

ГЛАСНИК ЕТНОГРАФСКОГ ИНСТИТУТА САНУ LXII (2)
BULLETIN OF THE INSTITUTE OF ETHNOGRAPHY SASA LXII (2)

UDC 39(05)

ISSN 0350-0861

INSTITUTE OF ETHNOGRAPHY SASA

BULLETIN
OF THE INSTITUTE OF ETHNOGRAPHY
LXII
No. 2

Editor in chief
Dragana Radojičić

Editor of the Topic
Jadranka Đorđević Crnobrnja

International editorial board
Radost Ivanova, Elephterios Alexakis, Jana Pospíšilová, Karl Kaser, Gabriela Kiliánová,
Milica Bakić-Hayden, Ingrid Slavec-Gradišnik, Marina Martynova, Fernando Diego Del
Vecchio, Kjell Magnusson, Tatiana Podolinska, Peter Finke

Editorial board
Gojko Subotić, Sofija Miloradović, Jelena Čvorović, Srđan Radović, Aleksandra
Pavićević, Lada Stevanović, Ildiko Erdei, Jelena Jovanović

The reviewers
Vojislav Stanovčić, Petko Hristov, Mladena Prelić, Dušan Drljača, Mirko Blagojević,
Gordana Blagojević, Kosta Nikolić, Ljiljana Gavrilović, Jovanka Radić, Rajna
Dragičević, Mirjana Detelić, Milina Ivanović-Barišić, Đorđina Trubarac Matić

Secretary
Marija Đokić

Accepted for publication by the reference of academician Vojislav Stanovčić, at meeting
of the Department of Social Sciences SASA October 7th 2014

BELGRADE 2014

УДК 39(05)

ISSN 0350-0861

ЕТНОГРАФСКИ ИНСТИТУТ САНУ

ГЛАСНИК
ЕТНОГРАФСКОГ ИНСТИТУТА
LXII
свеска 2

Главни и одговорни уредник
Драгана Радојичић

Уредник Темата
Јадранка Ђорђевић Црнобрња

Међународни уређивачки одбор
Радост Иванова, Елефтериос Алексакис, Јана Поспишилова, Карл Касер, Габриела
Килианова, Милица Бакић-Хејден, Ингрид Славец-Градишник, Марина Мартинова,
Фернандо Диего Дел Векио, Шел Магнусон, Тагиана Подолинска, Петер Финке

Уређивачки одбор
Гојко Суботић, Софија Милорадовић, Јелена Чворовић, Срђан Радовић,
Александра Павићевић, Лада Стевановић, Илдико Ердеи, Јелена Јовановић

Рецензентски тим
Војислав Становчић, Петко Христов, Младена Прелић, Душан Дрљача, Мирко Благојевић,
Гордана Благојевић, Коста Николић, Љиљана Гавриловић, Јованка Радић, Рајна Драгићевић,
Мирјана Детелић, Милина Ивановић-Баришић, Ђорђина Трубарац Магић

Секретар уредништва
Марија Ђокић

Примљено на седници Одељења друштвених наука САНУ одржаној 7. октобра 2014.
године, на основу реферата академика Војислава Становчића

БЕОГРАД 2014.

Издавач:
ЕТНОГРАФСКИ ИНСТИТУТ САНУ
Кнез Михаилова 36/IV, Београд, тел. 011–2636–804
eisanu@ei.sanu.ac.rs
www.etno-institut.co.rs

Рецензент
академик Војислав Становчић

Лектор
Софија Милорадовић

Превод
Соња Жакула
аутори текстова

*Дизајн корица и
техничка припрема*
Атеље, Београд

Штампа
Академска издања, Београд

Тираж
500 примерака

Штампање публикације финансирано је из средстава
Министарство просвете, науке и технолошког развоја Републике Србије
Часопис Гласник Етнографског института САНУ индексиран је у:
DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals); SCIndeks (Српски цитатни индекс); Ulrich's Peri-
odicals Directory.
The Bulletin of Institute of Ethnography SASA is indexed in: DOAJ (Directory of Open Access
Journals); SCIndeks (Srpski citatni indeks); Ulrich's Periodicals Directory.

CIP – Каталогизација у публикацији
Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

39(05)

Гласник Етнографског института = Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnography /
главни и одговорни уредник Драгана Радојичић. – Књ. 1, бр 1/2 (1952) – Београд
: Етнографски институт САНУ (Кнез Михаилова 36/IV), 1952 – (Београд :
Академска издања). – 24 cm
Полугодишње
ISSN 0350-0861 = Гласник Етнографског института САНУ
ISSN 2334-8529 = Glasnik Etnografskog Instituta SANU (Online)
COBISS. SR-ID 15882242

Садржај **Contents**

Тема броја – Истраживање миграција **Topic of the Issue – Migration Research**

Јадранка Ђорђевић-Црнобрња, <i>Ко, где, како и зашто – аспекти савремених миграција у иностраној и домаћој етнолошкој/антрополошкој литератури</i> (2)	11
Jadranka Đorđević-Crnobrnja, <i>Who, Where, How and Why – Aspects of Contemporary Migrations in Foreign and Serbian Ethnological/Anthropological Literature</i> (2)	13
Miroslava Lukić Krstanović, <i>Migration Studies: Ethnology and Policy of the Institute of Ethnography SASA (1947–2014)</i>	15
Мирослава Лукић Крстановић, <i>Истраживања миграција: етнологија и политика Етнографског института САНУ (1947–2014)</i>	33
Јадранка Ђорђевић-Црнобрња, <i>Миграције из Горе крајем двадесетог и почетком двадесет првог века</i>	35
Jadranka Đorđević-Crnobrnja, <i>Migrations from the Gora Region at the End of the 20th and the Beginning of the 21st Century</i>	47
Duško Petrović, <i>Fenomen izbjeglištva u modernom političkom sistemu</i>	49
Duško Petrović, <i>Phenomenon of Refugeeness in the Modern Political System</i>	65
Gordana Blagojević, <i>The Influence of Migrations on the Ethnic/National and Religious Identities: the Case of the United Methodist Church in Banat</i>	67
Гордана Благојевић, <i>Утицај миграција на етнички/национални и религијски идентитет: случај евангеличке методистичке цркве у Банату</i>	80
Varia	
Младена Прелић, <i>Јован Цвијић и прве деценије формирања и институционализовање етнологије као науке у Србији</i>	83
Mladena Prelić, <i>Jovan Cvijić and the Beginnings of Establishing Ethnology as a Discipline in Serbia</i>	97
Ивица Тодоровић, Анђелка Вучетић-Драговић, Анђелко Марић, <i>Компаративни аналитички осврт на најновија генетска истраживања порекла Срба и становништва Србије – етнолошка перспектива</i>	99
Ivica Todorović, Anđelka Vučetić-Dragović, Anđelko Marić, <i>Comparative Analytical Review of the Latest Genetic Studies of the Serbs and the Serbian Population – an Ethnological Perspective</i>	111

