

[*Sažeci/
Abstracts*]

Luka Bogdanić

Čemu *Praxis*? Ili o historijskom porijeklu i mjestu *Praxisa*

Rad je svojevrstan nacrt genealogije časopisa *Praxis*. U tom kontekstu osobito se naglašava važnost časopisa *Pogledi*, jer analizirajući navedeni časopis postaje evidentno kako su budući osnivači *Praxisa* u *Pogledima* brusili svoju misao koja će 1964. godine, kao zrela *praxis* filozofija, dobiti svoj striktno filozofski glas u *Praxisu*. U radu su prikazani neki od tekstova tkz. zagrebačkih *praxis* filozofa iz *Pogleda*. Radi se o člancima u kojima su već naznačene neke od tema koje će kasnije postati okosnice *praxis* filozofije i oko kojih će se raspravljati na stranicama filozofskog časopisa. Istovremeno se ne zanemaruje da je riječ o bitno različitim časopisima, namjera je samo ukazati kako i gdje je nastala političko-kulturna podloga na kojoj se razvio specifično filozofsko marksistički smjer. U radu se također poentiraju filozofsko-historijski i kulturni izvori *praxis* filozofije koji nadilaze okvir *Pogleda*, unutar kojeg su poprimili samo svoj prvi izraz.

Why *Praxis*? Or about the historical origins of the *Praxis* journal

This paper is an attempt to sketch a genealogy of the *Praxis* journal. It offers an analysis of some of the early works of the major *praxis* philosophers from the Zagreb group, published in *Pogledi* magazine, prefiguring many of the topics that were later to become central for *praxis* philosophy. Within this context, the importance of *Pogledi* for the birth of the *Praxis* journal is emphasized. Through a reading of this magazine it becomes evident that the future founders of Yugoslav philosophy of practice were sharpening their thoughts in *Pogledi*. The paper also points out the philosophical, historical, and cultural roots of *praxis* philosophy that lie behind the *Pogledi* framework. Particularly, the aim of this survey is to emphasise the local Yugoslav political, cultural, and historical context in which a specific Marxist school developed that has expressed itself in the pages of the *Praxis* journal. ¶

Lino Veljak

Tipologija kritike *praxisa*

U ovom se prilogu prikazuju i komentiraju tri osnovna tipa kritike filozofije i društvene teorije kakva se razvila u okružju časopisa *Praxis*, i to kako s obzirom na filozofijsku tako i s obzirom na socijalno-političku dimenziju svakoga od tih tipova. To su: građansko-konzervativne kritike, dogmatsko-(neo)staljiniističke kritike i tzv. “ekonomiciističke” kritike. Dokazuje se da u svakoj od tih kritika ima održivih elemenata ali i da svaki od tih tipova kritike upućuje na pozicije kritičara, bitno ispod razine dosega *praxisa*.

A Typology of *Praxis* Criticism

This paper presents and comments on three main types of criticism concerning the philosophy and social theory that were developed around the journal *Praxis*, with respect to both the philosophical and socio-political dimensions of each type. These types include a bourgeois-conservative critique, a dogmatic-(neo-)Stalinist one, and a so-called “economistic” one. It is demonstrated that although each type of criticism entails some acceptable elements, they nevertheless point to the position of the critic, his or herself, which is essentially under the level of achievements of *Praxis*. ¶

Karlo Jurak

Filozofija *praxis* u akademskom polju i proizvodnja znanja

Rad se bavi mjestom, utjecajem i posljedicama pozicioniranja filozofije *praxis* u akademskom polju te pitanjem proizvodnje znanja kao glavnim obilježjem intelektualnoga rada.

Prvo, *praxis* filozofija shvaća se kao ogranak “zapadnog marksizma”, kako ga tumači Perry Anderson, zaokupljen prvenstveno strogo filozofskim temama. Uslijed toga u *praxisu* dolazi do “okoštavanja” u akademskom polju (ideje dobivaju prividnu samostalnost od konkretnih društvenih praksi unutar kojih nastaju) kao i do problema slobodnolebdeće inteligencije (K. Mannheim) te tradicionalnih i organskih intelektualaca (A. Gramsci).

