Hodžića i I. Kešetovića je ozbiljna analiza ograničenja postojećih mjera monetarno-kreditne politike na posljedice krize izazvane koronom te potrebe jačanja kapaciteta fiskalne politike. Važani su zaključci: “Postoji realna mogućnost da korona kriza postane jedna od najrazornijih ekonomskih kriza koje je svijet ikada vidio” i “u srednjem roku presudnu ulogu će igrati količina proizvedene robe a ne količina novca”.

Sadržaj i koncept teksta nesumljivo su razlog da preporučim njegovo objavljivanje u Zborniku “Sarajevo i svijet”.

Hamdija Hadžihasanović, THE PANDEMIC AND BOSNIAN DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES / PANDEMIJA I BOSANSKI RAZVOJNI IZAZOVI

Izudin Kešetović

Publicističkim stilom autor dočarava težinu socijalnih i političkih posljedica pandemije Covid-19, uključujući čisto moralni sadržaj i elemente moralnog prava u svoju percepciju postpandemijskih bosanskih razvojnih izazova. U sjeni pandemijske prijetnje autoru se otvara strah od gubljenja sloboda, dužničkog ropstva i siromaštva. Ali, metafizičkim obratom mišljenja on strah pretvara u nadu, pa pandemijski virus predstavlja pravednikom koji nas poput smrti sve čini jednakim. Perspektivu bosanskohercegovačkog razvoja, ujedno i izlaza iz sveopšte pandemijske krize, sugerira otvaranjem dva fronta. S jedne strane su to moralne norme u reformisanju Ustava Bosne i Hercegovine, s kojim bi se relaksirala postojeća politička nestabilnost i eliminirao strah jednih od drugih. Među njima su najvažniji uvođenje stvarnog protektorata nad Bosnu i Hercegovinu u periodu do 4 godine i stvaranje timova stručnjaka za upravljanje zemljom. S druge strane, njegova je sugestija da se razvoj Bosne i Hercegovine provodi vlastitim znanjem i sredstvima. Ovakav pristup u suštini nosi utopistička očekivanja, ali i moralne nazore održivosti Bosne i Hercegovine, utemeljene u razumu.

Rasim Gačanović

Veoma zanimljivo promišljanje jednog od važnih aktera odbrane Bosne. Tekst dodiruje brojna pitanja teškog bosanskog stanja, koja se čine nerješivim. Ali Bosna je dragocjena i vrijedi uporno i ustrajno tražiti izlaz.

Osvrnut ću se samo na neka promišljanja iz teksta.

Autor lijepo poziva na univerzalno načelo “Ne čini drugom ono što ne bi volio da on učini tebi!”. I to je lahko ostvarivo, moje je mišljenje – KLJUČ RJEŠENJA SVIH PROBLEMA NA BALKANU JESTE - PRESTATI LAGATI! I okrenuti se etičnosti, tj. živjeti u skladu s moralnim načelima.

Kad je u pitanju prijedlog da se normira i definira pojam “mir”, mislim da bi bilo efikasnije držati se milenijskog svetog bosanskog pravila: nikog nećemo napadati niti činiti bilo kakvu ekspanzionističku prijetnju, ali istovremeno odlučno koristiti neprikosnoveno pravo (i obavezu) šticeanja i odbrane domovine te u skladu s tim poduzimati potrebne pothvate – osiguranje resursa, sredstava, vještina i znanja za odbranu.

Tu mogućnost (odbrane) valja uporno tražiti (i naći) čak i u ovakvim složenim okolnostima, kada ispostave Beograda i Zagreba u Bosni proklamiraju pacifizam, demilitarizaciju i razoružanje (ali samo Bosne), a intenzivno podržavaju i prizivaju agresivno naoružavanje svojih centrala, pa onda Srbiju i Hrvatsku, koje su pokazale zločinačka agresorska djelovanja protiv Bosne, nevješto i lažno prikazuju kao “garante” Dejtonskog sporazuma.

Prijedlog autora o uvođenju “stvarnog protektorata” možda bi bilo prikladnije preformulirati u “odgovornog protektorata”, jer dosad je važio protektorat bez ikakve odgovornosti.

Od tog je, smatram, neizmjerne važnije to da bosanski ljudi – njih ne može biti malo, ma koliko da ih je – preuzmu odgovornost za sebe i svoju državu. Kada postanu organizirani u osvješćenju važnosti bosanskog ideala, sadašnji etno-nacionalistički razaratelji Bosne pokazat će se u svakom pogledu nemoćnim.

Rasim Gačanović, ON TWO SIEGES OF SARAJEVO / O DVJEMA OPSADAMA SARAJEVA

Neven Anđelić

Ovaj vrlo zanimljiv i nadasve ličan rad neminovno vodi ka brojnim pitanjima, iako je jasno da je prostor ograničen. Prvo bih ustanovio da je konsocijacijski sistem u Bosni i Hercegovini refleksija složenog društva i ustanovljen kao garancija kolektivnih prava unutar države, koju autor vidi kao jedinstvenu i na toj osnovi vodi dalju argumentaciju. Međutim, dok država jeste jedinstvena (šta god to značilo, jer svaka država je jedinstvena), ona je složena. U teoriji države osnovna podjela može biti na kompleksne i unitarne. Bosna i Hercegovina svakako nije unitarna. Stoga, kao kompleksni subjekt posjeduje podsisteme koji tokom kriznih situacija, kako autor odlično navodi, mogu uzročiti napukline. Više radova u ovoj istoj kompilaciji navodi

upravo kompleksnost Bosne i Hercegovine, njenog političkog sistema i modela, pa je onda tvrdnja o jedinstvenosti donekle disonantna.

Smatram da su različite reakcije tokom pandemije donekle podcrtale probleme u odnosima podsistema u Bosni i Hercegovini. Štaviše, smatram da je pukotine moguće bilo uočiti i prije same pandemijske krize, što ne znači da se teritorijalni suverenitet zemlje pukotinama ugrozio. Retoričko kritičko postavljanje nekih političkih lidera prema suverenosti je irelevantno za stvarni status države. Dakle, ja bih relativizirao ovaj početni stav u tekstu.

Opis agresije iz 90-tih mogao bi dodatno doprinijeti ovoj relativizaciji, jer ona je, po nekim izvorima, bila dvostruka i lako je dokaziva. Ukoliko se fokusiramo na Sarajevo, onda je moguće govoriti o onom tipu agresije koji autor navodi, ali, primjera radi, mnogi Mostarci će govoriti o drugoj vrsti ili čak o dvjema paralelnim vrstama agresije iz dviju susjednih zemlja.

Organizovanje odbrane u okviru legalnih institucija Bosne i Hercegovine nije realno bilo moguće te u tom kontekstu bi trebalo sagledati kreiranje Patriotske lige. Tu se ne bih složio s autorom, pošto Patriotska liga nije bila dio legalnih institucija. Zbog načina na koji je vlast u Bosni i Hercegovini bila koncipirana, nije bio moguće slovenski scenarij po kojem je osnov odbrane kreiran kroz Teritorijalnu odbranu, dakle legalnu instituciju sistema. Niti hrvatski scenarij nije bio moguć, gdje je osnov odbrane kreiran kroz jedinice policije i Ministarstvo unutrašnjih poslova, opet dijelove legalnih institucija. U Bosni i Hercegovini je, dakle, osnov kreiran kroz vaninstitucionalno organizovanje. Pri tome se ne upuštam u diskusiju opravdanosti i mogućnosti, pošto autor argumentovano navodi radnje koje su prethodile.

Drugi period krize koji autor nastoji paralelno prikazati u radu je trenutna pandemija i sličnosti, kao i razlike, uvjerljivo su prezentovane. Jedan oblik slabosti funkcioniranja vlasti je u oba slučaja korupcija i kriminal, koji nizom primjera autor poentira. Bilo bi zanimljivo ako bi autor dodatno elaborirao na paralelne afere s nabavkom medicinske opreme u oba entiteta i koji paralelno dokazuju osnovnu autorovu tezu o karakteru (dijela) vlasti u Bosni i Hercegovini. Lično iskustvo i svjedočenje su dragocjeni dokument koji ovaj rad predstavlja.

Na kraju imam dvije sugestije. Jedna se odnosi na učestalo pominjanje "Rusmira" u tekstu. Bilo bi dobro, iako je jasna uloga "Rusmira" u ovom projektu, da se u dvije rečenice predstavi "Rusmir" jer, ako je projekat ambiciozan da dostigne do šire publike, neće obavezno svi biti upoznati s "Rusmirom". Druga sugestija je citiranje ratnog zločinca s govornom manom

“*Vivovitica – Kavvovac - Kavvobag*”. Smatram da bez obzira na karakter ličnosti, ne treba ismijati nečiji urođeni nedostatak, pa makar to bio i ratni zločinac. Veliki je broj mogućnosti ismijavanja i kritikovanja pomenutog zločinca, ali smatram da prirodnu manu ne treba uvrstiti u to. Autor umjesno navodi izvor za ovaj citat, ali mišljenja sam da je citat nepotreban.

Vahid Tanović, FUTURE ENERGY SOURCES FOR HEATING BUILDINGS IN B&H AND AROUND THE WORLD GIVEN THE FIGHT AGAINST CLIMATE CHANGE / BORBA PROTIV KLIMATSKIH PROMJENA I BUDUĆI IZVORI ENERGIJE ZA GRIJANJE ZGRADA

Rasim Gačanović

Tekst je odličan, aktuelan, argumentiran i izuzetno važan u promišljanju bosanske energetske i ekološke budućnosti.

Rad razotkriva uzroke sadašnjeg teškog bosanskog stanja u toj oblasti. Naime, iz citiranih dokumenata (npr. Okvirna energetska strategija Bosne i Hercegovine do 2035.) vidljivi su nekompetentnost, neodgovornost, nestručnost, neznanje, a sada sam uvjeren i namjera u kreiranju zakonskog okvira za pljačku.

Tako taj i slični dokumenti plasiraju i, što je još gore, obvezuju veoma sumnjivim “strateškim” pravcima bosansku energetiku. Upitno je da li energetika treba biti “motor stabilnosti ...”. Ovdje valja dodati da energiju (kao nužnu) treba proizvoditi samo za bosanske potrebe i ništa više ..., okaniti se megalomanskih floskula “da je Bosna energetska velesila ...” i sličnih populističkih parola bez utemeljenja u struci i nauci! Energija nije i ne može biti sama sebi svrha.

Energetski sektor u Bosni ne može biti “motor razvoja”, jer Bosna nema ni tehnologiju niti proizvodi opremu u tom sektoru, koji bi pozitivno utjecali na bosanski ekonomski prostor.

Upitna je “strateška” vrijednost, odnosno “strategičnost” tog dokumenta za Bosnu – jer je napravljen kao puki zbir entiteskih “strategija” (!!!). To nije u skladu sa standardnom metodologijom kreiranja ovakvih dokumenata, nego je rezultat “kompromisa” – tipa dogovora triju plemenskih poglavica, što automatski diskvalificira taj papir i za državu je nerelevantan dokument!!!

Može li Bosna “preskočiti” *plinsku* i odmah krenuti u *vodikovu* energetska generaciju? To jest, možemo li ovo zaostajanje za razvijenim svijetom pretvoriti u prednost i napraviti odmah tranziciju *fosilna goriva-vodik*?

To su pitanja ozbiljne energetske, ali i svake druge politike.

Anes Podić, MINI HYDROPOWER PLANTS – DANGEROUS SCAMS WITH LONG-TERM DAMAGES / MALE HIDROELEKTRANE – OPASNE PREVARE S DALEKOROČNIM ŠTETAMA

Rasim Gačanović

Hvale vrijedno, hrabro i neposredno razotkrivanje osmišljenih kriminalnih i za Bosnu pogubnih konstrukcija pljačke i uništavanja vitalnih resursa tla, vode i zraka kroz gradnju malih hidroelektrana – a u oblandi tzv. zelene energije. Kako je to neposredno izloženo u radu, ništa od motiva navedenih u “Strategiji”, kao razlog za taj pothvat, ne stoji: niti ekonomski razvoj, niti zapošljavanje, niti zaštita okoline.

Valjalo bi napraviti analizu do sad donesenih odluka, zakona, uredbi te urađenih elaborata i “studija” s naručenim rezultatima i zaključcima, kako bi se opravdao i legalizirao pogubni pothvat gradnje mini hidroelektrana i osigurao okvir nekažnjivosti za učinjenu štetu.

Možda bi trebalo iskazati oprez i rezervu prema prijedlogu supstitucije malih hidroelektrana vjetro i/ili solarnim elektrenama. Naime, te elektrane, osim vrlo oscilirajuće proizvodnje (ne osiguravaju pokrivanje temeljnog – konstantnog dijela dnevnog dijagrama potrošnje), također imaju negativan utjecaj na okolinu (što još nije dovoljno i detaljno istraženo ni publicirano).

Sva tehnologija u vezi s tim je također u rukama nebosanskih proizvođača.

Kad su u pitanju problemi *energija-okolina*, mislim da bi za Bosnu pravi strateški pravac bio indirektni, pasivni pristup – štednja, odnosno energetska efikasnost – smanjenje intenziteta energije: gradnja energetske štedljivih objekata, uvođenje niskoenergetskih industrijskih tehnologija, prelazak na ekonomičan i ekološki prihvatljiv transport...

Safet HadžiMuhamedović

This paper deals with one of the most damaging, insidious, threats to Bosnian landscapes, the unrelenting construction of mini hydropower plants. The pandemic lockdown, we learn, has been used to accelerate the destruction of Bosnian rivers, particularly those most qualifying for state protection as biodiverse habitats. The paper uncovers useful details about the main stakeholders and the legal changes that made these plants possible. We see that the destruction of rivers depends on an orchestrated effort of international companies and local political actors. It would be good to see a further discussion of the community resistance to small hydropower plants, as well as the importance of these rivers to local cosmologies. I very much enjoyed reading this important paper.

