

Fragments
of Memories

of Life and Work at
Inter–University Centre Dubrovnik
1971 – 2007

PUBLISHER

Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik
Don Frana Bulića 4, Dubrovnik

FOR PUBLISHER

Dr. Krunoslav Pisk

ISBN 978-953-99765-2-9

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the National
and University Library in Zagreb under the number 697154

Fragments
of Memories
of Life and Work at
Inter–University Centre
Dubrovnik
1971 – 2007

Edited by Berta Dragičević & Ørjar Øyen

Inter
University
Centre
Dubrovnik



Foreword I

The remarkable 35th anniversary of the Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik, celebrated in the fall of 2007, motivated me to start this project, i.e., to set up a booklet, a patchwork of short personal accounts of some of the people who have left their great mark upon the IUC history.

In the late fall of 2007, I wrote to many IUC friends and invited them to contribute to this booklet. It was meant to be a special present to the IUC and also their gift to me personally which would add special value to the decades I spent with the IUC. It was not easy to give strict suggestions on the expected content, yet it was inspiring to motivate IUC friends to contribute to this booklet. Some of enclosed texts arrived as early as the spring of 2008 while many others took some more time. The texts vary from rational to emotional but they all contain individual experiences and offer fragments of the long and rich IUC history.

This, certainly, is not a compilation of educational and scientific achievements of the IUC. It is a collection of reminiscences of some of the longest-standing IUC associates and partners who have been addicted to the IUC for years and who were captured by Dubrovnik and its genius loci. All IUC officials and course organisers present in the collection have left deep traces in IUC history and have greatly contributed to its success and growth. They have passionately promoted the basic goal of IUC, i.e., bringing together people from different backgrounds and cultures and advocating dialogue and understanding.

I wish to express how proud I am for having worked and lived with the IUC from its very beginning in 1971. In times of peace, war, and post-war it was an immense honour and challenge to contribute to the life and work of the IUC in the position of the IUC Executive Secretary.



Through this publication, I wish to extend my deep gratitude to all who enriched Dubrovnik, my hometown, placing it on the world map as an important centre for international cooperation, and who have also enriched my own life, teaching me unforgettable lessons of openness, tolerance, and respect of diversities.

The Inter–University Centre was for me a unique experience, and my deepest gratitude goes to Academician Ivan Supek, the founder of IUC, who introduced me into the IUC world.

I dedicate this book to the memory of Hinko and to my sons, Mladen and Marko, who have throughout so many years accepted “to share” me with IUC!

Dubrovnik, 5 March 2009

Berta Dragičević

Honorary Member of IUC

Foreword II

At the time of the Inter–University Centre’s anniversary celebrations in the spring of 2007, the soul and spirit of the Inter–University Centre, our beloved and highly esteemed friend Berta Dragičević came up with one more of her creative ideas. She felt that now was the time to put on record some more personal accounts of associations with this special institution over the last decades of service to the international academic community. She circulated a note addressed to long–time friends of the IUC, presenting her proposal – from which I quote:

The remarkable 35th anniversary of the Inter–University Centre has also a very special meaning for me. Ever since October 1, 1971, I have worked and thus matured with the IUC. Throughout these long years, I have been enriched by hundreds of friendships and acquaintances. I owe immense gratitude to many outstanding people with whom I worked and from whom I learnt so much.

I would now like to capture, if only in fragments, the presence and vivid interaction of many of you from various national and professional backgrounds who worked in the framework of the IUC and thus promoted the universal idea of science and friendship in my home town.

I plan to carry out a project for which I need your help and cooperation. I wish to publish a booklet, a patchwork non–fiction edition consisting of a number of short personal accounts of episodes related to people you encountered here, your memories of time spent at the IUC and Dubrovnik. I ask you to write ... on something you particularly remember from your work at the IUC, focusing not only on the scientific context of your studies but also on people and on experiences you had here around.

It was indeed a worthy cause. The response was perhaps more than Berta had anticipated. A number of contributions kept coming and gave her reason to be very



happy about the effort. The greetings, articles, and essays cover a wide range of genres and styles and moreover, they offer a wide range of insights into life at the IUC and in Dubrovnik and thus also form a supplement to the history of the institution. Above all, the contributions are in essence an expression of gratitude to the IUC and to those who made the institution possible. Readers will be touched – as I am – by the articulation of appreciation for what the IUC has entailed on the personal level and in terms of scholarly contact and network-building across various kinds of boundaries in a troubled world. We sense genuine love for the IUC as well as for the city of Dubrovnik and its friendly people.

Of course, Berta's invitation could not reach all those who might have wished to offer their voice to the chorus. Yet, I feel that the 38 contributions across a variety of contents, styles, and genres give a fair expression of the locus of the IUC in the minds of those who have kept coming to Dubrovnik over the years.

I offered Berta my help in compiling the contributions into a format that could serve as a basis for further processing toward a printed edition. The editing has been light. A few more or less obvious misspellings have been corrected and, hopefully, some sentences here and there have been improved. Yet, in the English text a lot of foreign accent remains – that's also how it is in everyday life within the premises of the IUC!

Bergen and Dubrovnik, 5 March 2009.

Ørjar Øyen

Honorary Member of IUC

Table of Contents

<i>Foreword I</i>	5	9
<i>Foreword II</i>	7	
 <i>Eugen Pusić</i> A Good Idea	 13	
 <i>Berta Dragičević</i> Memories, Memories...	 16	
 <i>William H. Allaway</i> Remembrances of Dubrovnik	 29	
 <i>Marianna Birnbaum</i> Henrik Birnbaum	 34	
 <i>James Brown</i> Dubrovnik Reminiscences	 36	
 <i>Ognjen Čaldarović</i> The Everlasting, Unique, Durable and Unbreakable Inter-University Centre in Dubrovnik	 38	
 <i>Vida Demarin & Zlatko Trkanjec</i> Healthy Lifestyle and Prevention of Stroke	 41	
 <i>Ante Graovac</i> Twenty-four Years of MCC Meetings at Inter-University Centre	 44	

<i>Goran Gretić</i> Dubrovnik's Encounter	48
<i>Robert Hayes</i> Memories of People at the Inter–University Center, Dubrovnik, 1977 to 2008	50
<i>Nenad Hlača</i> A Greeting of Thanks from Rijeka	53
<i>Dunja Jutronić</i> Philosophy of Linguistics Conferences in Dubrovnik	56
<i>Peter Kampits</i> Greetings!	60
<i>Biljana Kašić</i> The Power of Remembering	63
<i>Gottfried Künzlen</i> Dubrovnik and its Inter–University Centre: A Look Back	66
<i>Frank Laubert</i> Some Scraps from the IUC	69
<i>Dada Maglajlić</i> Pictures from the Memory Box	75
<i>Silva Mežnarić</i> Hotbed of Excellence: The IUC – Information on Time about Time 1977–1987	79
<i>Nenad Mišćević</i> My Three Decades at the IUC: A Testimony	83
<i>Henning Salling Olesen</i> My Self–managed Experience of Self Management, or Self Management and the Management of Selves	88

<i>Michael Ott</i>		
IUC Reflections	94	
<i>Ørjar Øyen</i>		
Even the Carpet Tells a Story	96	
<i>Darko Polšek</i>		
Beneath Lovrijenac, around Danče: My Love and Life with the IUC	103	
<i>Zdravko Radman</i>		
IUC: The Place Where Intellectual Globalization Germinates	108	II
<i>Joanna Regulska</i>		
Dubrovnik Conversations	112	
<i>Werner Ruf</i>		
The Spirit of the IUC	114	
<i>Hans Joachim Seitz</i>		
Medical Summer Schools at IUC	118	
<i>Rudolf Siebert</i>		
Memories of Friends in my Life with the Inter–University Center	121	
<i>Fuada Stanković</i>		
A Greeting from Novi Sad	132	
<i>Bart van Steenbergen</i>		
Berta and Dubrovnik – Sweet Memories	134	
<i>Paul Stubbs</i>		
For Berta	137	
<i>Zvonimir Paul Šeparović</i>		
A Quarter Century of Victimology in Dubrovnik: A Personal View of People I Met	139	
<i>Ivan Urlić</i>		
A Very Unexpected Revelation	145	

<i>Alan Uzelac</i> My Encounters with the IUC: The Unfinished Story	147
<i>Kirsten Weber</i> Through Your Eyes Only	150
<i>Mitja Žagar</i> The IUC and the Course on Divided Societies	155
<i>Krunoslav Pisk</i> The Building in Don Frana Bulića 4 and the Spirit of IUC	161
<i>Peter Fischer–Appelt</i> Berta Dragičević: Ambassador of a Modern Academic Centre and an Ancient Maritime Republic	166

A Good Idea

By Eugen Pusić

Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts

The creation of the Inter–University Centre in Dubrovnik was a good idea. It is also an example of how many coincidences are needed, of favourable circumstances and sheer good luck, to make an idea good.

The principal promoter of the idea was the then rector of the University of Zagreb, Ivan Supek, a physicist who had spent some time working in the laboratories of Werner Heisenberg. Supek belonged politically to the Left, though in no sense to the then ruling Communist Establishment. In the absence of any real liberal political tradition in the country, an independent leftist orientation was a condition to appear trustworthy to the majority of Croatian intellectuals at the time. After the experience with Croatian right–wing nationalism during World War II and with communist dictatorship after it, nothing else could be expected. This basic trust motivated the first team of academics to follow Supek into the adventure of the IUC. It also persuaded the City of Dubrovnik to offer the building of its former Teachers College for the Centre.

The principle of international openness demanded that the directors of the Centre be selected among the academic staff of other universities, outside Croatia. So the first director, Johan Galtung, came from the University of Oslo. An adventurous spirit, if ever there was one, Galtung described himself as “70 percent Buddhist, 70 percent Marxist, and 70 percent Western Liberal”. Though he found it sometimes difficult – as anybody would – to keep the proper balance between these three demanding commitments, he launched the Centre, as a ship of exploration, towards unknown and challenging shores. As a fitting counter–weight, the second director, Siegfried Korninger, was neither Buddhist nor Marxist nor consciously liberal but a Central European professor from the University of Vienna. His idea of an Inter–University Centre was rather that of a regular institution of higher education,

Krunoslav Pisk and Eugen Pusić, in the
Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts
in Zagreb, in 2007, celebrating
Academician Pusić's promotion to
Honorary Member of IUC



that should follow in the tracks of existing universities and shun an excess of fancy in the make-up of its curriculum. In his emotions towards the Centre there might have been just a touch of a feeling of responsibility for the fate of higher education in one of the former Habsburg crown-lands.

Directors come and go. The fate of an organisation in the longer run depends rather on its permanent staff, pre-eminently on the leadership of that staff. It is here that the element of luck played a significant role in the creation of the IUC. Its Executive Secretary was from the start Berta Dragičević, coming from one of those old Dubrovnik families who have learned, in the course of centuries, how to combine immovable tenacity with elegant adaptability in the right proportion to survive as an independent city-state between the imperial ambitions of Venice and the imperial reality of the Ottoman empire.

This is how the Inter-University Centre became from an idea, a good idea. In two senses. In the present, we were happy there. To work on a problem of one's choice and of one's intensive interest in excellent company, both under the impulse of critical controversy and the complementary exchange of specialised knowledge, in a

geographically exciting and historically inspiring environment, is probably the nearest we can approach beatitude, this side of a hypothetical transcendence,

For the future, we realized that what had started as an adventure in academic exploration, with no holds barred, was likely to become the standard form of permanent learning which the increasing pace of discovery made necessary. After mastering the tools of the trade – language (maternal with one or two *linguas francas*), mathematics, computer – after learning the methods of research, after getting to know the facts of one's special field, the work itself could have no other form than a constant confrontational and at the same time mutually complementing dialogue. The ships of discovery have every chance of becoming normal vessels of transportation on scheduled lines.

May the *Inter-University Centre in Dubrovnik* live long and prosper!

Memories, Memories...

By Berta Dragičević

Honorary Member of IUC

16

It was Advent time some years ago. I walked into a shop on Stradun and on a shelf I saw a chocolate Advent calendar. It brought back memories from the late seventies when I used to receive such calendars from Vienna, sent by the then Director General, Siegfried Korninger. In those times such items could not be found in our part of the world. It was a special joy to receive those modest calendars; they were the first messengers of the approaching Christmas holidays and their spirit.

It is not simple to select out of a dense concentrate of memories the ones that are the most important and relevant. The immense amount of flashbacks includes vivid pictures of so many IUC events and personalities. The reminiscences of long decades which I spent with the IUC, the exciting and challenging struggles, successes and joys shared with so many wonderful people are an immense treasure. I was privileged to be a part of the unique IUC project. It developed and prospered thanks to numerous dedicated volunteers who served IUC as directors, members of the Executive Committee, Council, and course directors. I remember particularly well those exceptional people who have been at the helm of this institution. Here I can only pay homage to a few of them due to the lack of space, but many more are in my memories and in my heart. Some of those mentioned here are still active and contribute to the work of the Centre and some have left us but remain part of memories that still live within the IUC.

Academician Ivan Supek, Rector of the University of Zagreb and later President of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, a great humanist and visionary, already in 1970 had the idea to establish IUC and to make Dubrovnik its home. In the fall of 1971 I accepted his offer to work for the Centre, which was then in the stage of first preparations for its operation. Looking back to that time, I am well aware that it was a chance which happens once in a lifetime, a chance I seized with immense joy.



1st Council Meeting in June 1972. Paul Milhøj, Predrag Vranicki, Ørjar Øyen, Berta Dragičević, Ante Pažanin, Karl Wohlmuth



Academician Ivan Supek with colleagues visiting Dubrovnik on December 14, 1991

My earlier jobs in this city of great history and impressive culture, yet rather small and without sufficient openness, were fine but not too exciting. The plans for such an international programme to be developed in Dubrovnik and thus place my city on the world map of science and culture presented a wonderful opportunity that I could not miss. I am forever grateful to Ivan Supek for bringing me into such an interesting programme.

Through many years of my work with IUC in each of the manifold occasions of meeting Ivan Supek I was again and again impressed by his incredible enthusiasm and trust in the importance of his vision of bringing the world to Dubrovnik, creating a special free haven where people from different backgrounds and cultures would meet and work in an atmosphere of openness and tolerance. As Rector Magnificus of the University of Zagreb, Supek invited the world to Dubrovnik and the world from Europe to America responded to his invitation with great enthusiasm. It was particularly impressive how – in spite of unfortunate changes in the political situation in Yugoslavia occurring in early 1972 and making him a political “persona non grata” – he never gave up, but rather intensified his engagement on this project, even more.

With immense energy and with the help of numerous colleagues from all around the world he incessantly pursued the IUC goals. He organized some of the first IUC courses and following his invitation the most important world scholars from various fields of science came to the Centre, among them Nobel Prize winners Werner Heisenberg, Linus Pauling, Hans Alfvén, to mention just a few, who greatly contributed to the international reputation of the Centre’s work. When in the spring of 1974 Werner Heisenberg came to Dubrovnik to give the opening lecture in Supek’s course series on the Philosophy of Science, I had the privilege of taking him and his wife on a tour, a visit around the city. They were quite interested to see and learn about our cultural heritage and I was particularly happy to invite them for tea to my place on Bunićeva Poljana when we were walking nearby. I remained impressed by how nice and gentle our Nobel Prize winner guest was. Supek’s international contacts were always most important for the Centre’s development and acceptance in the scientific circles of the world.

In times of war, as President of the Croatian Academy, Supek continuously appealed to the international community to help the Centre rise again and continue its valuable mission. He was the first to come to Dubrovnik only a few days after the



Siegfried Korninger and wife Inge in Hamburg on the occasion of the Executive Committee meeting in 1985. Behind them is Monica Partridge (Nottingham)

destruction of the IUC building in December 1991. In the then besieged city he organized a conference for the revitalization of Dubrovnik and for the preservation of the Centre's continuity. His offices, both Rector's and President's, his telephones, his home, were open at all times when the Centre needed him for whatever help or support. In 1998, the City of Dubrovnik made him Honorary Citizen. His last visit to the Centre was on the occasion of the IUC's 30th anniversary in 2002 when all IUC members present were so proud and happy to have him with us.

I remember Ivan Supek with greatest respect as a man of unique integrity and am always grateful to him for the great gift he offered to my city by making it the seat of IUC.

Academician Eugen Pusić, from the University of Zagreb, was a co-founder of IUC. As expert professor of law, with great international reputation, Pusić constantly contributed to the IUC position in various stages of its life. In the very beginning he produced the text of the IUC Constitution which was adopted in August 1971, and then, in many difficult situations, he most successfully defended the IUC position and



Kathleen V. Wilkes

status. The foundation of the IUC Association perhaps would not have been possible without his support, his knowledge of the legal chances for such an association and his strong advocacy for it.

Academician Pusić also was director of one of the first IUC course series on the Local Government which still continues under the title of Economy and Democracy, now directed by his former students and assistants.

When in 2007 Academician Pusić was made Honorary Member of IUC, I was most proud to be honoured by the offer of the same title in the company of a professor I so much admired ever since in the sixties I was his student at the Law Faculty of the University of Zagreb.

Among my most cherished memories are the years spent working together with Kathleen Wilkes, a philosopher, an energetic lady from Oxford. Throughout two decades Kathy contributed to the work and success of the Centre. She was a most devoted “addict” engaged in different capacities, as course director, as Chair of the Executive Committee and in times of war as a most engaged defender of IUC and of Dubrovnik. Her mission in the war period was exceptional. The war months we spent together informing the world and in particular IUC friends and partners about the suffering of Dubrovnik and its people, dramatically appealing for their support, were a most memorable experience. Much too early we said goodbye to Kathy, depositing her ashes into the sea under Lovrjenac, according to her last wish. Kathy, an Honorary Citizen of Dubrovnik, a guardian angel of IUC, does represent a very special chapter of the IUC history.

Throughout my thirty-five years with the Centre I had the opportunity and privilege to work with seven outstanding General Directors.

Professor Johan Galtung from Oslo was our first Director General. He was guided into the Centre by Academician Ivan Supek, his colleague from the Pugwash group. Galtung was a scholar most widely known in the circles of sociologists, political scientists, future studies networks, and peace researchers. With incredible brio and energy he gave a strong impulse to the start of the IUC operation, introduced many international contacts and set up the very first IUC programmes. His colleagues from the Club of Rome, World Future Studies Federation, and peace institutes gladly accepted his invitations to lecture and participate in his courses. The practical formulas of the IUC office operation were also introduced by Galtung. He strongly motivated all of us at the Centre and impressed us with his widest international links.



Wroxton Abbey, near Banbury, England

It was unfortunate that a few years after he left the scene in a rather explosive way. His departure was motivated by political and practical misunderstandings with the university structures in Yugoslavia. But remembering him so many years after I am well aware of how valuable was his input and how lucky I was to work with him and learn such a lot at the very beginning of my engagement at the IUC.

In the late seventies Professor Siegfried Korninger, former Rector of the University of Vienna, succeeded Galtung as the Centre's Director General. He was a kind and gentle man, a man of great integrity who was strict and rigid when defending the IUC's autonomy and independence. His Austrian charm and efficiency greatly contributed to the development of the Centre. In that period, in the late seventies and early eighties, the IUC registered immense growth. And each of Siegfried's visits to Dubrovnik was memorable. We used to work hard, but also enjoyed time circulating with Hinko, my husband, around Dubrovnik surroundings. He loved my city, our summer house in Zaton, my mother's cuisine. (Just a small detail – Siegfried was particularly fond of a small palm tree just outside his office and

a turtle living near it. At each of his visits the first thing was to inspect whether the tree was alive and growing.)

I particularly well remember our lunches at Rozarij restaurant (which in those days was the preferred restaurant for most IUC participants) which were part of the daily schedule and offered chance for long friendly conversations. Siegfried's wisdom and friendliness were of a very rare kind. I was so very proud to have him as a friend, apart from his being our Director General.

In the late eighties it was again time for a change. Professor Ørjar Øyen, former Rector of the University of Bergen, one of the IUC founders, was elected as Director General. Before this election Ørjar held various important positions as the Chair of the IUC Council and as member of the Executive Committee. The ten years of his office as the Director General were the most turbulent years in the IUC history. It was most fortunate for IUC to have Ørjar as a leader in the war and post-war period. He was strong and most devoted and gave all of us in Dubrovnik necessary support and strength for going ahead, for continuing the mission of IUC in Dubrovnik at times when all seemed impossible, after the destruction of the IUC building and the long war months which stopped all activities. Among hundreds of people I met during my work with IUC it is impossible to single out anybody who can compete with Ørjar's contribution to the Centre and his most valuable friendship to all of us here.

Following Professor Øyen, the position of Director General was held by Professor Hylke Tromp, from Groningen University, Professor Helmuth Moritz, from the Technical University Graz, and Professor Ivo Banac, from Yale University. Working with each of the mentioned scholars was a most rewarding experience.

The current Director General, Professor Krunoslav Pisk, from Zagreb, now serves his second term as Director General and is contributing greatly to the Centre's promotion. He has been with IUC for some fifteen years and in a number of different capacities as an indefatigable supporter of the IUC operation. As President of the IUC Association Kruno has achieved the greatest merits in securing the Centre's smooth operation, particularly in the area of organizational matters and logistics of the operation. With great patience and skill he managed to secure valuable support of the Croatian Ministry of Science and also solid, good relations with the University of Zagreb.