Drugo, *praxis* filozofi djelovali su u okvirima jugoslavenskog realsocijalizma u kojemu je unutarnji oblik kritike bio moguć, koliko god se činio marginalnim.

Treće, kao posljedica uvjeta akademskog polja u filozofiji, *praxis* filozofi poduzimaju redefinicije nekih marksističkih koncepata (npr. “rad”, “praksa”, “revolucija”) u skladu s filozofskim kanonom prije ili poslije Marxa, i otvaraju daljnje pitanja poput odnosa između ideologije i znanosti te teorije i prakse. (Za primjer se uzimaju neka Kangrgina i Petrovićeva promišljanja.)

Četvrto, *praxis* filozofija suprotstavlja se *dijamatu* kao dogmatičkoj verziji marksizma, što je za praksisovce značilo prihvatanje humanističkog marksizma i odbijanje mehanicističko-redukcionističkog tumačenja Marxa.

Konačno, u zaključku se afirmiraju pozitivne oštavštine *praxisa*, ponajviše u didaktičkom smislu, kroz gramscievski koncept kulturne hegemonije. Obrazovanje se stavlja u samo središte revolucionarnog političkog projekta, a razumijevanje proizvodnje znanja u akademskom polju shvaća se kao pretkritički dio za mogućnost implementacije Marxovih ideja.

***Praxis* Philosophy in the Academic Field and the Production of Knowledge**

This paper examines the place, influence and consequences of *Praxis* philosophy's positioning in the academic field along with the problem of knowledge production as a salient characteristic of intellectual work. Firstly, the *Praxis* philosophy is understood as an offshoot of “Western Marxism”, as defined by Perry Anderson, dealing primarily with

strictly philosophical topics. On this ground, an “ossification” occurs in the academic field (the ideas become seemingly independent of the particular social practices within which they arose) along with the problems of *free-floating* intelligence (Karl Mannheim) and traditional and organic intellectuals (Antonio Gramsci).

Secondly, *Praxis* philosophers acted within the conditions of Yugoslav real socialism in which a form of internal, though marginal, criticism of the political system was possible.

Thirdly, due to their position in the academic field, *Praxis* philosophers came to redefine certain Marxist concepts (e.g. “work”, “practice”, “revolution”) in accordance with the philosophical canon before or after Marx, and thereby encountering problems such as the relationship between ideology and science, and theory and practice. Some reflections offered by Milan Kangrga and Gajo Petrović are used as examples.

Fourthly, *Praxis* philosophy opposes the *diamat* as a dogmatic version of Marxism, which, for *Praxis* philosophers, meant the acceptance of Marxist humanism and the rejection of mechanistic-reductionist readings of Marx.

The paper concludes by affirming the positive legacy of *Praxis*, mostly in the didactic sense, through the Gramscian concept of cultural hegemony. Education is placed at the very centre of the revolutionary political project, and the understanding of the production of knowledge in the academic field is seen as the foundation of a possible implementation of Marxian ideas. ¶