Keith Doubt, THE SPIRIT OF CAPITALISM IN THE FACE OF THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC / DUH KAPITALIZMA U SUOČENJU S PANDEMIJOM VIRUSA KORONA

Rusmir Mahmutćehajić

It seems to me that this text and Said Yazid's text "Global Crisis and Global Justice: Some Theological Reflections" should be read together. The convincing intellectual panorama of social dynamics given here complements, in its concrete and accessible openness, what the other text offers us in its close intimacy, namely the dependence of this world of contingency, focused in and through the individual, on unconditioned God. It may seem that the two - the sociologically materialistic social public on the one hand and the complete intimacy of the individual's relationship with God on the other, can be separated. But can it?! The pandemic seems to have reinvigorated prevalent theological and non-theological approaches to God as though he were definable and so a being among beings and to the world as though it were its own cause and effect, with a return from oblivion to our evident power in powerlessness and to our discovery of the right to be absolutely happy and absolutely alive?!

Čini mi se da bi ovaj i tekst Saida Yazida "Globalna kriza i globalna pravda: neke teološke refleksije" trebalo čitati jedan iza drugog. U ovoj uvjerljivoj intelektualnoj panorami društvene dinamike, u njenoj odredljivoj i dostupnoj javnosti, naznačeno je i ono što je u drugom tekstu potpuna intimnost, odnos uvjetnog svijeta, sabranog u pojedinačnome čovjeku, s neuvjetnim Bogom. Može se činiti da to dvoje – sociološki opredmetljiva društvena javnost, na jednoj, i potpuna intimnost pojedinačnog odnosa s Bogom, na drugoj strani – može biti razdvojeno. A

može li?! Nisu li najučestaliji teološki i neteološki vidici – govorenja o Bogu kao da je odredljiv, a zato biće među bićima, i govorenje o svijetu kao da je i uzrok i razlog sebi – pandemijom iznova uvedeni u vraćanja iz zaborava očitoj ljudskoj moći u nemoći, otkrivanju prava na pojedinačno bivanje apsolutno sretnim i apsolutno živim?!

Nerin Dizdar

Keith Doubt analyses the flaws and the shortcomings of the contemporary social order through the prism of Karl Marx's, Emile Durkheim's and Max Weber's critique of capitalism. Doubt argues that the crisis caused by the Covid-19 pandemic is exposing all the weaknesses of a deeply flawed and unjust social order. He supports the claim with examples and statistical data from the United States, which show how embedded classism and racism remain in American social structure.

Reminding us that these three thinkers all distrusted capitalism as a potentially fatal threat to society as a phenomenon and a form of desirable human organization in the world, Doubt attempts to prove that Marx's, Durkheim's and Weber's fears are not only not unfounded but are actually being realized in a world struck by the pandemic. Recognizing that the pandemic has exposed the failures of "capitalistically motivated leaders" and the contemporary bourgeoisie, Doubt is not claiming that the predicted uprising of the "proletariat" or the working class is actually going to occur, but nor does he exclude it as a possibility in a "torturous" society. Whether it has become the "society-less jungle" Durkheim predicted or is a manifestation of the "charismatic authority" embodied by Donald Trump, with all his flaws, Doubt recognizes an urgent need for return to efficient bureaucratic authority as the ruling mechanism in American and many other democracies. The author doesn't suggest solutions himself, but rather ponders whether a return or an evolution to a more just and "healthier" society is still a possibility.

Sonja Biserko, THE CORONAVIRUS ENIGMA AND THE BALKANS / BALKAN I ENIGMA
KORONE

Desmond Maurer

There is something that bothers me in this eloquent analysis of the impact of the pandemic on the Balkans. The author correctly points out that the coronavirus has exposed the inner tensions and weaknesses of society here and connected this to the flight to populism. She refers to “captured societies” but recommends designating them “hostages of the past”, manipulated skilfully by their political elites through representations of the past experienced as an inheritance of pain and suffering.

All this is true, but it is not enough truth. The fundamental fact of Balkan society is not the undoubted fecklessness and even wickedness of the elites. It is the complicity of the populations with their elites. This may be the complicity of an abusive relationship, born of “false consciousness”, but it is nonetheless an active complicity, derived in equal parts from despair, greed, and interest.

Incorporation within the EU cannot provide a solution on its own. The countries of the region will only be ready to join the European Union when they no longer need to. This was what the stabilisation and accession process was supposed to achieve and has failed to. What the EU pretends not to understand is that the elites and their clientelist networks have no “objective” interest in steering their countries towards membership. They have an interest in having someone else to blame for not being able to join. This is a sustainable bad equilibrium. The only way out of it is to create a framework that offers the people of each country an alternative to clientalist dependency, which is to say an enabling environment that offers a prospect of flourishing.

The key is to come to terms with what maintains this bad equilibrium, which is that everyone in the region is incorporated in more or less covert webs of interests and costs, within which there is no public trust and so there are no reserves of social capital. One approach is through the concept of “rent seeking”, which goes alongside clientelism and neo-patrimonialism, and reveals the essentially transactional nature of the situation (not emotion or identity, but interest). Through various forms of de-mobilisation and atomisation, people are isolated, but they are then re-situated, and re-incorporated into networks through patronage or, often, even just the prospect of patronage and an assumption/awareness that that is how things work. The lack of social capital prevents faith in an alternative, which sends us looking for Heidegger’s “Only a god can save us now”, whether it is a leader or the EU or even Tito reborn... Consequently, the people cannot be absolved of their complicity and so share of responsibility. They are actively undermining their own future. If Europe wants to solve this, it

will have to be in it for the long haul and commit the resources required to bring about a degree of social transformation. Otherwise it risks undermining its own project.

Kadrija Hodžić

Istaknuta aktivistkinja borbe za ljudska prava, Sonja Biserko, u svom prilogu je usredsređena na posljedice pandemija po marginalizovanje univerzalnih vrijednosti koje oslikavaju ranjivost Zapadnog Balkana. Već “zarobljena” balkanska društva, kako to autorica precizno analizira, dramatično uvećavaju svoje dosadašnje odlike: korumpiranu političku klasu, nekompetentnost birokratije, fragilnost ekonomija, pri čemu populistički lideri na krilima etničkog nacionalizma, suverenizma i religije potiskuju ionako slabašnu ideju liberalizma na ovim prostorima. Nalaz da pandemija na taj način učvršćuje Zapadni Balkan u statusu stagnantnih društava Biserko proširuje s još dva faktora, koji, po njenoj ocjeni, guraju Zapadni Balkan u krajnju nestabilnost, a to su Evropska unija i Rusija – prva sa svojim neodlučnim stavom prema evropskoj perspektivi balkanskih društva, druga čineći u nekim od ovih društava snažnu antizapadnu/antievropsku opoziciju. Pa ipak svoj prilog Sonja Biserko završava s optimističkim uvjerenjem: regionalna konsolidacija i stabilizacija, regionalna solidarnost i saradnja jedini su civilizacijski ishodi trajnog mira i razvoja Zapadnog Balkana.

Mile Babić

Sonja Biserko precizno analizira stanje u svijetu i na Balkanu u vremenu pandemije. Po njoj su vidljiva tri fundamentalna geopolitička trenda: podizanje Azije, odnosno Kine, povlačenje Amerike i jačanje Njemačke unutar Europe. Pandemija je osobito razotkrila politiku na Zapadnom Balkanu. Srbija se izdvaja kao zemlja koja ne želi prihvatiti novu realnost u regiji. To se vidi u njezinu odnosu prema Bosni i Hercegovini, Crnoj Gori, Kosovu, pa i prema Makedoniji. Na taj način Srbija proizvodi tenzije kroz govor mržnje i demoniziranje susjednih naroda. Bilo bi potrebno da Evropska Unija ubrza proces svoga proširenja na Balkan i tako onemogući negativne trendove. Istinoljubivost i dobrohotnost Sonje Biserko, koja želi da demokracija i humanost vladaju na Balkanu, vrijedni su poštovanja i divljenja.

Rusmir Mahmutćehajić

Sonju Biserko mnogi istraživači smatraju najuvjerljivijim i najustrajnijim tumačem velikosrpskih djelovanja, koja se odražavaju u zapriječenostima južnoslavenskog i okružujućeg mu područja Jugoistočne Evrope. Prema tome, ona je vjerovatno i najodlučniji zagovornik volje

budućnosti srpskog naroda, za što je preduvjet gradnja prijateljstva s drugima umjesto ustrajavanja na njihovom ponižavanju, koje nerijetko prerasta u užas kojem odgovaraju različita imena. Kako vi gospođo Biserko prognozirate utjecaj neizbježne ekonomske depresije, uzrokovan pandemijom Covid-19, na moguća dekonstruiranja velikosrpske ideologije i njenih realizacija?

The fourth panel / Četvrti panel

CITY AND STATE UNDER CRISIS CONDITIONS / GRAD I DRŽAVA U
VREMENIMA KRIZE

Neven Anđelić, BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA: STATE-POWER AND SOCIETY / BOSNA I
HERZEGOVINA: DRŽAVA, MOĆ I DRUŠTVO

Desmond Maurer

The author begins his stimulating paper by referencing Francis Fukuyama's end of history thesis, Samuel Huntington's response to it, the place of liberal democracy in the period since the fall of the Berlin wall and so the Bosnian war, the comparisons made by intellectuals around the world to the Spanish Civil War, and so the symbolic importance of Sarajevo for the liberal project. He uses this to introduce a review of the performance of the Bosnian state since Dayton and how it relates to the pursuit of a new liberal order in the Balkans against the background of an increasingly illiberal world, deploying a range of indices culled from the many “international organisations, academic research centres and think tanks” that have turned this field into a form of industry.

Prof Anđelić's review is thus both interesting and useful, but subject to the same caveat as any attempt to aggregate disparate indices. It can only serve as a point of entry and orientation rather than firm ground for drawing conclusions. The author's care in showing the full range of assessments available and discussing critically the grounds for them shows how aware he is of this and it only adds to the value of his essay. The truth is not to be found by averaging results but by critically distinguishing the informed from the uninformed or biased. Examples, to which

the author himself draws attention, are the description of Bosnia and Herzegovina as an occupied country and of its being ranked as more autocratic, with considerably less fairness in electoral process, pluralism, government functionality, political culture, and respect for civil liberties than not just Croatia but also Serbia. I would certainly not argue that Bosnia deserves a much better ranking than it receives, but I would equally wonder on what grounds Croatia and especially Serbia are to be considered twice to three times as functional and democratic, plural, and open. It seems that one of the few constants in Balkan history is that accession to the Western club (or usefulness) absolves not just of the sins of the past but also of the sins of the present, so long as they are displaced onto another scene (e.g. Bleiberg in Sarajevo). The whitewashing of Croatia and Serbia at the expense of the countries they have destabilised and continue to destabilise is proof of that.

The author's suggestion Bosnia and Herzegovina be classified a "populist democracy with moderate human and economic freedoms, the weak rule of law, and human rights standards affected by corruption and problematic media freedom" rather than "a populist autocracy" seems fair. Our leaders are not autocrats, they just wish they were. They still rely on the complicity of the people, and they receive it. The author also uses his own aggregate scale to classify Bosnia and Herzegovina as a "suppressed society", which again seems fair. At the heart of it lies the calcification of the so-called nationalist wartime structures of power in and through the post-war constitution and the fetishisation of so-called consociational democracy, which has functioned here less to create competing and cooperating "pillars" within the state than to fragment the state into ethnic autonomous zones within each of which the ethnicised electorate can be kept in a state of antipathetic apathy. The logic of consociationalism hollows out the middle or any forms of political association not based upon ethnic identity. Northern Ireland provides the obvious comparison. Both there and here one must accept that the people are never just the victims of their elites.

The author returns at the end of his piece to suggest that Sarajevo has regressed since the days of the war, asking whether Sontag would have put *Godot* on stage there today. Probably not, but less because of the changed nature of Sarajevo than the lack of any flashy incentive for her particular brand of liberal grandstanding and attention seeking. The projection onto Sarajevo of the role of liberal beacon for supposed multiculturalism (there is no multiculturalism in the Balkans, all the peoples here belong to a common Balkan cultural continuum) in a region clearly intent on snuffing out difference, after the model and logic of 19th and 20th century Europe, necessarily placed the city and country in a peculiar form of

double bind, given the rigidities and internal contradictions of the Dayton constitution and its approach to the constitutive peoples. The country has had a further 25 years of schismogenetic processes, which reinforce barriers, promote withdrawal behind them, and what Churchill cynically called on a far grander scale after the World War II the “disentanglement of peoples”, until such point as fission becomes the natural result. The international community and its policy of containment for Bosnia and entente for Croatia and Serbia ensured an enabling environment for this process. When it had the power and the authority to change Dayton, it refused resolutely to do so or to allow those within the country willing to mobilise in favour of such change to even discuss it, and it has spent the past 10 years perfecting the role of Pontius Pilate. And it is that same international community more or less that creates these damning indices and that have consistently put relations with Croatia and Serbia ahead of regional stability.

N.b. there is an interesting but surely unintended alteration to the scale used by the Economist Intelligence Unit for its Democracy Index, where the top (technically lowest) score is represented not as full but as fool democracy. *Nomen omen*, perhaps.

Suada Kapić

Had we not completed two editions of our multimedia Time is Up! project, I would not have understood so easily a text that addresses the condition of BiH society today through statistical data. That experience of needing to include infographics with up to date statistical data for any proper grasp of the different levels in society through thematic interviews has been of great value in furthering my understanding of our thematic views.