When going back to the first IUC years, the figure of Professor Nasrollah Fatemi, from Fairleigh Dickinson University, New Jersey, a longstanding Chair of the Executive Committee stands out as someone who enriched the Centre with special



Ivan Supek, Karmen Bašić
and Ivan Prpić at the party of the OSI
Croatia in Zagreb

class and exceptional charisma. Fatemi joined the Centre as a friend of Academician Supek. He was an expert in financing and in Sufism philosophy. A grand old man, a gentleman from Iran, diplomat, member of numerous international associations like the Club of Rome and the World Congress of Unity, with a wife who was a princess from Shiraz, Fatemi wisely and tactfully helped guide the Centre through over fifteen years. In the mid seventies he organized at the Centre a conference on Arabs and Jews, a topic of utmost importance then as well as now. Fatemi's home university owned as its overseas campus the medieval Wroxton Abbey, near Banbury in Oxfordshire, England. In the seventies he generously hosted a number of important EC meetings there. The Wroxton Abbey was a place where several English kings and queens had dwelled and its medieval halls with fireplaces were a setting for many important discussions on the Centre's policy and plans.

I remember what a privilege it was to walk through the immense park with crowds of daffodils and silver squirrels, along the artificial lake and waterfalls ...

Ivo Banac, Director General, speaking
at the 30th Anniversary of the IUC,
in 2002



Stories were told about ghosts living in the Abbey, but they must have approved of our presence and never disturbed us.

No one could compete with Nasrollah's gift in telling the most interesting anecdotes and an endless number of jokes. In each of the encounters I was impressed by the impeccable butterfly ties that were always adorning him; each encounter with that gentleman was a most memorable event.

And then, last but not least, there is the outstanding figure of the great "protector" of the IUC, Dr. Peter Fischer-Appelt, longstanding President of Hamburg University, who joined the Centre at the very beginning. For almost twenty years he was Chair of the IUC Council and played an immensely important role in all stages of IUC life and work. His indefatigable engagement and support to the Centre were always crucial. His more than hundred visits to Dubrovnik testify of his "addiction" to the Centre and to the city. In any of the Centre's situations he was someone one could always turn to. And it is rare to find anyone who talks about Dubrovnik and its culture and history with more passion and respect. I am always so very grateful for his love and praise of my town.



US Ambassador Peter Galbraith donating books to IUC library in 1997

At this point it is a must to mention with gratitude a great IUC friend from Zagreb, the late Karmen Bašić, Director of the OSI (Open Society Institute) Croatia, a part of the Soros Foundation's network. The OSI Croatia was founded in the early nineties, and in that crucial period of IUC life Karmen offered us the most valuable financial support. It was the time when the Centre was rising up from the ashes (after the destruction of the IUC building in December 1991) and financial injections from the OSI, for scholarships, equipment, library, were essential for our going ahead. It would have been hard to survive without that help. I was happy that as a member of the OSI Board I could contribute to the Board's decisions in support of the IUC. Karmen's trust and confidence in the importance of the IUC's work in the then troubled, traumatized region badly in need of tolerance and openness that the IUC was promoting were priceless. She was a very special woman, an extraordinary manager, a real friend who unfortunately unexpectedly died too soon in one of her important missions in the East.

It is important to mention that we had the great luck that in the late eighties Mr. George Soros came to the IUC where his office organized a series of courses on the



35th Anniversary of IUC in 2007. Berta Dragičević (in centre) was promoted to Honorary Member of IUC

Central and Eastern Europe in Transition Processes. He was impressed by the mission and role of the IUC and based on the IUC experiences he founded the Central European University in Budapest. Because of his acquaintance with the work of the IUC, the OSI Croatia had immediately after its opening his green light to offer necessary support to the IUC. And Karmen implemented the Soros policy towards the IUC with the greatest understanding and good will.

After some ten years of support through the OSI Zagreb it was the HESP Programme of the Soros Foundation in Budapest that continued to support the IUC with scholarships fund for participants from the Southeast and East Europe. This valuable support still continues.



Srećko Kržić, Dube Kapetanić
and Berta Dragičević



Meeting with George Soros in Zagreb
in June 2005. Krunoslav Pisk,
George Soros, Berta Dragičević

My fragmentary memories include two more people, my longtime colleagues, Dube Kapetanić and Srećko Kržić. Because of their company, efficiency, dedication, and their warm friendship I so much enjoyed every work day at the Centre. The three of us were a team that could fulfil all expectations and perform all jobs with great satisfaction. It is also because of them that my long IUC years remain so precious and memorable.

Remembrances of Dubrovnik

By William H. Allaway

Director Emeritus, Education Abroad Program, University of California

Sitting in a plenary session of the meeting of the International Association of Universities in Montreal in August 1970, I was suddenly deeply moved by a plea from Rector Ivan Supek that there needed to be a means of increasing dialogue between Yugoslavia and western universities. As rector of the University of Zagreb he proposed that a center be established in Dubrovnik which would afford an opportunity for academics from any university to put together a short course in cooperation with other professors which could be attended by students from throughout the world with a special emphasis on participation from eastern and south-eastern European universities.

As then Director of the Education Abroad Program of the University of California responsible for hundreds of students studying in Europe each academic year, this appeared like a golden opportunity for our students to have an interesting experience wider than their enrolment in a single university. When the session ended I sought out Ivan and told him of my enthusiasm for the implementing of his dream and asked what I could do to help. He took my card and assured me that he would be in touch when there was a need for assistance to the project.

A year later a group which included Professor Ørjar Øyen and his wife, Prof. Else Øyen from the University of Bergen and President Peter Fischer-Appelt of the University of Hamburg met for five days in Park Hotel in Dubrovnik to discuss the proposal by Ivan Supek. One of the key factors in the discussion was a building just outside of the old city which was owned by the University of Zagreb and could serve as a focal point for the proposed program. I happened to be chairing the Committee on the Constitution and when our work was completed we had the framework for the Inter-University Center for Postgraduate Studies in Dubrovnik (IUC). One of the policies agreed upon was that each course would have at least two leaders from

different countries so that there would be different perspectives available in any given course offered at the IUC.

As a result of that meeting, Rector Supek proceeded to consult with the government and other interested parties to make it possible to initiate courses and the staff to administer the IUC. He had the good fortune to find Mrs. Berta Dragičević to serve as the head of the staff and her strong interest and great organizational skills resulted in rapid preparation of the facilities and the initiating of courses by faculty members from universities all over Europe and the United States. As the IUC grew and further developed she not only increased her responsibilities with the IUC but became strongly involved in the politics of Dubrovnik, including a period on the City Council and as Deputy Mayor. Her greatest challenge was probably to appeal to the Croatian as well as the international academic community to keep the IUC in Dubrovnik and have it continue its mission in spite of the destruction of the IUC building in December 1991.

This was a dangerous period to be in Dubrovnik because from September 1991 to mid-1993 the city was under periodic attack, including shelling from the sea and the mountains, sniper fire from the surrounding hills, and ultimately, the occupation of the surrounding villages and the siege of the city itself. It should be noted that for an extended period during the war, a member of the IUC governing body, Professor Kathleen V. Wilkes, from Oxford University, stayed in Dubrovnik, assisting the Mayor of Dubrovnik in spreading information about the suffering of Dubrovnik and its people to the international community, and also was actively engaged in many civil initiatives in the besieged city. Hers was an unforgettable experience. Many of us who viewed both the destruction of the inner part of the building of IUC and later its restoration were amazed at the wonderful job that Berta and Kathy had done in that difficult period of Dubrovnik and IUC history.

To turn now to the role played by the University of California Education Abroad Program (EAP) at the IUC, we started by assuming that the best time for encouraging our students to participate in the program was during the Easter vacation. We found that Dubrovnik had become a magnet for faculty interested in Peace Studies and that a number of different seminars were offered during that period of the academic year. Such peace researchers as Hylke Tromp from the Netherlands, Jan Öberg, a Dane teaching in Lund, Sweden, Håkan Wiberg, a Swede from the University of Copenhagen, Andrew Mack, from Australia, were presenting courses and either





Ivan Supek speaking at the 30th
Anniversary of the IUC, in 2002

accepted our students in their courses or would give lectures in courses which we set up for our own students and any others who wished to participate. Dubrovnik was an ideal venue for such courses because of its long history as a city state by the Adriatic Sea and because it was located on the brink of Eastern Europe but governed by a communist, Tito, who was deeply interested in dialogue with the West. It was only after his death that Yugoslavia divided along cultural lines, some of which led to conflict and outright war.

There have been many changes in the Education Abroad Program in the almost 20 years since I retired so I don't know how many faculty and students are now participating in the life of the IUC. I hope that study centers are still getting copies of the IUC offerings so that our students remain involved. I have noticed over the years that a variety of faculty and students from many parts of the world take part in a wide range of courses – and that gives me great pleasure.

Berta, this small summary of my involvement in the IUC is dedicated to you as the person who has given the IUC its very being in the face of some overwhelming obstacles. But it is not just your role in the IUC that we remember, but visits to your home, coffee or wine in a bar, and all of the ways you made strange people in a strange land comfortable in their tasks and their surroundings!!

Henrik Birnbaum

By Marianna D. Birnbaum

University of California, Los Angeles

34

My late husband Henrik Birnbaum and I were married for thirty-six years. Each summer we left our home in California and flew to Dubrovnik in order to spend a month in our most favorite city on earth.

When we first heard of plans to create an international study and research center in Dubrovnik, we greeted the idea with great enthusiasm. Because of our wonderful friend, the late Ivan Supek, the heart and mind of the project, we were able to follow, step by step, as his beautiful dream turned into reality. Soon, Ivan enlisted Henrik's active participation and he served as Member of the Executive Committee from 1974 to 79, and again from 1995. In 1996, he was elected Vice Chair of the Council and in 1998, he was made Honorary Member of the IUC.

Although later, I too served on the EC (1996–2002). Our commitment to the Center went beyond serving on committees. We both taught courses, scouted to find eligible students and helped increase the number of participating institutions. In 1989, Henrik donated a large number of books from his own collection to the IUC Library. Those books fell victim to the fire-bombs of the Serbian army.

We watched the devastation of our beloved city on American TV. However, as soon as it became possible, we went back Dubrovnik, to see what had happened. The sight that greeted us was pitiful. The airport had no runway, no lights, no building. With the exception of a group of Spanish soldiers (peace-keepers on furlough) we were the only guests in our hotel. The personnel were so moved by our loyalty that they tore up our bills and refused to take payment from us. Finally, the money went to the widow and the family of the hotel's cook. He was killed in the war.

Hoping for the revival of IUC and delighted with the fast work of reconstruction, in 1994, we sent a second shipment of books. They can be found on the shelves of the rebuilt IUC Library.



Henrik Birnbaum and Berta Dragičević

During the last couple of years of his life, my husband was too ill to serve, but we still visited Dubrovnik and immediately went to see our great friend Berta, and the staff.

Henrik died in the spring of 2002 and I set up a memorial fund in his honor. It stipulates that the Medieval Department of the Central European University in Budapest – where Henrik was the Chair of the Advisory Committee, and where we had both taught as visiting professors – is entitled to select and send two students each year to Dubrovnik. They can participate in a course, offered by the IUC. I think Henrik would have liked this.

I often return to Dubrovnik and to my friends at there. I am –forever – a fan of the IUC, and fervently hope that this important anniversary will be followed by many more years of activity and success.

Dubrovnik Reminiscences

By James Robert Brown

University of Toronto

36

Every room in the IUC had a picture of Tito on the wall. That's one of my strongest memories. It was a simple, unadorned, and dignified photo, probably from the time Tito was a partisan leader. It was resolute, assured, but unthreatening. When I first started coming to the IUC in the early 1980s, Yugoslavia was the perfect host for East–West meetings, and Dubrovnik the perfect site. It was liberal-minded and cosmopolitan, and it easily accommodated the tensions of the cold war. There were ironies galore. Many of us from the West hated Reagan and Thatcher and warned our Eastern colleagues of the foolishness of embracing their policies. Easterners, no less sure of themselves, told us how naive we were to think socialism works – at least not their version. And it was all washed down with slivovitz.

The war changed all that. The Philosophy of Science annual meetings continued every April even through the troubled times. We came and went by boat, since the city was under siege. We were often down to about ten people, whereas before the war over 100 would attend. The IUC was gutted in the shelling, so we met for a couple of years in the music school. Talks were accompanied by loud rehearsals next door. Our evenings were spent in the Argentina, the only hotel open at this time, which we shared with NATO, UN, and EU observers. Machine gun fire overhead was common in the nights, as was sniper fire into the city during the day. Walking next to a wall to stay out of site of the snipers becomes instinctive. Eventually, of course, things returned to some sort of normality, but they never returned to what they were. The breakup of Yugoslavia changed things considerably, but not as much as the collapse of the Eastern countries. The IUC's rational as a meeting place for East and West was gone. No longer do we have the significant numbers from the Soviet Union,



25th Anniversary of the Philosophy of Science course series in 1999. Course directors with awards: Lars Bergström (Stockholm), Wladislaw Krajewski (Warsaw), Jim R. Brown (Toronto) and Srđan Lelas (Zagreb)

from Poland, from Bulgaria, and so on. Philosophers in those countries cannot afford to come. This is a loss and I miss them greatly.

When I think of Dubrovnik I think of my co-organizers present and past. Among the latter, Bill Newton-Smith is now deeply immersed in educational affairs in central Asia, a kind of continuation of his earlier activities in bringing East and West Europe together. Srđan Lelas, Kathy Wilkes, and Sławek Krajewski have all died. They did so much for our annual conference and for so many years. Kathy Wilkes was fanatical in her love of and devotion to the City. She was often very amusing in recounting the difficulties. It took a great emotional toll on her, but she would not have wanted it any other way.

It's been a delight to see Dubrovnik and the IUC arise again so splendidly. Both are as beautiful as ever. And seeing Berta and Srećko every April gives everything a reassuring continuity. It's hard to guess what the next few years might bring. I, for one, would be happy if Dubrovnik served as a new meeting ground for Europe and the Arab world, the way it did for East and West Europe. But this is only one among great many possibilities. In any case, coming out of a long winter in Toronto, I am sure I shall always look forward to spring in Dubrovnik.

The Everlasting, Unique, Durable and Unbreakable Inter–University Centre in Dubrovnik

By Ognjen Čaldarović

University of Zagreb

38

Due to the fact that I know the activities of the IUC from the very beginning, I might say that this institution has survived all the “tests” of the time and that still today it represents its basic functions in changeable conditions. At the beginning it was “a place where East and West meet”, which was understandable due to the fact that free movement of the scholars from the East was limited (impossible). But, former Yugoslavia was a place of interest – we were a first society that was developing a system of self–management. And that caused a lot of attention of many researchers from every corner of the world – from Scandinavian countries, from the USA, from Israel, England, etc. The IUC is an educational institution with much more flexibility than you might expect in a regular higher education institution. It was and it is still a place where people from all over the world meet, discuss, socialize and – come again, and again! This is also a unique institution that relies mostly on the activities and capacities of the scientists and students that take part in the activities as well as on the generous help of the maximum three people in the administration.

I started to come to the IUC when I was a postgraduate student, then, a few years later, as young professor I was one of the directors of several courses. I remember the course Social Sciences and Philosophy that was held every year in the 1980 and where all important persons come that gave us, younger scholars, finally “to see” big faces and to hear them speak. Once, I remember listening to the lecture by Jürgen Habermas on Max Weber. I listened carefully, but could not get much. Close by me there was an American, a student. I asked him – “How do you understand Habermas?” He responded – “about 40%”. It felt relieved because I was afraid that I had problems with my English ...



Ognjen Čaldarović (on the right)
with a colleague

As a postgraduate student I participated in the courses devoted to Self-management and Participation, headed by Professor Josip Obradović and other foreign scholars where many important industrial sociologists and philosophers used to come and gave lectures. Also, I participated in several sessions of the courses headed by the late professor Ivo Maroević from the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Zagreb on the topic on historical restoration and the role of musicological approach to the investigation of cultural heritage. Several times I participated in the courses devoted to the Mediterranean issues. I also participated – for many years – in the activities of the course on Social Stratification and Social Structures headed by Professor Ivan Kuvačić from the University of Zagreb with generous help from the late professors Arthur J. Vidich and Stanford M. Lyman. This course – after several years – changed its name and today it is called “Social Structures and Social Institutions: The Quest for Social Justice” – needless to say, I am one of the directors. Not to mention many conferences on important and contemporary issues.

So, there is a long history of my cooperation and socializing with the people, staff and students in the Centre. I used to come to Dubrovnik for many years when I was a small boy because my grandfather spent his last years in this beautiful city studying

his cultural past, but later, as a young scientists and professor I was really grateful to the Centre that I was able to come at least once a year to Dubrovnik. In this sense I was also a witness of many changes that occurred in the Old city, many changes in the organizational scheme of the Centre as well as of the life courses of the people employed in the Centre.

An important issue that should not be forgotten is the building itself. Even though it was completely destroyed during the Homeland War, it regained its previous charm. The building is almost as important as the content of the educational activities of the Centre. It gives everybody a sense of peacefulness, stability, freedom. The courtyard is probably the best part of the open space of the building. And, what is important – the building was built as an educational institution and through the activities of the IUC it continues to be viable, an important place for scientists to meet.

Dubrovnik is an old town and one of the nicest places in the world. Its university, recently established should continue to develop with full incorporation of the IUC in its activities. And people will continue to come, enjoy, and spread the nice spirit of the IUC in their local environments! So, once more, thank you all for everything you've done!

Healthy Lifestyle and Prevention of Stroke

By Vida Demarin and Zlatko Trkanjec

University of Zagreb

The traditional international postgraduate course: Summer Stroke School – Healthy Lifestyle and Prevention of Stroke has been regularly held at the Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik since 1990 organized by the Croatian Stroke Society, Croatian Society for Neurovascular Disorders of the Croatian Medical Association, Academy of Medical Sciences of Croatia, and since 2002 its organizer is also School of Medicine, University of Zagreb. Course directors are: Professor Vida Demarin, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia; Professor Roman Haberl, University of Munich, Munich, Germany; Professor Kurt Niederkorn, University of Graz, Graz, Austria, Professor Tanja Rundek, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA; and since 2002 Professor Zlatko Trkanjec, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia.

Primary objective of the course is to encourage cooperation and to promote exchange of knowledge between participants from different countries. The course is a meeting point of respected scientists that work with various fields of cerebrovascular diseases and stroke presenting and discussing all major aspects of stroke risk factors, as well as new insights in epidemiology, prevention, diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation of stroke. Probably the major feature of the course is enabling exchange of experience among experts and comparison of stroke data from various countries. Also, the course allows knowledge transfer between respected scientists from western countries and colleagues from transitional states in Central and East European countries. In this way, International Postgraduate Course: Summer Stroke School – Healthy Lifestyle and Prevention of Stroke has become a meeting ground for learning and knowledge transfer between West and East in accordance with the main purpose of Inter-University Centre founded in 1971.

Each year between 30–50 participants from various countries like Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Latvia,



Vida Demarin and Zlatko Trkanjec
with participants of the Course Healthy
Lifestyle and Prevention of Stroke

Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, have attended this postgraduate course. The course is celebrating its 20th anniversary in 2009, so we can calculate that somewhere between 600 and 1000 participants has attended the course.

The scientific program of the course lasting for five days is rich, condensed and very tight, but course directors always try to find the way to organize social events, providing the participants with pleasant opportunities for friendly and informal gathering. Participants are delighted with the unique beauty of Dubrovnik and its

surroundings, and they enjoy sightseeing, cultural events as well as Mediterranean sun, sea and excellent food. Probably the mixture of tight scientific program and social program makes this course unique.

However, we know that our course is one of the courses that are being held in Inter-University Centre (IUC) Dubrovnik. It could not be possible to have postgraduate courses without the help of dedicated staff of IUC who are always working their best to help participants with every problem they might have: from organization of transportation and accommodation to and from Dubrovnik, help with the equipment necessary for courses, transportation in Dubrovnik, faxes, letters, E-mails, internet access, and every other problem. And what is even more significant, they always find the way to solve all problems in a casual way and with a smile. In this way they all the times cheer up participants who may be worried and concerned about their particular problem.

Therefore course directors as well as participants love to come to Dubrovnik and attend our course and they will continue to do so in the future.

Twenty-four Years of MCC Meetings at Inter-University Centre

Ante Graovac

Ruder Bošković Institute, Zagreb
University of Split
University of Dubrovnik

44

I am not fond of abbreviations. But after a long usage they started to be rhymed like a verse. MCC, am-see-see, am-see-see, what you appeared to be?, and so for twenty four years. M stands for Mathematics, C is for Chemistry and the second C for Computer sciences. So, in some length one writes MATH/CHEM/COMP. Under such name twenty-three MATH/CHEM/COMP Courses and Conferences have been held at the Inter-University Centre (IUC) in Dubrovnik and the twenty-fourth such meeting will be held there in June 2009. How all this started and who are the characters behind a scene? What is the aim of these meetings and what we learned from them?

As will be seen later, serendipity played a great role there. But one thing was lasting and stable and we counted on it through all these years. It is a highly professional, educated and friendly staff of the IUC. *Here on the first place we have in mind all the support given by the IUC Secretary, Mrs. Berta Dragičević, and we dedicate these notes to all energy and devotion and love she invested in the growth of the IUC and to success of our meetings.* On the occasion of 35 years of the IUC we also offer thanks to other people who helped to shape the IUC and ensure a decent framework to the MCPC meetings. They are Mr. Pero Portolan, Mr. Srećko Kržić, Mrs. Dube Kapetanić, and Mrs. Nada Bruer Ljubišić. Special thanks go to the IUC Director, Professor Krunoslav Pisk.