Borislav Mikulić

Politicum praxisa: filozofija u ogledalu vlasti

Članak ocrtava različite aspekte 'političkog' na časopisu, grupi i intelektualnom strujanju u bivšoj Jugoslaviji poznatim pod imenom 'praxis' od početaka djelovanja 60ih godina i osobito kraja ranih 90ih. U prvom dijelu tematizira se novo značenje pojma 'prakse' koje djelomice obuhvaća i samu grupu a koje je grupacija *praxis* afirmirala početkom 60-ih godina kroz usvajanje i reinterpretaciju filozofije mladog Marxa i marksističke filozofije 20. stoljeća. U drugom dijelu prikazuje se bliska, ali uglavnom nepriznata paralela između načelnog kritičkog gledišta *praxisa* o disciplinarnoj podjeli same filozofije s pragmatističkom kritikom teorije spoznaje kod R. Rortya. Njegova identifikacija moderne filozofije od Hobbesa do Kanta kao "tribunala uma" i "nadglednice legitimnosti" ispituje se, u trećem dijelu, kroz primjenu takvog modela političnosti filozofije na samu grupaciju *praxis*. Na pretpostavci o postojanju zajedničkog općeg teorijskog i svjetonazorskog ishodišta grupacije *praxis* iz glavnog razdoblja djelovanja 1964-1974., ustanovljavaju se bitni momenti postupnog udaljavanja u shvaćanju političnosti između najistaknutijih članova zagrebačke i beogradske grupe kroz različite faze djelovanja (prije i poslije zabrane časopisa *Praxis* 1974., uključujući i razdoblje časopisa *Praxis International* 1981-1994.). U četvrtom dijelu izlaže se shvaćanje da se politička diferencijacija između vodećih članova dviju grupacija odvija s jedne strane kroz još uvijek zajedničku odanost praksisovaca načelu društveno-kritičke funkcije filozofije koja je, napose u Beogradu kasnih 70ih i ranih 80ih, poprimila tipične oblike disidentske borbe za ljudska prava iz toga vremena. S druge strane, kasniji angažman vodećih beogradskih praksisovaca za srpski politički *maspok* s kraja 80-ih i početka 90ih prikazuje se kao pragmatički motiviran zaokret, gonjen željom za političkom moći poput Heideggerovog, unutar disidentskog modela borbe prema apologiji 'nacionalnog'. U odnosu na izvornu kritičku investiciju iz kasnih 60ih-70ih godina taj zaokret je konceptualno proizvoljan i pseudofilozofski, oslonjen na nacionalističko-ideološko prezaposjedanje pojma 'autentičnosti'.

The 'political' of Praxis: Philosophy in the Mirror of Power

The article outlines different aspects of 'the political' as they emerge from the work of philosophical group *Praxis*, its journal, and its ambiguous intellectual role in the former Yugoslavia from the mid-1960s to the mid-1990s. The first part of the article addresses a new meaning of

the notion of ‘practice’—in contrast to the traditional understanding of practice as opposed to theory— which refers partly to the *Praxis* group itself due to their re-interpretation of and inscription in both young Marx’s and the early 20th century Western Marxist philosophies (such as G. Lucács’, E. Bloch’s, and H. Marcuse’s). In the second part, a closer parallel is drawn between, on one side, the critical stance of several leading *Praxis* philosophers towards general disciplinary divisions in philosophy, and on the other, Richard Rorty’s pragmatic critique of theory of knowledge. On this basis, Rorty’s identification of modern philosophy from Hobbes to Kant with a supreme “tribunal of Reason”, allied with civil power against the ecclesiastic one, is re-examined and applied to the *Praxis* group itself and its relationship to political power in socialist Yugoslavia. Assuming that all members of *Praxis* group shared a common position and worldview during the main period of their activity (from 1964 to 1974), the article points to important moments of a slow and continuous differentiation between Zagreb- and Belgrade-based groups, tied to the inherent political character of their respective theories. It is suggested that these moments can be found before and after 1975 when both the journal *Praxis*, in its national and international editions, and the Korčula Summer School were denied financial support by the Croatian authorities. This political development includes a period of a radical split between Zagreb and Belgrade groups over the controversy around journal *Praxis International*, published in Oxford between 1981 and 1994. The process of differentiation is described, in the fourth part of the article, as a result of an enduring commitment of the *Praxis* philosophers to the ideal of a social-critical function of philosophy, which then, especially in Belgrade between 1975 and 1985, assumed forms typical of the dissident movements, active in Eastern European states at that time. On this background, the late 1980s and early 1990s participation of several leading members of the Belgrade group in the Serbian nationalist mass-movement is revealed as a pragmatically motivated, Heidegger-like ‘turn’, driven by desire for political power, within their late 70s and early 80s dissident battle for civil rights towards the ‘national’. It is argued that this shift required a falsified revisionist autobiography, quite typical of ex-Yugoslav intellectuals in this period. Compared to their original theoretical investment from the early 1960s onward, this later development appears conceptually contingent and pseudo-philosophical, based only on a nationalistic-ideological re-possession of the rather vacuous notion of ‘authenticity’. ¶

Đurđica Degač

Praxis i rodna tematika: Raskol između akademskog polja i prakse

Rad se bavi feminističkim aspektima djelovanja u bivšoj Jugoslaviji. Djelovanje je shvaćeno u širem smislu tako da obuhvaća i akademsko polje i praksu prikazujući na primjeru časopisa *Praxis*, objavljivanog od 1964. do 1974. godine, kako je rodna problematika, iako prisutna u praksi (AFŽ), izostala u teorijskom ispitivanju.