Neven Anđelić has essayed an analysis under three subheadings of our society as it was, is and will be soon. He deploys certain indices in the second section to put BiH in a regional and even broader comparative context. His explication brings those statistics to life and corrects them in some aspects, as number can never fully comprehend a case like BiH. The indices are presented between some thoughts on the war and the siege of Sarajevo and how European intellectuals responded to the resistance two Sarajevo's four years of terror. The truth is that Sarajevo, as they referred to that period of their lives when incorporating it in their intellectual formation, was for four years a territory on which crucial battles were fought that transcended the imperative of multiculturalism, which was automatic, and that took the form of a higher level of resistance to mass terror on the part of all the citizenry through art, culture, humour,

inventiveness, and mental survival, to become part of world heritage and witness to the grandeur of human nature.

Neven was therefore right, even if he did not term things as I have, to divide his story of BiH society and Sarajevo into three parts. The third is his conclusion, with its profound concern for the future, but I feel a responsibility to point out that the citizenry of part one are not entirely responsible themselves for having become enmired in the political framework of depressing indices that show a divided society and gridlocked institutions. The social framework is a product of the various peace treaties that facilitated the landgrab by the various political nationalisms.

It is worth remembering that the most avantgarde projects, with all their fecundity of thought and art, have through history often succumbed to the black pits of the darkest times.

I hope Neven will expand and develop his framework into a case study that, given so many avenues of connection, will serve as a basis for lectures.

Da nismo radili dva izdanja multimedijalnog projekta Time is UP! ili Vrijeme ističe, ne bih tako razumjela tekst koji se kroz statističke podatke određuje prema stanju BH društva danas. Ali, imajući to iskustvo da ukoliko želimo razmotriti kroz tematske intervjuje različite nivoe društva, uključenje infografika sa najnovijim statističkim podacima, bilo je dragocjeno za bolje razumijevanje naših tematskih percepcija.

Neven Anđelić je u tri poglavlja pokušao da da dijagnozu društva nekad i sad iz čega izlazi i sutra, uključivši statistiku u drugi dio, postavivši tako BH u regionalni i širi kontekst sličnih i različitih društava. Njegova pojašnjenja oživljavaju tu statistiku i koriguju je tu i tamo, jer brojke ipak ne mogu sažeti takav slučaj kakav je Bosna i Hercegovina. Statistika stoji između prvog dijela osvrta na rat i opsadu Sarajeva kao i recepciju evropskih intelektualaca na otpor Sarajeva četverogodišnjem teroru. Istina je da je Sarajevo, kako su oni god zvali taj period svog života stavljajući ga u svoja intelektualna opredjeljenja, u te četiri godine bilo teritorij na kome se dešavala krucijalna bitka, koja čak prevazilazi potrebu za multikulturalnošću, koja je bila automatska, nego se pokazala kao viši nivo otpora masovnom teroru, svakog građanina, kroz umjetnost, kulturu, humor, invencije, mentalni opstanak, i postala nasljeđe svijeta o veličini ljudske prirode.

Zato je Neven dobro uradio, iako nije sve ovako nazvao kako ja sada pišem, što je priču o BH društvu i Sarajevu stavio u tri dijela. Treći je zaključak, duboka zapitanost o budućnosti,

ali moram reći da građani iz Poglavlja 1, nisu u potpunosti odgovorni što su upali u politički okvir nepovoljnih statistika jednog podijeljenog društva i blokade institucija. Društveni okvir nastao raznim mirovnim sporazumima je dao mogućnost nacionalističkim politikama da zauzmu svoje teritorije.

Ali, samo da podsjetim, kroz istoriju su najavangardniji pokreti, raskoš misli i umjetnosti često padali u crne ponore najmračnijih vremena.

Nadam se da će ovu matricu Neven proširiti i razviti u case study koja može sa dobrim poveznicama biti predmet predavanja.

Asim Zubčević

It is hard to contest the findings highlighted in Neven Anđelić's article on Bosnia-Herzegovina today, based as they are on the reports compiled by reputable international bodies tasked with measuring European countries performance on the basis of various indices (human rights, rule of law, free media, economic freedoms, etc). Two things come to my mind by way of observation. First, I think any depiction of Bosnia as provided in the article, while factually true, is contextually incomplete and therefore potentially misleading because it overlooks the significant role of the external players (mainly Belgrade and Zagreb, but also some other capital cities) who, to various degrees, bear responsibility for the current state of Bosnian society on account of their continued, open meddling into the country's internal affairs, distorting and corrupting the internal politics of Bosnia. The context is important. Bosnia may not be Switzerland in terms of upholding the values of liberal democracy, human rights, and media freedoms, but unlike Switzerland, it is not surrounded by functioning liberal democracies such as Germany, France and Italy either.

My second point is that Bosnia-Herzegovina's constitutional arrangement is not simply flawed, but it actually favours nationalism and, therefore, populism, cronyism and corruption. It goes without saying that this is not to absolve the domestic players from their share of responsibility for the current state of affairs.

Another comment I have - and once again, without wishing to question the general tenor of the findings presented in Neven Anđelić's article – is as follows: I wonder how much the everyday experiences of many ordinary Bosnian citizens can be understood if measured solely in terms of cold statistical figures. What I have in mind is the fact that when it comes to intercommunal relations, Bosnia seems, in spite of the limitations arising out of the

constitutional organisation of the country, to perform better than some of the liberal democracies. And again, in spite of the corruption and populism. I cannot demonstrate the soundness of my impression with facts and figures, but it is something that comes from personal experiences. And I am fully aware that the picture is not exactly rosy, but I would argue that it is much better than one might think reading the reports in questions.

I would like to think that this is due to the historical experience of common life more than any particular ideology such as multiculturalism which, to my understanding, is really a misnomer when applied to Bosnia as opposed to, eg. Germany or Canada.

Lastly, by way of a question, I would like to ask Neven Anđelić if he thinks that the current pandemic – though undeniably having a terrible impact on the lives and well being of many people - will upset and perhaps help redefine the prevailing political conditions in Bosnia to the extent that it may serve as a catalyst for the emergence of a more open society or will it rather facilitate and strengthen the populist, corrupt policies still at play?

Thank you!

[Suada Kapić, THEN-NOW-TOMORROW / ONDA-SADA-SUTRA](#)

Almir Bašović

Tekst Suade Kapić pod naslovom ONDA-SADA-SUTRA upozorava u kojoj mjeri živimo u posredovanoj stvarnosti. Njena sjajna i vrlo utemeljena usporedba između onog “onda”, a to je opsada Sarajeva u periodu 1992-1995, i ovog našeg “sada”, uzrokovanog korona virusom, pokazuje da nismo spremni učiti iz ljudskog iskustva. Dovoljna je nagla promjena uslova da se čovječanstvo vrati na početni stadij barbarstva, pisao je jedan veliki pjesnik. Suada Kapić nam u svom tekstu pokazuje koliko je kultura važan fenomen i u kojoj mjeri kultura govori o kondiciji i “imunitetu” jedne zajednice da se odbrani, jednako od barbarstva kao i od virusa. A toj kulturi je imanentan kontinuitet. Zato sam ovo prividno suprotstavljanje između prošlosti, sadašnjosti i budućnosti u tekstu Suade Kapić ONDA-SADA-SUTRA doživio kao retoričko sredstvo da se naglasi kako slika povijesti u zapadnoj kulturi možda jeste zasnovana na velikim rezovima, ali smisao toj povijesti daje kontinuitet kulture. Barbari su u početku bili svi oni koji ne govore grčki jezik. Vakcina protiv barbarstva još nije otkrivena, zato što smo možda

zaboravili slušati druge i zato što odbijamo razumjeti ono što nam oni govore o svom graničnom ljudskom iskustvu.

Rusmir Mahmutćehajić

U Bosni kažu: Ni majka se djetetu ne odazove dok ne zaplače. U 1440 dana opsade Sarajeva, a zapravo cijele Bosne, s izgladnjivanjima, progonjenjima i ubijanjima, plač i krici bosanskih ljudi odjekivali su i po zemlji i u nebu. Ali mnogima se činilo da ih se ne tiču, jer razlozi za to nisu njihovi. I samo rijetki su osjećali odgovornost da se odzovu tim kricima i plaču. I onda, neočekivano i posve drukčije, okrunjeno i nepoznato biće, uređeno u vojske koje opsjedaju svakog čovjeka, u svakom mjestu i svakoj državi, podsjećaju ljude da ih se tiče i mora ticati sudbina svakog drugog. Jedan čovjek isto je što i cijelo čovječanstvo. Zato patnja jednog mora biti isto što i patnja svih. Činilo se da će opsada Sarajeva brzo potonuti u zaborav. Suada Kapić je podstakla i vodila pothvat suprotstavljanja zaboravu te muke za koju krivci nisu kažnjeni, a čije žrtve mogu biti posve poražene samo zaboravom i poricanjem da im se to doista i dogodilo. Možda niko drugi koliko Suada Kapić svojim djelom o iskustvu života u Sarajevu pod opsadom nije podstakao ovu online konferenciju. I doista, u riznicu iskustava svijeta Suada Kapić je doprinijela svjedočenje o iskustvu Sarajeva i Bosne pod ubilačkom opsadom. Zato je, smatram, ovaj njen tekst važno uključivanje iskustva iz sarajevske opsade u svjetsko iskustvo trajućee pandemije. Ako iz pretrpljenih patnji čovjek postaje mudriji, u ovome tekstu treba tražiti dokaz za to.

Gojko Berić, TWO SIEGES, TWO EXPERIENCES / DVIJE OPSADE, DVA ISKUSTVA

Mirsad Kunić

Gojko Berić kaže: “Neki su nakon rata napustili Sarajevo, a neki izgubili volju i snagu da se bore s vjetrenjačama nacionalizma.” I još kaže: “Ne čudi to što su baš novi stanovnici Sarajeva, koji su milom ili silom stigli mahom iz ruralnih krajeva u glavni grad, najglasniji u protestu protiv mjera predostrožnosti.”

Urbana svijest i urbano biće je protiv doseljavanja ruralnih primjeraka, za zatvorenost Grada od nesoja... I tom novodoseljenom ruralnom stanovniku urbanoga Grada se pripisuje

otpor prema restriktivnim mjerama. A u tekstu koji prethodi Suada Kapić piše o svome otporu protiv tih mjera i nije jedina koja tako misli.

Gojko Berić nadalje zaključuje: “Ali, u poseljačenom gradu, kakvo je današnje Sarajevo i kakvi su mnogi drugi gradovi na prostoru bivše Jugoslavije, knjige malo ko čita.” Ovo je jedan od najprisutnijih i najdugoročnijih stereotipa međunarodnog karaktera “urbano-ruralno”, čak i više od stereotipa, neka vrsta civilizacijske matrice, koja na određen način razotkriva sav sjaj i bijedu iste te civilizacije čiji smo dio. Moglo bi se posebno o tome fenomenu promišljati i pisati, ali da pojednostavimo: on je (stereotip) samo jedna od izvedenica univerzalno postavljene matrice pismo-usmenost, pri čemu pismo postaje sinonim za učenost, znanje, knjigu, nauku, tehnologiju, progres, urbanizaciju, a usmenost sinonim za nedoučenost, neznanje, besmisleno brbljanje, mit, folklor, regres, ruralizaciju... Stvari su, srećom, drugačije: i usmenost i pismo su dva lica jedne iste potrebe čovjeka za smještanjem u jezik, bez čega nema ničega. U povijesti našeg postojanja nije usmenost tek prevaziđeno stanje, nego nužni uvjet za pojavu pisma. Isto važi i za naše pojedinačne egzistencije, niti je selo tek neko primitivno stanje koje nadilazimo potrebom za drugačijom urbanizacijom prostora.

Keith Doubt

I have not read all the papers in this collection, but I imagine that one of the wisest statements, one of the most telling comments is this one that Gojko Berić makes:

I return now to Camus. When the plague has ended, one of his heroes says: “Some say: ‘That was a plague. We have endured a plague.’ Almost as though they expect a medal. But what is the plague? It’s life, that’s all.”

Berić extends the wisdom he inherited from the siege of Sarajevo. Heroes receive medals, and receive them deservedly. Heroes, however, may recognize something. Life is an existential privilege. The pandemic reveals the existential aspect of life, which heroism can never overcome.

But by following the sun, from when it rises to when it sets, he is proving in his own way that the coronavirus pandemic is still just life. And that’s all.

Camus and Berić offer a valuable window through which not only to see but also to understand the pandemic.

Neven Anđelić

Ovaj memoarski prilog savršeno predstavlja dvije situacije u historijski bliskom, a životno podalekom periodu od nekih četvrt stoljeća. Simbolicizam sarajevske multireligijske zajednice, iako čini mi se sve više možemo govoriti o monoreligijskim zajednicama, tako je lijepo naznačen u samo jednom kratom opisu. “Crkve i džamije su prazne. (Sarajevske sinagoge su holokaustski ispraznili nacisti u Drugom svjetskom ratu.)” Bog je prisutan u ovom radu na više mjesta, kako u Sarajevu tako i u fiktivnom Camusovom gradu. Staro je pitanje “gdje je bog bio u Auschwitzu?” Isto pitanje se moglo postavljati u Sarajevu devedesetih, a možda bi ga se moglo postaviti danas globalno. Intrigantno je pomisliti kakva su autorova razmišljanja na tu temu.

Pomalo nostalgična priča o Sarajevu završava s klošarom Ramizom. Bilo bi zanimljivo od autora saznati da li ga je neki lik u Camusovoj *Kugi* možda podsjetio na Ramiza? Također, ukoliko su sjećanja jaka, kakvi su utisci o knjizi bili prvi put, bez pandemijskog okruženja i bez iskustva opsade Sarajeva, a kakvi drugi put s dodatnom životnom mudrošću?