It is said that some discipline only then becomes a science when it is formulated and discussed in mathematical terms. A general consensus is established that this is true for physics. But this statement is still under dispute when one is concerned with chemistry and even more when dealing with biology. Chemistry is a lively field, which, especially in the past, was not too worried about mathematics. Stoichiometry, differential calculus to study chemical kinetics and a few extra ingredients were



Ante Graovac at a party on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the IUC, in 2007

sufficient for a successful research in chemistry. But all that changed when in the thirties of the previous century it became clear that matter on the atomic and molecular scale has to be described by waves. We have witnessed then an advent of quantum mechanics and later of quantum chemistry. However, a tedious task of performing computations of molecular structure and properties was limited to very small molecules until computers entered the field after the Second World War. Today computers and computing are so much interlinked with chemistry both in its theoretical and experimental parts, and this is properly reflected in the second C of the MCC.

However, rumours started to spread that there should be a more direct way to chemical reality based on intuition but formulated in mathematical terms. These voices intensified and the seventies of the previous century witnessed a rise of chemical graph theory, CGT, a new field of chemistry where mathematics is extensively used. This is ground to have the M in the MCC. Besides paper-and-pencil

approach, computers are these days used also in the CGT, and so the second C in the MCC plays a double role.

Serendipity plays a great role in sciences. It helped also to come to an idea to organize the MCCs. One winter day in 1985 Professor Sibe Mardešić told Professor Trinajstić and me that maybe we would like to attend a lecture Professor Chris Lacher will deliver at the Faculty of Electrical Engineering in Zagreb. We went there and after the lecture we realized we share very close interests with ideas presented there. We have not hesitated to invite Lacher and his companions from the Florida State University of Tallahassee, Professors DeWitt Sumners, Edelson and Bryant. to have a dinner with us in Restaurant “Stara vura”. Both groups of researchers had already remarkable achievements in the CGT. The Theoretical Chemistry Group of the “R. Bošković” Institute in Zagreb was a pioneer in applications of discrete mathematics to chemistry, at beginning to conjugated molecules. It already organized two international meetings, one on aromaticity and another on mathematical chemistry. The Florida Group was world known for its synchronized work of chemists, topologists and computer scientists on various chemical problems, especially in polymer chemistry. Seminars entitled MATH/CHEM/COMP have been regularly held in Tallahassee. After a cheerful dinner, wine and discussions all present in “Stara vura” found the acronym MCC very suitable for future undertakings and decided to organize jointly the first MCC meeting at the IUC in June 1986. Besides the Florida Professors and father founders on the Croatian side, Professors Svrtan, Veljan, Trinajstić and Graovac, a bunch of other enthusiasts and students, altogether some fifteen of us, attended the MCC 1986. We liked the happening and decided to attract in future a larger audience which stabilized these days up to 80–90 participants which gather annually each year in glorious City of Dubrovnik. One is free to tell that whoever contributes significantly to mathematical chemistry and related fields has showed up at the MCC meetings.

In autumn of 1986 serendipity again played its role. The author has by chance met Professor Ivan Butula and after a drink and talk in then popular Bistro “Splendid” it was agreed the first MCC Proceedings will appear as the December 1986 issue of the journal “Kemija u industriji” (“Chemistry in Industry”) whose Editor-in-Chief was Butula with the Croatian father founders as the Guest Editors. After that the MCC Proceedings flourished and have grown in volume and quality. They are, altogether thirty of them, published in various journals and series, with

most of them appearing as special issues of the CC journal “Croatica Chemica Acta” and the interested reader can free of any charge download them (from 1996 onwards) from: <http://public.carnet.hr/ccacaa/prev.html> The programmes and abstracts of the MCC meetings from 2000 up today are to be found at: <http://mcc.irb.hr>

Today the IUC is recognized as one of the focal points for exchange of ideas and recent results among mathematical and computational chemists and related scientists and we hope we can count on a continued help and valuable advices of Mrs. Berta Dragičević and her co-workers in years to come.

Dubrovnik's Encounter

By Goran Gretić

University of Zagreb

48

Some time ago, Mrs. Berta Dragičević told me that she was in the process of preparing a book about IUC and kindly asked me to contribute with an article related to my numerous visits to Dubrovnik and involvement in IUC activities.

Immediately I remembered one small anecdote which happened in 1986, probably September. Dubrovnik was still full of tourists and the IUC had many seminars and conferences going on.

And, as always at that time of the year, it was not easy to accommodate all the participants. I was offered – and I considered it a small privilege – to stay in a marvellous villa just across the road from the IUC. The villa belonged to Professor Anica Gunther Perić who was personally and professionally associated with the IUC.

After I settled in one of the rooms of that comfortable villa surrounded by a beautiful garden, I found out that Prof. Fischer–Appelt, President of the University of Hamburg and Chair of IUC Council, was also staying there. I had met him briefly before at the IUC on several occasions.

During the week we spent in the villa we were meeting very often, discussing the IUC and its activities, even developing the concept of organizing one seminar together. We both found it very interesting, but of course, the idea was hypothetical, because Prof. Fischer–Appelt was an extremely engaged person, and I assume he is still today. At that time for me it was a true compliment to have the chance to talk to him and consider such a possibility of cooperation.

One evening I was coming to the villa very late, climbing fairly steep stairs that led to the garden. Suddenly, at the top of the stairs I saw, or rather heard, a person who was standing there looking at his watch and shouted vigorously in my direction: “Are you young Prof. Gretić?” “Yes”, I said self consciously when Prof. Fischer–Appelt

came laughing and assured me that I didn't need to be frightened. He explained to me that a gentleman sitting next to him was his respected colleague and rector of a university in the DDR – I forget his name – and that it was common there to be very rigorous with younger colleagues!

On that September evening in 1986 Prof. Fischer-Appelt was sitting in the garden with two colleagues from the former DDR discussing the possible future cooperation in the framework of the IUC. I had a glass of wine with these three university leaders, spent some time with them chatting and went to sleep. Finally, the seminar was starting the following morning at 8:30.

At that time it was clear to me, and today it is even clearer, what excellent and fortunate circumstances we – the young scientists from this region – had. We and our students had the opportunities to meet and collaborate with the scholars from all around the world, without any ideological or political boundaries and restraints. At the same time, for many young scientists from East and West, Dubrovnik and the IUC in particular, was the place where they had possibility to meet, cooperate and plan the mutual projects.

Memories of People at the Inter–University Center, Dubrovnik, 1977 to 2008

Robert M. Hayes

University of California, Los Angeles

50

During the past 32 years, from 1977 to 2008, I have had the great pleasure of participating almost every year in Conferences held at the Inter–University Center in Dubrovnik. In doing so, there was both professional value in the substantive content and personal values in the opportunity to work with people whom I regard as friends as well as colleagues. Among them, of course, is Berta Dragičević who has asked me to participate in this publication, and I am most grateful to her for her invitation. It has given me the opportunity of reliving the many experiences I have had in Dubrovnik!

There are many wonderful memories from those 32 years and many wonderful persons associated with them, so I have had to be very selective in order to fit within the number of pages allotted to me. But I will start at the very beginning. Indeed, it goes back to 1974 when I was visited at UCLA by a most remarkable man, Professor Božo Težak. He was in the process of creating a new National and University Library building in Zagreb and, as part of doing so, wanted to see first hand the then new University Research Library at UCLA. But while at UCLA, he asked to meet with me to discuss what turned out to be a remarkable match between our professional activities. When he arrived at my office, it was as though a Meštrović sculpture has come alive!

At the end of our discussion, which was literally hours long, he said to me, “Bob, I would like to have a conference in Dubrovnik about the things we have been discussing and to have you serve as co–chairman of it with me.” Since by this time we had already found a deep friendship, I said I would be delighted to do so. And thus began the history of my trips to Dubrovnik.

The topic he chose for the conference, held in 1977, was “Universities in the World Information Network” and that continued as the topic of virtually yearly

conferences in Dubrovnik until the final one held in May of 1991. It must be said that the “conference” during that first year was more of a seminar for his students in the academic program in library and information science he had created at the University of Zagreb. But each subsequent year was a true international conference and during them there were hundreds of participants from throughout the world.

It must also be said that, while I had the great honor to serve as nominal co-chairman during most of the conferences, the work was all done by Professor Težak and his staff. And that brings me to the second of the many persons that have become dear friends, Neva Tudor-Šilović. She was his chief of staff at the International Referral Center of the University of Zagreb and thus the person responsible for all of the logistical arrangements for the conferences. It really was a wonderful experience for me to work with her and to see what she accomplished in support of Professor Težak’s objectives!

Among the students who participated in that first program, two in particular, Professor Nenad Prelog and Professor Velimir Srića, have also become very dear friends as well as professional colleagues. Their individual careers have been quite spectacular and it has been a great personal pleasure for me to see their success!

Among the international participants in the subsequent years, there were so many of great renown that I cannot even begin to review them here. I will, though, use three of them to illustrate. The first is Ching-chih Chen, professor at Simmons College, Boston. We asked her to participate in order to present her spectacular CD-ROM publication, “The First Emperor”, which was based on the “terracotta warriors” of Xian, China. I remember our arrival at Dubrovnik airport, as she and I made our way through passport control and then through baggage screening. She battled against the x-ray examination of her computer equipment lest her files might be damaged, and she succeeded in that battle!

The second is Tefko Saračević, professor at Rutgers University. He is far more than just a participant in these Dubrovnik conferences. He represents a history of association that has been deep and long, and that continues today. The third is Blaise Cronin, professor at Indiana University. For many of the “Universities in the World Information Network” conferences, he served as co-director, and most effectively so.

The conference in May 1991 was especially memorable for me, not for the conference itself but for the process of getting to and from it. There were no flights I

could get into the Dubrovnik airport, so I landed in Munich, rented a car, and drove through the Krajina. I was stopped repeatedly, by police, by militia, and by soldiers with tanks, alternatively Serbian and Croatian. In each case, I would explain who I was and that I was driving to Dubrovnik to serve as co-director of a conference there. And, in each case, eventually they would pass me on. It was a most fascinating experience!

Of course, the war erupted later that year, and the conferences on “Universities in the World Information Network” came to an end. But then, after the end of the war and at least partial recovery from it, they were replaced by two new series of conferences. One was directed by Professor Nenad Prelog; it was focused on “Information Technology and Journalism”. He invited me, along with Professor Damir Boras, to serve as co-chairmen, thus continuing our relationship. The second was directed by Professor Tatjana Aparac; its title was “LIDA: Libraries in the Digital Age”. The opportunity to participate each year in each of these two series of conferences has been both a personal joy, because of the deep personal friendships, and a professional joy, because of the intellectual content.

In sum, for over thirty years I have come to the Inter-University Center in Dubrovnik. It is in every respect an academic home away from home, with great memories both of people and of intellectual content. I am deeply grateful to all who have made it possible for me to have had this experience.

A Greeting of Thanks from Rijeka

Nenad Hlača

University of Rijeka

I very well remember a yellow poster with black letters announcing courses at the Inter-University Centre in Dubrovnik in 1984. It was then necessary to get two recommendations, write my curriculum vitae and send it to the University of Zagreb. I admit that I did write those recommendations myself and then asked professors for their signatures. Maybe this is why today when students or colleagues ask me for a recommendation I act in the same way asking them for a text and then signing it.

At that time Dubrovnik was for us a mythical, expensive, distant place. When remembering those courses I always conclude that the IUC was for us a door, a window and an exit into the boundless world without borders. One had to have courage, think freely, and be a friend of truth as it is the only stronghold of persistence. The IUC and Dubrovnik were at that time a place of encounters with interesting people, open-minded, curious people, and true seekers of new ideas. Our devotion to it was always rewarded and we were offered more and more invitations. It was then that all my contacts and acquaintances were born that led me afterwards to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Poland, the Unesco seat in Paris, Japan, India, USA, Canada ... The IUC opened to me all possible doors and now I have to be very careful in selecting where and when I will travel ... But I am probably happiest when at the time of Candelora feast I can stand near the Orlando statue at the opening of the St. Blasius feast in early February!

During those eighties Galleria Sebastian was our cult gathering place and still today I occasionally take out of a drawer a paper clip with the Sebastian logo. At that time it also seemed impossible to buy paintings anywhere except in Dubrovnik. And it was at Marko's Cafeteria that I met my future wife...



Nenad Hlača (first on the left)
with the Seminar group
Human Rights and Medicine

I well remember where I was and what I was doing on 6 December 1991 when the IUC building was hit. With Miro Mastilica and Marija, I was in Zagreb, at Jelačić Square, and we were shocked, angry, and sad. I wrote a letter which had to be written but of course could not reach the destination. It started as follows: Now that all connections with the City are cut off, those of my heart remain open with all my fears for you there, for your town.

Soon afterwards we returned to Dubrovnik, organized courses on human rights of displaced persons and war victims, participated in Deša workshops, and had discussions with UNHCR officials.

Behind wooden covers we were examining all damages on buildings, measured all wounds on Stradun. And before that I remember my watching the departure of the ship “Slavija” from the Rijeka harbour bound for Dubrovnik, regretting that I could not be on board.

When after many years I recently stayed again at the Centre’s dormitory I felt happy. I remembered our days of youth – and all the dear people with whom we were in a truly “Bologna style” learning and development setting. I remembered the food we cooked there, places we used to visit. Therefore I am happy to come to Dubrovnik for its Feast or to open an exhibition at Guke’s Gallery when she invites me. I am happy when I see familiar faces on Stradun and when I sit in a restaurant on Gundulić Square. I am happy to see a lady who cleans the Centre, with a somewhat longer working period than mine (I was there in 1984, she came in 1981). We always chat and I learnt that she plans to retire soon. I told her that my retirement will also follow in a couple of years and that my pension as a university professor will also be minimal, like hers.

I hereby wish to express my special gratitude to the IUC founders. Their IUC proves that such projects are eternally young and continue to live, the same way as our Human Rights and Medicine course series has become a part of us and which we dedicate to our students with much love.

Philosophy of Linguistics Conferences in Dubrovnik

Dunja Jutronić

University of Maribor

56

I. How it all began

I started attending Dubrovnik conferences late. Why do I say late? Late in comparison with my other colleagues who were there in the worst of times, during the shelling of Dubrovnik in 1991. I hear stories told and often retold about Canadians who were participating in the philosophy of science course (which was the only course that went all throughout the war years), One of them says how the late Professor Kathy Wilkes from Oxford was enthusiastically pointing out all of those small and (even for us) unknown places around Dubrovnik that the enemy was firing at with their cannons. One of the participants, obviously frightened, asked Kathy: Could you point out in which direction Canada is? It gives you an idea of how disturbing it was to be in Dubrovnik at those times, with the feeling of loss, uneasiness and inevitable fear.

Some September courses before our war were much more in my area, in the philosophy of language and philosophy of mind. Those were the times when we were learning, it was not easy to obtain foreign books and journals. One of the most encouraging things for us was that professors from abroad who came to Dubrovnik conferences were very willing to continue their stay in ex-Yugoslavia and come to places like Zadar and Rijeka. They did that on the promise that we could put them up and provide meals and they would give lectures for us and our students. We started many valuable scholarly exchanges this way, but life-long friendships, too.

One of the professors that we got to know that way was Michael Devitt who came to Zadar with his colleague Georges Rey who used to be a Fulbright professor at Zadar in 1983. During his Fulbright year Rey taught us analytic philosophy and Michael Devitt, who became his colleague at the University of Maryland in 1988,

came to give a series of lectures in Zadar a year later. Apart from their professional philosophical fervour, Georges and Michael understood, and were very sympathetic to our difficult situation at the time when Yugoslavia was breaking up. Both of them helped me and Nenad Mišćević to go to conferences out of the country at the time when we were politically branded as liberals and anti-Tuđman at our University in Zadar, when we hardly had enough money to support our families and when the funding for research and travel was totally meagre. They so well understood our situation and were most sensitive to our eagerness to persist as if things were normal and were supportive in our belief that life had to go on although Zadar was under Serbian fire. One of the big things for Nenad Mišćević and me was when we went to the Congress of the European Society for Analytical Philosophy held in Aix-en-Provence in 1993. At which Nenad was elected the next president of the society (ECAP). This could not have happened if it were not for Georges Rey and Michael Devitt, two regular participants of the IUC conferences.

After the war I became a regular at Dubrovnik conferences. There were some organizing problems with the course “Mental Phenomena” that we started with the British colleagues and it looked as if we would lose our September slot at the IUC when Michael Devitt offered to get some people together (on a very short notice) and have a course in the philosophy of linguistics. So the invitation for the conference went to a number of friends and colleagues stating that we were organizing a small conference in Dubrovnik at the Inter-University Centre, Sept. 5th to 10th, 2005 on the philosophy of linguistics and language and mind. The focus of the course was Michael Devitt’s work on philosophy of linguistics. We included the summary of Devitt’s then forthcoming book *Ignorance of language* (in the meantime published by Oxford Clarendon Press in 2006) and thought the discussion of this book would provoke heated debate since Devitt’s views about language stand in a stark contrast with the dominant Chomskyan mainstream. But participants were free to talk on any topic that they found suitable. We asked Peter Ludlow, then at the University of Michigan, USA and Barry Smith of Birbeck College, London to be our directors. The others whom we invited and who did not have some previous engagement enthusiastically accepted our invitation. So Philosophy of Linguistics course was born and it was a great success. To my huge surprise the following was immediately noticed that whereas philosophy of language conferences were common, philosophy of linguistics ones were rare to nonexistent. Our conference became precious for

philosophy of linguistics, and very soon we started getting enthusiastic comments from across the Ocean. Next conferences, again held in September 2006 and 2007, confirmed this. It now seems obvious that this, in the opinions of all participants, very fruitful, lively, convivial and productive conference will be taking place every year.

II. Croatian Journal of Philosophy's Symbiosis with the IUC

Papers given at conferences linger a bit in the memory but they would soon be forgotten if there was no written record of them. We were most fortunate that we also had a journal that established a symbiotic relationship with our conferences, the *Croatian Journal of Philosophy* published by Kruzak, Zagreb. Immediately in 2006, a year after the first conference, one of the yearly three issues of the Croatian Journal (Vol. VI, No. 18) was wholly dedicated to the papers given at the first conference in the *Philosophy of Linguistics*. Our inevitably intricate and pleasantly heated discussions that went on during the conference are present in those pages. Some of the most important issues that came to the fore and which continued to be discussed in later conferences are: (1) What is the essence or (true) nature of language? Is language something material, behavioural, mental, biological, social, cultural, abstract or autonomous? Is linguistics concerned with cognitive structures of the psychological reality of its speakers or is linguistics about linguistic reality of symbols that the speakers produce. (2) If speakers know their language, what kind of knowledge is do their linguistic intuitions express that knowledge? What kind of knowledge is linguistic knowledge? The discussion goes way back with different authors giving different objections to Chomsky's claim that speakers know or cognize their language. What are linguistic intuitions? Are they the voice of competence or are they simply opinions about linguistic data? (3). If linguistic entities exist, where do we find them? The opinions vary from mentalist answer where the entities are seen to be in the mind, to the realist according to which, for example, sound really have their phonological properties, to the eliminativist view where linguistic entities are illusory they do not exist and they are realized nowhere.

These themes (and others) discussed follow a venerable tradition. The criticisms of Chomsky's mentalism have been around for a long time. John Searle, for example, emphasized how peculiar and eccentric Chomsky's overall approach to language is. Wittgenstein certainly thought that psychological model introduces shadowy mental

events and gives pseudo-explanations. Different and opposing views are presented in the next three issues of the *Croatian Journal of Philosophy* (one in 2007 and two in 2008). The happy circle of Dubrovnik presentations and Zagreb publication is growing, and the international members of our current squad are coming to Dubrovnik to consider the views from the previous issue and push the discussion forward, which will of course be published in the next edition.

III. The *sine qua non* of the Inter-University Centre Itself

We feel that we have a conference that is missing on the wide map of conferences around the world. Maybe we should advertise it more but at the same time we want to keep it small and thus more concentrated and meaningful.

We would not have succeeded in it were not for the understanding and generous support of the leaders and organizers of the IUC: dr. Krunoslav Pisk, director of the IUC and the chief secretary Berta Dragičević, both of whom never failed to greet us warmly and wish us luck. We should also mention the secretaries, Dube Kapetanić who used to work there, Nada Bruer Ljubišić and Srećko Kržić without whose help, efficiency and good humour we would not have got very far. So our warm thanks go to all of them for making this very important event for us possible, and keeping for us a slot in the overbooked IUC program of courses and conferences and making all our participants feel absolutely great.

Let me close with a quote that will appear in one of the forthcoming issues in the *Australian Journal of Philosophy* that expresses, I hope, the opinion of all the participants: “Most of these papers arose from very productive conferences in the philosophy of linguistics held annually in Dubrovnik since 2005. As a result most have been published in the *Croatian Journal of Philosophy*, which has become a center for the philosophy of linguistics.”

So, thanks to Michael Devitt for having started it all, to past, present and future participants, to Krno Zakarija and his *Croatian Journal of Philosophy* and, above all, to our host, the IUC.