Александар Крел, Јадранка Ђорђевић-Црнобрња, <i>Име и знак: лично име као симбол етничког идентитета војвођанских Немаца</i>	113
Aleksandar Krel, Jadranka Đorđević-Crnobrnja, <i>Name and Sign: First Name as a Symbol of Ethnic Identity of Vojvodina Germans</i>	123
Александра Павићевић, <i>Од муње до праха – Смрт, сахрана и посмртна судбина Николe Тесле</i>	125
Aleksandra Pavićević, <i>From Lightning to Dust – Death, Funeral and Post Mortem Destiny of Nikola Tesla</i>	139
Весна Трифуновић, Јована Диковић, <i>‘Миле против транзиције’: друштвене промене и сукоби вредносних оријентација кроз призму једне телевизијске серије</i>	141
Vesna Trifunović, Jovana Diković, <i>‘Mile Versus Transition’: Social Changes and Clashes of Values through the Prism of a Television Show</i>	153
Петрија Јовичић, Ивана Башић, <i>За сликарским потезом: границе женског тела на ‘Акту’ (1956/1957) Зоре Петровић</i>	155
Petrija Jovičić, Ivana Bašić, <i>In Search of a Painter’s Stroke. Female Body Boundaries in Zora Petrović’s Painting ‘Acts’ (1956/1957)</i>	169
Снежана Петровић, Тома Тасовац, <i>Збирка речи Димитрија Чемериџића као извор за етнолингвистичка и етнологишка истраживања</i>	171
Snežana Petrović, Toma Tasovac, <i>The Lexicon Manuscript by Dimitrije Čemerikić as a Source for Ethnolinguistic and Ethnologic Research</i>	180
Ђурђина Шијаковић, <i>Другост варварке: ‘Медеја’ Еурипидова и ‘Медеја’ Велимира Лукића</i>	181
Đurđina Šijaković, <i>The Otherness of a Barbarianess: Euripides’ ‘Medea’ and ‘Medea’ by Velimir Lukić</i>	199
Анђелка Пејовић, <i>Паремије као део етнолингвистичког наслеђа</i>	201
Anđelka Pejović, <i>Proverbs as Ethnolinguistic Heritage</i>	214
Ђорђина Трубарац Матић, <i>За њим и у гору и у воду: семантичко-прагматичка анализа формуле у контексту добровољне брачне отмице</i>	215
Đorđina Trubarac Matić, <i>I will Follow him through Woody Mountains and Water: Semantic-Pragmatic Analysis of a Formula within the Context of Consensual Abduction</i>	233

Сећање/Мемори

Селена Ракочевић, <i>Етнохореолошка делатност Оливере Младеновић</i>	235
Selena Rakočević, <i>Ethnochoreological Work of Olivera Mladenović</i>	250
Биљана Миленковић-Вуковић, <i>Библиографија др Оливере Младеновић</i>	251

Научна критика и полемика
Discussion and Polemics

Срђан Радовић, <i>(Нова) критика балканистичког дискурса у хрватској етнологији/културној антропологији</i>	289
Александра Павићевић, <i>Књижевност између уметничког дела и историјског сведочанства</i>	292
Срђан Радовић, <i>Етноантрополошко истраживање савременог националног идентитета. Црна Гора након Југославије – динамика идентитета</i>	297
Милош Луковић, Ján Novák, Ján Podolák, Iveta Zuskinová, Milan Margetin: <i>Po stopách valachov v Karpatoch (Monografia)</i>	302
Милена Жикић, <i>Научни допринос жена</i>	306
Ања Абрамковић, <i>Ваишар у пограничју источне и југоисточне Србије</i>	310

Тема броја: Истраживање миграција
Topic of the Issue: Migration Research

Miroslava Lukić Krstanović

Institute of Ethnography SASA, Belgrade
miroslava.lukić@ei.sanu.ac.rs

Migration Studies: Ethnology and Policy of the Institute of Ethnography SASA (1947–2014)¹

Ethnological migration studies carried out within the Institute of Ethnography SASA² have been institutionally positioned and appropriately conducted over the previous six decades, according to political and scientific policies. Subject matters and contents of these studies have been embedded into current policies, state interests, national ideologies and scientific trends, which have largely determined the course, dynamics and (in)dependency in work, thus shaping its utilitarian character. In order to understand the way in which the policy of migration studies has been devised and carried out, it is necessary to shed light on the historical context of constitution and construction of policies/programs at the Institute of Ethnography SASA, which serve as an important research point and a barometer of scientific currency and relevancy, as well as social and political determination.

Key words:

migration,
ethnology,
scientific
policies,
Institute of
Ethnography
SASA

Studying Migration from a Distance

Changing, acceleration, amassing, and the thickening of migration leave no room for scientific delays or gaps. Therefore, it is necessary to have permanent research mobility and to be scientifically well-founded *here* and *now*, *there* and *then*, as well as *always*. To what extent have certain scientific strategies been shaped by the subject matter of migration, or to what extent has the scientific picture of migration been

¹ This paper is a result of the work on the project *Multiethnicity, Multiculturalism, Migration – Contemporary Processes* (177027), funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

² The Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts.

influenced by ongoing policies and economies? Is the science always ready to gasp keeping up with all the movements of people? The time of steamship migrations is gone, the spaces of migrations have become accessible to all, diaspora and information have fused into cyber-spaces; nevertheless, flow of refugees, asylum-seekers, illegal migrants, labor migrants are roaming around the world. Routes, migratory geometries, points, and zones are not clearly focused anymore, because unpredictability of catastrophes and evil has prevailed at the moment of decision-making on movements and relocations. Migration studies are always a current issue, and they are never cut off from macro and micro policies and economies, which give them additional scientific redirection and retargeting. Going back to the 20th century, we can observe that each and every scientific and research period had its own distinguishable approach within the respective discipline, terminology,³ theoretical conceptions, analytical framework, thus creating its discursive autonomies and shaped paradigms. Hence, we can speak about scientific framework, researches, and institutional policies. In relation to the ethnological science and institutional policy of the Institute of Ethnography of the SASA, the aim of this text is to explicate why migration studies in ethnology and anthropology, from the very institutional outset, have not been sufficiently supported, or else – if they were – why did they remain on the margin of contemporary scientific studies and approaches? Why did research, in particular research on emigration processes, balance between national policy and contemporary approaches to ethnicity and migration studies? How did, if at all, academic circles accept such a research? Which gaps and divergencies the studies have?

Subject matters and content of research carried out within projects at the Institute of Ethnography SASA have been deeply embedded in contemporary policies, state interests, national ideologies and scientific trends, which have largely determined the course, dynamics and (in)dependency in work, thus giving shape to their utilitarian character. In order to understand the way in which the policy of ethnological migration studies has been devised and realized, it is important illuminate the historical context of constitution and construction of programs at the ethnological institutions, that is, establishment of role models and authorities as markers and barometers of scientific valorization. Institutionalization of the ethnology of migration is founded on key parameters which have set the directions and patterns of *longue durée*, that is, the positions of national and state policies toward migratory movements, ethnological and anthropological scientific trends in migration studies.

³ For instance, in the socialist times, persons who moved abroad for political reasons were called *émigrés*, and those who moved abroad for non-political reasons were called *iseljenici* (*emigrants*), while persons who moved abroad for economic reasons were called *labour migrants*. (Pravna enciklopedija [Encyclopaedia of Law]1979: 298). Nowadays, diaspora is the term that prevails, while labour migrants are called *Gastarbeiters* (*guest workers*).

Ethnographization of Migration in Hands of Scientific and National Policies and Authorities

Origins of population, settlements, and processes of movements of people, have become a subject matter of investigation in two compatible scientific fields: geography and ethnography. Credits for this fusion of science and investigation largely go to Jovan Cvijić, who held lectures, starting from 1893, in the course entitled Geography with Ethnography. In 1894, the Ethnographical Section was founded with the Serbian Royal Academy, which started with the publication of the Serbian Ethnographic Bulletin (SEZb). The Board, edition and lectures constituted the main institutional framework for the foundation of ethnological national science, which established three constitutive paradigms: study of settlements and origins of population, folk customs and lives and Serbian folk tales and oral traditions (Drobnjaković 1958: 1). In 1896, Cvijić wrote *Instructions* for studying villages, which served as a cornerstone for the field work as a specific investigative pilgrimage with field work devotees taking part in it (Cvijić's students, teachers, priests and other volunteers).⁴ Collected material was then presented in monographs that were published as editions of the SEZb. Movements of people from one village to another, from one region to another, were registered more as a sequence of circumstances and historical processes, rather than dynamical processes of certain changes going on in the lives of people. For the first time, the subject of migrations in the Balkans had its synthetic image devised in Jovan Cvijić's "Balkan Peninsula"⁵, that is, in the chapter entitled "Migration Movements". It was exactly this phenomenon of migrations, that had its main synthetic effect in ethno-psychological "characters", which gave incentive to all subsequent manners that Cvijić's interpretations and constructions have been put to use. Handing down an enormous database, Cvijić's legacy was waiting for better days to come in its scientific, analytical and critical scrutiny, but it has never been brought to fruition throughout the 20th century. At present day, looking from a distance, Cvijić's work and his contribution or any deficiencies in it make two critical poles, which are reflected in the theoretical and methodological consistency based on positivism and empiricism with abundance of systematized material on the Balkans (Radovanović, 1953-54: 4), but also in geopolitical and ethno-psychological guidelines, which are interpreted as romantic inclinations in ethno-anthropological concepts (Pišev, 2013: 179). Characterological and typological constructs in the form of ethno-genetic clues on Slavic and Balkan origins, territorial distribution of "psychological types", mappings and ethnic categorizations, established a political and scientific platform for population and migration issues. Movements of people, that is, populations, have largely remained accordant to these lodestars, with insufficient room for maneuver in methodological and empirical restructuring and re-conceptualization, which involved