Ovaj rad je dokument barda novinarstva koji lijepo kazuje o gradu, književnosti, historiji, ali također apostrofira sve nedostatke i mane današnjeg Sarajeva. Zajedno s još nekoliko autora u ovoj kompilaciji, poput Habula recimo, Berić predstavlja život, prošlost i možda ostavlja utisak pomalo razočaranog intelektualca u današnje doba. Da li je to razočarenje, ako je utisak tačan, lokalno omeđeno s južne strane Trebevićem i drugim geografskim toponimima, ili je možda razočarenje vremenski postavljeno i univerzalno u sadašnje vrijednosti svijeta?

Jovan Divjak, [WHITE IMAGE OF THE SARAJEVO PANDEMIC / BELA/BIJELA SLIKA SARAJEVSKA PANDEMIJE](#)

Rusmir Mahmutćehajić

Jovan Divjak navodi tvrdnju Ive Markovića: “Država BiH je bogalj, nema je. Postoje samo te političke hijene, koje grizu još dok ima šta gristi. I ne samo da su te stranke uništile državu Bosnu i Hercegovinu nego su i zarazile narod.” Tvrdnja je razumljiva sa stanovišta nezadovoljstva svime što ovi ljudi u ovoj zemlji, u svom ukupnom bivanju, žele kao svoje neopozivo pravo, kao uvjet ozbiljenja svoje ljudskosti. Ali tvrdnja faktički nije tačna. Bosna

nije i ne može biti bogalj sve dok ima onih koji se za nju zalažu kao vazda višu i bolju zbilju. Nema savršene države. Nije je nikad bilo. I nikada neće je biti. Uvijek je pitanje o tome šta je ideal tih ljudi koji se ne mire s tim što jest. Ima bosanske države. I nikad je nije bilo više, sve od njenog uništenja u 15. stoljeću. Svetozar Pribičević, jedan od vodećih političara onog vremena kada su Bosna i njeni ljudi uvedeni u Kraljevinu Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca i ministar “unutarnjih dela” te države, kaže u Sarajevu 1919. godine da je sretna okolnost da su Turci uništili Bosnu i da treba sve učiniti da se zatre ideja bosanske državne suverenosti, a to znači i ideja bosanskog naroda. To gotovo isto kaže 1948. godine u Sarajevu Moša Pijade, tvrdeći u ime jugoslavenskog komunističkog vodstva da u Bosni žive Srbi i Hrvati, a da je prisutnost “neopredjeljenih” muslimana posljedica njihove zaostalosti. Poznato je šta o tome istom kažu Slobodan Milošević, Radovan Karadžić i Ratko Mladić te Franjo Tuđman, Mate Boban i Jadranko Prlić, i mnogi drugi od njihovih antibosanskih prethodnika i nasljednika. Tih nekoliko činjenica može ocrtati historiju političkog, kulturnog i ekonomskog uništavanja Bosne i njenog naroda. To su stoljeća zločina i izdaja, zloupotreba i ideoloških laži. Ako treba tražiti dokaz da ideju dobra, a to je ideja Bosne i njenog naroda, ne može uništiti zlo, a zlo su antibosanske ideologije i s njima povezani pokreti, evo ga: I pored sve sile razaranja izvana i iznutra, Bosna i njen narod nisu uništeni. Ma koliko te hijene grizle, a to će i dalje činiti, neće nikada svladati ni Bosnu ni njen narod. Teško je reći da u Bosni postoje političke stranke. To su manje-više mafijaški karteli, koji se predstavljaju ovako ili onako. Ali o njima svjedoče njihova zla antibosanska djela. Tačno je da šire zarazu u osjećanjima i svijesti naroda. Ali i razlog i svrha čovjeka je dobro. U odnosu na to dobro odmjeravano je to što svaki čovjek, uz osjećanje odgovornosti za sebe i druge, čini i mora činiti. Vjerovati da je konačna budućnost u rukama pokvarenih, razbojnika i varalica značilo bi nevjеровати u razlog i svrhu ljudskosti. Zato je, smatram, navedena tvrdnja Ive Mrkovića koju preuzima Jovan Divjak moralni krik dvojice bosanskih podvižnika protiv sadašnjeg stanja, a za drukčiju budućnost.

Nataša Tabori, SARAJEVO IN A TIME OF PANDEMIC ON THE PERIPHERY OF EUROPE'S NEO-MEDIAEVAL EMPIRE / SARAJEVO U VRIJEME PANDEMIJE, NA PERIFERIJU EVROPSKE NEO-MEDIJEVALNE IMPERIJE

Amra Hadžimuhamedović

Nataša Tabori u svom članku problematizira ponovno značajno pitanje teritorije, koja je reifikacija moći, i, posebno, teritorijalizacije svijeta – pojave suprotstavljene procesima globalizacije i idealima liberalizma – sa svim iskazima koje ta pojava ima u Sarajevu, i ukazuje na izazove post-pandemijskog planiranja prostora. Članak otvara brojna pitanja, od kojih će ovdje biti navedena 3 kao poticaji za raspravu:

1. S obzirom da teoretičari političke geografije ukazuju da što je stupanj pluralnosti nekog društva veći, to su teritorijalnost i teritorijalizacija slabiji, bilo bi značajno dodatno eksplicirati specifičnost krize teritorijalizacije Sarajeva kao izravnu posljedicu rata i opsade. Pitanja koja iz toga proističu, a koja su neizbježna za definiranje strategije prostornog uređenja Sarajeva, jesu: je li moguće kvalificirati i kvantificirati gubitke i ograničenja potencijala za postizanje globalnih SDG (UN ciljeva održivog razvoja) koje iz te teritorijalizacije proističu, kao i kako je instrumentarijem upravljanja prostorom, uključujući i prostorno planiranje usmjereno prema ciljevima održivog razvoja, moguće prevladati ratom postignutu teritorijalizaciju, a integraciju prostora postaviti kao racionalni cilj poslijeratne obnove, koja u Sarajevu nije završen proces, a koja je neizbježni kontekst za provedbu Agende 2030?
2. Autorica članka na strani 461. daje usputno izjednačavanje teritorijalizma koji predstavlja Brexit, a koji prijeti praksom srednjevjekovnog izoliranja i osiromašenja Evrope, i one izolacije i fragmentiranja kojima je Sarajevo bilo izloženo u namjeri njegovog uništenja koncem dvadesetog stoljeća. Bilo bi značajno da ta poredba ne ostane usputna i da bude s dodatnom preciznošću provedena, prije svega s obzirom na različite izvore i poticaje. Iako posljedice “bijede teritorijalizacije” (sintagma koju koristi A. Faludi) u ratu protiv Bosne i Sarajeva na evropsku budućnost nisu razmatrane s onom pažnjom koju *Brexit* izaziva, sve je više pokazatelja kako je ustezanje da bude spriječena kriza teritorijalizacije u središtu kontinenta, makar i na periferiji EU, navjestitelj mogućih sve intenzivnijih procesa teritorijalizacije, ekskluzivizma i ksenofobije u srcu Unije i da je takvo razmatranje i aktualno i potrebno.
3. Kako pandemija Covid-19 ne prepoznaje granice i teritorijalnu fragmentiranost, središta i periferije, zanimljivo je pozivanje u članku na evropsku neomedijavelnu teritorijalizaciju po načelu koncentričnih krugova i ukazivanje da se Sarajevo nalazi na njihovoj periferiji, a da je cilj osigurati njegovo smještanje u središte jednog od krugova. To prevođenje modela evropskog prostornog uređenja zasnovanog na koncentričnim

krugovima, koje prepoznaje Jan Zielonka, ograničenog “bijedom teritorijalizacije”, u mnoštvo umreženih krugova, ili “santi leda” koje su sposobne mijenjati oblike i prilagođavati se zbilji (alegorija koju koristi A. Faludi), u čijem središtu su evropski gradovi (pa bi i Sarajevo trebalo postati središte jednog od njih) značajan je dio zaključka. Članak bi dodatno dobio na snazi ako bi model umreženih krugova, koji je člankom nagoviješten kao rješenje za Sarajevo, bio eksplicite objašnjen kao prijedlog, a njegova opravdanost i provedivost sagledana u odnosu na sljedeće:

- nastavak Covid-19 pandemijom nametnute izolacije i karantena kao snažnu teritorijalizaciju privatnog prostora, a jačanje hibridnosti javnog prostora kao fizičko-virtualnog, pri čemu se virtualni javni prostor ulijeva u privatnu teritoriju;
- sve češće nagovještavanu promjenu odnosa središte-periferija, selo-grad kao izravnu posljedicu pandemije, koja je pokazala da mjesto stanovanja i koncentracija znanja nisu više nužno vezani sa mjestom rada koje, posebno kad je u pitanju industrija znanja, postaje virtualno;
- koliko su evropska počela prostornog planiranja sposobna da odgovore na izazove koje je pandemija Covid-19 postavila, ili je očekivano njihovo preispitivanje;
- može li prostorno planiranje marginalizirati planiranje virtualnog prostora i koji model tom prostoru više odgovara "sante leda okružene morem" ili koncentrični krugovi;
- koliko su geografska politika EU i sistem planiranja, kao njen instrument, sposobni da u prilagođavanju zbilji prevaziđe "bijedu teritorijalizma" o kojoj svakodnevno svjedočimo u pandemijskoj groznici na granicama Bosne i Hercegovine i Hrvatske (odnos prema emigrantima koji su u prolazu kroz Bosnu i Hrvatsku, filtriranje bosanskih građana na granici prema kriterijima koji nisu povezani sa zdravljem, lociranje zagadjivača na hrvatskoj teritoriji ignorirajući utjecaj na okoliš u Bosni, premošćavanje teritorijalnih voda Bosne, i brojni drugi indikatori odnosa središta prema periferiji, koja služi kao resurs i odlagalište za razvoj središta);

- i na kraju, je li u evropskom modelu prostornog uređenja, u kojem Jan Zielonka prepoznaje neomedijevalnu teritorijalizaciju, središte i periferije, moguće da "periferija" postane jedno od središta, imajući u vidu geografsku politiku EU?

Azra Dobardžić, SENIORS AS A RISK GROUP DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC – A CASE STUDY OF ONE CITY IN THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA, USA / STARIJI LJUDI SKUPINA KAO UGROŽENA COVID-19 PANDEMIJOM: SLUČAJ PROUČAVAN U JEDNOM GRADU WAŠINGTONSKE METROPOLE, SAD

Bakir Nakaš

In her paper, the author looks at the place and role of the elderly as a risk group under corona virus pandemic conditions in College Park, a city in the Washington Metropolitan Area in the US.

The purpose of the paper is to share relevant data on the Covid 19 infection and the measures take to prevent it spreading amongst the high risk group of the over 65s in the town. This group represented 5.9% of the population of 32,196 in July 2019. The data presented in the paper and the recommendations and considerations are all based on internet sources and communication cited from eight references and two annexes (on seniors and medical conditions and frequently asked questions relevant to seniors and the Covid 19 infection). Computer literacy and ability to utilise this information is cited as a particularly important precondition for seniors, particularly under conditions of isolation and social distancing, as with the present Covid 19 infection. The author also notes that 96% of households in College Park have computers.

The paper also includes a short review of how the Covid 19 infection appeared and was identified in Wuhan, in Hubei Province in China, in December 2019 and of its characteristics and how it spreads. A particular stress is placed on three sets of important information for seniors in isolation at home: (1) Health and medical status while in self-isolation, (2) social distancing and the impact of isolation on mental health, and (3) nutrition and shopping under conditions of contactless behaviour.

The author concludes by noting the importance of personal responsibility in carrying out protective measures and keeping informed by using reliably and scientifically based sources of information during the pandemic.

Autorica u svom radu pod gore navedenim naslovom daje prikaz mjesta i uloge starijih osoba kao rizične grupe u vrijeme pandemije korona virusne infekcije u gradu College Parku Washington Metropolitan Area u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama.

Cilj rada je razmjena relevantnih informacija Covid-19 infekcije kao i preduzimanih mjera radi prevencije širenja infekcije među rizičnom populacijom 65+ u tom gradu, koja je iznosila 5,9% od ukupne populacije (32.196) jula 2019. godine. Sve prezentirane informacije, savjeti i preporuke u radu zasnovane su na internetskim izvorima i komunikacijama navedenim u osam referenci i dva dodatka (starije osobe i prateća medicinska stanja i česta pitanja od značaja za starije osobe i Covid-19 infekciju). Kompjuterska pismenost i sposobnost korištenja ovih informacija je navedena kao vrlo važan preduvjet kod starijih osoba, posebno u uvjetima izolacije i “socijalne distance” tokom pandemije Covid-19 infekcije. Osim toga, navodi se da je 96% domaćinstava u Collage Parku opremljeno s kompjuterima.

U radu je dat kratak pregled pojave Covid-19 infekcije, identificirane u Wuhanu, Hubei provincije u Kini, u decembru 2019. godine, kao i osvrt na njegove karakteristike i način širenja. Posebno su naglašene tri grupe bitnih informacija s kojima se susreću starije osobe za vrijeme kućne izolacije, a koje se odnose na: (1) Zdravlje i zdravstvena stanja za vrijeme samoizolacije, (2) Socijalnu distancu i utjecaj izolacije na mentalno zdravlje i (3) Ishranu i nabavku u situacijama bezkontaktnog ponašanja.

Autorica rada u zaključku navodi značaj lične odgovornosti kod provođenja zaštitnih mjera i stalnog informisanja iz naučnih i validnih izvora informacija tokom Covid-19 pandemije.