Greetings!

By Peter Kampits

University of Vienna

60

The first time I came to Dubrovnik the IUC was passing through a very difficult period. There was still the terrible war between Yugoslavia and Croatia, and the damages of the bombs not only in the building of the IUC, but also in the whole city were witnesses of the strong fights covering the city and the surroundings.

Anyway, the Austrians in corporation with the IUC risked realizing the planned symposium. Professor Zovko from Zagreb came with a handful of assistants and students, and the Austrian party was lead by Leopold Melichar, at this time director of the Austrian Cultural Institute in Zagreb.

Shocked by the damages of the building and forced to live in the nowadays most expensive hotel in Dubrovnik, “Argentina” – for all the other hotels and hostels were destroyed – we had to accept a rather long walk to the IUC.

It was the first time that I met Berta Dragičević and I could only admire the calm and overall view with which she handled the preparations for the symposium.

I have never seen Dubrovnik in such a condition. The Stradun was completely deserted in the evening, but despite the sad situation there was a kind of beauty coming from the buildings, the little streets and the one or two restaurants that still served for visitors.

In the following years I could watch the increasing development in tourism, the rising number of seminars and courses organized by the IUC and a certain return to normality.

Even if at this time my visits in Dubrovnik were rather short ones (only during the seminars we organized and which were focussing more and more on the problems of the Middle European cultural identity), I could observe the diversity and also the quality of the courses which the IUC was offering.

In the meantime also the aims and the purposes of postgraduate education were in a process of change. All over Europe new structures of University education were established and in my opinion IUC changed also in its structures.

Due to the support of Croatian, especially Zagreb authorities, and also of Austrian institutions, we could continue our seminars and courses in the following years.

The collaboration with IUC committees and especially with Berta Dragičević was always of big importance, even if our Middle European course was just a little part of the impressive programme of the IUC.

We met a very warm and careful hospitality which made the atmosphere of our discussion very comfortable. Especially for us Austrians it was a touch of Mediterranean atmosphere which made Dubrovnik every year a desirable event for us.

Our course was in the last years supported by the Austrian embassy in Croatia, and in 2006 I was asked to become a member of the IUC Executive Committee. This was a big honour for me, and I accepted with pleasure.

These years I became more and more familiar with my colleagues in this committee, coming from Scandinavian countries, from Croatia, from the USA and Germany, but I also got into a closer contact with Berta. One evening she invited us to her house in the centre of the old city and I could admire the cultivated and artistic atmosphere that surrounded her.

I will not mention the good contacts to my colleagues in the committee without mentioning the name of Krunoslav Pisk, who served as a general director, and who really managed to move the IUC into a direction which in my opinion is the best one concerning its purposes.

In 2007 I was named Deputy General Director, and I accepted once more with pleasure this function, feeling that the contribution of an Austrian university professor of philosophy could be very helpful to realize the tasks of the IUC in present times and in the future.

By the way, in the meantime our course of “Middle European cultural identity” was enlarged and by support of the Austrian embassies in Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro we could increase the number of our lecturers and students.

Coming from a very long university career and many University functions, especially as Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy and Education at the University of

Vienna, I can only say that Dubrovnik and the IUC offer not only a special climate, but give the opportunity to realize an academic freedom which seems more and more to be in danger because of the European university policy.

I have to say that this atmosphere due to all my colleagues in the committee, but especially due to Berta Dragičević has given me an experience that I don't want to miss in my academic and in my personal life.

The Power of Remembering

Biljana Kašić

Centre for Women's Studies, Zagreb

“**A** ‘guided tour’ through different understanding of concepts that invites opposites” – is a statement which at first glance signifies both a theoretical invitation and theoretical dispute on differences but certainly a threshold for thought-provoking notions and ways to critically look at the role of theory nowadays.

This statement, or better yet, excerpt, is from the evaluation of the feminist postgraduate course that was held at the IUC in Dubrovnik in May 2004. It was not entirely coincidental that this was expressed by a participant from Lithuania and that the title of this course was “Boundaries, Borders and Borderlands”. In this course, calling to mind simultaneously the materials and notes on the content, discussions and presentations by Rada Iveković from Paris, Gail Lewis from London, Daša Duhaček from Belgrade, Marina Gržinič from Ljubljana and Vienna, and Catherine Z. Sameh from New Jersey, all gave their presentations and the range of topics encompassed various spheres, concerns or claims on issues of boundaries and borders. Titles ran from “Cosmopolitan Phantasies and Multicultural Publics”, through “Reading Islamic Feminism in Iran through Transnational Feminist Practices” to “Acting as the Border-line between the ‘World of Culture’ and the ‘World of Life’” and “Corporeality, Border and Poetics of Frida Kahlo”.

How do we understand borders and boundaries that are at once geographic and theoretical, disciplinary and disciplining, national and gendered, sexual and the juridical? This very challenging agenda in away embraces and evokes all the *topo*; of memory that links feminists from the region with the Inter-University Centre. It can be analyzed from any chronological point; nevertheless it creates a very point of meaning. Or, if I might rephrase outstanding postcolonial writer Bill Aschroft’s

thought, who once pointed out: “Apart from the invention of History, horizon is that what matters.”

The year 2000 as a beginning of a new cycle beyond already established geographical borders was in the sign of cooperation between the Centre for Women’s Studies from Zagreb and Belgrade together with Rutgers University; then 1990 as the year at the dawning of war and division when the feminists in Dubrovnik appealed for peace; and then to an earlier time – 1988 and 1986 – when two meetings in Dubrovnik were the place of discussion of Croatian theorists with their American and French colleagues on “écriture feminine” and feminism. Or, when one’s gaze faces forward, in the year 2008 directed to the very striking topic on potentials of feminist voice to create one’s own power of expression across borders of any kind. And this ongoing year bears witness to several feminist courses in Dubrovnik, diverse thematic units, and perspectival methods of theoretical enjoyment.

Why do I mention all these ‘events’ right now; or, why do I feel overwhelmed with these many layers of memories of program curricula, names, titles what makes the images and photos of Dubrovnik very alive all the time? One of the possible answers is the intrinsic relation between the textuality of that what is happening in the space of the IUC and context of the very same events, and this is formed by the people, place and possibility that the aforementioned author named as “horizon”.

I remember the year 2000. The physical borders in this region and territory were sharp, and the borders within the mental maps of people including mainstream academic ones were very visible and unbridgeable often demonstrating limited human knowledge of relations among us. At that moment when I called Berta Dragičević and outlined my proposal for the course, everything became open, bridgeable, inviting and becoming. And indescribably simple. The fact that the Centre for Women’s Studies from Zagreb was outside academia did not present a problem, nor did the Centre for Women’s Studies from Belgrade as being a co-partner seem like a “disruptive” or suspicious moment within the arrangement in Dubrovnik.

The gesture of hospitable ceremony prepared in the atrium of the IUC at that moment meant a lot more than just a gesture. It was away of paying respect, acceptance and inner reconciliation among some of the participants, but at the same time it was a gesture of crossing borders in various ways. This starting event opened

up the possibility that appeared to us as a gift in the same manner as “Transborder Translating” itself, as Rada Iveković noted in her lecture at the IUC, actually means an open-ended and reciprocal gesture of freedom and mutual respect between cultures. Of course, it may or may not apply to this particular situation but the idea of openness is essential. We ‘translated’ it as hospitality which we have embraced fully.

In this regard it gave a meaning to our continuous gatherings after that. During this whole time, the Inter-University Centre has created an intellectual and scholarly terrain in which geographical location is a signficatory moment as it is the very place of the IUC that enables simultaneous streams of various theoretical discussions that flow over the borders of its place. Spaces just like people remember and carry memories.

As a feminist I know the importance of semantic intimacy and the interrelatedness between content of knowledge and contexts of knowing especially when the process of locating ourselves takes place in Dubrovnik every year. It is a transformative adventure with a set of productive shifts and critical entries. And it seems to be for various feminists from the world, theorists, activists and artists, more and more a place of being and belonging.

Dubrovnik and its Inter–University Centre: A Look Back

By Gottfried Künzlen

Universität der Bundeswehr, München

66

Dubrovnik and the Inter–University Centre (IUC): They did not fail to work their charm on me – back then, when I first joined the IUC’s ‘Future of Religion’ course in Dubrovnik as a young scholar in 1981.

Dubrovnik: For many visitors, its often–praised and much–lauded magic may be but a distant notion, but some of them will remain under its spell. I am one of those. It is hard to say why this is so, for Dubrovnik is not ‘lovely’, just as the Mediterranean is not lovely. And a city of the Mediterranean it is: With all its serenity and harshness, its glaring midday light and the blackness of its nights, its flair of easy living and its wistfulness, imbued with its history, with its riches and burdens. The Mediterranean has both, and so does Dubrovnik: *Jugo*, who lets the sea turn grey and lets your mood turn dark; and *Bura*, who brings back the sea’s sparkling blue tint, who freshens the spirit and makes your senses tingle. Dubrovnik’s magic is the Mediterranean, the ‘mare nostrum’, and in a remote corner of your soul you may feel that this is where you belong to – even if you hail from Swabia, like me.

On the first evening after my arrival in Dubrovnik in the spring, I sense something of that as I stroll up and down the *Stradun* again, as I sit down at a table at the *Konoba Rozarij*, my ‘home away from home’ in Dubrovnik, and as I enjoy *skampi na buzaru* and *travarica* from Konavle, which harbours the flavour of the Mediterranean.

The Inter–University Centre: Inseparably, it belongs to Dubrovnik. And it is unimaginable that this jewel of the academic world would not have found its place in Dubrovnik. And a jewel it is, indeed: It brings together scholars and students from all over the world: Established couturiers of the mind as well as those who take their first steps into the world of scholarship. At times, fairly odd and exotic figures, quite remote from the scholarly sphere, came drifting into the *Frana Bulića 4* from somewhere. I have met all these kinds of people in those almost thirty years in which



Course directors of the Future of Religion course series, at its 25th anniversary in 2001: Mislav Kukoč (Zagreb), Rudolf Siebert (Kalamazoo), Nikola Skledar (Zagreb), Gottfried Künzlen (Munich). First on the left is Vido Bogdanović, Mayor of Dubrovnik, who greeted participants in the anniversary celebration

I have come to this place. At my first attendance at the 'Future of Religion' course, I marvelled at the special 'IUC culture', that peculiarly fascinating melange with its mix of scholarly seriousness and sobriety, scholarly criticism of the subject matter, and steadfast tolerance for those who differ: The profound connoisseur of Hegel from Germany would sit next to the Buddhist guru from Denmark and his disciples; the Franciscan monk from Sarajevo would be seated next to the young "Praxis"-philosopher from Zadar, while the Born-Again Evangelical missionary from the USA would wind up sitting next to the God-is-dead theologian from France. And the miracle came to pass: They were able to listen to each other, and they would even possibly begin to understand each other.

And there is something else that is part of the IUC culture – maybe the most important part of it: You can find friends there. The climate at universities – and this applies presumably not only to German ones – is ill suited for finding friendships that deserve to be called just that. There, you are a competitor, or maybe a temporary ally,

but not a friend. At the IUC, I found friendships. Some have faded away with time, but others have endured until today.

Dubrovnik and the IUC: For me, the first ten years were a time of serenity and largeness of the mind; a time of Mediterranean brightness and of mimosas blooming in spring. Then the war came. I will never forget the spring of 1991 in Dubrovnik: Springtime was just as it had always been, and yet everything had changed. All of a sudden the city was empty of tourists, and a kind of silence had spread that had never been there before – like the calm before the storm. At this stage, nobody could really foresee the terror of war that was to come, but many people had an inkling of what would come to pass. The *Rozarij*'s 'chief, whom I had come to know as a somewhat withdrawn person, gave me a hug on the last evening before my plane would take me back to Germany, and he said to me: "Hopefully, we'll meet again in good health." A few months later, he was sent to the frontlines, and Dubrovnik fell victim to the barbaric, yet deliberate aggression of Serbia and Montenegro – and the IUC was reduced to smoking ruins.

There is much that could be told of the war and its aftermath, when the friends of Dubrovnik and the IUC felt closer than ever before: Of the shock to see the IUC building in ruins; of the admirable will of the citizens of Dubrovnik to resist; of the helpless desire to do something even though there was so little that could be done; of the shame felt because of the stance adopted by the European powers towards that war; and of the cowardice displayed by the European intelligentsia. Just to give one example: The international PEN Club announced that its 1993 annual meeting would be held in Dubrovnik. What important a token of solidarity that could have been, had the writers of the world chosen to attend. They cancelled the event at the very last hour – citing 'political' reasons; and one of the advocates of this cancellation was the German publisher Professor Walter Jens. In April 1993, I was sitting in the *Gradska Kavana* together with a *Slobodna Dalmacija* journalist, and all along the *Stradun* one could see the posters that had been put up by the city of Dubrovnik to welcome the PEN and its writers. In my mind, I can still see the utter bewilderment in his face as the journalist asked me: "Why haven't they come?"

So many years have passed since then, but those memories will not just melt away like the snows of yesteryear, but they are going to stay with me.

Yet, there are also the other, cheerful memories, which will not melt away either. Among them, and above all, one thing remains: The grateful astonishment over the 'new' IUC which still is the 'old' one: It is a jewel of the academic world.

Some Scraps from the IUC

Frank Laubert

University of Hamburg

It is exactly a quarter of a century since I had my first acquaintance with the IUC. My remembrance of these 25 years is a composition of fragments and pieces rather than a continuous wave of impressions. And before they will turn into dark or even black holes, some of them should be brought up into the light of our present time.

Bramante Introducing Raffael to Pope Julius II

When I started my 'career' as the IUC's auditor in August 1983, it was love at first sight, not exactly the auditing, but the IUC with all its strong personalities I had the opportunity to meet, the friendly and open-minded reception and introduction I was offered by them, above all by Siegfried Korninger from Vienna, then Director General of the IUC, by Ørjar Øyen from Bergen, former Chairman of the IUC's Council, later DG and until today – together with Peter Fischer-Appelt – the institution's 'caretaker' and protector and, by Berta Dragičević, then Executive Secretary and the spirit of the place and of the Centre, and the overwhelming experience of the 'Old City' and the Mediterranean I had never paid a visit to before. Many of the IUC's famous 'family members' I had the chance to meet and to accompany have passed away over the years: Siegfried Korninger, Nasrollah Fatemi, Ivan Supek, Edward G. (Ted) Edwards, Enver Šehović, Kathy Wilkes, Henrik Birnbaum, Monica Partridge and Hinko Dragičević. But they are still hovering through the Frana Bulića-building and the narrow streets of Dubrovnik.

I first got acquainted with the IUC on the occasion of its 10th anniversary, just a few weeks after I had taken over from my predecessor as Head of the Department for Research Management and International Relations at the University of Hamburg.

The 'IUC business' was part of it. It was on a hot late summer day when I came to Dubrovnik, full of expectations and equipped with the most valuable source of information, packed in a booklet that had been produced for this remarkable event by Peter Fischer-Appelt and Ted Edwards. It contained Ted Edward's paper, "Interdisciplinarity: The Relation between Objective Knowledge, Moral Purpose and Social Practice", forming the leading topic of the conference, and all the names and data giving a newcomer an instructive overview of the IUC. As one of the first actions on our arrival Peter Fischer-Appelt took me to "Berta's house" where all close friends of the IUC had been sitting, drinking, talking and joking so many times. I'll never forget the friendly reception I was given, and being seated on the sofa under the huge, grave portrait of "Bramante introducing Raffael to Pope Julius II", listening to the conversation about the programme of the 10th anniversary celebrations and other issues, I really felt included in the IUC business as if I had been familiar with it for years. That was the beginning of a long-standing relation and friendship.

Horses from China

It was impossible not to take notice of Bill Allaway from the University of California at Santa Barbara, one of the IUC's founding fathers. First because of his tall figure, secondly, since he was sometimes accompanied by a large golf bag, and on request you would be informed that he already knew most of the famous golf courses worldwide. And not least because of his unforgettable sense of humour through which he could easily give long-drawn-out meetings a more relaxed atmosphere. I remember an EC meeting dating years back, when after a long and laborious discussion Kathy Wilkes, who at that time had various scientific relations not only with colleagues in East- and Southeast European countries but also with universities in Asia, brought in a delegation of scientists and authorities from Beijing University who had made it all the way from China to the Mediterranean and were glad to be guests of the IUC. When they were given an official welcome in the course of the EC meeting they announced Beijing University to apply for IUC membership (it still is on our list). Underlining their intention and expressing their gratitude, our guests presented a special gift to the DG: It was kind of tapestry which someone fixed to the blackboard and unrolled it. The picture on it didn't represent what Westerners were used to expect: Instead of some Chinese scenery known from their old watercolour



Frank Laubert and Ørjar Øyen

paintings it showed as embroidery three mustangs in very dynamic movement. When the head of the delegation started to give some explanation on the tapestry's design pointing out that the horses would stand for 'speed', Bill Allaway threw in and added: "Yes, speed on the agenda." I don't remember whether we followed his advice, but apparently China had already made up for the Western market.

The Quest for Independence

Although the question of legal independence had been on the agenda of the IUC governing bodies from the very beginning, it had been kept out of the way because the IUC could live and act within a well balanced system of an appropriate material basis for its operation on one hand, primarily provided by the University of Zagreb, and of academic and self-governmental independence on the other. But the war in former Yugoslavia left its marks, and the IUC was not located on the Elysian fields: The IUC's 'home institution', the University of Zagreb, started to reshape its concept of international cooperation where the IUC didn't get a privileged position any

longer. Moreover, there were actual and legal changes at the University of Zagreb and in the newly formed Croatian Republic which made the IUC strive for recognition as a legal and autonomous entity in compliance with Croatian law. An appropriate decision was taken by a subcommittee and addressed to the University of Zagreb in the beginning of 1993. When I was asked to draft the necessary documents, I cautiously indicated that the person in charge of this legal matter should at least have some basic knowledge about the relevant Croatian legislation. But my objection was turned down remarking that a lawyer from Zagreb, an expert on this issue, would then take the necessary legal actions.

The presentation of the draft documents was scheduled for the EC's May meeting 1993 in Zagreb. It was just once that I took the opportunity to travel down there by train. The DG and I went to Vienna where we had a stopover and met Siegfried Korninger. Our train left in the afternoon the next day, and it was a seven or eight hours trip, time I was glad to have for my homework. When we reached Zagreb, I hadn't seen much of the countryside but I had at least managed to finalize drafts of a "Foundation-Charter..." and of "Statutes of the Inter-University Centre Foundation". With the support of Enver Šehović and his colleagues, who offered their computer facilities at the Telecommunication Department, we were able to provide printed versions just in time for the EC meeting. The documents were discussed and accepted, a circular letter was sent out to all member universities to get their written approval, and after having received it our lawyer was expected to take the final procedural steps. Weeks and months went by, inquiries were made repeatedly, requests for information were submitted, reminders were sent out, but nothing happened. Half a year later, and with the help of other legal advisers it turned out that we had taken the wrong path since our plan of an international foundation was not in compliance with Croatian legislation. That's how we then got to the "IUC Association". What do we have to learn from this experience? By adaptation of a saying perhaps this: "On high seas and at the legal experts we are all in God's hands."

The Spirit of Marcus Antonius de Dominis

Human rights and academic freedom weren't the key topics on the agenda during the war and the early post war period. It was again Ivan Supek who together with some other intellectuals from scientific institutions in Croatia, Eastern and Western Europe

thought it important to point the way in these difficult times through initiating an international conference on “Peace, Human Rights and the Responsibility of Intellectuals” in the autumn of 1994. Since the conference was expected also to take a standpoint in favour of the IUC’s further existence and development, and since this event offered another opportunity to have an informal IUC meeting, representatives and friends of the IUC were especially supposed to follow the organiser’s invitation. The conference was held in Opatija, a city which to my remembrance looked quite peaceful and unharmed with its impressive 19th century houses and its islands scattered over the Mediterranean. The place contrasted remarkably to the violent conflicts that had been carried on in former Yugoslavia and which were still pending, as well as to our own mental and emotional status with all kinds of doubts about the IUC’s future. The somewhat strange situation seemed to be underlined by the unusual way we were taken to the place: Peter Fischer–Appelt and I took a flight to Vienna and from there to Trieste, a city I merely knew by name as Austria’s only access to sea during the Habsburg Empire. We arrived there in the late afternoon and had been promised to be picked up by Ivan Supek’s driver who had been instructed to bring us safely to Opatija. After having been seated in a huge black and powerful Mercedes, the kind once ‘commemorated’ by the famous rock singer Janis Joplin, the driver ‘took off’.