Radom se obuhvaćaju relevantna pitanja koja se odnose na status žene prije 1960-ih godina u bivšoj Jugoslaviji, ispituje se izostanak problema kod filozofa okupljenih oko časopisa *Praxis* te se prati pojavljivanje feminističkih tendencija u akademskom polju krajem 1970-ih i početkom 1980-ih godina karakteriziranih kao drugi val feminizma ili neofeminizam s naglaskom na ekonomskim pitanjima.

Predlažu se tri moguća odgovora na pitanje o izostanku problematizacije u filozofiji prakse s naglaskom na ideji nesukladnosti univerzalističke koncepcije čovjeka i partikularnih pitanja, poput rodnih.

Preostala dva odgovora odnose se na moguće prihvaćanje teze da je položaj žene bio mnogo bolji nego ranije te da se izostankom bavljenja uže ekonomskim pitanjima ispuštala iz vida nejednakost u ekonomskoj sferi i domaćinstvu.

Praxis Philosophy and the Issue of Gender: the Split between the Academic Field and Practice

This paper addresses the feminist aspects of agency in former Yugoslavia. Agency is understood in the broader sense to include both the academic field and praxis, through the example of the journal *Praxis*, which was published from 1964 to 1974. The issue of gender, although present in practice (Women's Antifascist Front — Antifašistički front žena, AFŽ), was absent from theoretical examinations.

This paper covers relevant questions related to the status of women before the 1960s in former Yugoslavia. It examines the absence of this problematic amongst the philosophers gathered around the journal *Praxis* and traces the appearance of feminist tendencies in the academic field at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, years characterized as the second wave of feminism or neofeminism with an emphasis on economic questions.

Three possible answers are suggested as to explain the absence of this problematisation in the *Praxis* philosophy. The first one emphasizes the incompatibility between the universal concept of man and particular

questions such as gender issues. The remaining two answers refer to the thesis that the status of women in socialism was much better than before and that in the absence of dealing with strictly economic issues, inequality in the economic sphere and the household was lost from sight. ¶



Ljerka Schiffler • Ernst Bloch • Alfred Sohn-Rethel •
Michael Landmann • Jean-Michel Palmier • Đuro Šušnjić
(NESIGURNA IDENTIFIKACIJA) • Korčula, 1968.

Nikola Cerovac

Praxisov 'stav filozofije'. Može li marksizam biti znanstven?

U radu se raspravlja o marksističkoj filozofiji i njenom odnosu spram znanosti kako je on shvaćen u okviru zagrebačkih *praxis* filozofa. Pripadnici *praxisa* zastupali su stajalište kako marksizam, ako smjera biti kritika, ne može biti i znanost, budući da znanost za predmet ima čovjeku otuđeni, a time i neistiniti svijet. Takvo stajalište u radu naziva se stavom filozofije. Polazeći od Kangrgine i Petrovićeve interpretacije Marxovih *Teza o Feuerbachu*, razrađuje se na koji način *praxisovo* shvaćanje prakse kao ljudske samostvaralačke djelatnosti privilegira filozofiju kao jedini mogući izvor i sredstvo kritike. Kangrgina spekulacija i Petrovićevo mišljenje revolucije stoga predstavljaju filozofska promišljanja koja počivaju na pretpostavci kako znanstvene činjenice ne mogu doprinijeti kritici, budući da kritika otuđenog svijeta ne može biti utemeljena na znanju o otuđenom svijetu. Sljedeći dio rada bavi se Kangrginim shvaćanjem ideologije kao "točne svijesti neistinitog bitka" u skladu s kojim se Marx određuje isključivo kao filozof. Kritizirajući takvo shvaćanje ideologije, zastupa se stajalište o ideologiji kao posljedici neistinitog mišljenja, a ne bitka. Ta se razlika u shvaćanju ideologije temelji na razlici u shvaćanju prakse: iako se s jedne strane prihvaća stav *praxisa* da postoji jedinstvo teorije i prakse, s druge se strane inzistira na konstitutivnoj ulozi prakse u svim društvenim oblicima, otuđenim i neotuđenim. Slijedom toga, tvrdi se da je marksistička znanost, prihvaćajući to jedinstvo, bitno različita od ideološke objektivne znanosti koju kritizira *praxis*. Zaključno se naznačuje na koji način *praxis* filozofija, iako kritična spram znanosti, predstavlja poticajan doprinos etičkoj i filozofsko-antropološkoj problematici koja prethodi znanstvenoj, a o kojima ovisi opravdanje marksističke pozicije.