⁴ As regarding immigrations, settlement of population, and ethnical and social makeup, Cvijić devised a field mechanism "from village to village" (Cvijić 1987: 128).

⁵ Jovan Cvijić, *The Balkan Peninsula and South-Slavic Countries*, was originally published in French language in 1918, while Serbian issue was published in 1922.

permanent monitoring of social and cultural changes and political ruptures. Prelić rightly believes that Cvijić's followers have not sufficiently devised methods of studies in culture and migration, and that they oversimplified ethnology to "collecting material for its own sake".⁶ While vertical hierarchy of scientific authorities was being established, ethnographization of migration started to gain ground and to acquire its constitutive place within institutional and national accommodation, such as editions and future projects with the Academy of Sciences based on the paradigm of *settlements and origins of population*. Therefore, cultural-historical approach firmly stuck to the anthropogeographical pattern in studying settlements and origins of population, and with respect to this, ethnic categorization and stereotyping, which remained in a petrified form of the collection of material through a large part of the 20th century. Long-lasting influence that Cvijić cast on migration studies makes it manifest that there was a lack of willingness and readiness to think over and reexamine the indisputable authority of Cvijić and his followers. The blending of ethnology and geography in the life and works of Jovan Cvijić and his followers remained on the position of ethnological traditionalism, allowing no advances in interdisciplinary revision.⁷ The responsibility for this goes to scientific policy of the Institute of Ethnography SASA from its foundation, and likewise to its subsequent disruptions and retargeting.

As a part of the constitution and construction of scientific policies at the Institute of Ethnography SASA, we can distinguish the following stages that are related to the migration studies: 1. Anthropogeographical concept – studies of area units (1947–1964); 2. Ethnographical concept – studies of sociocultural changes (1964–1980); 3. Ethnological concept – studies of diaspora, ethnicity and labor migration (1980–2000); 4. Anthropological concept – migration studies in the period of crisis and transition (from 2000 onward).

Structured Studies: National Strategy and Socialistic Politics

Ethnography/ethnology entered the age of socialism with elaborated paradigms of "national science", having its worked out programs, recognized pre-war names and ethnological authorities. It is a fact that the successors of Jovan Cvijić's school, namely Radovanović, Drobnjaković and others, would come to establish a paternalistic referential hegemony in the ethnological scientific and research production. Cultural-

⁶ See: Mladena Prelić, „Jovan Cvijić i prve decenije formiranja i institucionalizacije etnologije kao nauke u Srbiji“ [“Jovan Cvijić and the First Decades in the Formation and Institutionalization of Ethnology as Science in Serbia”].

⁷ Here I will only single out two papers in which anthropogeographic school still posed an imperative in research during the 1920s. Dragoslav Antonijević, Lik i naučno delo Vojislava Radovanovića [Life and Works of Vojislav Radovanović], *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU*, XLI, [Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology SASA, book XLI], Belgrade 1992, 32; Milovan Radovanović, Ka obnavljanju tradicionalnih metodološko-gnoseoloških veza između etnologije i geografije, [Towards Restoration of Traditional Methodological and Gnoseological Connections between Ethnology and Geography] *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU*, XLI [Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology SASA, XLI], Belgrade 1992, 56.

historical direction based on the ethnogenesis, “organicist approach” based on the peasant society and anthropogeographic⁸ spatial mapping in the first stage served to situate ethnology in its geographic and historical context. The “new times” and the continuity of the “science about people”, inseparable from the 19th century, established an institutional policy of organization and goal-setting (Prelić 2008: 271). It became manifest that institutional policy of ethnology was to follow this anthropogeographic and ethnographic course of self-admiring and self-sufficient collecting of material for a long time. After the Second World War, ethnology was given a new form, even though its content was not fully new. This form took shape in 1947 when the Institute of Ethnography⁹ was founded under the aegis of the Serbian Academy of Sciences. In the first paragraph of its Statute it is stated that the main aim of the Institute is to carry out “systematical and planned study of settlements and origins of population, folk customs and lives, and folklore in our country, as well as our peoples, in the first place in the territory of the PR Serbia and in the other regions with Serbian population” (from the archives of the IE SASA: document no. 200, September 15th, 1947, see: Zečević 1952: 579; Radovanović 1952: XV; Urošević, 1972; 7). These statutory principles clearly testify that ethnology, in its reconciling of national and socialist ideologies, was a two-faced science. This is particularly contextualized in the formulations like *our people, our country, our peoples*, thus creating mimicry and providing a shield for ideological interests in the form of socialist, Yugoslav or Serbian paradigm. Balancing between the options of state-building politics of Yugoslav federalism and the Serbian nation, institutional ethnology was successfully assessing the propositions of the warranted term *people* in the name of ethnos-nation-state-society. This is the point of initiation of the ambivalent process of the two-faced identity of the ethnological science – the socialist paradigm of Yugoslav federalism and the paradigm of the national principle under the aegis of the SASA.¹⁰ The institutional

⁸ The term anthropogeography is a concept from the modern German anthropogeographic school that was coined by F. Ratzel in 1882 (see: Spasovski and Šantić 2013: 3). The influence of geographic environment on the lives of people was taken and elaborated by Jovan Cvijić in his scientific modes. One of the aims of anthropogeography is to determine specific psychological traits of population in different natural environments and to highlight the part taken by geographic, historical, ethnic etc. determinants in the formation of such traits (Cvijić [1922] 1987: 326). On the following pages, Cvijić grounds his method on a classification of Southern Slavs and ethnic groups and peoples and the indicating of their common traits. Human morphology in its relation to the geographic environment and ethnopsychological traits provided methodological underpinnings for ethnic traits, which were mostly passed on to all subsequent interpretations, providing strong support to all sorts of idealizations and stereotyping.

⁹ The term *ethnographic* reconciled two options – pre-war legacy of the science of ethnography which was based on the study of folk customs and lives and the Soviet model of ethnography. Notwithstanding the changes in scientific and research concepts and theoretical profile of this scientific discipline, this term has remained up to the present day.