And indeed, our trip was much more a flight than a ground bound transportation. The man behind the wheel drove like hell; he raced through darkening forests, over hills, winding country roads and highways. From time to time, Peter Fischer–Appelt tapped on the man’s shoulder from behind, quietly but firmly asking him to slow down. It only helped for a few minutes before our driver pushed the pedal again, and after several useless attempts we succumbed to our fate, which finally brought us safely to our destination. To have a conference on peace and human rights in Opatija in these days with more than 150 participants from 22 countries must be regarded as remarkably successful. Together with the “Opatija Declaration” the conference produced an appeal to Croatian and international authorities and institutions to make every effort in securing the IUC’s mission. The resolution revealed that the IUC’s future was very much endangered, and we all felt deeply uneasy because the institution’s further existence seemed to be at stake. And indeed, we had an extremely critical situation where we had to be prepared for the possibility that the IUC was going to be abandoned by its long–standing host

institution and to loose its material basis. When the inner circle of IUC officials and 'caretakers' subsequently met to consider opportunities, chances and limits to how we could save our famous institution, it wasn't a very promising discussion. Fortunately, we didn't leave our meeting in such a desperate atmosphere but were happy to have an excursion the next day which brought us on a hydrofoil to the island of Rab where we could re-arrange our thoughts. We went for a long talkative walk through the beautiful park, and we learned something about the island's famous 'son', Marcus Antonius de Dominis, who, as a contemporary of Galileo Galilei, ranked among the greatest theologians, philosophers and scientists at the turn of the 17th century and whose main preoccupation was the problem of peace in Europe through finding ways to avoid religious separation and conflicts.

Looking back it really appears as a miracle that the IUC had overcome those unfavourable times maintaining its academic vitality until today. Who knows whether and to what extent the spirit of Marcus Antonius de Dominis contributed to this success?

Pictures from the Memory Box

By Dada M. Maglajlić

Bemidji State University, Minnesota

In twenty two years many events took place, some very positive and the others very disturbing. The IUC School of Social Work Theory and Practice has been blessed with a large number of wonderful associates who supported the program during the times of War in the region and after it. We briefly returned to Dubrovnik immediately after the siege, and Hotel Argentina kindly offered free of charge lecture rooms and very low rate for all participants. The year before, City of Budapest offered its beautiful ancient City Hall. The year after, Brijuni Islands offered its hospitality – our courses took place in the historic hall in which nonaligned movement was founded by presidents Tito, Nehru and Naser. We also staged program at the beautiful St. Anne Church in Seattle and Prof. Dr. Paul Shane's private home in Philadelphia. So many institutions and individuals provided support it will take more than a chapter to remember them all. That does not mean that we didn't encounter hardships of all kinds and sorts. For ex. for the year 1994, we made a plan early on to stage three courses at the School of Public Health "Andrija Štampar" in Zagreb. We worked for month to attract colleagues from all over the world, both as lecturers and participants. When course were about to start School cancelled initial plans due to unforeseeable circumstance. After initial panic we managed to find affordable lecture hall/s at hotel International. For this brief reflection I have selected three events that popped up immediately after I received invitation: initiative to start the School, meeting Arun Gandhi, and the 1999 in Dubrovnik!

As Rector of the University of Zagreb Prof. Dr. Zvonimir P. Šeparović, visited University of Minnesota in the Twin Cities (Minneapolis and St. Paul) during the academic year 1984/85. Upon return I was informed that well known professor from this university will be presenting at the World Congress of Victimology and would like to visit with me regarding programs offered within the IUC. The congress took

place in Zagreb, the Summer of 1985. Since I had two presentations I set aside time to be at the Congress, allowing enough time for visits with Prof. Dr. Burt Galaway. We decided to start a set of courses within the IUC Dubrovnik under the umbrella title “School of SW Theory and Practice” and approach for support International Association of the Schools of SW (IASSW) at that time headquartered in Vienna, Austria and International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) at that time headquartered in Norway. We obtained approval from both organizations and Dr. Vera Mehta, Secretary General of the IASSW actively participated in the creation of the academic program for one of the first three courses. Tom Johannesen, Secretary General of the IFSW was not able to attend in person but continues to offer his support; his statement can be found in the Journal (). Now we have a set of eight courses. Initially we had a proposal to offer half of the program in the fall and the other half in the spring. We learned quickly how it would be impossible to carry out such proposal even if we agree that one of the two of us is present in Dubrovnik during the fall and the other during the spring. As originally planned we have developed a set of eight courses, and we offer two courses per each week of the month of June.

Small town of Bemidji is known as the 1st city on the Mississippi river. It has only 15000 thousand inhabitants and it is hard to say is it with or without five thousand BSU students? Bemidji State University is a small public university, a member of Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, the 5th largest higher education system in the USA. Small town of Bemidji, however, has a large number of excellent leadership programs including training for peaceful mediation geared toward middle and high school youth. In 1996, Arun Gandhi from Christian Brothers University Memphis, TN MK Gandhi Institute for Nonviolence was brought in as a trainer. Professor Gandhi staged a set of workshops grounded in the legacy of his grandfather M.K. Gandhi. I attended workshop open to the public and approached Prof. Gandhi with an invitation to attend our program at the IUC Dubrovnik. I made it clear that we don't have funds to cover his travel expenses and provide even a symbolic honorarium. Beautifully caring the legacy of M.K. Gandhi, Prof. Arun Gandhi and his wife Sunanda kindly agreed to honour us with their presence. They staged a workshop within our Course SW and Spirituality and offered lecture for the public at the IUC conference room.



Last photo from my memory box is related to the 10th Anniversary Conference. While in Ireland at the joint IASSW and IASW Conference I met Dr. David Macarov, Professor Emeritus from Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Israel. Deeply moved by his closing lecture – evaluation of the conference, I invited him to serve as a keynote speaker for our 10th Anniversary Conference to be held in June 1999 at the IUC Dubrovnik. He kindly agreed to it, and did come in spite of the warning that Dubrovnik is marked RED due to the NATO intervention in Serbia/Kosovo. We worked very hard on academic program for each of the five courses and the Conference. Unfortunately large number of UN and other Officers and our long term Associates was not able to attend due to the above mentioned marking. At that time IUC Secretariat had only one computer. Two Staff Members (Dube Kapetanić and

Dada Maglajlić (in centre)
and Arun Gandhi, grandson of Mahatma
Gandhi (next to her) with participants
in the course Spirituality and Social
Work in 1997

Srećko Krzić) kindly agreed to let us use the computer in order to reach hundred associates all over the world. Inspired by the actual situation we decided to draft a document “Towards a Peaceable Community”. As we worked on the draft, NATO planes were literally flying over our heads. With input from almost all Associates we finalized the document (to be found in the issue no. 3. of the Journal). Late Professor Enver Šehović from the University of Zagreb presented it at the International Association of the University Presidents and UN Commission on Disarmament Education, Conflict Resolution and Peace Conference at Aalborg University in Aalborg, Denmark while we all committed ourselves to its promotion and implementation. Document continues to inform and inspire our day-to-day practice. It can be found in the same issue (no. 3) of the IUC Journal of SW Theory and Practice.

Hotbed of Excellence: The IUC

– Information on Time about Time 1977–1987

By *Silva Mežnarić*

Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, Zagreb

We were a fifties academic cohort (philosophers, sociologists, political scientists) that came of age in particularly favourable time in former Yugoslavia; first generation in former century that finished obligatory and secondary schooling in peaceful period after 1950–1960, without disruption. We had an opportunity to enquire humanist and social sciences in a bliss of “opening-up” of the semi-authoritarian socialist state towards European not-only-Marxist and Enlightenment heritage of the European thought; for former Yugoslavia citizens, free visa regime (1965) has been made available for nearly all European countries (except Soviet bloc, Greece and Albania). Import of foreign periodicals and books used to update us on recent developments in social sciences and humanities fields.....who could disregard the role of famous Gunduličeva Street bookstore in Zagreb?

Sure enough, a number of key problems were not resolved at time; they would intermittently turn up (first massive Zagreb university students’ demonstrations in 1959) showing that vulnerable, tiny layer of academic freedom in “socialism” is there all but expanding. At the same time, Student centre (SC) in Zagreb set off as receptive and approachable space for variety of artistic and political innovations. For the first time in Zagreb, university started to function as a “campus”, informal college-like exchange of well-timed European ideas. New music, new theatres, new politics, new graphic arts ... all were represented there. In mid-sixties, summer school for social and humanities started in Korčula, followed by Komiža. Periodicals like *Perspektive* in Ljubljana, *Razlog* in Zagreb and *Praxis*, shouldered through tight censor’s control reaching out for their new readership. They all got through to “us”, individuals in “self-management” socialism, and to young European revivalism of enlightenment ambition. And then, gone with the roar were global sixty-eighties and local seventy-one-nines... . That left behind liberalism stranded within “plumbic

years” of Titoism. Actors scattered, emigrated, got employed...cohort got replaced by new cohort of rockers, punkers, heavies (metal), writers and artists. Former Yugoslavia academic stage in humanities and social sciences split up into two groups: transmitters of “dominant knowledge/ ideas” and innovators. The Interuniversity Centre in Dubrovnik assumed a vital role among the latter.

With amazing and unprecedented synergy of global ideas something like a virtual, exterritorial centre of graduate studies emerged in then socialist Yugoslavia (Croatia). Within a decade 1977 – 1987 Croatian (Yugoslav)¹ graduate students and post-PhDs have had a privilege that for majority of European and American colleagues was unimaginable – that is to enrol to three weeks courses with a minimal fees and listen to, work with the otherwise “high-priced stars” of western scholarship in humanities and social sciences. Course: *Philosophy and Social Sciences* became a central event in a spring term. Jürgen Habermas (1977–1981), Anthony Giddens (1979–1982), Claus Offe (1979–1986), John Keane (1982–1986), Richard Bernstein (1976–1986), Andrew Arato together with former Yugoslav scholars were the key organizers and lecturers² at the courses³. In addition to that, women studies started as early as 1975⁴.

The whole cohort of then Croatian and Yugoslav scholars acquired there information without which the whole gamut of explanations “what has been happening” in late eighties in the Balkans and Eastern Europe would have been spurious and scientifically bogus – to say the least. We get hold of information on theories of modernity – whether empirical or normative, crisis of modernity and reconstitution of public sphere, social transformation in Eastern Europe,

¹ IUC was available to all member universities as well.

² Between 1977 and 1986 other prominent lecturers on occasions were: Agnes Heller, Zygmunt Bauman, Friedrich Naschold, Charles Taylor, Rom Harre, Ian Hacking, George Conrad, and Russell Berman.

³ Courses between 1977–1987 comprised the following topics: Critical Approaches to Sociology (1977), Rationality in the Natural and Social Sciences (1978), Social Transformation (1979), Equality and Freedom (1980), Theories of Modernity 1 (1981), Theories of Modernity 2 – The Crisis of Modernity and Reconstitution of a Public Sphere (1982), Aspects of Democratic Theory; Post-modern Critique of Humanism (1983), Identity, Interest and Rationality (1984), Culture and Politics – Forms of Critique, Directions and Changes (1985), Socialism and Civil Society (1986), New Social Movements and Democratization of Society (1987). Source: IUC Archive.

⁴ Women studies were initiated by Johann Galtung (1975) and supported by then Yugoslav feminists; later women studies broke up into several courses, one of them became a workshop of *Philosophy and Social Sciences* course; Nancy Fraser, Judith Butler, Gayatri Spivak, Carol Pateman were among organizers and lectured there.



Silva Mežnarić with participants in
Divided Societies seminar in 1997

post-modern critique of humanism and feminism, post-modern culture and politics, aspects of democratic theory... . Contacts with professors made possible for students to attend courses and to apply for MA and PhDs at universities and colleges like: Balliol and All Souls at Oxford, New School for Social Research, Lund, Cambridge, Boston University, Max Planck Institute at Sternberg and Göteborg, Princeton Department of Philosophy, Universität Konstanz, Bremen... to mention a few were IUC students obtained their degrees.

On the occasion of taking on the position of Director General at IUC (1973) the young, forty years old Oslo University professor Johan Galtung wrote that IUC as an inter-University federation is the organization “which is in itself the message”. It should “aspire to the highest possible degree of excellence”. According to Galtung, this could have been done without cultivating elitism and with full academic freedom, tolerance and responsibility. Perfunctory, emphasized Galtung, beyond the formulas as interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary or cross disciplinary research and teaching /learning there is the transdisciplinary approach. This relatively recent

development “for our Centre would mean UNiversitas rather than MULTiversitas, viewing multidisciplinary as a step rather than the end result”.

This “freedom of learning” without unavoidably being part of the same habitual paradigms developed into essential tenet of IUC mission. The latter has been established on the heritage of *libertas*. Said Galtung: “Dubrovnik has tradition as a republic, as a port, and there is the age–old concept of the free port. That concept, however, has been given a narrow economic interpretation in the past ... it should be our contribution to try to create within the wonderful setting of Dubrovnik *an intellectual free–port*, a place where people could come and be free to express and exchange their ideas, in a way that is unconstrained by narrow political considerations and narrow academic conventions. We want people to be disciplined in their thinking, in order to communicate, to develop, to expand – but we do not want that discipline to kill creativity.”⁵

At the time, in its post–graduate courses, IUC supplied vital information on the European space and time. By lifting “higher learning out of its nation–state context....and the compartmentalization of human knowledge into disciplines” (Galtung, *ibid.*) IUC gave to many new ideas of eastern European origin their “surplus of meaning”. Thus enabling (some) actors not to be clichéd and repetitive in interpreting (at that time) emerging world(s).

⁵ Letter to IUC Board, Johan Galtung, Oslo, June 8, 1973. Source: IUC Archives.

My Three Decades at the IUC: A Testimony

By Nenad Mišćević

University of Maribor

Everybody is saying that the IUC has been the meeting place of West and East in the old days, and that it has continued to be the focus of intense intellectual exchange up to the present day. I can not only concur but also witness and illustrate. So, like the early Christians testifying to their experiences, I shall briefly recount the intellectual theology of my errant years, from the encounter with the god of hermeneutics, through the guardian angel of the IUC and of analytic philosophy, to some miraculous occurrences of the later days.

Story One: The God of Hermeneutics

At the age of twenty eight, I was invited by the Leuven philosopher Jan Broekman to come and give a paper on hermeneutics at his course at the IUC. I was glad, and moderately impressed, I had a story to tell about Gianbattista Vico's hermeneutics, I wrote it down, and in the evening of the day before my presentation I arrived to Dubrovnik. German colleagues, of my age, sat with me till late in the night correcting my paper, and then one young lady, her name was Ria, said: "Oh, you know, professor Gadamer is here." I froze; Gadamer was the living god of hermeneutics, I had no idea I might be talking in front of him. "Mach' dich keine Sorgen," Ria went on, and explained that he will probably be still sleeping in the morning, at the time when my presentation was due. Of course, in the morning, Gadamer was there, awake and active, and I started worrying seriously about my presentation. Well, I began talking and, at this point a shocking thing happened: Gadamer took his notebook, and started taking notes. I had no idea why I was being honoured in that way, I didn't know that he has always been doing this at talks, and I started dying of fear. However, the talk went on nicely, and the first to raise his hand was, of course,

Gadamer. He gave a short talk presenting his reading of Vico, and I was saved. But then, he walked up to me, complimented me, and invited me and Ria for a coffee. I was the happiest person in the world at that moment. It turned even better: the three of us spent several days talking to each other, joined occasionally by Ria's professor, now the famous Waldenfels.

Story Two: The Guardian Angel

At the end of the seventies, I started converting to analytic philosophy. Here is some prehistory. Thanks to the philosophical culture of Zagreb and of the University of Chicago Divinity School, with Paul Ricoeur in charge, in the early seventies, I had been through the constructive heritage of Heideggerianism, and then in Paris I switched to its de(con)structive variant, and became a student and fan of Derrida. But deconstruction started to look to me as dishonest and cowardly: you poke fun, in a super sophisticated way, on every philosopher who ever spoke his mind, and you never say openly what you think, you just go on insinuating. And then, one day, I read Austin's "Sense and Sensibilia", saw light, and fell off the couch. I had my moment of conversion: this was the style of thinking and writing. I wanted to make my own. The only person in Zagreb who could help me was Neven Sesardić, and he did help me, most generously.

But where do you find analytic philosophers from big centres where the action is taking place? Of course, only at the IUC. And indeed, the guardian angel that descended upon the few aspiring analytic philosophers from Croatia and Slovenia, flew right from Oxford, in the shape of charming, energetic lady, the one-and-only Kathy Wilkes, the thinker who had formulated several important doctrines in philosophy of mind and psychology, and furthermore, some crucial ideas about interpreting its history had been formulated by her, in an original and pioneering fashion. I didn't know then that before joining us she was active in communist countries, especially in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, organising help for dissident intellectuals, giving lectures, legally in the latter, semi-illegally in the former and bringing intellectual and political news from the West. She was a kind soul, I would be tempted so say, but she was arguing that there is no soul at all, and even no mind.

Kathy's main area of work was naturalised philosophy of mind, and she had a strong interest in neurology and psychology. She managed to combine it with a keen

effort to reinterpret ancient Greek thinkers, in particular Aristotle, along the lines of her naturalistic predilections. She has anticipated the kind of approach that was later made famous by Churchlands; many of us feel that her pioneering work has not received the recognition it deserves. A central topic of Kathy's work concerned the status of folk-psychology in relation to its scientific cousins, psychology and neurology. She argued that philosophers are wrong in taking the former as a serious theory and trying to accommodate it within philosophy, or, even worse, trying to ground philosophy of mind upon it. It is, or so she argued, more of a hodgepodge of practical attitudes rather than a theory with laws and theoretical terms. It is a useful and indispensable hodgepodge, but its extreme usefulness does not make it fit for refinement into a philosophical or scientific theory. A crucial line of argument she proposed for her view concerns the taxonomy of mental functions. Functions which folk-wisdom was able to recognise, turn out to be composita, built up from rather autonomous sub-functions, autonomous in the sense that the impairment of one sub-function leaves the others intact. For example, in the case of so-called phonological dyslexia, the patients make almost no mistakes in reading normal words of, say, English, but make quite a lot of mistakes in reading meaningless strings or "non-words". Such a selective impairment points to the conclusion that known words are recognised by a different procedure using mechanism different from the procedure which deals with meaningless non-words. Usually, a scientist would go further and look for sub-sub-functions. As Carramazza has put it once, "The most fundamental assumption of cognitive neuro-psychology is the fractionation assumption – the belief that brain damage can result in the selective impairment of components of cognitive processes." It is sometimes claimed that the very plausibility of factorisations is already evidence against folk psychology. But the proper argumentative strategy is the following: take a well known capacity, say recognitional capacity. Find an odd but successful and important factorisation. For example, in the case of recognition, point out that there are cases where patient is able to recognise the ordinary inanimate but unable to recognise faces (prosopagnosia). Use the oddity as testimony against the psychological notion of recognition, by hinting that the folk-psychological notion was a notion of a single capacity whereas here we find the most unexpected sub-capacities. Further, regroup the original "sub-capacities" of several given folk-capacities, so as to obtain a different, even incommensurable taxonomy. Conclude that scientific taxonomy is

orthogonal to the one implicit in folk psychology. Given the credential of science, argue that folk-psychology is wrong and not to be rescued as a theory of the mental.

So, what do you say about the character of a physicalist guardian angel like Kathy, who would be offended if told she had a good soul or a great mind? Well, that she had a great heart. That's physicalistic enough. After the collapse of communist regimes, the guardian angel spent a lot of time in Croatia, playing a heroic role in the besieged town of Dubrovnik, aiding the town and the Inter-University Centre.

Story Three: π in the Sky and the Buridan's Ass

What is left, once you met a god, and a guardian angel? Saint Paul and Saint Mathew would think this was all. Saint John the Evangelist would know better: there are divine signs in the sky. Neoplatonic tradition linked them with numbers and similar matters. And one of them descended upon us, the π in the sky. James Robert Brown and his work in philosophy of mathematics pushed me to dedicate fifteen years of my work to intuitions, and to trying to refute him. He is a Platonist, who thinks that in thought experiments we see abstract mathematical entities, numbers like π in the Platonic heaven. This irritated me so much that I got hooked on his topic. And he went on, helping me extremely generously, for decades to come. (Just to illustrate how balanced the IUC courses are, let me mention Kathy's criticism of thought experiment in philosophy, in contrast to those in science. The former do not satisfy one vital constraint: "the experimenter, in thought or in actuality, needs to give us the background conditions against which he sets his experiment. If he does not, the results of his experiment will be inconclusive." Since experiments, typically, set out to show what difference some factor makes; in order to test this, other relevant conditions must be held constant, and the problematic factor juggled against that constant background. Philosophers just don't make the background conditions precise enough, and then the play of the experimenter's imagination is too unconstrained to teach us about real possibilities and necessities.)

Enough of philosophy. The craziest story about thought experiments is that we did a course-conference on them in the besieged Dubrovnik, right under sniper fire. Jim was there, and Kathy as well. I used to walk from Hotel Argentina to the Music School where the course was taking place in the company of Lars Bergström, an elegant, slim gentlemen, dressed in an almost violet sporting suit. The sniper alarm

would sound, and I would tell Lars: “In a minute we will know about the sharp-shooter. If he is a perfectionist, he will aim at you; you are so slim that you are very hard to hit. If he goes for a certain catch, he will aim at me, I am so broad, he can’t miss.” We survived; the ass probably could not decide at which of the two to aim. And the craziest thing was that we had serious discussions, almost quarrels, about questions like whether thought experiments essentially involve spatial intuition or whether logic is enough. Any normal person would have taken us to be a bunch of crazy idiots.

This is then the glorious history. Now, we have a team of famous philosophers of language and mind (Dunja Jutronic said she will write about them, so I am not allowed to), a philosophy journal that follows every step of our Dubrovnik activities (I am also not allowed to praise it, since I am the editor in chief, and Dunja is actually doing it), and a small legion of talented students, from Croatia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, and now again Serbia, for whom IUC is a testing ground and a springboard. But this is a story for another occasion.