Marko-Antonio Brkić, SARAJEVO – FROM BIRTHPLACE OF INTEGRAL HUMANISM TO UNIVERSALIST DESERT OF MIND / SARAJEVO – OD RODNOG MJESTA CJELOVITOG HUMANIZMA DO UNIVERZALISTIČKE PUSTINJE DUHA

Safet Hadži Muhamedović

This paper is articulate, and one could hardly contest many of its suggestions or references. However, it gradually becomes apparent that the author seeks to ‘exonerate’ the so-called ‘holy mass for Bleiburg victims’ in Sarajevo from the wider protestations that this act of remembrance was deeply entangled within the Croatian nationalist project(s). Firstly, there is a suggestion that the event was a ‘religious ceremony’, ‘which would normally imply, in a civilized society at least, a modicum of piety for the victims’. Leaving aside the problematic constellation of the civilised and the uncivilised, the author’s suggestion that the commemoration was (but) a religious ceremony seems to be justified by its location and captain (cathedral/archbishop). Is the argument that religious ceremonies cannot be highly political? Have not religious institutions, religious buildings and their clergy been deeply embroiled in the twentieth-century violence in the region? Perhaps just not this one event? Is the author arguing that this ‘mass’ should be read apart from other interlaced occurrences (the systematic killings preceding ‘Bleiburg’, or those celebrated in Bleiburg and for the sake of ‘Bleiburg victims’)? The author asks:

‘Is the call for investigation, perhaps even punishment, sufficient reason to relativize and devalue so fully the significance of a horrific crime, in which between 80,000 and 100,000 soldiers and civilians of various social groups, but mostly Croats and members of the Catholic Church, were systematically massacred, in an organised and planned way, after the wartime conflict was over, without any process (except “summary execution”)?’

In this question, the author blurs the matter at hand: the May 2020 sacropolitical event – the ‘mass for Bleiburg victims’ – is not the same as what it purports to be (i.e. ‘nothing but commemoration for the innocent’). If this were the case, the preceding events of the same title in Austria would not have been banned. The Sarajevo protest against the ‘Bleiburg mass’ does not run counter to the acknowledgement of Partisan crimes. And, this is for a simple reason: the Bleiburg commemorations are, first and foremost, a Nazi event. Their Nazism was (partially) ‘curtailed’ in the Sarajevo cathedral (as there were no visible *Ustaša* insignia), but not in Austria, Croatia or other parts of Bosnia whenever similar commemorations have taken place. In the 16 May 2020 sermons in the Sarajevo Cathedral, ‘all innocent victims’ were repeatedly mentioned. This ‘totality of victims’ on offer sounds a bit like the famous racist line in the United States, when one expresses tolerance for all people: ‘I don’t see colour’. In Puljić’s ‘all victims’ trope during the Sarajevo ‘mass for Bleiburg’, there is a similar violent parody. One might ask both Puljić and others who took part in this sacropolitical spectacle: what about the continued violence (with and by the church) in Stolac, what about the celebration of murders

of Serbs at these events, and so on? The author's central point is absolutely clear when they note:

'The real question, in fact, is whether there is still any universal integral humanism left for these victims, for their descendants and *ethnic fellows*, who have for decades been marking with sadness and pain the painful and tragic anniversaries of a tragedy that left its biological mark on the Croatian Catholic corpus, especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina?'

The sadness felt so deeply for these 'victims' is the author's sadness for their own ethnic body. I believe that the author's experience indeed is painful, and I agree that it is tragic.

On the other hand, the author suggests that those who opposed the commemoration are turning Sarajevo into a 'desert of the mind'. To counter this predicament, we are told, political 'rehabilitation' should be instigated. The author, for example, notes: 'The issue of rehabilitation is a reflection of historical responsibility, awareness of the need to correct injustices, untruths, misconceptions, opening up opportunities to preserve existing or of achieving new values'. I wonder how the author would incorporate into this idea the rehabilitation of Draža Mihailović in Serbia. I would suggest to the author that, rather than, as they state, 'abandoning the *mythical determinism* of the history textbooks studied half a century ago', they should direct their 'ethnic fellows' (since this seems to be the population they are concerned with) to the contemporary parking lot in Praška Street, which used to be the Zagreb synagogue. There, everything is utterly clear.

Rusmir Mahmutćehajić

Je li današnje Sarajevo doista univerzalna praznina? Ako bi bilo tako, ideja Bosne i bosanstva kao političkog poretka jednog religijski pluralnog naroda bila bi mrtva. A može li ijedno političko i bilo kakvo drugo iznevjerenje te ideje nju i usmrtiti. Ne može, jer život i dobro su njeni. A smrt i zlo nisu im jednaki. Kažu da stanje i budućnost društva valja odmjerati na osnovi stanja na njegovim rubovima. Šta je od ideje bosanstva, društvenog natkriljenja i utemeljenja u pravu na različitosti danas ostalo u Grudama, Bijeljini i Kladuši te u Kostajnici, Foči i Posušju? Možda ništa. To "možda", bez kojeg bi iznijeta tvrdnja bila zasigurno netačna, znači mnogo. Ali privid učvršćenosti i dovoljnosti nacijstava, zaogrnutih maglama kulturnih rasizama srpstva, hrvatstva i bošnjaštva, ne nudi ljudima ništa drugo do agoniju i mržnje svega sarajevskog u čemu vojnici antibosanstva još nisu završili svoj anticivilizacijski pothvat. Zato ovaj tekst dovoljno izazovan podstiče na pitanje: Šta znači bilo koje pripadanje ako ostane bez ideala o nepovredivosti prava na život, njegovu povezanost sa cjelinom postojanja i njeno sabiranje u pojedinačnom jastvu te stalno podsjećanje na ugovor čovjeka i Boga s odgovornošću

za slabe i progonjene te siromašene i ponižene? Kakvo god da je stanje u sadašnjem Sarajevu, malo je tako snažnih simboličnih predstavljanja tog ideala. Na svakome je da se opredjeljuje protiv političke realnosti i radi na njenom dekonstruiranju, a za ideal koji pojedinačnom čovjeku i cijelom postojanju daje smisao

Safet HadžiMuhamedović, LOCATING PANDEMIC GRIEF IN SARAJEVO: GEORGIC NOTES AGAINST SELF-ISOLATING REGIMES / SMJEŠTAJUĆI PANDEMIJSKU ŽALOST U SARAJEVO: JURJEVSKE BILJEŠKE PROTIV REŽIMA SAMOIZOLACIJE

Desmond Maurer

In this interesting and insightful text, the author contrasts two social themes he sees as irreconcilable. He places the development of both the contemporary socio-political discourse on the Covid 19 virus and the historical use of virus-discourse for biopolitical control within the theoretical framework provided by Foucault (referenced) and Agamben (not referenced), with additional explicit callouts to Achille Mbembe (necropolitics) and Mary Douglas (purity and danger, dirt) and an implicit one to Walter Benjamin (mere life). Against this politics of control and exclusion, he posits a generative cultural matrix of fecundity, mutuality, and the nurturing of difference, which he associates with the cult of St George or Khidr/the Green Man, in a manner suggestive of not just Sir James Fraser but also of Traian Stoianovich, both of which contexts would put it into a Balkan (and eastern Mediterranean) *longue durée* that transcends ethnic and religious categories (and straddles in interesting ways the Indo-European and the Semitic divide).

Attractive as this perspective is, it shares a problem with much of the critique of biopolitics, at least as I see it, namely that what is in play is not the concept of life or even mere life, as Benjamin put it, but the existence of hierarchies and so of value, which Louis Dumont teaches us are the same thing. The complex category of life derived from vitalist philosophies is just such a tool of hierarchisation between individuals, groups, sexes and genders, sexualities, and races, et cetera. The Benjaminian critique is thus itself caught up in the same system of valuation it critiques. Dumont expresses this paradox when he notes that the transformation of traditional holistic systems, with their internal hierarchisation, into modern egalitarian ones was at least part of what converted the ranking of social groups to the exclusion and dehumanisation of modern racism. What cannot be equal must be excluded. Gregory Bateson express this

relation differently, when he defined information as the difference that makes a difference. It is clear how the Nazi and other similar ideologies deploy hierarchies of value in order to create differences that make all the difference and use the symbolism of life to do so and it is clear, as the author eloquently points out, how a certain claim to honour “all life” can quite clearly be intended to establish those same hierarchies and systems of exclusion under cover of the same symbolism, while apparently denying or even arguing against the hierarchy. What is less clear is how we escape this logic of value into one of difference that both does and does not make a difference and so result in a ranking. Modern social justice movements all face this challenge precisely at the point when they are tempted to invert the hierarchy they oppose rather than to deconstruct it. Is not just such an implicit ranking also in play in the self-definition of the so-called anti-fascists, their continued emotional cathexis on the symbolism of partisanship and Yugoslavia, their reliance on the demonisation of the “fascist other”, and so their justification of past unjust treatment of the unacceptable (the author does not share these views)?

My own experience of the past 25 years living here suggests to me that Bosnians, including Sarajevans, are considerably less prone to polarisation on this issue than either Croats or Serbs. This is partly because it has been the destiny of the Bosnian Muslims over the past 150 years to negotiate a path between the projects of Croatian and Serbian nationalism and of their transformations within political religions. As a result, they have tended to avoid full ideological identification with any project in favour of tactical cooperation based upon the balance of really-existing forces. This may be why so many such groups actually took the initiative of sending formal resolutions to the Ustasha authorities during WWII calling for an end to the abuse and killing of their fellow countrymen of other religious or ethnic backgrounds. I am not aware of a similar set of initiatives by any other ethnic or religious group in Yugoslavia at the time (these were community initiatives; the limited interventions made by the Catholic hierarchy are not really comparable).

The constant in this history has been the Bosnian Muslims commitment to preserving Bosnia as a framework for their own survival and that of the society which they contribute to and are a constituent part of, alongside all their fellow Bosnians. Most Bosnian Croats and Serbs naturally also share this sensibility. A good deal of the negative response in Sarajevo to the Bleiberg mass derived precisely from this sense that Croatian problems were being projected into Bosnia and being used to promote a reconfiguration of the political terrain. Many more preferred not to react or to express a degree of tolerance precisely because they did not want matters to escalate and because tolerance is their default position.

This does not mean that there are not strong feelings on the topic of Bleiberg, but they tend to be on the part of those who carry an unresolved burden of grievance, all too often misrepresented as grief. Grief is personal and present. A grievance is nurtured and developed and may be shared by a group as a marker of identity. The cultural transmission of discourses related to socially unaddressed trauma is not the same as the initial experience of trauma itself, but it can certainly provide fertile ground for its political mobilisation. Insistence on the “innocence” of “victims” for any form of commemoration or prayer for them to be justified is itself a covert reintroduction of the same hierarchisation and exclusion mechanism. This sets up a schizogenetic mechanism of polarization that teeters on the further edge of Carl Schmitt's enemy concept and so the tipping point between the political and conflict. It is surely true that the vast majority of those killed in the various processes brought together under the label of Bleiberg were not “innocent” in any absolute sense, but that in no way justifies what was done to them or how. Ultimately, the offence was not one against “innocence” but against justice. Any governmental order that would proceed so against those unquestionably within its power and at its mercy is simply unjust and creates both immediate grief and long-term grievance. Over the longer term it proved corrosive for the legitimacy of the new order established by the Yugoslav Communists in the eyes of very many.

A final point is to make clear that there is a difference between celebration, commemoration, and intercessory prayer. It is to be remembered that the purpose of the mass for the dead is to pray for intercession and forgiveness for *their* sins not their thisworldly suffering, their status as sinners not as victims. The Church would do well to foreground this aspect of ritual in future.

Asim Zubčević

A question for Safet Hadžimuhamedović: Could he please clarify who, or what is “the otherwise” in the final sentence of his article? Also, I would welcome his comments on what are the possibilities, based on his work and experiences, for reviving the significance of shared sacred calendar in Bosnia, especially among Bosnian Muslims. What are the obstacles to such an endeavour? Is it something worthwhile and if so, why?

Desmond Maurer

This beguiling paper takes the deceptively unassuming form of “personal reminiscences and reflections” of the author’s experiences in what must now be classified as his youth, studying in faraway India while his family and loved ones were under siege in Sarajevo, and connecting them with the experiences we have all shared separately over the past few months. It is of course far more than that and I think I enjoyed reading it more than any other piece in the collection, not least for its elegant readability. Several others writing here have drawn the connection between the two sieges, but only in this piece do two very different forms of isolation come into contact and counterpoint. In 1992-1995, the author was isolated from his family, who were under siege and unreachable to him, but also isolated within India, which was undergoing one of the most serious of its periodic phases of heightened anti-Muslim tensions. He was there during the beginnings of the rise of Hindutva. He does not go into what brought him to study in India in those days and how he came already to be at the Aligarh Muslim University when the war in Bosnia broke out. It was, as he recalls, a time before the Internet and cheap and reliable international telephony, and those of us who can remember back that far and travelled anywhere outside of the first world back then can well imagine the real degree of isolation he must have been experiencing, broken only by a brief trip to Germany in December 1992 to visit an uncle on diplomatic mission there. The author’s touch is however delicate and he avoids pointing his lessons too obviously. One must read somewhat between the lines to fully imagine the impact on his young mind and character of the anti-Muslim violence he both witnessed and experienced directly, including the destruction of historic mosques, in the name of a new religious, identitarian, and palingenetic nationalism, just as his family and fellow countrymen were experiencing the same and worse back home. 25 years later, as he shows, the situation in India has certainly not improved, at least in this regard. Nor has it in Bosnia. As he says, in a restrained and therefore masterly formulation, “Post-war Bosnia is a country in which politics is based on the country’s constitutional set up, which rewards nationalism. It is a self-perpetuating machinery (media, parties, party-controlled public companies, etc) that cultivates selective readings of history, wallows in collective national self-pity, and is soaked in racism. Its main nationalist parties thrive on keeping communal tensions sufficiently high to prevent a reordering of the political system in favour of a more civic-oriented political system.” He does not stop with such a pessimistic conclusion, as others might. He provides an insightful series of parallels between the historical positions and development of Bosnia and India, their

relationship to various forms of Muslim and Western imperialisms, the allure of post-war secular socialism and what he refers to as the “pull of religious nationalism”, but also their shared heritages of “unity in diversity” and the ways in which the pandemic has, in both of them, helped people read the signs of the time better, recognise the bankruptcy and hypocrisy of religious nationalism, and potentially become “wellsprings of inspiration for themselves and for the world, by drawing on the best of their history and the present”. If I’m not fully convinced by this optimism, I can only say that I sincerely hope he is right and that the world would be a better place if more people thought like and saw as clearly as he does.