¹⁰ Here is how it looks like from the perspective of the institutional program/policy. The work is carried out in sections: study of partisan and other poetry from the National Liberation War, reviews of material from folk tales and oral traditions, study of rural and urban building and construction, study of popular medicine and herbalism, study of tribes and tribal lifestyles, study of costumes (Bulletin of the Serbian Academy of Sciences 1949: 280).

policy was increasingly directed toward the so-called folklore phenomena, which were set apart from the elaborated program of *settlements* and *origins of population*, and were most appropriate to represent the collectivist and populist folk culture. Hence, all accumulated as part of the same elaborated, lyric and epic poems from youth work actions during the construction of the Belgrade–Zagreb highway were collected together with oro dances in some regions.¹¹ It could be said that socialist branding was just a smokescreen for a consistent and hard-and-fast order of studies of traditional phenomena and the continuity of heritage based on the paths well-trodden by forerunners, which were to be replicated without further problematization in new situations. At the same time, the post-war period and the communist system of the Yugoslav state federation established on the borders of the Republics at that time¹² restructured human mobility and spatial entities shifting them toward the old¹³ as well as certain new demographic occurrences: colonization, refugees, reconstruction and rebuilding of the country, gradual flow of population into newly settled zones – cities, etc. The goals of the Institute, as approved by the Academy of Sciences and verified by the state establishment, were meant to keep a record of such changes and thus testify to its loyalty to state politics.¹⁴ The anniversary papers on the work of the Institute give emphasis to the research on changes during “the progress of socialist society and the development of self-governing society”, in parallel to the study of the Serbian traditional culture (Miljana Radovanović 1973: 14–15).

Migrations in the Discourse of Sociocultural Changes: Old/New Paradigms

Migration processes taking place in the ethnological research during the 1960s mostly remained within the boundaries of the Yugoslav state and new population restructuring arising from the relevant regulations and five-year plans for country

¹¹ From the *Report on Folklore Collection* (Markovič, 1952: 580–584).

¹² The Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia was divided into Republics as national units which were positioned as territorial units: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia with its Autonomous Provinces of Kosovo and Metohia and Vojvodina, Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia and Montenegro.

¹³ Until 1953, studies of settlements and origins of population were carried out in parts of Serbia: in Srem and Banat, Pocerina and Posavina in the environs of Šabac, in Dobrič, Takovo, on the Kopaonik mountain, in Raška, Pešter, and Sjenica, in the Pirot valley, as well as in Rugova, Lještanski Lug, Gora and Opolje, at the time parts of the province of Kosovo and Metohia. These data make it clear that studies were carried out within the borders of the Republics, which served to make regional and state configuration circumscribed.

¹⁴ In his paper “Migracije i kolonizacije u Jugoslaviji u prošlosti i sadašnjosti” [“Migrations and Colonization in Yugoslavia in Past and Present”], Milisav Lutovac clearly shows that Cvijić’s approach is beyond dispute. In Lutovac’s opinion, even in conditions of new movements and migration flows, Cvijić’s ideas should be further developed with regard to new social conditions. Metamorphoses of migrations are perceived as positive outcomes and successful results of the new socialist order (country-city, colonization). The legacy of Cvijić’s school of thinking and socialist ideological programming and reforms thus share common denominators in sociocultural changes (Lutovac, 1987: 528–539).

development. The vertical genetic research made way for horizontal processes, which were still centered in rural environments (Nikolić 1997: 34). Starting from the 1960s, the scientific policy of the Institute of Ethnography was shaped in three thematic and methodological directions: study of traditional culture, sociocultural changes, and ethnic communities and minorities. In 1958, in the new cycle of institutional goals and targets, emphasis was put on further anthropogeographic studies of folk life with cultural and historical signifiers of reconstruction of the tradition and the past. Following the traces of ethnicity, rather than migration flows, researchers were focused, back then and later on, on the existence or the disappearance of ethnic entities more than on the population movement dynamics, which led to significant changes in rigid and unchanging population maps. Starting from the 1970s, the studies of the Serbian communities in the neighboring countries, as well as of the ethnic minorities in Vojvodina (Slovaks, Rusyns, Ukrainians, Poles) had also been conducted. The research in the field of cultural contacts and permeability of heterogeneous ethnic environments had anticipated studies of ethnic identities and multiculturalism, which became one of the main projects of the Institute during the 1980s (Nikolić 1997: 33). Within the scope of the acculturation processes and internal migrations at the Institute, following the *Matica Srpska* in Novi Sad,¹⁵ studies of the colonization coming to Vojvodina from Bosnia, Herzegovina and Montenegro were conducted. Although the occurrence of Vojvodina colonization can be traced back to 1945, it entered in the institutional plan for systematic research as late as 1975, while in 1979 special edition *Bačko Dobro Polje – Highlanders in the Plain* was published. It was stated that the emphasis was put on the “profound and manifold sociocultural changes experienced by the population of highlander settlers” during the acculturation process. If a *colonist* is interpreted as *highlander*, who is respectively interpreted as a Montenegrin or a Croat, then we have a special identifying prototype which goes through a dramatic scenario of a “new life”, often based on prejudices and stereotypes in understanding collectivist identity. From the ethnological point of view, colonist culture is undoubtedly framed, but in this case, just like in the previous ones, a critical perspective from the distance is missing, that is, repeated research conducted with different methodological approaches and reexamination undertaken by new generations of researchers.

The studies of the influence of the accelerated industrialization and urbanization on the changing habits and practices of population became a testing polygon for research reconstructions of traditional survivals and research mappings of contemporary changes. During the 1960s, the Institute’s organization of research was carried out through work in sections, which, in addition to anthropogeographic, ethnological, folklore sections, expanded to include a sociological section (starting from 1953, as a subdivision of sociology of population). The connection of ethnology and sociology was manifest in the studies of social transformations and social mobility, which saw migrations from a standpoint of functional approach. The migration studies, from the

¹⁵ *Matica Srpska* is the oldest cultural – scientific institution of Serbia.

late 1960s until the 1980s particularly, focused on the processes of industrialization and urbanization and population movements from villages to urban environments. The research was carried out through work at such designated points where changes were most evident: population movements in the settlements in the Kolubara coal basin, the affected settlements and displaced population during the construction of hydroelectric power plants Djerdap 1 and Djerdap 2, suburbia, sections of the Belgrade-Bar railroad, etc.¹⁶ Such projects at the Institute were given green light by the state administration (The Republic Board for Scientific Research of the SR Serbia), thus making a concrete contribution to the “development of the socialist society” and the evaluation of projects in a positive direction. In the late 1960s, a special attention was paid to fluctuations in workforce, which gravitated toward larger urban areas and the formation of suburbia in the form of outskirts. Research of urban settings was first undertaken by Dušan Bandić, who studied life and cultural changes of the population in the peripheries of Belgrade (1969–1970), gaining partial insight in the processes of internal migrations (toward Belgrade) and emigration from Belgrade (Bandić 1979: 14, 27). In the 1970s, a long-term project entitled “Ethnic and Ethnological Characteristics of the Serbian Population” took its form, and research of suburban settlements and continuous changes in folk culture was carried out within this project. The direction of the population–country–city change set new empirical strategies and a synchronic approach (IE SASA 1984). This partial redirection of the country-tradition paradigm did not, however, move away from the models of the study of the transformations in “folk culture”, it was only observed in a new environment, namely in the city and its peripheries. Ethnographic activism and actualization of topics fitted into the current phenomena of a steadily growing migration to urban environments thus establishing a new field of descriptive and functional analysis. The 1960s and 1970s saw the appearance of new and fresh topics, still with theoretical gaps, persisting ethnographic methodological standards, deficient deconstruction of meaning and subtle research penetration into essence of migration everyday life.