Praxis and the 'stance of philosophy'. Can Marxism be scientific?

The paper discusses Marxist philosophy and its relationship to science as understood by the Zagreb *Praxis* philosophers. Members of the *Praxis* school took the position that Marxism, if it were to act as a critique, cannot be understood as a science, since science takes an alienated, and thereby untrue, world as its object. This paper refers to such a stance as the "stance of philosophy". Taking Kangrga's and Petrović's interpretations of Karl Marx's *Theses on Feuerbach* as a starting point, the paper examines the way in which the understanding



of *praxis* as human practice of self-creation by the *Praxis* philosophers privileges philosophy as the only source and means of critique. Kangrga's speculation and Petrović's thinking the revolution represent, therefore, philosophical reflections that assume that scientific facts cannot contribute to the critique, since the critique of an alienated world cannot be founded upon the knowledge of an alienated world. The next part of the paper deals with Kangrga's understanding of ideology as "the adequate consciousness of untrue being" in accordance with which Marx is defined solely as a philosopher. Criticizing such an understanding of ideology, the paper understands ideology as a consequence of untrue thinking, not of untrue being. This difference in the understanding of ideology rests on different understandings of *Praxis*: while the assumption of *Praxis* philosophy that there is a unity of theory and practice is accepted, the constitutive role of *praxis* in all social forms, both alienated and unalienated, is insisted upon. A claim is therefore made that Marxist science, which accepts the aforementioned unity, differs significantly from ideological objective science which is criticised by *Praxis* philosophers. The conclusion outlines the way in which *Praxis* philosophy, while critical of science, represents a stimulating contribution to ethical and philosophical-anthropological problems, which precede scientific ones, and upon which the justification of the Marxist position depends. ¶

Mislav Žitko

Mišljenje i revolucija:

prilog kritici filozofije Gaje Petrovića

Teorijski rad Gaje Petrovića predstavlja samu jezgru *praxis* filozofije. Po opsegu i doradenosti priloga Petrović je otišao najdalje u pokušaju da se Marxova pozicija uklopi u filozofsku tradiciju te dao značajan doprinos analizi odnosa filozofije i socijalizma. U ovom radu analiziraju se temeljni teorijski koncepti Petrovićeve filozofije. Prvi dio rada čini kritika Petrovićevog pokušaja filozofskog utemeljenja, odnosno ovjeravanja marksizma. U drugom se dijelu teksta razmatra središnji pojam *otuđenja* kroz kritiku normativne dimenzije prisutne u Petrovićevoj filozofiji prakse. U zaključnom se dijelu pokazuje mjera do koje Petrovićev rad korespondira sa strujanjima zapadnog marksizma, te se u tom kontekstu analiziraju nedostaci vezani uz ulazak filozofije u političko polje u funkciji lojalne kritike jugoslavenskog socijalizma.