The fifth panel / Peti panel

HEALTH, THE INDIVIDUAL, AND POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY / ZDRAVLJE, NEPOVREDIVOST POJEDINCA, I POLITIČKA ODGOVORNOST

Elizabeth Alexandrin, MEDICINAL GARDENS, HEALING TRAILS, AND OUR PANDEMIC BODIES

Asim Zubčević

I appreciate how the author draws on and links Ibn ‘Arabi's thoughts with our current concerns about the Covid-19 pandemic and the opportunity it presents for reconsidering our cultural, political and economic paradigms, as she puts it.

At the start of the paper the author poses a number of questions, such as “What is it that the virus and the pandemic are veiling and displaying?” and whether “everything is apocalyptic, all of the time, and therefore everything is all *barzakh*, all *barzakh*, all the time, and time doesn't really exist? Would that mean that our bodies are standing all the time in front, or face-to-face-, with the ‘seen world’ and that, too, is a *barzakh*?” It would seem that in posing these questions the author is at the same time suggesting the answer, which is that the current pandemic has brought home the point that human beings are always in the *barzakh*, before the Day of Rising (*Yawm al-qiyamah*), which the Qur’an also depicts as humans sprouting out of the earth like grass. (I wonder whether Ibn ‘Arabi ever writes of God as Gardener?)

In her paper, the author offers the following quote from a work by Ibn ‘Arabi, “in her there are gardens and hidden grounds...” I would be interested to know what “her” refers to? Are these the words of Ibn ‘Arabi or the Qur’an?

There is much more in this rich paper that one could profitably discuss and comment on, but I will stop here for the present purposes. Thank you.

Sonja Dujmović, HEALTH AND RESPONSIBILITY: THE EXPERIENCE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA UP TO 1941 / ZDRAVLJE I ODGOVORNOST: ISKUSTVO BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE DO 1941.GODINE

Azra Dobardžić

S velikim interesovanjem sam pročitala članak *Zdravlje i odgovornost – iskustvo Bosne i Hercegovine do 1941. godine*, autorice Sonje Dujmović. Iskustva iz prošlosti mogu biti važna pouka za budućnost.

Rad ima dosta numeričkih podataka, i to je jedan od njegovih kvaliteta. Međutim, za te podatke važno je navesti izvore, to jest reference. Reference su važne, jer potvrđuju vjerodostojnost podataka. U isto vrijeme, reference su smjernice za buduća istraživanja.

Neke rečenice su duge i predlažem autorici da ih pretvori u nekoliko kraćih. Time bi se dobilo na boljoj jasnoći i lakšem čitanju rada.

Navodim jedan primjer (strana 548, drugi paragraf s dna): “Sljedeća napomena bi bila da odgovornost podrazumijeva odgovornog pojedinca, odnosno njegovu svijest da **je** njegovo djelovanje ide u pravcu ne samo vlastite dobrobiti nego i dobrobiti drugih članova njegove zajednice, dakle da odgovornost predstavlja odnos, obzirom na to da **je** pojedinac nije izolirana jedinka, već dio društvene cijeline.”

Predlažem, uz ispravku dvije gramatičkih grešaka (crvenom obilježene), da paragraf glasi: Sljedeća napomena bi bila da odgovornost podrazumijeva odgovornog pojedinca, odnosno njegovu svijest da njegovo djelovanje ide u pravcu ne samo vlastite dobrobiti nego i dobrobiti drugih članova njegove zajednice. Odgovornost predstavlja odnos jer pojedinac nije izolirana jedinka, već dio društvene cijeline.

Napominjem da ima mnogo dužih rečenica od gore navedene.

Zaključak:

- Navesti reference za navedene podatke;
- Ispraviti štamparske i gramatičke greške;
- Duge rečenice, gdje je god moguće, pretvoriti u više kraćih.

Midhat Jašić

Široka platforma borbe protiv pandemije Covid-19 otvorila je potrebu da se pored aktuelnih rasprava otvore i povijesne reminiscencije o društvenoj odgovornosti za zdravlje. Historičarka Sonja Dujmović pravi “diskurs prošlosti” kroz analizu i komparaciju dvaju perioda – perioda austrougarske vlasti (1878–1918) i Kraljevine Jugoslavije SHS/Jugoslavije (1918–1941). Prisustvo Austro-Ugarske u Bosni i Hercegovini u ovom je kontekstu predstavljeno prosvjetiteljskim racionalizmom u kojem zakonodavac, u uslovima opšte zaostalosti Bosne i Hercegovine, s vanjskom prisilom i moralnim podtekstom provodi društvenu i individualnu odgovornost za zdravlje, što podrazumijeva podrobnije bavljenje higijensko-zdravstvenim stanjem stanovništva. Za razliku od ovog tradicijskog vremena, kako ga autorica obilježava, država Kraljevina SHS/Jugoslavija je zaštitu zdravlja, vođena i međunarodnim zahtjevima, provodila nominalnim oblikovanjem ideje o državi kao i socijalnoj i kulturnoj ustanovi, čija je konkretna realizacija izostala pod utjecajem političkih faktora i odsustva materijalnih sredstava.

Mile Babić

Tekst autorice Sonje Dujmović vrlo je instruktivan i poticajan za današnje vrijeme u Bosni i Hercegovini. Riječ je o odgovornosti za zdravlje u Bosni i Hercegovini do 1941, odnosno u periodu austrougarske vlasti (1878–1918) i u vremenu Kraljevine SHS/Jugoslavije (1918–1941). Na početku austrougarske 90 % stanovništva živjelo je od poljoprivrede, a samo je 3 % bilo pismeno. Iz vremena Osmanskoga Carstva ostala je Vakufska bolnica za civilno stanovništvo i Turska vojna bolnica. Bosna i Hercegovina 1914. imala je 141 liječnika. Skoro svi su bili u gradovima, a samo 5 na selima. Prvi svjetski rat je donio enormno stradanje stanovništva u BiH. Ministarstvo zdravlja Kraljevine SHS/Jugoslavije bilo je skromno budžetirano, pa da bi se došlo do liječnika, trebalo je jahati pedeset kilometara na konju ili se voziti otvorenim zaprežnim kolima. S pravom se tada govorilo da Bosanci žive najkraće. Tek je u novom političkom uređenju u Bosni i Hercegovini nakon 1945. došlo do modernizacije zdravstva, koje se približilo europskim standardima. Sad bi trebalo usporediti stanje zdravstva u današnjem sustavu sa stanjem zdravstva u prethodnom.

Mile Babić, JURAJ DRAGIŠIĆ: DEFENDER OF REFUGEES AND EXILES / JURAJ DRAGIŠIĆ:
BRANITELJ IZBJEGLICA I PROGONJENIH

Desmond Maurer

I was utterly charmed by this text and the learning and humanity that inform it. It reminded me of my own desultory studies long-ago into the hermetic texts, the *prisca theologia* and the Kabala, which was when I first encountered Bessarion, della Mirandola, Ficino, and Reuchlin, as well as of my (unwarranted) surprise at encountering the 17th century Irish Franciscan Luke Wadding's *Annales Minorum* at Kraljeva Sutjestka. Like Dragišić, Wadding was an influential exile in Rome and outside candidate for the papacy (against his will – he also scuppered moves to elevate him to the cardinalate by ensuring Pope Urban VIII never saw the petition). He founded the Irish Franciscan College at St Isidore's and the Pontifical Irish College, was responsible for incorporating St Patrick into the calendar of saints and was the first editor of Duns Scotus' works. Unfortunately, the text also reminded me of one of the saddest aspects of the contemporary Bosnian intellectual scene, the lack of the tools or vision for a comprehensive and integrated understanding and presentation of the country's history through the stories of individuals who contributed to it and to wider regional and epochal processes. As the text proves, this is one of the best ways to disclose the nature of Bosnian (like all) history as a tapestry comprising many threads none of which can be unpicked without unravelling or disfiguring the whole. One cannot put off all responsibility for this neglect on disruptive and disintegrative forces – like the poor, they shall be with us always. Much of it lies with those who pay lip service to integration and solidarity and inclusive nationhood but fail to invest in the processes required to build it. An inclusive national biographical dictionary and popular literature that showcases the life stories of inspirational Bosnians of all stripes and their interdependence represent excellent tools for this inclusive project. If Bosnians do not claim all of their heritage, others will co-opt it.

Senadin Lavić

Juraj Dragišić je “kršćanski humanista iz Bosne” i advokat slobode. Pripada evropskom humanizmu. Izbjeglica je iz Bosne. Pobjegao je iz Srebrenice pred osmanlijskom vojskom. “Kad je grčki emigrant aristotelovac Goergij iz Trapezunta žestoko napao Bessarionovo djelo

In calumniatorem Platonis [Protiv Platonova klevetnika], Dragišić je napisao obranu kardinala Bessariona pod naslovom *Defensorium cardinalis Bessarionis* [Obrana kardinala Bessariona].” Učestvuje u dijalogu o bitnim pitanjima filozofije i teologije. Za taj polemičko-odbrambeni čin, kao znak zahvalnosti, Bessarion je Dragišiću dao nadimak *Benignus* [Dobročudni]. Bessarion je, također, bio izbjeglica iz bizantskog Carigrada. Njegov je učitelj bio čuveni neoplatonski filozof Pleton (Georgios Gemistos Plethon).

Uzimanjem imena “Georgius Grecus de Bosnia” (Juraj Grk iz Bosne) iskazuje svoju veliku empatiju prema grčkim kršćanima iz propaloga Bizantskoga Carstva. Iz istoga je razloga uzeo ime “Georgius Macedonus”, što znači Juraj Makedonac/Makedonski.

“U Firenci Dragišić je postao regens tamošnjega učilišta, a 1488. objavljuje djelo *Dialectica nova*, koje posvećuje kardinalu Giovanniju, kasnije papi Leonu X, i njegovu bratu Pietru (zvanome Piero), s kojim je bio u prijateljskim odnosima.” Dragišić je upravo Pietru uputio pismo 9. siječnja 1493. u kojem ga moli da zaštiti Židove! To znači da je bio protiv rekonkviste koja je upravo u Španiji započela 1492. godine kao progon muslimana i Židova s Iberijskog poluotoka. Tražio je da se prestane sa spaljivanjem židovskih knjiga. Nije li ovo jedna trajuća, prepoznatljiva crta bosanskog čovjeka? Zalaganje za ljude i njihovu slobodu! Nije li u bosanskom biću prepoznatljiva univerzalna ljudska crta milosti, dobroćudnosti i saosjećnja za humano?

Ali Lakhani, IN QUARANTINE / U KARANTENI

Mohammed Rustom

This profound meditation offers us a wealth of insight, in a space of a few pages, of what is essential in our lives at all times, but the awareness of which has become more heightened due to the current situation wherein everyone—be they contemplative or not—is forced into something like a *khalwa*. Lakhani highlights very well the importance of the number forty, and the manner in which its profound symbolism pertains to our very existential situation these days, while we are all in quarantine. Forty is symbolically the number for maturity, and the fact that it is, as Dante says, the age wherein the ship of our life begins to sail back home. As such, it is in Arabic numerical symbolism the number of death, and is the number value for the Arabic

letter *mim*—which is the first letter of the word *mawt* (death) and the first letter in the name Muhammad, who was dead to the world and received the revelation at the age of forty. Herein is an important teaching for us: by tending to our own garden, by going inward, we too can die to ourselves—a death which is in fact life, since it is through this death that we can hear the divine voice, deep within ourselves, in the silence of our quarantine.

Ivo Marković

My approach to unravelling the enigma of the powerful symbolism of the number 40, treated here by M. Ali Lakhani, starts from rhythm. Rhythm is an unconscious and forgotten dimension of life, but one without which it would be impossible. When life lacks rhythm the experience of temporality becomes insupportable. Prison torturers use an even and persistent tone, without rhythm, in their abuse of prisoners. If the prisoners can introduce an element of knocking to the tone it reduces the unbearable effect of temporality. Rhythm is present in subatomic structure and permeates life down to the heartbeat. When choral singers follow a song's rhythm their heartbeats quickly synchronise. When we take first one and then a second step, we create the basic rhythm of the dance of life, in two four or four four tie, which intimates the number forty. Life is a dance. To disturb the rhythm of life is to halt life and enter the area of death. I agree with M. Ali Lakhani that the corona virus has introduced a disturbance of the balance and rhythm of natural life. It has snuck into the gap prepared for it by humanity through our irresponsible approach to life in order to rebalance positively the evident disturbances and so establish a disturbed rhythm.

All natural life is periodic, interwoven from periods that start, last, and end. To be periodic is to move in a circle that rolls forward, like the seasons of the year. Winter is preparation for spring. The forty-day withdrawal into the desert, or lamentation for the disorder to the rhythm of life, is preparation for a new beginning of rhythm, or perhaps a correction of the disordered rhythm of life.