Emigration Processes: Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Aspects

From the early 1980s, we can speak about recognizable characteristics of external migration that include multigenerational diaspora in the USA, Canada and some of the European countries, as well as a steadily growing wave of economic migration. Until the 1960s, Yugoslavia, a socialist country, implemented repressive policies on

¹⁶ Dušan Drljača, *Etnološki pogled na poljska i jugoslovenska ispitivanja posleratnih migracija* [Ethnological Perspective on Polish and Yugoslav Research on Post-War Migration], *Ethnological Review* 5, Belgrade 1963, 85; Breda Vlahović & Dušan Drljača, *Nova etnička kretanja i pregrupisanja u Srbiji u vezi sa razvojem industrije. Poseban otisak iz Cvijićevoг zbornika – vanserijsko izdanje SANU, Odeljenje prirodno-matematičkih nauka, Belgrade, 1968, 223–230.* [New Ethnic Movements and Regroupings in Serbia in Relation to Industrial Development. Special Print from Cvijić’s Collection – Extraordinary Edition SASA, Department of Natural Sciences, Belgrade]

emigration, particularly to Western countries, which was caused by the division on the Blocs (Iron Curtain). From 1964, regulations and laws with the view to liberalize the relations with the West and to facilitate citizenship proceedings for the citizens living or travelling abroad, had been passed.¹⁷ Nevertheless, behind those regulatory undertakings, the emigrant issues, their lives *there*, their social, cultural and economic situation, transformation of values and an entire set of modified roles and statuses remained within the narrative (oral stories and media constructions), imaginary pictures, prejudices and restrictive state policies toward emigrants. It is not difficult to conclude that such political positioning with respect to emigration processes could easily slip into all sorts of manipulations about “friendly Yugoslav” and “hostile anti-Yugoslav” emigration. Everything that was written about the emigration was constructed and framed as “highly classified” bulletins, exclusive newspaper articles and wide-spread oral stories, suitable for the shaping of the imagery.

The early 1980s marked a new period of intensified, though not more comprehensive, interest in, study and observation of emigration processes, which was going on several levels of institutional production. Sociology, contemporary history and ethnology set out on their research route within scientific institutions of the SFRY¹⁸: The Institute of Social Sciences in Belgrade (projects led by Živan Tanić and studies by Milena Primorac¹⁹), The Institute of International Politics in Belgrade (Vladimir Grečić), The Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies (1987) in Zagreb,²⁰ The Institute of Ethnography SASA, The Slovenian Migration Institute.²¹ Alongside this still insufficient work in scientific research, there were social and political institutions called *The Centres of Emigrants* based respectively in the then SFRY Republics. Starting from 1951, cultural and educational societies were established within the *Centres* with the aim to keep in contact with emigrants and to work on positive orientation in cultural cooperation in harmonization with the politics pursued by the socialist Yugoslavia (Yugoslav emigration societies). It is clear that such form of social engagement had strong political residues in propagating and selecting the emigration positively oriented toward the socialist Yugoslavia, in contrast to other emigrants and organizations that were labeled as “negative anti-Yugoslav elements”. Contrary to diffuse and insufficiently transparent work in scientific research, those

¹⁷ See: Law on Yugoslav Citizenship, *Bulletin of the SFRY*, no. 38, 23 September 1964, art. 5, 8.

¹⁸ The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

¹⁹ The work which particularly stands out on the sociological aspect of temporary economic emigration is a study by Milena Primorac (1980), as well as the thematic issue „Economic Emigration“, *Sociology* XV, no. 2, 1973. Also see works by Baučić, Milojević, Mandić, Djurić, Morokvašić, Petrović and others.

²⁰ Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies was founded in 1984, first as the Center for Migration and Ethnic Studies, while its present name dates from 1987. Continuous research of external migration can be traced back to 1967 within the Institute for Geography of the University of Zagreb, and the Agency for Migration and Nationalities which was established in 1965. It is the institution which was the first to fully unite research of migrations and ethnic groups and minorities.

²¹ Research Center of the Slovenian Emigration was founded in 1963, at the initiative of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts and the History Department of the Slovenian Emigration Institute. Since 1982, the Center has been renamed the Slovenian Migration Institute ZRC SAZU.

institutions enjoyed strong support from the government, because they performed work in the interest of state politics.

The phenomenon of emigration and expatriation took a new course in scientific policy starting from the end of the 1980s. Science embarked upon political programs, aiming to approach emigration not just from the position of political control, but also from the perspective of research subject matter. This step was still kept under political supervision, just like the formation of the Board for Scientific Research of Emigration (collection of papers *Iseljeništvo naroda i narodnosti Jugoslavije i njegove uzajamne veze sa domovinom*, [*Emigration of Nations and Nationalities from Yugoslavia and its Mutual Connections with The Homeland*] 1978). This collection of papers became the main platform for the forthcoming projects, programs and initiatives under the umbrella of the Yugoslav paradigm, but at the same time it was explicitly inclined toward national scientific course in research of its *own* national emigration (*Croatian, Serbian and Slovene* emigration, respectively). At that time, ethnologists became involved through making straightforward institutional project proposal for ethnological research of the emigration from Serbia, which was devised by Slobodan Zečević and Dušan Drljača. Their proposal was examined at a session held in 1978 by the SASA Department of Social Sciences. Whereas migration and emigration received a special political treatment by the socialist control establishment, the authorities at the SASA and the Institute of Ethnography saw a new national enthusiasm arising from emigration, which suited the politics of this Institution. It was only a matter of the direction that such research was going to take. The initiators of the Institute of Ethnography's project based the concept of emigration primarily on the works by Čizmić, Mikačić (1974) and Telišman (1976), Sobisjak (1978), as well as Cvijić's already customary reflections on the consequences of migrations. The concept of research of the emigration was focused, from the beginning, on the issue of ethnicity, that is, observation of the continuity and the changes in ethnic identity (Zečević & Drljača 1982: 417). From 1981, research of diaspora was undertaken within the project "The Ethnological Study of the Emigration from Serbia". For the first time, ethnological research stepped out of the state borders, but not out of the national ones. Research fellows from the Institute received their first research assignments. In the period 1981–1986, research was carried out in Canada (Miroslava Lukić Krstanović)²², in Chicago (Mirjana Pavlović), in Duluth, Minnesota (Dušan Drljača). In theoretical and methodological sense, it was the first time that research of emigration and ethnic processes was put within the frame of reference of modern scientific trends and tendencies such as symbolical context of ethnic identity, transcultural processes and Fredrik Barth's concept of "ethnic boundaries". By presenting ethnic identity as a construct and a problem, rather than an ideal type model to serve the purposes of ideological glorification, it was enough for the ethnology to free itself from its traditionalist hermeticism (but not enough). Those were the years when the ethnographic research, instead of positioning itself natively, focused on new grounds,

²² This research, which lasted several months, was funded by the Ministry of Science of the Republic of Serbia.

namely on Chicago and Canada (Ontario), and on urban areas and megalopolises, which is of particular importance. Field work lasted for several months, which guaranteed stationary concept of research – great deal of interviews, material from the archives, consultations with professors and experts in the field of ethnic studies and migration from the Universities in Canada and the USA, contacts made within multicultural institutions, immigration bodies and emigration organizations, etc. Those researches were among the first ones carried out in the Serbian and Yugoslav diaspora in Canada and the USA, which also aroused interest of the emigration and immigration establishments. It was applicable work, and those projects were backed by state policies, as well as the academic programs in both the immigration and migration countries. Although there were renowned supervisors for those researches, it was the researchers who managed to educate and organize themselves on their own, establishing adequate and modern theoretical and methodological frameworks and approaches, which were based on communicational and symbolical analyses of the indicators of ethnic identities, as very complex and multifaceted occurrences of social stratification in multicultural societies. Researchers' immersion in ethnic problems of the emigrants and their descendants showed that there was a process of specific stratification of the identity going on, which was manifest in whatever was handed down from their home environments, which was being segmented or reshaped in immigrant or multicultural environments (Lukić Krstanović 1991: 200–210, Pavlović 1990: 91–105). Finally, it served to dispel the misconceived interpretation of ethnic phenomena/problems solely as traditional essentialism and nationalization of cultural migratory phenomena. Results of the research of emigration were presented as monographs and papers published in local and foreign publications; however, due to impending financial difficulties, politically conflicting events and economic embargo, they halted. The nationalist but also the other propaganda employed for the glorification of the Serbian and other nations, wherever they were, which a number of researchers of ethnicity and diaspora dissociated themselves from, did not leave enough room for maneuver for scientific autonomy and critical judgments.²³