Thinking and Revolution:

Contribution to the critique of philosophy of Gajo Petrović

Gajo Petrović's theoretical works represent the core of the *Praxis* philosophy. The nature of Petrović's contribution shows that he has attempted to embed Marx's position into the philosophical tradition and made a significant contribution to the analysis of the relationship between philosophy and socialism. This paper aims to analyze the key concepts of Petrović's philosophy. The first part of the paper is concerned with the critique of Petrović's attempt at the philosophical constitution and verification of Marxian theory. The second part investigates the notion of *alienation* via a critique of the normative dimension present in Petrović's philosophy of practice. In the final part, the paper aims to demonstrate the extent to which Petrović's work corresponds with the main currents of Western Marxism. In this context, the paper scrutinizes the shortcomings associated with the entry of philosophy into the political field in function of a loyal critique of Yugoslav socialism. ¶

Raul Raunić

Teorijski prekoračiti teoriju:

Kangrga o povijesnosti, praksi i revoluciji

U prvom dijelu rada naznačen je povijesni, politički, ideologijski i idejni kontekst djelovanja filozofa *Praxisova* kruga, te su utvrđena polazišta i načela interpretacije filozofskog rada Milana Kangrga. U drugom dijelu rada kritički su razmotrene tri nosive opozicije Kangrgina djela: povijesnost vs. metafizika; praksa vs. otuđenje; revolucija vs. etika. Osnovne teze rada su:

- a) kroz rekonstrukciju utemeljenosti Marxova djela u klasičnom njemačkom idealizmu Kangrga pokušava dosegnuti poziciju teorijski nadmašene teorije ili apriorne teorije prakse kao revolucije;
- b) kroz izvode filozofije duha došpijeva zapravo do lijevohegelovske pozicije filozofije čina;
- c) dovezni samostojeći pojam revolucije kao prakse ili povijesnog događanja s kojim se skokovito prekida ontološki niz, s jedne strane, pojmovno je prezasićen (*praxis, poiesis, tehne, theoria + produktivno povijesno vrijeme*) te gotovo zauzima poziciju apsoluta; s druge strane je neodređen i neposredovan, što Kangrgu mimo njegove volje izlaže prigovorima za desnohegelovsku apoteozu čina i radikalnog voluntarizma.

Neuspjeh u samozadanoj ambiciji da došpije do meta-teorijske točke objedinjavanja teorije i prakse, doveo je, međutim, do značajnih ali nedovoljno priznatih ostvarenja. To su:

- a) obnovljena pozicija radikalne kritike i realistične utopije;
- b) uvjerljiva rekonstrukcija humanističke biti Marxova mišljenja;
- c) afirmacija produktivne i emancipacijske moći uma, a nasuprot danas dominantne, instrumentalne i opslužiteljske moći razuma.

Stepping over Theory with Theory:

Milan Kangrga on Historicity, Practice, and Revolution

This paper outlines the historical, political, ideological, and conceptual context of the activities of the *Praxis* circle and outlines basic principles for the interpretation of the philosophical work of Milan Kangrga, one of the most outstanding members of the circle. Three key oppositions in his work (historicity v. metaphysics; practice v. alienation; revolution v. ethics) are re-examined. The paper highlights that Kangrga strove, through a reconstruction of the groundings of Marx's philosophy

in German idealism, to reach a theoretical position beyond theory or an a priori theory of practice as revolution. However, Kangrga's elaborations of the philosophy of spirit have in fact brought him to a left-Hegelian position on the philosophy of act. As a result, the related notion of revolution as practice or historical event, by virtue of which the ontological line of reality abruptly breaks, appears, on the one hand, conceptually over-saturated with notions of *praxis*, *poiesis*, *techne*, *theoria* and of *productive historical time*, and thus resembles the Absolute itself. On the other hand, it is underdetermined and unmediated, and this exposes Kangrga unintentionally to accusation of a right-Hegelian apotheosis of act and radical voluntarism. However, despite failure in his ambition to reach a meta-theoretical point of unification of theory and practice, Kangrga's thought has yielded significant, albeit insufficiently recognised, achievements: a renewed radical critical stance and a realistic utopia; a convincing reconstruction of the humanist essence of Marxian thought; and an affirmation of the productive and emancipatory power of Reason, in clear contrast to the dominant instrumental power of intellect. ¶