* Kathy applies the strategy to the ordinary notion of consciousness. She decomposes it into several quite unrelated components, and argues that once decomposed it is also easily deconstructed. Qualia and the subjective “point of view” are no problem; they can be treated by analogy with indexicals: “Just as a map of the London underground system often helpfully has an ancillary arrow stating ‘you are here’, so the notional, complete, psycho-physiological-physical picture of the world could be supplemented for its users: ‘this is you’, from which the way things are experienced from that position may be inferred. The addition ‘you are here’ to a map is, evidently, not the cartographer’s business ...; similarly, the addendum ‘this is you’ to a complete psycho-physical account is not a proper part of the scientist’s concern. But a fixed map in an underground station ..., or an objective psycho-physical description to which one could give the subjective ‘fix’—and both would be heuristics, assisting the user to interpret the maps—could each supply the point of view: from here, Victoria is four stops east on the Circle line, from this perspective, red and green would be indistinguishable (i.e. the viewpoint of a colour-blind man). Psychologists and neuroscientists, like cartographers, must first frame their representations; then, if they want to be helpful, they will show us how to interpret and use them—will show us how to find ‘the subjective point of view’. To sum up, sciences do not and need not explain every phenomenon under every description” (p. 227). Freed from folk-psychological commitments (alleged or real), the “mental” becomes capable of physicalistic reduction. Kathy’s last work, *Real people*, extends the analysis to philosophical and folk notion of person and personal identity.

My Self-managed Experience of Self Management, or Self Management and the Management of Selves

By Henning Salling Olesen

Roskilde University

88

In 1987–91, I spent one or two weeks every year in the IUC and in the Stradun discussing the emerging conflicts of Yugoslavia with good friends. Some of them told about Milošević's speech at Kosovo Polje, others about the harassment of Serbian scholars in Split...And together, in the daytime, we studied the Yugoslav self management system as well as experiences of cooperatives and workplace democracies across the world.

Had they not been good friends I would probably not have been able to accept the complex message. There were my international friends who were – like my self – enthusiastically interested in the experiences of self management in Yugoslav economy. There were indigenous people – at that time nationality did not seem a relevant category to me – who disagreed increasingly and insisted on drawing our attention to other aspects than the self management system. Recognizing the complexity and ambiguity of reality is probably the most challenging intellectual operation.

We all witnessed a process in which social psychology of disappointment, of fear, of misrecognition was ingeniously turned into identity politics and finally civil war and genocide – but we had to discuss while filtering our own identifications and projections, and direct situated involvements, respectively.

My entrance a few years earlier into the IUC was somewhat awkward – I was attending the Council meeting in 1980, being at the time Prorector for my university. I accepted the invitation mainly because of a professional academic interest in the practices of self managed workplaces. Researching theoretically and empirically learning in contexts outside formal education, particularly work related learning, in developed capitalist societies you find out that workers' participation in the management of their own work process play a significant role in their learning –

technical as well as social and political learning. The option for a comparative or contrasting case for worker participation and a specific workplace organisation in an entirely different wider socio-economic environment seemed extremely interesting, but how this could become realistic by attending an IUC meeting was, I think, not at all clear. I did not speak the language (at that time it seemed to be one rather than several languages) and I knew everyday life only on a tourist level, i.e. on the Dalmatian coast and the north.

I quickly realized I had come to the right place. There was in fact a course in the IUC programme on self management. When I inquired about it I learned from executive secretary, Berta Dragičević, that the organizer of this course, Eugen Pusić, one of the founding fathers of the IUC, who was a professor of Law in Zagreb, had also contributed substantially to the creation of the 1961 constitution in which Yugoslavia established the principles of self managed economic entities. Professor Pusić was not in Dubrovnik at the time but I decided to contact him later on.

I was of course also fascinated of the history of Yugoslavia and the region, and the ideas of a liberal or democratic version of socialist economy, and our membership of the IUC was founded in the role of the IUC and its role of being a meeting place across historical conflicts in the region and the meeting place between East and West. My first visit was very fruitful. Beside the information about Pusić's course I was guided by my good friend prof. Adolfsen from Aalborg, who was already a veteran, into the Kremlology of the IUC – the connections between the contemporary actors and the more and less glorious past of the IUC. There was professor Supek who had the apparition of a myth, and was one, there was the story of the Norwegian secretary general, peace- and conflict researcher Johan Galtung, who seemed not to have understood the rules of the game in Titoist Yugoslavia, the careful East-West diplomacy carried out by prof. Fischer-Appelt, establishing confident links with the elite of Bulgaria and Romania. I went home, hooked, and from then right until 2007 I was the representative of my university in the council and later member of the executive committee, and a stable course organizer.

I started exploring the contents and background of the self management courses. It was before e-mail and internet this was quite a complicated and time consuming process, but I managed to find out that the group behind had already split, more or less disagreeing about the nature of the course. It seemed the course had been running like an introduction to institutional arrangement of Yugoslavian self

Henning Salling Olesen, greeting
participants in the seminar Training of
Teachers in General Medical Practice



management and the ideas behind – and part of the participants would rather study practice and experiences. I got in contact with one of the latter, Gabriele Herbert in Frankfurt, who speaks Serbo-Croatian and was very well connected with intellectuals and political circles at least in then Croatia.

This was the start of an extremely exciting network of researchers and “practising intellectuals” who will – after many historical turns – meet again in the IUC in April 2009. Gabriele Herbert and I agreed to organize a new type of courses which should include the Yugoslav self management experience as well as world wide experiences of self managed work in different societal contexts – prominently Basque cooperatives and the alternative economic scene in Western Europe – later came the experiences from the transition in East block socialist countries, American employee ownership and cooperatives in the 3rd world. We are going to catch up with this and evaluate this development with a view to the future next April.

But in the first years we focussed very on the practical experiences and the ongoing discussions in Yugoslavia, we visited e.g. the factory Alata – a cutting edge tool factory in Trebinje – and other businesses in the area – and we heard the

different versions of the “real story” underneath the idealized presentation of the intentions in the self management system which was also a self presentation of Yugoslavia as a state and a 3rd way between western capitalism and eastern concrete communism. So of course as historical events in Eastern Europe and Yugoslavia speeded up this became a discussion about the political and economic circumstances in them selves but also about the relation between work place self management, economic democracy and societal system.

Before we set off with this process I managed to get in personal contact with professor Pusić. I visited him in his home in Šalata – I remember a skinny, extremely friendly man in a dark house full of books. In this way he stepped right into a framework that had grown up in understanding the IUC kremlology, namely one of “old time Charm” intellectuals and humanists who had kept their footing in an international academic community at the same time as engaging in the political process of their country. Pusic readily informed me about the self management system, which was a real innovative ideological response to the democratic deficit in communist systems which had become possible in after Tito’s break away from the communist block. I think I also realized at this occasion that we had done the right thing in focussing on the complicated realities in our self management study rather than remain with the ideas and their good reasons. Much later it became clear that many of the power structures also in the new system had remained in the hands of the old nomenklatura.

On my second visit to the IUC which was the 10th anniversary conference of the IUC in 1982 I got in contact with a journalist of Danas, the big(gest?) newspaper in Croatia, and he invited me to visit him in Zagreb, meet some other friends etc. I accepted the invitation (of course) and started what was my first real educational journey in then Yugoslavia which took me to Sarajevo, Belgrade, Zagreb and Novi Sad – I met colleagues who revealed a rather traditional and old fashioned elitist university system – with bubbling academic aspiration and a modernisation inside – and lot of informal social contacts – staying overnight in a Muslim family with a son studying medicine – meeting the female professor in her everyday busy life (she was divorced, living with her 8 year old daughter and a Zastava 770) – this exposed to me a restrained dynamic, a civil life very close to the one I knew from home emerging. My hosts readily informed me about all the specific circumstances in Yugoslavia I was curious about – and at the same time they exposed an everyday life which was very

easily recognizable. What impressed and puzzled me particularly bit, however, was something that I only in retrospect can see as identity politics. I was, by the journalist, invited on a Sunday family dinner in the home of a UofZ professor, Milan Mesić, who from then became a good friend – it was a fantastic day, eating, drinking, talking – personally, politically, playing with language and cultural bonds (I had great fun in discovering all the germanistic elements disguised in mysterious Slavic spelling – and they told me that this was their real central European soul: The good food, the pork, beer, Gemütlichkeit. It was an epitome of a theme which was there all the time.

I invited Milan Mesic to participate in our now established self management seminars. He brought his much more sinister perception of the realities of economy and management in relation to the then growing tensions between communist party core in Serbia, unpacking a new nationalist agenda and different (indeed very different) opposite trends of Croatian rightwing nationalism, democratic fractions in the Croatian and Slovenian communist parties, liberalist business elites looking to the western markets, old time humanists and intellectual democrats etc. It was extremely exciting discussions, unveiling a complexity which had not been accessible without knowing the language, and sometimes challenging the identification of foreigners with the Yugoslav self management utopia.

At the same time I had some practical observation exercises in the operation of the self management system. IUC was an international academic institution, but it was also a local OUR, a self managing work community inside the University of Zagreb. In the eighties it seemed to imply a form of parallel management, with a professor from Zagreb being the local leader of the institution and the staff being employed by UoZ, at the same time as the institution had its secretary general appointed by the governing bodies founded in the council of member universities. The IUC was a rather sleepy institution in my opinion, and I never ceased to wonder whether this was an effect of institutional deadlock or it was a university mentality thing – the whole atmosphere reminded me so much about Danish universities some 20 years earlier, in the 60'ies, before a massive take off in higher education and a student rebellion took them out of their magic sleep. Whatever the causal relations an organisational landslide seemed to take place in the period from mid 1980'es – during the civil war and after, which in my opinion represents a micro-version of modernisation in one specific workplace: Dormitories were constructed and furnished on the top of the Frana Bulića building, the first computer arrived in the

IUC (a gift from the university of Sofia, prompting you Cyrillic letters to be fed with a 51/2 inch floppy disk (this was only a couple of years after I myself acquired my first computer with a floppy boot disk, which prompted in English and denied to understand a few Danish characters) – the secretariat for the IUC developed, technically and socially, a much higher level of service, including photocopying (!) – all these small changes started before the war. And with the serious interruptions of the war they continued more rapid afterwards. While the secretariat of the IUC was now split off the major UoZ organisation – now probably not any longer an OUR (?) – the IUC secretariat developed into a very efficient and responsive organisation which managed with very low budget and staff to re-erect the international institution. What we have seen is a piece of workplace self management in operation under relatively complicated circumstances – people who identified with their work context but also took onboard inspiration and technological and social innovation and inspiration coming to it through its international contacts. For my academic perspective it remains open – mostly because of lack of knowledge – how different factors interacted.

I came to the IUC to find the opportunity for a contrasting study of self management across different societal systems, and I indeed found the material. I had not expected it to take a life time and still I wish I had the time and the resources to carry out an empirical study on the level of everyday work practices and mentalities the self management experience as a specific format of modernisation process may or may not have influenced work organisation and work identity. It would, however, necessarily have to reflect a thick and all pervasive layer of social psychology of identity conflicts which, though not all recognized from the beginning, turned out to manage the selves.

Note:

George A. Potts (1996) *The Development of the System of Representation in Yugoslavia with Special Reference to the Period since 1974*, Lanham/NY/London: University Press of America.

IUC Reflections

By Michael R. Ott

Grand Valley State University, Michigan

94

In April of 1978, my wife, Mary Louise and I travelled to Dubrovnik for the first time to attend the three week course on The Future of Religion at the IUC and to celebrate our honeymoon. We stayed at Hotel Lero where we had a beautiful room that looked out to the Adriatic Sea. Each day we would walk to the IUC for the day long sessions and absorb the sights, sounds, and smells of this wonderful city. We particularly got to know the staff at the Hotel, who would sit with us and tell us about Dubrovnik, how their worker owned Hotel and economy worked, and about their lives. They were also very interested to know about our lives in the United States. We had very interesting discourses throughout our stay at the Hotel and made friends with people we still meet from time to time even today in 2007.

Our experiences at the IUC were precisely what we hoped they would be: international, scholarly, friendly, challenging and inspiring. There were more than 40 people from a number of countries who participated in our course on the Future of Religion. It was during this course that I had the opportunity to meet and talk with one of our lecturers, the critical theorist Jürgen Habermas. I will never forget him saying during a discussion with our course director, Rudolf J. Siebert, that the most important and critical task today is “*to gather together the fragments of reason*” in the hope and struggle of creating a more rational and reconciled future society and world.

Along with Dr. Siebert, my wife and I took a sight-seeing trip to Split where we met our course’s Co-Director Srđan Vrcan, who took us to a wonderful restaurant where my wife fell in love with calamari. It was during our stay in Split that we also had the opportunity to see President Tito and his motorcade drive past our hotel.

Of course we walked the streets of the beautiful walled city of Dubrovnik and marvelled at the city’s architecture and history. One evening, as my wife and I

entered the old city, we saw a large crowd of mostly young adults walking on the main street of the city. The men were standing nearer the shops as the women walked by. It was here that I learned my first Croatian phrase, “*Hey, baby!*” spoken in perfect English many times by the men to the women! A universal language spoken during a universal spring ritual of love!

At the conclusion of the course, my wife and I stayed an extra week in Dubrovnik to celebrate our honeymoon by relaxing in the cafes, sun-bathing on the rocky shore of the Adriatic, and enjoying the splendour of the city. My wife and I returned to Dubrovnik, to the IUC and to the Future of Religion course in 2007 to celebrate our 30th wedding anniversary. This was my wife’s first return trip to Dubrovnik since our honeymoon and we had a marvellous and memorable anniversary.

I have returned to the IUC for many years to attend the annual Future of Religion course, where I am now a Co-Director. During our course’s 30th year anniversary celebration in April 2006, I, along with other Directors of the course, was honoured by the IUC with a certificate of recognition for my years of participation in the Future of Religion course and for my participation in building the Centre’s course offerings. Also, as an expression of the work of our course, in June 2007, my book of 21 edited scholarly papers presented in the Future of Religion courses from 2001 – 2006 was published by Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands. The book is entitled *The Future of Religion: Toward a Reconciled Society*.

I would like to thank the administration of the IUC for providing the opportunity for such wonderful and enlightening life-experiences and friendships that have been developed over the years. Both Mary Louise and I are looking forward to many more years of collegial participation in continuing our Future of Religion course, in developing the program of the IUC, and in returning to beautiful Dubrovnik.

Even the Carpet Tells a Story

By Ørjar Øyen

Honorary Member of IUC
University of Bergen

96

At the time when the first Director General made his entry into the halls of the Inter-University Centre in Dubrovnik, back in 1972, his eyes fell upon a red-and-black carpet covering a significant portion of the floor of his office. World traveller and transnational peace-builder Johan Galtung had seen similar creations before. They were known to have been woven by small fingers somewhere in a Middle East country. They reflected much meticulous care. Designs and shades of colour embodied enduring traditions kept alive and cultivated over centuries.

The carpet contributed to the warm and friendly ambience of the environment in which the newly appointed Director General embarked on the task of designing the many details of the intellectual and scholarly mission and agenda of the IUC for years to come. For some time, Galtung had to live with what came to be termed “the key issue”, namely, the problem that as a non-native, and for whatever other reasons, he was not entrusted with a key to the building – clearly a handicap because he was in the habit of working hard night and day. Notwithstanding such restraint he contributed much to setting up many of the formulas and procedures whereby the IUC has been operating ever since.

Siegfried Korninger, a former Rector of the University of Vienna, succeeded Johan Galtung as Director General. Even though Dubrovnik was not so very far away from Vienna in terms of bird-flight distance or in terms of historical linkages between Austria and Dubrovnik, the airline JAT usually took Korninger to Belgrade where he had to spend the best part of a day waiting in the somewhat unexciting airport for an evening flight to Dubrovnik. But always, as he arrived and stepped into his office he greeted his carpet and felt that life was good. He inspected his little palm-tree by the patio of his little backyard and exuded joy and happiness, knowing



Executive Committee meeting in Bergen in 1981. From right around table: Nasrollah Fatemi, Siegfried Korninger, Berta Dragičević, Rikard Lang, Piet Thoenes, Bariša Krekić, Peter Fischer-Appelt, Helmut Meise, Werner Ruf, Monica Partridge, Đorđe Pribičević and Ørjar Øyen, then Rector of the University of Bergen

that the strains of his journeys were fully worth it – and he was in a happy mood when facing his piles of mail and entering into his administrative duties.

The carpet was there when yours truly took office as Director General of the IUC. I guess I had come to take its presence more or less for granted. It was a noteworthy feature of the environment and as far as I was concerned it could serve, throughout my term of office, as part of the symbolic reward for efforts to promote the goals of the IUC.

In my imagination, the carpet had been given as a gift to Academician Ivan Supek while he travelled the world as Rector of the University of Zagreb, and, being so enthusiastically engaged in the founding of the IUC, he must have considered it appropriate to have the carpet placed in the IUC building. Later I have learned that my imagination relating to the details of the origin of the particular piece of textile has scant foundation in brute facts of history. But never mind, the carpet was there, on the floor of the Director General's office, thanks to Ivan Supek and no one else.

One day, as I arrived from Bergen in Norway, the office looked bleak and naked. The carpet was no longer there. Could it have been taken to the cleaner? – No, it had been carried up to the top floor of the IUC building where it now lay idle under

antique and stylish furniture in a kind of representation room where visiting dignitaries could, if they so wished, have a glass of local champagne or perhaps Napoleon while talking business and enjoying the magnificent view of Dubrovnik's Old City.

By this time, I had acquired a little bit of awareness of a certain dualism of the system within which I was doing my best to relate to rights and duties. Proudly I looked upon myself as having been entrusted with the elevated task of heading the Inter-University Centre of Postgraduate Studies in Dubrovnik, an independent and autonomous international academic institution committed to the task of seeking truth and understanding in an atmosphere of friendly scholarly exchange – and the number of universities associated with the IUC had now reached more than 250. But I could not always know the limits of my authority, for good reasons.

As we all know, before the Balkan wars Yugoslavia maintained its unique system of self-management, whereby employees of an enterprise or organisational entity had a voice and were entitled to speak their mind, express their opinions, and partake in decision-making in matters concerning the operation of the particular unit. So of course, the staff of the building Don Frana Bulića 4, known in Dubrovnik and elsewhere as “The IUC Building” – approximately 15 individuals, all counted – had its self-management body; it was headed by Pero Portolan. Mandated by the University of Zagreb to host the IUC, the self-management unit was not the Director General's arena, for presumably obvious reasons. Nevertheless, it played a vitally important role over the years in providing the conditions under which the IUC could do its job in accordance with the visions of Ivan Supek and his cofounders. And as Director General, I was guided by the wise opinions of IUC Council and Executive Committee, bodies usually not concerned with carpet matters. Fortunately, my most prominent helpers through turbulent times were Executive Secretary Berta Dragičević and Oxford philosopher Kathy Wilkes.

Now, could it be that the self-management unit had reached a decision to move the carpet away from the Director General's office, thus reducing his role and appearance in the international community of higher learning? I didn't entertain such a view. Or could it be that instructions had been passed down from some external source to strip the Director General of a spectacular item of his paraphernalia? During the times of self-management we foreigners kept hearing rumours about “The Man in the Black Suit” who comes from somewhere to tell the



William H. Allaway (Santa Barbara), Peter Fischer-Appelt (Hamburg), Berta Dragičević (Dubrovnik), Ivan Supek (Zagreb) and Ørjar Øyen (Bergen), in August 1993, gathered for the 9th Council meeting

decision-making body what decision to make. I honestly believe we even saw him in person on special occasions.

To be sure, the carpet problem was not the most demanding problem faced by the IUC during the formative years. Nevertheless, it gave the Director General an opportunity to probe the limits of authority. One day, when the situation seemed appropriate, I simply said to Pero Portolan, in a most affable tone, “I would like to have the carpet back”. He didn’t even blink before saying “OK”. A few minutes later the carpet was back where it belonged. For this, and for a host of other reasons, I have counted Pero Portolan among my Dubrovnik friends, and I feel that the IUC has had lots of reasons to do likewise.

There is more to the carpet story. On 6 December 1991 the building that had served as the home of the IUC came under heavy bombardment and was destroyed. Two caretakers’ living quarters were lost when the building went up in flames and the occupants, our loyal friends Nino and Maja Surjan and Hamdija and Sale Sinanović lost everything – and barely saved their lives. All holdings of the IUC’s

library were lost. Only the scarred and miserable walls were left standing when the tragic ordeal was over. Miraculously, the four chestnut trees providing welcomed shade in the courtyard withstood the flames. And furthermore, the ground floor offices of one corner of the building were found relatively unscathed under the debris. Thus, the archives of the IUC were on the whole recovered. And so was the carpet on the floor of the Director General's office!

Following the reconstruction of the building the secretariat of the IUC, including the Director General's office, was demoted by forces beyond our control from ground floor to first floor. What happened to the carpet? Who knows? My more or less uninformed guess is that the Director General's carpet exists somewhere, probably rolled up in some storage room somewhere within the building complex, placed there at a time when the presence of the IUC was not fully favoured by everyone and while hopes were entertained in some circles that the institution would disappear.

Maybe some day the incumbent of the office of Director General might wish to retest authority by venturing a demand to whomever that the carpet be dispatched to the cleaner and then comes back to where it belongs, once again. Such an event would warrant a special ceremony, with salutations and local champagne or perhaps Napoleon – or similar.