Economic migration, set out as a problem in sociological studies, political economy and demography, has usually been put in the context of observation of the dynamics and the process of population movements from developing societies to industrialized capitalist societies. It is evident that these research resources have not been adequately recognized by ethnology, which unrelentingly stuck to its ethnic research autonomies. However, as part of the Institute's program, there were research projects that didn't go unnoticed, drawing attention to causal trends in labor migration, pointing to temporary long-term arrangements in the positioning of migrant guest

²³ In the 1990s, the authors of the books *Serbs in Canada* and *Serbs in Chicago* refused to take part in any kind of public appearance with the propagandist purpose of glorification of the Serbian emigration and proving their great importance for the *Serbian cause*. Those were the years when pseudo-analysts and quasi experts on the diaspora were at the zenith of their media popularity, asserting that there are great numbers of Serbs in the world and affirming their importance for the nation.

workers' role and status in relation to their home environment. The research was focused on the territory of the Eastern Serbia, as the largest guest workers "enclave". Ethnographic observation was based on single-site location in situationist research mobilization *hic et nunc*. The research in Ljubičevac village, which a large number of its denizens left to work in Denmark, first carried out in 1973 by anthropologist Carl Ulrik Schierup, who was followed in 1975 by Dušan Drljača, as a part of an exclusive archeological-ethnological project related to the construction of the hydroelectric power plants Djerdap 2 and the overflowing of villages, provided ethnographic input in shedding light on the transformations of cultural values of emigrants-immigrants. But in this case, just as in the research carried out subsequently (Bratić and Malešević 1982, Romelić and Stojanović 1989, Drljača 1991, Antonijević 2000), cultural changes in transmigratory lives were noticeable, and therefore interesting for research mostly in the area of economic ruptures – spending and the reactivation of status symbols (house, money-spending, weddings, etc.). No doubt that making ethnological observation and taking heed of such phenomena was important, because social and economic consequences of cultural transfers were put within the frame of reference of value structures/characteristics. Later on, research of labor migrants going from central Serbia (Priboj, Ivanjica, Arilje) to the European countries, such as Germany, Austria and France, were focused on the problem of separated families and total reshaping of lifestyles and cultural values in everyday life. Nevertheless, ethnological research of migration and external migration were lacking both in research potential and research strategy so as to maintain certain continuity. Needless to say, the Academy's exclusive attested project prevailed, with its focus on research of ethnic identity and the Serbian diaspora. It is evident that only a small number of papers referred to Yugoslav population of labor or Yugoslav migration (Secanski Noussair 1981: 35, Jakovljević 1989: 109). Clearly, topics that could be subsumed under the *parent symbol* "Yugoslav" were underrepresented, and avoided or bypassed instead, although it is a known fact that notions of shared belonging, social affiliation (organizations etc.) and ethnically mixed families have left their mark on what used to be called "Yugoslav emigration". Likewise, emigration of other ethnicities from Yugoslavia was not a topic in ethnological research at the Institute, except for a small number of papers in the Bulletin, such as Muslims emigrating to Turkey and Muslims emigrating to Palestine (Mušović, 1981: 65, Seferović 1981: 47).

From a Planning National Parent Symbol to Recent Topics

Starting from the 1990s, with the disintegration of Yugoslavia and ethnic conflicts in the Western Balkans region, along with the process of constitution of state entities (Republic of Serbia), the national interest has been to a great extent put on a pedestal by the scientific policy. From 1991, the leading project at the Institute of Ethnology was denominated "Ethnology of the Serbian People and Serbia", while its sub-project on emigration was renamed "Serbs in the Diaspora and Ethnic Minorities in the Territory of Serbia". During that period, research was entirely focused on ethnic and

national minorities in the neighboring countries, particularly in Hungary (Prelić, 1995; Pavlović, 1991; Lukić Krstanović, 1991), and after 2000 also in Romania (Pavlović, 2012). The question/problem of ethnic identity is thus introduced into multiethnic environments of neighboring countries, which have shaped their habitus through long history of multigenerational (co)existence. It is clear that those researches, both in methodological and empirical sense, required a different kind of field work, which turned toward processes of continuity in preserving or losing one's ethnic identity, rather than observing migratory processes. The contextualization of ethnic identity was problematized primarily through different social and cultural processes (waves of immigration and intergenerational stratification) and symbolization of elements/indicators on the road that stretches between real and imagined phenomena/perceptions of origins and belonging. It is those ethnological researches that brought the analytical discourse to the point of reexamination of the ethnicity, rather than ethnicization of the phenomena.

The dissolution of the socialist Yugoslavia, wars in the Balkans region, economic recession and embargo, political antagonisms, state instability, refugees, visa requirements, reshaped migratory movements within the sphere of emigration and migration both from the country and within it. However, those tumultuous years and hyper-occurring ruptures in everyday existence did not eventuate in organized research programs, since research was aimed more at individual initiatives in observing some of the current issues, such as the problems of refugees. Only in some cases did preexisting situation, circumstances and research motives bring about a subjective response to zoom in on certain occurrences/processes. Miroslava Malešević wrote about a network of women refugees from the former Yugoslavia which was formed in New York (Malešević, 1995: 198), while Ljiljana Gavrilović researched on virtual networks of refugees (Gavrilović 2007: 63).

In recent years, the Institute's planning policy has been partially harmonized with the flows in state politics and scientific institutional restructuring and harmonization with European standards, which can also be observed in project names such as "Multiethnicity, Multiculturalism, Migrations: Contemporary Processes".²⁴ On the one hand, more attention is paid to the problems of ethnic and national communities in multiethnic areas in Serbia, and related to this, to migration processes, such as the Germans in Vojvodina (Krel 2014), while on the other hand, recent migrations are observed, too. Topics now dwell on the following issues: 1. Conceptualization of the problems of refugees and irregular migrants; 2. Scientific networking and programming of research in Serbia; 3. Migrants in the metropolis (case study of Gorani people); 4. New labor markets, etc. Diversifying migrant mobility points to the fact that anthropological research primarily lays stress on trans-individual resources and mediating agents, which is associated with the communicational approach and the narrative discourse. Now the focus is not (only) on ethnic enclaves and collective identities, but likewise on networks and circulation flows that have been established

²⁴ This is the last planning cycle 2010–2014, which is funded by the Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Serbia.

by modern communications and technologies. Within the Institute of Ethnography, research is carried out according to individual interests and the selection of topics that make a relevant step forward, because they shed light on very sensitive questions, often politically abused. Here I will single out current researches going on within projects at the Institute of Ethnography. Marta Stojić Mitrović focuses her research on asylum systems and irregular migrations, particularly on the reception of migrants in their home environment by the institutions and local population, as well as on the discursive practices that serve to justify or criticize such treatment. Sanja Zlatanović carried out extensive field research among members of the Serbian community in Southeastern Kosovo (in Vitina enclave, in Gnjilane and surrounding villages, as well as among people displaced from this region in several towns in Serbia in the period 2003–2006). Jadranka Djordjević Crnobrnja centers her research on the Gorani ethnic community, primarily its members living in Belgrade. In her research, Dragana Radojčić targeted the markedly increasing immigration trend of Russians coming to Montenegro, that is, reasons for the creation of new immigration points as socioeconomic interests, which served to establish new value distinction among residents *us–them*. These researches of migration are conceived of in the context of current socioeconomic and political situation, following a period of political instability and transition in the region starting from the 1990s. The ethnographic topography and anthropological contextualization of these topics profoundly pervade contemporary global problems, such as stigmatization of strangers and dehumanization of irregular migrants, as well as profoundly altered context of identity politics in border zones of identification.