Zagonetku o moćnoj simboli broja 40, o kojoj razmatra M. Ali Lakhani, odgonetavam iz ritma. Ritam je nesvjesna i zaboravljena dimenzija života bez koje je on nemoguć. Kad u životu nema ritma, doživljaj prolaznosti je nepodnošljiv. Mučitelji u zatvorima puste ravan i trajan ton bez ritma, koji izludi zatvorenike. Ako se zatvorenici sjete u taj ton unijeti neke otkucaje, nepodnošljivi doživljaj prolaznosti se umanjuje. Ritam je prisutan u subatomskej strukturi i prožima sav život do otkučaja srca. Kada pjevači u zboru slijede ritam pjesme, ubrzo im se

svima ujednače otkucaji srca. Koračamo jedan i dva koraka i stvaramo osnovu ritma plesa života, dvočetvrtinski, odnosno četveročetvrtinski takt, koji sluti i broj 40. Život je plesna igra. Poremetiti ritam života znači zaustavljati život i ulaziti u područje smrti. Slažem se s M. Ali Lakhanijem da je virus korona ušao u poremećaj ravnoteže i ritma naravnog života. Ušao je u prazninu koju mu je čovjek pripremio neodgovornim odnosom prema životu da bi pozitivno uravnotežio te poremećaje koji su evidentni, dakle uspostavio poremećeni ritam.

Sav je život prirode periodičan, satkan od razdoblja koja počinju, traju i završavaju. Biti periodičan znači kretati se u krugu koji se kotrlja naprijed, poput godišnjih doba. Zima je priprema za proljeće. Četrdesetodnevno povlačenje u pustinju, odnosno okajavanje poremećaja ritma života, priprema je za novi početak ritma, odnosno korekcija poremećena ritma života.

Rusmir Mahmutćehajić

Yes, it is time to think again about time. The All-merciful says that wherever we turn, there is His Face, that all things vanish but His Face. In Bosnian Sufi tradition, we find it instructively repeated that if you are not alone, you are not in the world, if you are not in the world, you are not alone. For a human being to realize the right to survive and be happy her or she must also recognize that it will not be possible so long as the contingent is taken for the unconditioned and the absolute presence of the Unconditioned is denied. Everything that exists can and must be a duality or a river of dualities manifesting the One, the Living, the Standing, relation with Whom is transcendence of duality by ascent to the One. That is the challenge and the saving call in all human situations. Both of the recent sieges of Sarajevo, the one by guns and snipers and the other by the Coronavirus, terrorized people, but so long as we refuse to reduce them to the mere destruction of the meaning of human existence, our experience of them has the potential to offer far more - a chance to read the signs of God as a precondition for opening the gates of absolute salvation.

Asim Zubčević

The author's reference to the Prophet and Abu Bakr in the cave as the protective also reminds one of the People of the Cave (Ashab al-Kahf), of course.

Almir Bašović

Stanje je beznačajno, mogućnosti su beskonačne. Ponekad mi se čini da ova rečenica Augusta Strindberga opisuje sliku Bosne kakvu nam u svojim knjigama i tekstovima nudi Rusmir Mahmutćehajić. U svom tekstu *Pojedinačno jastvo i sva obzorja: O povrijeđenom pravu šišmiša* Mahmutćehajić nam paralelom između opsade Sarajeva i “opsade” virusa korona sugerira u kojoj mjeri strah predstavlja moćno sredstvo ne samo za vladavinu nad narodima, nego i za ovladavanje pojedinačnim jastvom. Pišući o pravu šišmiša, s kojeg je virus korona prešao na čovjeka, Mahmutćehajić suptilno raspravlja s evropocentričnošću našeg svijeta. Naime, nije slučajno što se na kraju ovog teksta zapadnjačkoj slici te životinje suprotstavlja slika karakteristična za bosansku kulturu. Ne treba posebno podsjećati da šišmiš čini važan dio dekora u formama kao što je horor, dakle formama koje za svrhu imaju proizvodnju mehaničkog straha i jeze kao pitanja da li je nešto živo ili mrtvo, što bi trebala biti zamjena za ono “pročišćenje emocija” u klasičnoj tragediji. Mahmutćehajić toj slici suprotstavlja bosansku sliku šišmiša kao blagoslovene životinje, ne dozvoljavajući nam da svoju ljudsku odgovornost za svijet i prirodu sakrivamo iza konstruiranih strahova. Biti subjekt, to nas podsjeća Mahmutćehajić u svom tekstu, znači imati obavezu prema visokom stupnju dosljednosti. Ako se već kao Evropljani kolektivno bojimo šišmiša, onda bismo se također trebali bojati i onoga što pokušava izbrisati našu pojedinačnost i specifičnosti bosanske kulture.

Safet HadžiMuhamedović

This is a beautifully written, coherent examination of the responsibility towards the weak, through the prism of Sarajevo’s interrupted history and resurgent life. Violence is not a necessary response to the fear of the unknown, we are told through the curious image of the bat. This paper, much better than the foreword, encapsulates the various concerns of the contributors to the conference, and, as such, could stand in place of the introduction. On the other hand, the bat itself deserves more time and space in the paper.

Asim Zubčević

A question for Rusmir Mahmutćehajić who writes: “Destroy the Bosnian idea of a plural society once and for all and raise a monument to our murderous passion on the killing field.” What monument does he have in mind?

By way of general remark, a number of participants have stressed the link between the language of sickness, disease, plague, etc and biopolitics. In discussing his recently published book (*Travelling Home: Essays on Islam in Europe*), Abdal Hakim Murad warns us of the continuing increase in the scapegoating of minorities by the European far-right in the wake of the corona virus pandemic. He reminds us, rather unsettlingly, of the historical precedent in this regard, the rise of Nazism in Germany as an outcome of the various social upheavals, one of which was the epidemic of Spanish Flu. Perhaps somebody would like to comment on this.

Mehmedalija Hadžić

Rusmir Mahmutćehajić podsjeća na dvije egzistencijske krajnosti u njihovoj neosporivoj zbiljnosti, na bivanje u sada i na smrt. Sadašnja pandemijska prijetnja tiče se tog sada. Njome su ljudi uplašeni, pa im se smrt pričinja ovisnom o njoj, a tako i otetom od njezine pune zbiljnosti. Tako je pitanje o zlu dodatno izmaknuto u nejasnoću njegovog porijekla. Prijetnja virusa korona i njezini učinci u bolestima i smrti mogu biti shvaćeni Božijim kažnjavanjem ljudi. Ako je tako, čovjek je uzrok tog što mu se zbiva. A je li nasilje od Boga? U vidicima svetih tradicija, a tako i judejskoj i kršćanskoj i muslimanskoj, Bog nikome ne čini nasilje. Čovjek ga može činiti sebi. Ako nametnutu mu patnju shvati kao svoju odgovornost za sebe, činit će sve da joj umakne, ali prije svega u nalaženju punog odgovora na to što mu se zbiva. Zato je, vjerujem, važno podsjećanje u ovom tekstu na potrebu da pojedinačni čovjek prvo nađe odgovor na pitanje o zlu u sebi te na osnovi njega razumijeva prilike u društvu i cjelini svijeta. Ovome radu uputno je podsjećanje na kazivanje Alija, Ebu Talibovoga sina, o čudnoj stvorenosti šišmiša. Za pandemijski teror traženo je žrtveno jare i nađeno u šišmišu. Na njega je "svaljena" krivica. A ne može šišmiš biti odgovoran čovjeku. Čovjek ne odgovoran i za se i za cijelo postojanje.

Nerin Dizdar, RESTRICTIONS AND REPRESSION: ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC APPROACH AND IMPLEMENTATION OF SOCIAL MEASURES IN THE TIME OF THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC

Desmond Maurer

This text displays the characteristics I have come to associate with the author over several years reading papers by him, his excellent book on cultural racism, and listening to him speak at various fora. Those characteristics are analytical acuity, clarity and muscularity of prose, forceful and at times even forensic argument, and a clear and clean moral orientation without moralising. He has a great eye for the telling quote, detail, or anecdote, and the politician's instinct (I mean this as a compliment) for how to wield them. The paragraphs on migrants and how they have been characterised and dealt with are almost literally an indictment. In many ways, this paper should be read together with that of Neven Anđelić, for which it provides the evidentiary basis regarding Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as what one might consider an alternative approach to our neighbours. The second half of the paper seems somewhat more condensed, no doubt because of the length restrictions which some of us paid more attention to than others, and I feel sure the author has considerably more he wishes to say on the topics he here merely broaches and which we would profit from being able to read. I therefore feel that the paper would benefit from some expansion before publication, which would also allow a more formal structure to emerge in its second half.

Asim Zubčević

The author mentions the former minister for security as an example of a high Bosnian official using dehumanising language for migrants. Would it be right to say that in doing so, he is openly pandering to potential future partners in government (primarily the SNSD and HDZ) and – no less important - to right-wing political parties in Europe. On more than one occasion he has used shockingly demeaning language for migrants, whom he calls “locusts” (<https://avaz.ba/vijesti/bih/548981/radoncic-bih-nece-bitiplato-s-kojeg-ce-migranti-kaoskakavci-uskakati-u-hrvatsku-i-eu>). To the best of my knowledge, nobody has publicly challenged this or similar statements. His language is all the more galling coming from a Bosniak, given that so many Bosniaks were welcomed as refugees by various, shall we say “non-Muslim” countries.

I fully agree with the author's final remark: "The mentioned examples, as well as numerous other cases, statements and actions show that in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in the countries in the region, there still exists a certain neo-communist concept of consummating political power and managing the state institutions. Suspension of institutions and enforcement of a concept of all-powerful leaders who are above the system is a continual practice in Bosnia and Herzegovina, while the state still functions under the imposed, real or pretentious states of emergency."

My question for Nerin Dizdar is: how should Bosnians go about changing this vestige of the communist era and its corrosive effect on public life in Bosnia?

Midhat Jašić, NUTRITION AND CORONA VIRUS / PREHRANA I VIRUS KORONA

Azra Dobardžić

Sa zadovoljstvom sam čitala rad *Prehrana i virus korona*, autora Midhata Jašića. U radu je dat jedan sveobuhvatan pristup prehrani, a posebno u situacijama rizičnim po zdravlje. Moja jedina primjedba je nedostatak bibliografije, koja je važna za vjerodostojnost kazanog, kao izvor i podsticaj za dalje izučavanje prehrane.

Jedan primjer gdje je referenca, između ostalih, važna: "Pokazalo se da je mukozna barijera vrlo moćna. S druge strane, valja znati da suhi zrak uništava mukožu u nosu i ustima. Ako je zrak suh u prostoriji, on suši sluznicu, pa je preporuka za održavanje relativne vlažnosti zraka u rasponu od 60 do 80% u prostorijama izuzetno značajna." Ref?

U zaključku, ovaj rad je dobro napisan i sveobuhvatan, s dosta korisnih podataka.

Samir Beglerović and Kerim Sušić, THE GLOBAL WORLD AFTER THE PANDEMIC: THE NOTION OF A POST-VIRUS WORLD AS CONCEIVED BY IMRAN HOSEIN AND ALEKSANDR DUGIN / GLOBALNI SVIJET NAKON PANDEMIJE: POJAM POSTVIRUSNOG SVIJETA KOD IMRANA HOSEINA I ALEKSANDRA DUGINA

Desmond Maurer

This text broaches an important aspect of the pandemic and its impact, namely its incorporation as a symbol into radicalising systems of interpretation of the contemporary world and the discursive integration of those systems within and subordination to the new media that inform and reinforce our isolation and passivity through the illusion of interaction. The authors look at two related ideologues of a reactionary return to “tradition” and provide a refreshingly un-reductive analysis of their views and intellectual sources and influences. They acknowledge the reality of many of the problems being tackled and processed by their discourses and the sincerity of those discourses, which reinforces their attractiveness to the very large numbers of disoriented people seeking anchorage in a fluid and fundamentally alienating world.

The authors point clearly to the importance of Internet dissemination, and I feel this is an area that deserves further research, particularly with regard to the spread and influence of such virtual discourses. The Internet promotes interiority without centring, with a tendency towards resonance and replication rather than understanding. “Knowledge” has broken free of its institutional base and so has the formation of the self. The feedback mechanisms that once allowed for the correction of growth and development (by training) do not operate within the economy of the Internet. Nor is it a free market, precisely because so much of what is provided is monetised in covert fashion or indirectly but offered free to its target recipients, which are categories, misrecognised as groups but effectively and functionally atomised through the replication of a common chosen identity. It reveals the passivity at the core of experience garnered via the Internet and lays bare its effectiveness as an irresponsible tool of largely uncoordinated propaganda and indoctrination, suggesting we should take far more seriously the warnings of Marshall McLuhan: here the medium really is both the message and the message.

Neven Anđelić

Ovaj rad je iznimno zanimljiv i čitljiv zbog same teme, ali i načina na koji su autori obradili i predstavili stavove dvojice interesantnih mislilaca. Neki od stavova, doduše, mogli bi biti dodatno interpretirani i analizirani. Borba triju ideologija tokom dvadesetog stoljeća nije novo viđenje. Brojni su autori tako sagledavali Evropu dvadesetog vijeka. Mark Mazower pada na um s njegovim djelom “Tamni kontinent: Evropsko dvadeseto stoljeće”. Potom “evroazijizam” zagovaran u Moskvi od Dugina nije njegov jedini oblik. Ankara je razvila koncept istog naziva a drugačije koncepcije, dok je Ahmet Davutoglu bio intelektualni i državni lider neo-otomanske

politike. To nas dovodi do prepreka ostvarenju Hosainovih i Doginovih ideja od kojih je jedna Aja Sofija, koju, sudeći po Erdoganovoj izjavi prošle godine, režim u Ankari ponovno razmatra pretvoriti u džamiju.

Gdje je smještena političko-filozofska misao u savremenoj Turskoj u odnosu na Duginovo viđenje, kako autori navode, rezultante njegove filozofije u sistemu koji je “vojna diktatura s elementima socijalizma”, te Hosainove “Pax Judaice” odnosno, ako sam dobro shvatio, “velike katastrofe”. Da li bi sirijski režim, zasnovan na ideologiji Michela Aflaqa, možda mogao biti uprizorenje konflacije te dvije metafizičke ideje na zemlji? Dakle, jedno dominantno muslimansko sekularizovano društvo? Ovo je samo niz ideja o empirijskim ostvarenjima nekih političkih filozofija koje donekle mogu odgovoriti idejama Hoseina i Dugina. Moguće je i da su oba seta ideja utopijski.