Even the IUC, only 35 years old in 2008, needs some symbols – some icons of identity. Over the years, representatives of many member universities all around the world have brought symbols of their academic environments. We have our own objects which in their own way may carry elements of the identity of the IUC – including pieces of art such as the sculptures donated by artist Anita Kontrec. Most of our accumulated prewar symbols of identity were lost in the flames of December 1991. Other icons have encountered other destinies.

I remember well one morning in the late eighties when dear Berta Dragičević called me in my Bergen office telling me that “our identity has been stolen”. She had come to work, discovering that the IUC's nice plaque by the entrance door had disappeared. I knew well then and I know today that I did not stretch my Director General's authority beyond its limits by telling her right out “just order another plaque!” – assuming that the symbolic content of one plaque would simply come to take occupancy in another. The old one was perhaps, at the time it disappeared, perceived by the perpetrator as legitimate war booty. Come better days – it may come back and find its niche!



Things do come back – sometimes. The IUC owned a bust of Dante Alighieri – a brass object so charged with wisdom and humanity. Our neighbour Miško Ercegović thought it would be a good idea to allow our Dante to sit down on the corner of the lavishly beautiful alley leading up to the entrance of the IUC. We agreed. But one night, Dante was stolen and disappeared. He survived and found his way back, by the good help of the Dubrovnik police. Whoever comes to Dubrovnik to take part in academic events at the IUC ought to make a brief stop for a gracious nod and a solemn salutation for Dante Alighieri, before turning into the alley so appropriately named *Dante Alighieri*.

Executive Committee meeting in Hamburg in 1985. Fahrhang Mohtadi, Monica Partridge, Josip Brčić, Bariša Krekić, Ørjar Øyen, Siegfried Korninger, Berta Dragičević, Inge Korninger, Edward Edwards, Roland Schaller

The reader will have noted that this is not first of all a story about some physical objects – including a carpet. Rather, it is an account of how physical objects acquire a life of their own, become charged with symbolic content, and, if they survive – as did purportedly the carpet, provide firm and perceptible linkages between past, present and future. A physical object may remain just a physical object and nothing more – even though it has its own unique history – such as a simple piece of rock ejected from the earth’s magma millions of years back. But even a piece of rock may become a sacred object, an object of worship, seized and elevated by human imagination to become a carrier of memory, tradition, and solemn belief and perform in our lives as a vibrant carrier of spirit and identity and as a focal point in the lives of bewildered crowds. You know the symbolic power of another piece of textile called the flag. You understand when you see “The Temple of the Tooth” in Kandy, Sri Lanka. And you sense the import of the monument’s collapse in times of “Mission completed!” and “We got him!”

The spirit of a physical object resides in the object because we put it there. Human beings have a way of attributing life and soul to external objects. But we know it’s in the eyes of the beholder – it is seen by the one who sees! Offense to our sacred objects may cause grief and pain. Yet, fortunately, many legislatures around the world have found that the burning of a flag is not sufficient reason to go to war.

And so, the IUC can live well without its carpet. Yet, wherever it rests today it holds some kernels of the spirit of the still young, enterprising Inter–University Centre because we who lived with it attributed life and spirit to it and made it an admittedly small yet not insignificant part of the IUC’s identity. Without its narrative attached any carpet is just a carpet! We recall that the tragedy of an antiquity shop is that the objects you see have been stripped of their most salient import, namely the spirit attributed to them and the stories told and passed on through decades and sometimes centuries.

Carpet or no carpet: The soul and spirit of material objects may have much more strength and stamina than we can imagine! But, to repeat, their stories must be told, retold, and retained. I have told my story!

Beneath Lovrijenac, around Danče: My Love and Life with the IUC

Darko Polšek

University of Zagreb

My love story with Inter–University Center Dubrovnik started 25 years ago, in 1982, when I was still a graduate student. Our professor, Neven Sesardić chose Andrea Zlatar, Rajka Rusan – my future wife, and me to represent “the Zagreb crew” at the philosophical seminar “Functionalism and the Philosophy of Mind” where “big shots” from Oxford and Cambridge were supposed to deliver papers. Three months before the conference, we started trainings, reading Fodor and Dennett, who were at the time, at least in ex–Yugoslavia, almost totally unknown.

Sesardić had his paper on physicalism, and “the Oxford crew” led by Kathy Wilkes has spread the news about the death of behaviorism and about opening the black box of the mind. But looking back, to be quite frank, apart from Dennett’s “three stances”, I do not remember much of it now. What was unforgettable, though, was the atmosphere of incredible trust among colleagues. We felt elated, and privileged, since our attendance and a generous allowance, unlike for the ones of our companions, was awarded by our University. My overall ignorance (we were all struggling with Marxism then) was rectified by our pride with Dubrovnik, and we were sending signals to our new friends: “We may not be a proper philosophical match for you, but at least we have *our* Dubrovnik.”

At the time, seminars lasted two weeks, and sometimes included two full week–ends. Two weeks? Inconceivable today. We had time to talk, to climb Lovrijenac, at the time still open for the public, to have long walks along Boninovo, to dive and hide in the water cave of Danče (which does not exist any more). On the way to Danče, some of us might have enjoyed a romantic moment in St. Mary’s Church, in front of the Dobričević’s masterpiece. The others got lost in the maze of old houses at Kolorina. And all of us found time to ruefully enjoy fish soup, calamari

or shrimps at “Rosarij”, with a fig brandy as a digestif, as we still do today. And above all, to organize football matches beneath Hotel Lero. I was never into it, but for others this was definitely the crown moment of the seminar. Among the students from all courses, Oxonians were a minority, and correct me if I am wrong, but in football, they stood no chances. (At about the same time, a similar love story with IUC was conceived in the heart of the IUC saint Kathy Wilkes.)

In the dorm, after a drink or two, during the long philosophical nights, some Oxonians spoke about their decadence. This seemed quite inappropriate. Were they not reading analytic philosophy, completely modern and new? Unlike us, provincials, who knew every joke and dictum from Diogenes Laertius to Hegel and Marx, but could not feel especially proud of it. So, Dennett and Fodor inadvertently at least woke some of us from a dogmatic slumber.

Years have passed. I chose several other courses. Instead of Oxonians, we were talking, and becoming friends with colleagues from Tuebingen, Mainz, Hamburg, Munich, and even from Oslo, Toronto, Geneva, New York or some other such distant place.

Gajo Petrović’s seminar, which I attended couple of years later, “Marxism and Existentialism”, was always full of “big shots”, “resource persons” and students. Yellow IUC course descriptions on the doors of our professors were pretty efficient appetizers, a motive enough to be hungry for any book we might find. Course directors often talked about even greater times of Korčula summer school, when they allegedly talked and drank with Sartre and Habermas, and who-knows-whom-else. Gajo (as we always called him) tried, and generally succeeded in convincing everybody that Heidegger and Jaspers were philosophers of *praxis* without knowing that they were. To say the truth, my German was just beginning to take hold, and sometimes it felt it was not all my fault. But the dorm was always full of students from other courses, and it was not difficult to communicate in any language we pleased. And we were full of non-philosophical ideas too. Once, it was the 1st of May, and Dubrovnik was plastered with communist posters and stupid ideological slogans. We tore some of them from the town’s panels and glued them in the dorm along with some quasi-erotic pictures. To make matters worse, we – Croatian students, invited some late-coming colleagues from abroad to have an overnight in the dorm’s hall. Sure enough, the police came, under a pretense of taking care for the peace and quiet, and several colleagues were reprimanded.

The dorm was the center of our intellectual lives. We used to talk night and day. And I knew even then that for some of us, these days were the crown of our *real* philosophical careers. Professors were gods for us, and they liked us in return. Mostly we felt inadequate, but our hopes new better.

Advancing further, there was a course on Aristotelianism in the Renaissance. Then, there were prof. Richard Wisser's courses on Heidegger or some other existentialist or phenomenological philosopher. We were wrestling with our German (and theirs) even more. Exchanging letters with prof. Wisser posed a number of difficulties, but in the end it was the proper way to cajole the language, for which I remain greatly indebted.

Couple of years later (it must have been 1997 or 1998), a course on Popper and Critical Rationalism with Hans Albert and Kurt Salamon took place. Compared to the German of the Heideggerian creed, this was a revelation. Suddenly, I could understand everything, and we were intellectually breathing with full lungs. And it showed. I suddenly became a Popperian (for a long time since). Of course, there were still some uncritical rationalists among us, but by then my colleagues were already young docents, already employed as novices. Philosophical passion might have somewhat waned, but intellectual honesty definitely sharpened. Colleagues from Graz (themselves scattered all over the world now) remained my friends till today.

Then the war came. The dorm and Hotel Imperial, where we used to lodge a couple of years previously, was shelled and destroyed by the Serbs. But for some scholars and course directors, this was not a hindrance. IUC seminars continued. Srđan Lelas and Nenad Mišćević invited me to the Philosophy of Science course. I greatly enjoyed the company of James Robert Brown who criticized relativists from the Edinburgh school, and his books. (Someone from his "Toronto group" lent me David Lodge's *Small World*, and this seemed all-too-appropriate for the overall climate at IUC.) Although I did not belong to the apocryphal generation of scholars who actually held seminars *during* the shelling (like Kathy Wilkes for instance, or Nenad Mišćević), I joined the group a year after. And this was perhaps the only possible occasion to be a resident, and to dine at Vila Orsula (since then in private property).

And then, finally, after all these war years and Dubrovnik's agony there was time to spread the news: IUC is back again. So, I contacted my old friends and colleagues,

ex-students from previous IUC courses from Graz, Mainz, Tuebingen and Oslo, (whom I occasionally managed to visit at their homes) and asked them – would they be willing to “join forces” and organize a completely new course, tentatively – and as it turned out – conclusively called, “Sociology of the Sciences”. Moritz Epple and Espen Schaaning responded favourably. Moritz, however, had some doubts or rather – preconditions. He wanted us to sign a statement announcing that we had nothing to do with the then present regime of Franjo Tuđman. Although I was never a Tuđman’s fan, I felt such a precondition for organizing an IUC seminar (“For God’s sake, you yourself know what an IUC seminar is like”) was a blow, an insult, to me, to Croatia, and perhaps the biggest to the IUC, the institution they must have known from those splendid times of the past. But with time the misunderstandings of the kind grew bigger, so Reinhard Brunner (himself an ex-student from IUC) and Peter Stachel (from Graz and Vienna), along with Jasminka Lažnjak (from Zagreb) replaced Moritz and Espen as course directors. We shall now be organizing our 15th meeting. Thank you, folks.

To be sure, Moritz and Espen must have sensed some unease, and for some good reasons. One of the reasons was my anti-Marxism. (And we are talking about mid-90s!) But the biggest unease was caused by Croatian academic authorities, which did quite a lot to scare away some international scholars, by transforming IUC into a Zagreb University subsidiary. And in turn, for such a move (appropriation of the building and the institution by Zagreb University) there were some good reasons: at the time when Dubrovnik was under assault, when IUC desperately needed some funds to repair the damage, to restore the library, to rebuild the dorm etc., and above all – to get some backup and endorsement to survive, only a handful of universities that once formed IUC (if any) were willing to donate funds for such a reconstruction. And only the rare exceptions among them gave a public endorsement for the IUC (and some scholars very quite vocal against it).

But negotiations between IUC and Zagreb University (if we could call it “negotiations” at all) did not fit well with foreign universities. And in those crazy war-time days, some people from Zagreb thought that scarring away the “leftist bunch” gathered around IUC might not be such a bad idea after all. And such an official policy dominated several years to come. Even in the late 90’s people who represented IUC must have had quite a difficult time to convince international

scholars to distinguish the old institution (IUC) from the new one (ICCU) located in the same building; to come back, feel safe and be at ease to philosophize again.

So, when I became a representative of Friedrich Naumann Stiftung (in 1994), and later a Deputy Minister of Science (in 2000), and when Ms Berta Dragičević and Dr. Krunoslav Pisk from IUC asked for financial assistance and moral help, I was more than willing to provide it (although I was at first not exactly sure how.) But I had all the reasons to do so: I was sentimentally involved with IUC. This romance still lasts, and hopefully it will never end. It is a significant part of my academic career, and I have every reason to be grateful to everyone who contributed to it, and to IUC.

And hopefully, IUC will again become the center of the academic world as it once used to be. This is a huge task. It was easy to be great in a bipolar world (playing the third, “independent” part). It is much more difficult to be big in our multi-centered, globalized world. I wish all the people running the IUC a lot of courage and a lot of luck in the times to come. And thank you for preserving what had to be preserved.

IUC: The Place Where Intellectual Globalization Germinates

By Zdravko Radman

Institute of Philosophy, Zagreb

108 **M**y professional, and personal, biography is intensively, and intimately, linked to the Inter-University centre Dubrovnik, from the very first days of its foundation in the mid seventies up to the present days. As a freshly graduated student and an assistant to Professor Ivan Supek I had an opportunity to witness the first steps in the erection of the institution, and be not only a close observer of the process of its maturation through decades, but also an active participant in the evolution of the project that has changed the course of intellectual history of many a generation of individuals throughout the spectrum of research disciplines.

My reminiscence of the beginnings are affiliated with first philosophy of science courses, and are coloured by mixture of intensive feeling of a discovery, on the one hand, and inability to often understand it fully or properly, on the other hand. The shock of newness, the amount of information difficult to instantly master, the styles of thinking to which most of us were not quite prepared, the unorthodoxy of discussions, the passion of disputes – all that is the salient illustration and true indicator of the degree of novelty to which we were exposed when we first attended the meetings there. Yet this very opening to the intellectual world of unrestricted discourse was fascinating.

Impressive were also personal encounters with so many outstanding philosophers whose work we knew, and whose theories and publications we appreciated, and who were suddenly there ready and prone to join us for the walk through the old city, have a drink in a local café, go together for a swim, or stay late after a dinner, and use the time to discuss issues in a way difficult to exercise in a lecture-room. With time IUC courses became popular, and praised, just because of the informal but productive exchange that proved to be particularly rewarding for us young researchers.



Zdravko Radman, Krunoslav Pisk
and Berta Dragičević

Certainly one of the most memorable such encounters was that with Werner Heisenberg. The man whose findings and theories had a tremendous impact on the 20th century physics was there not on a distant stage, but in our small auditorium, in front of us and available for questioning. The blend of respect and excitement made the atmosphere a quite unparalleled experience. Unfortunately, this was one of Heisenberg's last public appearances; we – the generation of 1975 – remain witness of his late attempts to affiliate modern physics and Platonist ideas, of the grand synthesis that only truly exceptional minds are capable of making.

A decade after its foundation the IUC was already established as an international meeting place of scholars from all over the globe, and beloved spot for both students and teachers. Without exaggeration it could be said that those were the germs of intellectual globalization that we presently proudly acknowledge. The unique position of the IUC on the academic map of the time was secured through the fact that it was a rare place where researchers from across the iron curtain could get together for the exchange they were looking for eagerly.

At its pinnacle in the eighties it was difficult to imagine that the achieved could be endangered in any way. Unfortunately, the ideals that we were creating and cultivating in our activities were more and more in a discord with the political reality of the former state of that time. The surroundings became a turbulent territory. It is not that the Balkans nations suddenly decided to (re)activate historical antagonisms, but it is rather that the well-prepared Milošević's *Kampf*, motivated by the idea of the Great Serbia (in which Dubrovnik was already labelled as the 'Serbian Athens'), and serviced by the Yugoslav army and paramilitary troupes, evidently threatened to commence the era of destruction.

At that time I was Alexander von Humboldt scholar, and later research fellow at the Center for Philosophy of Science of the University of Konstanz. The secure distance from the troubled area resulted for me in the feeling of moral discomfort. A way to cure it, at least partially, was to design plans how to personally resist the insanity and rebel against the aggression. I thought the best way not to allow abnormality to succeed is just to insist on our normal procedures. As my research was at that time focused on metaphor I proposed, prepared, and made everything needed to organize an interdisciplinary course *Metaphor and Cognition* that became part of the academic program. It was to take place beginning of October 1991.

What then happened could not be predicted either by the most bizarre fortune-teller or the most sober realist. The war in the region of Dubrovnik turned in the first line into the violence against the civilians, destruction of cultural monuments, and brutality against the nature. The Yugo-armada did not spare nor respect which all previous wars and enemies in the long history had. Thus, the cancellation of my course was inevitable.

However, those painful days brought up the decision not to yield. And clearly I did not feel like giving in to the aggressors who chose cultural objects for their military targets. The idea was born in an instant: I should find a form of substitute that would be more lasting than the meeting we were forced to abandon. What I had in mind was a book of collected essays that would exceed in thematic scope, number of participants, and plurality of views the original project.

The reactions to my invitation to potential contributors went far beyond my expectations. A number of prominent authors of different philosophical generations and theoretical orientations have responded favourably and contributed to the volume that then received the support of the renowned publisher Walter de Gruyter

(Berlin/New York), and was admitted in the prestigious series of *Philosophie und Wissenschaft / Transdisziplinäre Studien*. After a relatively long process of editing and publication my *From a Metaphorical Point of View: A Multidisciplinary approach to the Cognitive Content of Metaphor* was printed in 1995.

It was maybe a small, yet symbolic monument of our rebellion in which we used books to fight against those who burn them. In the Preface to the volume I wrote: “The Inter–University Centre Dubrovnik with its much praised staff was a favourite meeting–place for scholars from the worldwide intellectual community during the last two decades. For this reason, on the occasion of its 20th anniversary, I dedicate this volume to all those who made the Inter–University Centre what it was: from its founder and *spiritus movens* Professor Ivan Supek, to the people who cared daily for its efficient functioning.”

The dedication ends with a hope: “I am convinced that this is no farewell to the institution we all loved and appreciated, and I appeal for its revitalization hoping that it will bring a successful merging of fruitful tradition and new perspectives”. I am pleased to learn that the wish of that time finds its full realization in the present days. The ‘tradition’ does live again giving expression to the original ideals, but also expanding and complementing it with new projects, and new contents of research.

I strongly hope that what we have achieved is a stable and lasting peace, and that my publishing projects will never again be motivated by any sort of historical crises; that my books in philosophy will not have to relate to war in any way.

Indeed, peace is what the father and founder of the IUC, Ivan Supek, strived for actively all his life long, and promoted it as the most fundamental value. Through the recent past experience we have ourselves learned the importance of the appeal. May then what we do as academics not only increase our knowledge and competence, but also help us be more humane. And may the IUC remain to be the place where humanism and solidarity, freedom and creativity, openness and tolerance, will be purposefully cultivated, without ever being disturbed in its mission.

Dubrovnik Conversations

By Joanna Regulska

Rutgers University

112

I arrived to Dubrovnik and to IUC for the first time in June 1991. A group of feminists from across the Europe and the United States, came together to discuss and strategize how in the light of the dramatic changes in the region women from the “east” and the “west” can form a collaborative network to work jointly. We stayed at the Hotel Lero. Over the next few days, IUC became our home. Berta was there to greet us warmly, with her smile and energies, ready to offer help. The daily routine developed quickly... the beautiful walk to IUC along the ocean, blue sky everyday, fantastic food, swimming during the breaks, but most importantly conversations that forged friendships, collaborations and led to new activities and projects. The intense arguments and debates about how the transformation will affect women, what are the different women’s priorities and challenges, and how we can address them continued throughout the day into the night at the Hemingway or other “productive” venues. The walls of IUC witnessed these historic conversations that in the end resulted in the establishment of the Network of East–West Women (an international organization that to these days works with women from across the region). The coffee breaks in the monumental courtyard were just an extension of our meetings... and the ritual of reception where Berta Dragičević would get us all in a one place and try to calm conversations for a moment, so she can remind us where we are and how we are becoming part of the IUC history.

Little did we know that three weeks later the splendour of Dubrovnik would be inflicted by bombs, and the peace and calm of the surrounding beauty would vanish. On that very first trip, I bought a wonderful small pillowcase, black with small beads and pieces of lace sewn across. I am still regretting that I did not get another one, as after the war I never saw one like this again; they seems to vanished. Still that one memento connects me with Dubrovnik and its past.

I did not return to Dubrovnik until 2000, when a group of colleagues from the Center for Women's Studies in Zagreb, the Women's Studies Center in Belgrade, along with me representing Rutgers University, created a *Feminist Critical Analysis* seminar. Since then, almost every year I have been coming back, watching Dubrovnik lifting itself from the traumatic past, rebuilding its old town, and healing wounds that do not so easily fade away. As an outsider, I could see the external changes taking place – the reemerging beauty of buildings, the installation of new windows and wooden shutters. Every year there was more of a new “post-war” life; the life on the streets was picking up momentum with new stores and restaurants, and the noise of the evening crowds grew stronger and stronger every year. Yet, if one looks closer, the old walls of many houses speak the story of the violence, as marks on walls resulting from shelling did not disappear.

On my recent trip to IUC and Dubrovnik, I ended up as always in the bookstore in a search for Croatian writers who have been published in English. My eyes caught *A Dubrovnik War Story: They Won't Hurt Me Mommy*. Written by Anita Rakidžija, this painful story of displacement, war, violence and loss travelled with me to Rutgers and it became required reading for the students in my migration and displacement classes; thus forging new transnational connections of which I am privileged to be part.