Ethnology and Anthropology of Migration toward Transdisciplinary Mobility

Presently, for the migration studies to be situated in a proper frame of reference, it is necessary to undertake a critical reexamination, even revision of the earlier research. That necessary critical mass brings about a new apprehension and pondering of scientific policies not for reasons of state duty, but for the sake of scientific competence. On the other hand, what is the point of resorting to an endless sequence of published material and to search for something that is gone, when every day we are faced with new changes, destinations, decisions, circulation flows. Although continually conducted within institutional programs, ethnological and anthropological research on migration in Serbia was not adequately favored so as to become a relevant scientific field and academic program for studies and education. Migration research was recognized and fixed within given program contents as ethnic phenomena, and in general its standing hasn't changed much since. Culture-historical approach in the mapping of areal territories, ethnic categorization, functional approaches in social transformations and symbolical restructuring of ethnic identity set the guidelines for program and scientific policies in ethnological migration studies, taking into consideration the time frame from the mid 20th century to the 1990s. In the discursive sense, we can speak

about ethnographization and ethnologization of migration as scientific processes of problem-tracking, with partial confrontation of micro and macro levels of cultural, political and economic realities. In the range from ethnicization of migration, to sociocultural frameworks, and problematization of ethnicity, to emigration flows and transmigratory resources, keeping track of migrations has followed an ambiguous course, encompassing rigid/traditionalist or dynamic research practices, old/new scientific concepts, targeted programs, as well as independent initiatives, all the while instigating both individual and team work aimed at opening theoretical and methodological doors in ethnology. It was an ambiguous status that research/researchers had in between ideologies, politics and science. Research on migrations at the Institute of Ethnography SASA was sometimes delayed, missing, or outdated, as well as overseen and self-initiated. Therefore, ethnologists at the Institute, who have spent many years studying and researching this phenomenon, having gone through relevant scientific experiences, can assume a (self)critical stance, and be trustworthy when making comments and questions about the way the research policy on migrations has been formed, and the way the phenomenon of migration has been shaped by scientific and political transformations. Both history and ethnology have somewhat neglected migration studies in the Balkans and the territory of the former Yugoslavia. Notwithstanding the book *Imagining the Balkans*, by Maria Todorova, papers on the Balkan migratory processes, on the generation of concepts, on the *here* and *there* in the Balkans, on Balkan stereotypes in terms of *us* and *others*, are yet to find their proper place in monograph publications by local researchers. Likewise, studies on the Yugoslavization of migration have become uninteresting in the face of frantic nationalization of migration. Papers on various Yugoslav constructs (sense of belonging, social organizations, cultural life, etc.), on the processes of existence and the disintegration of all those concepts and identities, remained somewhere on the margins of scientific interest. Migration studies, connoting all dramatic outcomes in the war-torn 1990s, with trials and tribulations of refugee life, remained within confines of national borders. All scientific work in this area was declared to be national cause or else it was unready to look into the *face* of the tragedy and evil throughout the region of the former Yugoslavia.

On the other hand, sudden interest and fragmented research conducted by ethnologists and anthropologists today mark a significant headway; however, it takes time to extend relevant scientific and research potential *here* and *there* alike.²⁵ Research experience has shown that the ethnologists who started their scientific careers conducting research on migrations within projects carried out at the Institute lacked educational groundwork in the field of ethnology and anthropology of migration. There has never been such a course as part of the studies in ethnology and anthropology. Therefore, whether it dealt with labor migrations, ethnic identities and

²⁵ Worth mentioning is the book by Dragana Antonijević, *Stranac ovde, stranac tamo, antropološko istraživanje kulturnog identiteta gastarbajtera [Stranger Here, Stranger There: An Anthropological Study on the Cultural Identity of Guest Workers]*, as part of a project carried out at the Department of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade.

emigration processes, or global migration policies in theoretical discourse, research was leaning on simultaneous learning process, which was often acquired through foreign literature and study visits to universities abroad. Migration research also required an interdisciplinary approach: demographic statistics, accessing records and archives, conversance with judicial systems and legal regulations both in emigration and immigration countries, knowledge of social psychology, sociology, etc. Micro and macro, local and global migration markets are certainly too complex phenomena/problems that need to be opened up from all sides.

Migration dynamics always raise questions: why do movements of people from place A to place B happen exactly at specific moments in time and in specific areas? Micro and macro policies and markets that have the bifurcating global structures²⁶ – wars, ethnic conflicts, natural disasters, poverty and labor markets – certainly draw global and local migration maps which are never fully finished processes, transnational or translocal, but rather circulating movements of people. The state and scientific policies should be concordant in one respect, namely that migrations are an irrefutable reality of living, with all positive and negative consequences, which are permanently kept track of and examined. It is very useful for the Institute's projects, programs and initiatives to become networked, along with the other scientific institutions and domains, so as to generate constant research flow that deepens and problematizes incomplete or intensified processes of human mobility. Although I did claim that the field of migration has not been adequately represented in ethnology, and that it is very important to activate all scientific potentials to that end, I still believe that we should all beware of parochialism in our disciplines. Scientific conference which is going to be held in December 2014 with the aim to expound on migrations as scientific assignment on a transdisciplinary level, and thus to raise relevant issues that definitely go beyond national, state, local, and regional borders. Poverty, economic interests, natural disasters, wars and armed conflicts, terrorism and crime are drawing many migratory routes on daily basis. Nowadays, mobility and functionality of research require cooperation and compatibility in research, and needless to say, financial aptness to pull through on the (inter)national scientific market. To achieve functionality in research, there are no other options but to rely on its own scientific potentials, to receive financial endorsement from the state and international institutions, and all the same, to stay free from state and national tutelage and propaganda.

Literature

- Антонијевић. Драгана. 2000. „Сватовац” и гламурозна венчања – свадбени феномени у североисточној Србији, у: *Жизненијат цикл*, Етнографски институт с Музеи, при БАН, Софија, 251–264.
- Бандић. Душан. 1979. Неке новије промене у животу и култури становништва

²⁶ According to Rosenau, structures and processes are bifurcating systems which influence one another in turbulent interplays, which make it impossible to predict events, and form particular cascades, i.e. sequences of actions that are unpredictable realities (Rosenau 1990: 299).

- околине Београда, *Зборник Етнографског института САНУ*, књ. 9, 1–105.
- Bratić Dobrila i Malešević Miroslava. 1982. Kuća kao statusni simbol, *Etnološke sveske*, IV, Beograd, 144–152
- Џвијић. Јован. 1987. *Балканско полуострво и јужнословенске земље*, књ. 2, Српска Академија наука и уметности, Књижевне новине и Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, Београд.
- Čizmić. Ivan, Mikačić. Vesna. 1974. *Neki suvremeni problemi iseljništva iz SR Hrvatske, I dio*, Zagreb.
- Дрљача Душан и Зечевић Слободан. 1981. Приступ етнолошком проучавању исељеништва из Србије, *Зборник радова Етнографског института САНУ*, књ.12, Београд.
- Дрљача Душан и Зечевић Слободан. 1982. Етнолошко проучавање исељеништва из Србије, *Међународни проблеми*, 3–4, Институт за међународну политику и привреду, 413–419.
- Дрљача. Душан. Село Љубичевац у Дунавском Кључу, *Развитак*, 15, 1975, 51–57.
- Дрљача. Душан. 1991. Неке етнолошке промене у вези са спољним радним миграцијама из Ђердапског подручја, *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ XL*, Београд, 49–74.
- Дробњаковић. Боривоје. 1958. На почетку друге деценије рада Етнографског института, *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ*, бр. VII, Београд, 1–4.
- Iseljništvo naroda narodnosti Jugoslavije i njegove uzajamne veze sa domovinom*, Zavod za migracije, Zagreb, 1978.
- Јаковљевић. Бранка. 1989. Југословени у Катвајку и Рајнсбургу, Холандија, *Зборник радова Етнографског института САНУ*, књ. 20, Београд, Крел, Александар, *Ми смо Немци, Етнички идентитет припадника немачке националне мањине у Војводини на почетку 21. века*, Етнографски институт САНУ, посебно издање књ. 80, Београд, 2014.
- Лукић Крстановић. Мирослава. 1992. *Срби у Канади, живот и симболи идентитета*, посебно издање књ. 36, Етнографски институт САНУ: Београд.
- Лукић Крстановић. Мирослава. 1991. Значај Извора у проучавању етничког идентитета – Срби у Батањи, *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ XL*, Београд. 14–161.
- Лутовац. Милисав. 1958. Миграције и колонизације у Југославији и прошлости и садашњости, *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ VII*, Београд.
- Лутовац. Милисав. 1987. Поговор у: Јован Џвијић, *Балканско полуострво*, САНУ, Београд 1987.
- Марјановић. Милош. 1995. Гастарбајтерско село, *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ XLIV*, Београд, 247–260.
- Марковић. Р. 1952. Извештај о фолклорној збирци Етнографског института, *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ*, 1/1-2, 584–585.
- Мушовић. Ејуп. 1981. Југословенско исељеништво у Турској, *Зборник радова*