Autori dobro primjećuju njihove razlike i možda bi dodatno trebalo naglasiti, kada govore o Duginovom umreženju s Putinovim političkim ciljevima, da Hoseinu nedostaje upravo politička potpora za snažniji utjecaj van “virtuelnog svijeta” te, možda, stoga nije prisutan na Balkanu kao što Dugin jeste? Tu ponovno dolazimo do turskog utjecaja na Balkanu i Hoseinovih stavova ne samo o Aja Sofiji, od kojih su neki u suprotnosti s tim interpretacijama geopolitike.

Globalna hiperinflacija zahtjeva dodatno pojašnjenje, jer autori su uspješno postavili epistemološke okvire za studiju Hoseinovih misli, ali neupućenom čitaocu ostaje nejasno kakva je uloga globalne hiperinflacije koja se zapravo nije desila. Postojali su incidenti oblici hiperinflacije u ograničenim područjima ili državama, ali globalna hiperinflacija nije. Navođenje Hoseinovog magistarskog rada u kontekstu činjenice da je bio ministar vanjskih poslova Trinidada i Tobaga dodatno zbunjuje. Kakve veze ima njegov politički angažman u jednoj zemlji s akademskom titulom u drugoj?

Zanimljivu interpretaciju Hoseinovih stavova o petro-dollaru bilo bi dobro staviti u kontekst Nixonovog napuštanja “zlatne klauzule”, jer bi takav kontekst potencijalno doveo u pitanje Hoseinovu interpretaciju. Hronologija Pax Britanica, preko Pax Americana do Pax Judaica je, za moj ukus, neuvjerljiva. Mislim, po sjećanju, da Hosein počinje istoriju s Pax Romana, ali njegova nedosljednost tu dolazi do izražaja, jer između romanskog i britanskog imperija ima cijeli jedan milenij, uz još pokoje stoljeće. Koliko je realna “jevrejska imperija”

van antisemitskih razglabanja? Meni bi bilo zanimljivo da se autori postave prema ovim pitanjima i mislim da bi rad time dobio na vrijednosti.

Tekst u dvije jezičke verzije sadrži neke nepodudarnosti. Segment na engleskom “on the Qur’an, the Sunnah and reason” korespondira tekstu “na časnome Kur’anu, sunetu te razumu”, gdje je vidljiva razlika u opisu “časnome” koja ne postoji u engleskoj verziji. Lično mislim da takvi atributi ne priliče akademskim tekstovima i da je sasvim dovoljna odrednica “Kur’an”. Ta odrednica svete knjige prisutna je i kasnije u tekstu, ali autori nisu konzistentni u njenoj upotrebi, pa je ponekada i ne upotrebljavaju.

“Dvije prepreke” koje Hosein vidi, a autori vrlo zanimljivo predstavljaju čitaocu, neminovno podsjećaju na neke davno predstavljene stavove. Primjerice, britanski historičar A. J. P. Taylor pisao je prije više od pola stoljeća da se procijep između zapadnih crkvi, katoličanstva i protestantizma može premostiti, ali taj razmak prema istoku je preveliki i stoga nepremostiv prema pravoslavnom hrišćanstvu i islamu. To nas dovodi upravo do stavova dvojice mislilaca koji su tema ovog rada.

Samuel Huntington je u Sukobu civilizacija naveo da civilizacije, kada nisu dovoljno moćne za sukob s drugom, nadmoćnijom civilizacijom, uspostavljaju savezništvo s nekom drugom slabijom i zajedno se protive nadmoćnoj, dominirajućoj civilizaciji. To je upravo misao Dugina i Hoseina: pravoslavlje i islam u zajedničkom frontu protiv dominirajuće zapadne civilizacije. Ovaj animozitet prema Zapadu, stoga, nije nova filozofska osnova i možda bi autori mogli Duginove i Hoseinove poglede staviti u kontekst filozofskih misli dvadesetog stoljeća.

Autori Duginovu filozofiju posmatraju akademski kritički što, utisak je, nije uvijek slučaj s Hoseinovim stavovima. Ovo je subjektivni utisak čitaoca koji je nadasve sa zanimanjem pročitao cjelokupni rad. Uprkos ovom utisku, autori se povremeno slazu s Duginom, opisujući stavove koji su “zavodljivi zbog svoje snažne kritike koja razotkriva dekadenciju Zapada”, a da prethodno nisu obrazložili na osnovu čega se zasniva dekadencija Zapada i da li ona postoji. Ako ona postoji, dvije rečenice definiranja i utvrđivanja iste pojačale bi utisak i bezbjedno smjestile autore u neutralnu poziciju analitičara. Ovako, utisak je da autori smatraju da dekadencija Zapada postoji, ali morali bi u to ubijediti skeptičnog čitaoca. Oni nalaze Duginove slabosti u povezivanju dvaju svjetonazora, što ponovno njih pozicionira prema Huntingtonu i sukobu civilizacija. Bilo koja pozicija je akademski prihvatljiva mogućnost, ali bi ju trebalo obrazložiti.

Ostaje nejasna kritika Duginovih stavova koja kulminira stihovima iz islamske kulture. Da li autori time ukazuju na prednost islamske kulture nad pravoslavnom? Čitaocu ostaje nejasno zašto su ti stihovi citirani na tom mjestu? Možda ih autori mogu prebaciti u zaključak cijelog rada ili potpuno izbaciti? Nisam siguran da je “virtuelni svijet” jedna od zapadnih vrijednosti, što autori navode u zaključku, osim ako Daleki istok, koji umnogome dijeli taj virtuelni svijet, ne uvrstimo kao “počasne članice zapadnog svijeta”.

Asim Zubčević

Prvo pitanje: U slučaju I. Hoseina, može li se zbilja govoriti o nekom ko pokazuje “izuzetno dobro poznavanje tradicionalnih znanosti” ili o tome da on svoje učenje “razvija na tragu muslimanske racionalističke tradicije”?

Nisam se sistematski bavio I. Hoseinom, ali, ako je njegovo poznavanje historije pokazatelj učenosti, da se primijetiti da on povremeno ispoljava neznanje koje dovodi u pitanje neke njemu očito važne argumente, npr. insistiranje na tome da muslimani koriste naziv Konstantinopolj umjesto Istanbul, iako prvi naziv nikada nije izašao posve iz upotrebe u Osmanskom Carstvu, a ovaj drugi je grčkog porijekla i zapravo je pokazatelj povijesnog, kulturnog, pa i religijskog kontinuiteta grada i odraz značajne ulogu Grka – o Jermenima, Jevrejima i Slavenima da ne govorimo – u životu Osmanskog Carstva. Tu se javlja i potpitanje: može li utjecaj nekog predavača ili propovjednika (što autori teksta navode kao jedan od kriterija za razmatranje Hoseinovih i Duginovih stavova) biti mjereno brojem pregleda na internetu i društvenim mrežama ako je taj broj moguće vještački napuhati, možda upravo u pokušaju da se javnost uvjeri u njegov značaj? Za A. Dugina ne znam, ali u slučaju I. Hoseina mogla bi se, čini mi se, primijeniti on narodna “Velik turban, pod njim hodže nema”, a u skladu s digitalnim dobom parafrazirana u “Velik broj pregleda na YouTubeu, iza njih mišljenja nema”. Time ne želim reći da njegovi stavovi nisu utjecajni, niti vrijedni pažnje.

Drugo pitanje: U dijelu teksta o A. Duginu autori bilježe: “Tradicija, povrh svega, podrazumijeva, da ljudi u neizvjesnim i besmislenim vremenima, uvijek trebaju slijediti najveći dar, ne pribjegavajući pritom nerazumnim rješenjima.” Šta su autori mislili pod “najvećim darom”?

Hvala!

Mehmedalija Hadžić

U ovoj raspravi autori Samir Beglerovića i Kerim Sušić naglašavaju pitanje o odnosu vjesničkog znanja i tog što je uobičajeno zvano modernim znanjem. Prvome obliku znanja izvor je Bog. I ono je uvjetno, jer ga prima i prenosi uvjetni čovjek, Božiji vjesnik. Drugo znanje je stjecano u promatranju mjerljivoga svijeta, njegovom opisivanju te izvođenju zaključaka o zakonitostima među mjerljivim veličinama. Nikada ti zaključci nisu konačni. Moguće ih je stalno unaprjeđivati. Tako, prvo znanje ima izvor u Apsolutnome. Ono je od Njeg i s Njime povezuje. Drugo znanje je čovjekov odnos sa sobom i mjerljivim svijetom. Uvijek je ograničeno, pa sve što može biti saznato je unutar promjenjivih granica. Zato je važno pitati se šta o virusu korona i njime uzrokovanoj bolesti čovjek može znati iz vjesničkog naslijeđa, a šta na osnovi moderne znanosti? I jedno i drugo znanje je uvjetno. S prvim je moguće naći odgovor o krajnjem smislu ljudske egzistencije, a tako i o mucu uključenosti u pandemijsku dramu. S drugim znanjem, također ograničenim i uvijek malim, moguće je, valja pretpostaviti naći preventivnu vakcinu i lijek. Ali time nisu i ne mogu biti otklonjeni ni patnja ni smrt. Osjećanje sa mogu uvodi čovjeka u nerazrješiv strah od tog što nije i ne može biti.

Razmatranja u izlaganju Imrana Huseina temeljena su na uvidu u kuransko učenje i tradiciju vjesnika Muhammeda - mir i blagoslovi na njegov! Aleksandar Dugin na osnovi kritičkog preispitivanja ključnih postavki neoliberalizma u kojem ekonomski ciljevi i za njih korištena sredstva dodatno zamračuju zaboravi bitka, pretpostavlja i obrazlaže nužnost novog razdoblja u svjetskoj politici. Prema njemu, sadašnja prevlast političke, kulturne i ekonomske unipolarnosti mora biti zamijenjena multipolarnošću. Moć pandemije i nemoć neoliberalnog populizma potvrđuju opravdanost takvog predviđanja. Iako su polazišta Huseina Imrana i Aleksandra dugina različita, njihova kritika vladajućih političkih, kulturnih i ekonomskih kategorija omogućuje vrlo slične zaključke.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS / O AUTORIMA

Neven ANĐELIĆ (London) is Reader in International Relations and Human Rights at Regent's University London. He is also Visiting Professor at the University of Bologna and Visiting Senior Fellow at the LSE.

Mile BABIĆ (Sarajevo) is Professor at the Franciscan Theological Faculty in Sarajevo.

Almir BAŠOVIĆ (Sarajevo) is Professor at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Sarajevo.

Nerin DIZDAR (Sarajevo) is senior assistant at the Faculty of Humanist Studies of the University of Mostar.

Azra DOBARDŽIĆ (Washington) is Professor at George Washington University.

Keith DOUBT (Springfield) is Professor in the Department of Sociology at Wittenberg University. He is the editor of the interdisciplinary, bilingual journal, *Duh Bosne / Spirit of Bosnia*.

Rasim GAČANOVIĆ (Sarajevo) is Professor at the Faculty of Electrical Engineering of the University of Sarajevo and the president of the Centre for Energy of International Forum Bosnia.

Mehmedalija HADŽIĆ (Sarajevo) is a member of the Centre for Interreligious Dialogue of International Forum Bosnia.

Amra HADŽIMUHAMEDOVIĆ (Sarajevo) is president of the Centre for Cultural heritage of International Forum Bosnia.

Safet HADŽIMUHAMEDOVIĆ (Cambridge) is a Research Associate at the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Cambridge.

Kadrija HODŽIĆ (Tuzla) is Professor at the Economics Faculty of the University of Tuzla.

Midhat JAŠIĆ (Tuzla) is Professor at the Faculty of Technical Engineering of the University of Tuzla.

Suada KAPIĆ (Sarajevo) is co-Founder of FAMA Methodology, an educational and media association.

Izudin KEŠETOVIĆ (Tuzla) is Professor at the Economics Faculty of the University of Tuzla.

Mirsad KUNIĆ (Tuzla) is Professor at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Tuzla and a member of the International Society for the Study of Oral tradition, based at the University of Missouri.

Senadin LAVIĆ (Sarajevo) is Professor at the Faculty of Political Sciences at the University of Sarajevo.

Miloš LAZIN (Paris) is a Theatre Director.

Rusmir MAHMUTĆEHAJIĆ (Sarajevo) is the President of International Forum Bosnia and a member of Brill's Editorial Committee for the philosophy of religion and world religions at Leiden.

Ivo MARKOVIĆ (Sarajevo) is Professor at the Franciscan Theological Faculty in Sarajevo, and the founder and director of the Pontanima Choir.

Desmond MAURER (Sarajevo) is president of the Centre for Historical Studies of International Forum Bosnia.

Bakir NAKAŠ (Sarajevo) is president of the Antifascist movement in Bosnia.

Žarko PAPIĆ (Sarajevo) is the founder and President of the *Initiative for Better and Humane Inclusion* in Sarajevo.

Mohammed RUSTOM (Ottawa) is Associate Professor of Islamic Studies at Carleton University.

Adnan SALKIĆ (London) is president of the Centre for Technology and Economic Development of International Forum Bosnia.

Yazid SAID (Liverpool) is Lecturer in Islam at Liverpool Hope University.

Esnefa SMAJLOVIĆ-MUHIĆ (Tuzla) is a member of the Institute for the Investigation of Genocide in Canada.

Asim ZUBČEVIĆ (Sarajevo) is President of the Centre for Interfaith Studies at International Forum Bosnia and Professor at the Faculty of the Islamic Studies of the University in Sarajevo.