- Етнографског института, књ. 12, Београд.
- Николић. Десанка. 1997. Теренска истраживања, *Споменица Етнографског института 1947–1997*, Етнографски институт Српске Академије наука и уметности, Београд, 31–46.
- Павичевић. Александра. 2004. Нека питања спољних миграција југословенског становништва током друге половине двадесетог века – Време за преиспитивање, *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ LII*, Београд, 129–136.
- Павловић. Мирјана. 1990. *Срби у Чикагу, Проблеми етничког идентитета*, Етнографски институт САНУ, посебно издање књ. 32, Етнографски институт САНУ и истраживачка задруга Идеа, Београд.
- Павловић. Мирјана. 2012. *Срби у Темпшвару*, Етнографски институт САНУ, посебно издања књ. 78, Етнографски институт САНУ, Београд.
- Павловић. Мирјана. 1991. Појмовно – методолошки оквир проучавања етничког идентитета – Срби у Батањи, *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ XL*, Београд, 131–145.
- Pavlović. Mirjana. 2003. The Role of Immigrant Organisation in the Community life – Serbs in Chicacago, *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ L–LI*, Београд, 62–69.
- Pišev Marko, 2013. *Politička etnografija i srpska intelektualna elita u vreme stvaranja Jugoslavije 1914–1919: Slučaj Jovana Cvijića*, Srpski genealoški cenatar i Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta: Centar za antropologiju nauke i obrazovanje, Београд.
- Pravna enciklopedija*. 1979. Savremena administracija, Београд.
- Прелић. Младена. 1995. *Срби у селу Ловри поред Будимпеште у XX веку*, „Издан”, Будимпешта.
- Prelić. Mladena. 2003. Ethnic Identity: the Serbs in Hungary, *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ L–LI*, Београд, 71–78.
- Prelić. Mladena. 2008. Ethnographical Institute of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SASA) in Search of the Lost subject of Serbian Ethnology: From Ethnos to the Ethnic identity, in: *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II, Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe* (ed. Vintil Mihăilescu, Ilia Piev, Slobodan Naumović), vol.17, LIT, Berlin, 261–285.
- Primorac. Milena. 1980. *Strani radnici, sociološki aspekti privremen ekonomske emigracije*, Studentski izdavački centar Univerzitetske konferencije SSO Beograda, Београд.
- Радовановић. Миљана. 1972. Перспективе рада у Етнографском институту, *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ XXI*, Београд, 13–17.
- Радовановић. Војислав. 1952. Јован Цвијић – из перспективе савремене научне мисли један поглед на живот и научно дело великог српског научника, с нарочитим обзиром на антропогеографију и етнографију, на дан двадесетпетогодишњице његове смрти (16.1.1927 –16.1.1952). *Гласник Етнографског института САН 2 – 3* (1953–54): 1–66.
- Радојичић. Драгана. 2009. Колонисти из Црне Горе на Косову и Метохији у

- првим деценијама 20. века. *Зборник радова Филозофског факултета Универзитета у Приштини* (ур. Драги Миланковић), Косовска Митровица, 93–94.
- Ромелић. Живка и Стојановић. Марко. 1989. Неки елементи културе гастарбајтера Ђердапских насеља, *Етнолошке свеске X*, Београд. 197–202.
- Rosenau. James. 1990. *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity*: Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Сефреновић. Нина. 1981. Колонија херцеговачких Муслимана у Кајзерију у Палестини, *Зборник радова Етнографског института САНУ*, књ. 12, Београд. 47–64.
- Сечански. Јованка Noussair. 1981. Историја миграција југословена у Аустралији, *Зборник радова Етнографског института САНУ*, књ. 12, Београд. 35–46.
- Собисјак. В. 1978. Исељеништво као предмет етнолошких проучавања, *Гласник Етнографског института САНУ XXVII*, Београд, 9–21.
- Зборник радова Етнографског института САНУ*. 1984. књ. 14–16, Београд.
- Златановић. Сања. 2011. Family in the Post-War Context: The Serbian Community of Southeast Kosovo, *Southeast European (Post)Modernities* (Klaus Roth, Jutta Lauth Vacas, eds.), *Ethnologia Balkanica* 15, LIT Verlag, Berlin, 227–250.

Мирослава Лукић Крстановић

Истраживања миграција: етнологија и политика

Етнографског института САНУ (1947–2014)

Етнолошка истраживања миграција у оквиру Етнографског института САНУ била су институционално позиционирана и сврсисходно усмеравана током протеклих шест деценија, сходно политичким и научним политикама. Теме и садржаји истраживања усађени су у актуелне политике, државне интересе и националне идеологије, што је умногоме одређивало ток, динамику, (не)зависност рада, односно – њихов утилитарни карактер. Да би се разумело

на који се начин стварала и остваривала политика проучавања миграција, потребно је расветлити историјски контекст конституисања и конструисања политика, тј. програма Етнографског института САНУ, који представљају важан истраживачки пункт и барометар научне актуелности и релевантности. Издвајају се следеће фазе институтских политика које се доводе у везу са истраживањем миграција: 1. Период истраживања ареалних области – политика антропогеографизације (1947–1964); 2. Период истраживања социо-културних

Кључне речи:
миграције,
етнологија,
научне
политике,
Етнографски
институт САНУ.

промена – политика етнографизације (1964–1980); 3. Период истраживања дијаспоре, етничитета и радних миграција – политика етнологизације (1980–2000); 4. Истраживања миграција у периоду кризе и транзиције - антропологизације (након 2000). Етнологска и антрополошка истраживања миграција у Србији, иако су се континуирано одвијала у оквиру институтских програма, нису била довољно фаворизована да би постала релевентна научна област и академски програм и предмет студија проучавања и едукација. Културно-историјски приступ у мапирању просторних ареала, етничке категоризације, функционални приступи друштвеним трансформацијама и симболичко реструктурирање етничког идентитета били су маркери програмских и научних политика етнологског проучавања миграција, имајући у виду временски распон од средине двадестог века до данас. Истраживачки пут праћења миграција био је усмераван, али и самосталан, традиционалистички, али и иновативан у подстицању индивидуалних иницијатива и тимског рада на отварању теоријских и методолошких врата. Био је то амбивалентан статус истраживања / истраживача – између идеологија, политика и науке. Истраживања миграција Етнографског института САНУ јесу понекад каснила, изостајала, застаревала, била усмеравана, самоиницијативна, динамична или статична. Истраживања миграција подразумевају интердисциплинарни приступ, што спутава сваки дисциплинарни парохизам, али она такође подразумевају јаке теоријско-методолошке оквире у свакој од дисциплина. Сигурно је да су микро и макро, локална и глобална миграјска тржишта сувише сложене појаве / проблеми, који се морају отворати са свих страна. Мобилност и функционалност истраживања сада тражи сарадњу и истраживачку компатибилност, наравно – и финансијску снажљивост на научном (интер)националном тржишту. Функционалност истраживања нема других могућности осим да се ослони на сопствене научне потенцијале, на финансијско разумевање државних и интернационалних институција, али изван државног и националног туторства и пропаганде.