The seminar at IUC continues to these days with different co-sponsors joining in and bringing every year a new group of young scholars for whom Dubrovnik seminar is unforgettable. As one of my students from Rutgers said, her stay in Dubrovnik inspired her and allowed her to learn so much, but also it was a refreshing experience because of the surrounding beauty of Dubrovnik. Indeed, I felt many times rejuvenated and reenergized when leaving Dubrovnik and the IUC, saying goodbye to Berta, but knowing that “I will see you next year.”

The Spirit of the IUC

By Werner Ruf

University of Kassel, Germany

114

This is not a story about strange phenomena happening in British castles. But it is the story of something strange characterising the IUC. And it seems that this strange “something” is still alive after so many decades of the existence of the IUC. The something is called “the Spirit”. It never took a material form and has never been seen in the premises. Nevertheless it seems to exist. As all spirits or supranatural beings, he or she – or should we say “it” – has some specific particularities: Of course, “it” is invisible. “It” has no age, no sex. “It” gives no lectures, “it” does not clean any rooms or prepare coffee. This Spirit is not just one person in a Trinitarian construction. “It” is behind a lot of things which appear to be miraculous, sometimes even to some extend crazy.

The irrational dimensions so characteristic of the present and the past of the invisible but real activities of the Spirit of the IUC were present already at its foundation: Was it not a crazy and absolutely unrealistic idea of Ivan Supek (a physicist!) and some of his friends more or less close the Pugwash Conference to set up an institution which to some extent was to be administratively independent of its mother institution, the University of Zagreb. Has anybody ever seen a central institution creating a sub-structure designed to be independent of its “mother”? The IUC was imagined to be such a sociological wonder. Of course, the concept of self-administration was one of the holy beliefs of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. In the sixties and seventies of the last century the idea became so attractive and worthy of studying to many leftist and critical intellectuals and students so that Yugoslavia became a goal for political pilgrimage. Most of the pilgrims took quite some time to realize that behind the theory and some of its appearances there were hard real structures on the backside. So it was with the relationship of the “autonomous” and self administrated IUC and its “mother



Participants in Executive Committee meeting in Zagreb in 1987: Nasrollah Fatemi, Enver Šehović, Siegfried Korninger, Kathleen Wilkes, Werner Ruf, Pero Portolan, Ivan Supek

institution”, the University of Zagreb. Having served many years in the Executive Committee of the IUC, I do well remember how we suffered from this reality: The very existence of the IUC seemed to be threatened so many times – but it was the Spirit who saved it, sometimes at the very last moment.

Of course, the choice of Dubrovnik was a master piece of the game: The unique beauty of the city was an attraction by itself. But behind that was another idea: At the very high and tense phase of the Cold War, Dubrovnik with its past, its location on the shore of the Mediterranean and its belonging to Yugoslavia, was at a unique crossroad between East and West: People from the West travelled easily to this country with the word “socialist” in its label, and people from the East (although often with difficulties) could go there as well. And: Yugoslavia was as well a unique place because it was one of the leading countries in the so called movement of the non-aligned states, together with Algeria, India, Cuba ... This made it possible to transform the IUC into an absolutely unique and truly international meeting place for scholars from all over the world, to confront ideals and ideas as well as hopes and bitter experiences. All this was not due to the prophetic capacities of the might of the

spirit, but to a very particular constellation of the international system. But it strengthened the power of the spirit in the battles of the IUC against all kinds of bureaucratic forces which tried to transform it into an instrument of their own purposes and strategies.

It may sound nostalgic, and it probably is: It was the unique geo-political situation which gave the Mediterranean Studies course which I directed more than a dozen times its particular drive: Students from Europe and the South and East of the Mediterranean, colleagues from Eastern countries, people from Africa, Asia and Latin America met for debating subjects which were – and still are – crucial to this region: economic development, development theories, labour policies, ecology, migration ... In our discussions the IUC appeared as what it was and what, hopefully, it will be for many, many years: A place of freedom and exchange of ideas, as controversial as they may be, a place of mutual respect and understanding of each other.

It is in this sense that the Spirit enhanced the building of an IUC identity, uniting the direction and the staff, the course directors and the students, producing a feeling of togetherness, of a “we”. One could feel this identity-building when entering the building, when meeting colleagues in the City or in restaurants, when taking with us participants of other courses on one of our excursions. The Spirit consists of a nearly endless multiplicity of dimensions which engender tolerance, mutual respect, and the feeling of belonging to the “We” – the unique academic experience.

This Spirit guided the actions of all the famous people who engaged all their energies for the IUC: All the people on its board, the course directors and – above all – the staff, and so many many others.

This Spirit is as unique as the IUC, and probably the secret lies in the fact that both are intrinsically intertwined: The Spirit cannot exist without the IUC, as the IUC would not exist without its Spirit who is, I am pretty sure about this, something like its soul. And after lengthy reflections and empirical verification I am pretty sure that the Spirit is highly contagious, like some kind of a virus. It does not really make you sick, it is rather like drugs: It makes you feel high. This is not speculation: There is evidence: All the people who got infected show some identical behaviour – and forgive me not to name them all: If I did, this would mean writing an encyclopedia. Late Ivan Supek, whom I already mentioned, struggled for the IUC for so many years. Likewise Nasrollah Fatemi who accompanied the IUC with his tremendous wisdom

and diplomatic sensitivity, late Monica Partridge whose capability of sharp intellectual analysis was so important for the spirit guiding the Executive Committee in difficult negotiations. But let me turn to some of the old warriors of the IUC, some of the most infected who are still alive – and, of course caring about this unique institution: Peter Fischer–Appelt – nobody understands how much time he could devote to the IUC when he still was – for almost 25 years – president of the University of Hamburg; Ørjar Øyen, once as well Rector of the University of Bergen, looks as if his office stood in Dubrovnik – so much he preferred the Adriatic to the Northern Sea. Kathy Wilkes who was so much devoted to the special local products ... And there is that youngster who did such a lot of the groundwork: Frank Laubert, who now is no longer far from retirement: That's a good thing because he will have even more time for serving the IUC.

You may ask me what I am talking about, reminding me that I wanted to talk about the Spirit, not about persons. But that's what I am doing! I am just showing you how people behave who have been infected – or should I say possessed? – by the Spirit.

This something called “the Spirit” really exists, as I showed in the few examples above. It even can infect objects – as Ørjar shows it in his contribution on the famous carpet in the office of the general director.

I just do hope that by now you are convinced that it is a privilege to get this infection, to be possessed by this virus–like phenomenon. There is a way to get into the circle of enlightened people who are under the guidance of the Spirit: Meet Berta Dragičević, talk with her about the IUC, look at its performances in the past, have, maybe, a glass of cognac with her – and you will feel the Spirit getting hold of your mind.

Medical Summer Schools at IUC

By Hans Joachim Seitz

University of Hamburg

118

Is there another region in the world where in the last century so many wars have raged as in the Balkan region? The First and the Second Balkan War, World War I and World War II, and the war in the former Yugoslavia which was followed by the Kosovo War. From 1940 and throughout the following years, especially Germany was deeply involved — and with the utmost aggression. While former enemies in Europe, now for more than 50 years, have joined together so intensively and on the whole have been quite successful, the Balkan region again, as so often in history, has not become integrated in this ongoing process. On the contrary, new states have been created, new borders have been drawn, five currencies are in use, and you may see selfish isolation called “finding identity”, where ever you look. How could an institution such as the university survive, not to say develop under such desert-like conditions: lack of teachers and student exchange, lack of visa, poor or no libraries, and arrogant self overestimation of scientists so long isolated.

Luckily, the IUC, so intelligently placed in Dubrovnik, is a constructive answer for bridging and reconciliation by science, so important in cold war time when placed between East and West, and equally important now in post war Balkan states.

By support from DAAD, the German Stability Pact for Southeast Europe, German Universities (Hochschulrektorenkonferenz), and private foundations such as Volkswagenstiftung, medical societies, industry, etc., it has been possible to organise numerous Medical Summer Schools bringing together young medical doctors and biochemists.

In 1996, the IUC started its successful organisation of the following Medical Summer Schools with the following themes: Oncology, pathology, endocrinology, human genetics, clinical chemistry, and also took up curriculum reform in medical studies.



Nobel Prize Winner Edmond Fischer and Mrs. Fischer (in centre) on the occasion of a Medical Summer School in 2001, organised by Hans Joachim Seitz (at the right), next to him is Mayor Vido Bogdanović. Mrs. Tilda Bogdanović is at left

The spirit of these meetings spread to similar meetings in Zagreb (Oncology, Curriculum Reform II, III, IV); in Sarajevo (Diabetes, Medical Psychology I, II, III, Human Genetics); in Ohrid (Gastroenterology I, II, Endocrinology, Cardiology); in Tirana (Stomatology I, II, III, IV, Public Health, Medical Psychology I, II, III).

For two to six days, more than 500 participants with more than 60 teachers had intensive lectures, discussions, breakfast, lunch and dinner, dancing, and excursion together.

I would like to recall two events from my long-time association with our common concern – the Inter-University Centre in Dubrovnik. These events have a special place among my many happy memories.

Some years ago, a meeting of the IUC Executive Committee was held at the Central European University in Budapest. Our good friend István Teplán, CEU's Director General and Chair of IUC Council, was our generous and active host. Following the meeting, Marianna Birnbaum, Professor at the University of California at Los Angeles, accompanied me along the streets of Budapest. We were heading for

a restaurant, hoping to get a good meal. Suddenly, she stopped and pointed to the school building where she once was a pupil and where she as a young Jewish girl escaped the Nazi soldiers by running out the back door – while lorries were waiting in front of the building. She mentioned this to me, her German colleague, without any accusation. I appreciated so very much the moment of being invited to look into her childhood situation in her home city, and then we continued our friendly walk, discussing future academic life at the IUC. This moment was a reminder that following the terrible disruption of Europe we were again approaching a united academic Europe in which – to us – the IUC in Dubrovnik had come to play a highly significant role. And fortunately, Germany was accepted as a partner and friend.

Another event: On a beautiful sunny day in June 2000, a bus had just arrived in Dubrovnik from Sarajevo with a group of more than 40 doctors from Tuzla, Sarajevo, and Mostar, assembled by the late Dr. Hussein Kulenović, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Sarajevo. They now joined the group of young doctors already assembled at the IUC, from Zagreb, Rijeka, Split, and Osijek, having been brought together by Dr. Krešimir Pavelić, Zagreb. We, the scientists from Germany, Croatia, and Bosnia, then started our first Medical Summer School Dubrovnik. Now, who ought to give the opening lecture? We asked Dr. Edmund Fischer, Nobel Prize Winner (in medicine) from Seattle, Washington, USA, who took part in a parallel scientific meeting organised in Cavtat. His introductory presentation about communication inside a cell (his discovery was the first piece in this signal transduction field) was finally extended into the philosophy of human communication, reminding all of us to take well care of the light towers of science – such as the IUC – in a world of conflict.

Cordial thanks go to Mrs. Berta for her role in keeping the IUC active and alive and thereby providing a place for science and communication!

Memories of Friends in my Life with the Inter–University Center

By Rudolf J. Siebert

Western Michigan University

Ivan Supek

121

I met Professor Dr. Ivan Supek (1915–2007) the first time on his trip to the United States in 1974. He was a guest at Western Michigan University. At that time Ivan invited me, to come to the Inter–University Center in Dubrovnik, which he had just founded in 1970. A year later, I participated and gave papers in his course on the *Philosophy of Science*, and in another course on *Marxism and Phenomenology*. At the end of both courses, Professor Ivan Supek and Professor Branko Bošnjak asked me, if I was interested in founding a course of my own in the IUC. I happily agreed and took the title from the endings of my two papers: *The Future of Religion*.

Two years later, in March 1977, we started our course. From 1977 on I met Ivan almost every year in the IUC or in Hotel Lero, and during and after the war in Hotel Argentina, when Hotel Lero had become the home for many refugees. We had wonderful discourses with each other on quantum physics; on the law of gravity; on religion; on his novels; on history; on dialectics and positivism; on politics; on the principle of uncertainty; on the freedom in the atom as well as in society; on Heisenberg’s God, who gambled; on inverse evolutionary selection in civil society; and many other topics, which interested us. Some times Ivan challenged me. He was not a dialectician like his brother Rudi Supek. Thus once Ivan asked me, to explain the law of gravity dialectically. So I did. Then he developed the law of gravity in terms of theoretical physics. using up for that purpose all the blackboards in the IUC lecture room, where we found ourselves. . Then Ivan pointed out triumphantly and lovingly the superiority of his non–dialectical approach, of which I had understood very little. That happened still during the socialist time, and under the system of self–management.

We talked about Ivan's studies with Werner Heisenberg. We remembered his arrest by the Gestapo in Germany in 1941, because of his antifascist activities: as a spy for the British. His Professors Heisenberg, Hund, and von Weizsäcker intervened to release him from prison. We talked about Ivan's return back to Croatia in 1943, after his doctoral work with Heisenberg had been completed, and about his time in the Croatian anti-fascist movement, and about his struggle against the German occupation forces as a partisan. After the Gestapo officers had released Ivan from prison, they asked him, where he wanted to go. He said he wanted to go back home to Zagreb, where his father was dying from cancer. The Gestapo officers counseled Ivan not to return to the *inferior Slavic race* in allied Croatia, but rather to stay in victorious Germany. Ivan proudly went back to his beloved Zagreb, and his family and nation, and joined the anti-fascist partisan movement.

Ivan and I reflected on his time as Minister of Education and Science in Zagreb. Ivan was a humanist and a man of peace. Already in 1944, fourteen months before Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Ivan warned of the danger of the newly developed atomic bomb, which had the potential to destroy all life on earth. We talked much about war and peace, particularly his unwillingness to participate in a project for building the atomic bomb for the former Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia.

We reflected on Ivan's consequent turn from active research in theoretical physics to researching more in philosophy and literature. In the year 1960, Ivan became not only the Rector of the University of Zagreb, but he also founded the *Institute for the Philosophy of Science and Peace*. The Institute was also a center for the nuclear disarmament movement. Ivan was also the founder of the international organization *World Without a Bomb*. Ivan formulated his famous ten humanistic principles, which were repeated at almost every later peace summit and event. Ivan also established the *International League of Humanists*.

Ivan did not stop his humanistic peace work with his retirement in 1985. Ivan was a critic of the globalization process, and a proponent for the *Global Justice Movement*. His life long struggle for peace, human rights, and democracy made Professor Supek one of the greatest humanists of the 20th century. Also after his death on March 5, 2007, in his home in Zagreb, after a long illness, his heroic peace advocacy remains of highest actuality.

Ivan continually legitimated and protected our course on the *Future of Religion* in the former Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia, and thus made its uninterrupted continuation through 32 years possible. While for Ivan art had become his religion, he at the same time showed a wonderfully wise tolerance toward and understanding for the Abrahamic as well as all otherworld religions. Maybe Hegel had been right after all, that art, religion, and philosophy share the same content, and differ only in form. It was not always easy to keep our course on the *Future of Religion* open for all types of scholars on the Hegelian Right, and on the Left and in the Center. I noticed early on, that the praxis philosophers from Zagreb were missing in our course. I protested and said we would not come, if the praxis philosophers could not come. In the next course some praxis philosophers arrived, but the Yugoslav students were missing. The next time the inverse happened. The Tito Government obviously wanted to keep the praxis philosophers and the students apart, because the professors wanted self-management moving up into the highest layers of government, while the government was afraid, that such a move was premature and would cause restlessness among the students. It took some time, until we were able to get professors and students together. Ivan, who's brother Rudi was a praxis professor, was always most helpful.

Ivan was amazingly objective, truthful, and honest in his academic work, and in his novels in an always changing and often very difficult political and cultural context: in the communist and post-communist period. Ivan had many friends at home and abroad, not only in Europe, but also in the United States and Canada. Ivan was not only an outstanding scholar and artist, but also a great, and wonderful, and most friendly and warm-hearted human being, who deserves our remembering solidarity, as well as our admiration, and our love, and our imitation, if also on a much smaller and modest scale.

When Ivan and I had breakfast together a last time at Hotel Argentina, he spoke about his dreams. He had also studied under Carl Gustav Jung in Switzerland. , and thus dreams meant a lot to him. As he looked across to the Island of Love and beyond toward the sunny Adria, he told me, that he had recently had some bothersome dreams, in which German soldiers appeared to him, who reproached him for having killed them, when he was a partisan during World War II. I told Ivan, that as a Heisenberg student he was of course a superior mathematician and that, therefore, he had certainly been put into the artillery, and that the artillery kills people many

miles away, and that, therefore, he could not possibly ever have seen any of his victims. Ivan affirmed, but insisted that these complaining German soldiers appeared in his dreams, nevertheless. So I told Ivan, that he had had a moral right as a Croatian partisan, to defend his country against the German invaders. Ivan affirmed, but argued that the protesting German soldiers continued to appear in his dreams, nevertheless. Was it, that these German soldiers were not only soldiers, and not only Germans, but also and most of all human beings? Ivan, the great prophet of peace, had not only the great imagination of the artist, but also a deep and rigorous religious, moral, and humanistic conscience.

Ivan will be with us in spirit in all our courses to come, and he will continue to inspire us to work for peace among the nations through promoting peace among the world religions in continued open discourse. We have dedicated our 32nd international course on the *Future of Religion: The Wholly Other, Liberation, Happiness and the Rescue of the Hopeless* to our great friend, Professor Dr. Ivan Supek. His whole life and work was driven by the insatiable longing for the totally Other than the horror and terror in nature and history: including the yearning for enlightenment, friendship, and love, as well as liberation, happiness and the rescue of the hopeless victims of society and history. I had the honor, to participate in a well-deserved *Festschrift* for Ivan Supek, which affirms all aspects of our experience with the truly great man.

Branko Bošnjak

I met Professor Branko Bošnjak (1923 – 1996) the first time in the course on *Marxism and Phenomenology* in the IUC in March 1975. After we had decided, that there would be a course on *The Future of Religion*, and that I would be the director of the course, he volunteered right away to be the co-director. There existed a rule in the IUC at the time, that every Western director had to have an Eastern-European co-director on his side, Dr. Bošnjak served as co-director to our course in 1977 and 1978. On Easter 1978, at 8.00 in the morning, we experienced the horrible earthquake in Hotel Lero. There was great devastation and emotional depression in Dubrovnik and in the wonderful cities south of it. This natural catastrophe was an anticipation of the social catastrophe, the war, which we would experience in Hotel Argentina 15 years later. In spite of the earthquake the resource persons and

participants of our course continued bravely to arrive, as they did later on during the war. After our course of 1978, Professor Dr. Srđan Vrcan took Professor Bošnjak's place as co-director, up to the end of the war.

Professor Bošnjak and I had many wonderful discourses with each other inside and outside of our course in Dubrovnik, and also in his office in the University of Zagreb. We talked about the history of philosophy and about the relationship between art and science. Professor Bošnjak had been the co-founder and member of the Editorial Board of the famous journal *Praxis*, which according to the great Marxist philosopher of religion, Ernst Bloch, was the world's best Marxist journal.

Dr. Bošnjak had also been the co-founder of the *Korčula Summer School*, which was an international Neo-Marxist philosophical conference, in which many members of the Frankfurt School took part. It lasted from 1965–1973. Professor Bošnjak and I considered our course to be a humble continuation of the *Korčula Summer School*, as we developed further the Frankfurt School's critical theory of religion.

Professor Bošnjak had also been the founder and director of the first post-graduate inter-disciplinary study of religion at the University of Zagreb: *Theories of Religion and Atheisms*, in 1967/1968. In his philosophy of religion, Dr. Bošnjak moved continually more and more from anti-theistic Marxism to dialogue with the world religions. At the time when I met Professor Bošnjak, some people were already convinced, that he had never been, or that he was no longer a Marxist atheist. When I once visited the Orthodox Seminary in Athens, Greece, scholars told me, that Professor Bošnjak had always been a practicing believer in the Orthodox Church.

Once I visited Professor Bošnjak in his rather comfortable office in the University of Zagreb. The office had huge white curtains, which could have come from the Imperial Palace in Vienna. We had a long discourse with each other, including topics like: Aristotle; the history of philosophy as science; Christianity; Marxist Christian dialogue; higher criticism of the Bible; the problem of truth. I was astonished to hear, that Professor Bošnjak was not only very knowledgeable and pleased with the work of the fascist philosopher Martin Heidegger, but that he had even visited him in the Black Forest in Germany, and had been very well received by him and his wife. We discussed intensely Heidegger's post-humous article in the German journal *The*

Spiegel, from which it became only too obvious, that he had given up his fascist position as little as had Carl Schmitt or Mircea Eliade, in contrast to Carl G. Jung, who did convert. Professor Bošnjak and I discussed particularly the title of Heidegger's last article: *Only a God can help us!* For Professor Bošnjak's sharp analytical mind, it was most important to find out, on which word in the title the accent was put. Professor Bošnjak's scholarly greatness consisted precisely in his ability to be open toward the Hegelian Right and Left, without losing his own identity.

Also after Professor Bošnjak had left our course, when once he saw, how well it developed, I met him again and again at the occasion of scientific and philosophical meetings in Dubrovnik and Zagreb. Our course had always a firm place in his heart, and he did whatever he could, in order to support it. We owe Professor Bošnjak the greatest gratitude particularly for the initiation of our course. It would probably not have come about without his initiative.

Srđan Vrcan

Professor Dr. Srđan Vrcan was a most devoted and passionate sociologist in the Law Department of the University of Split, Croatia. He was the director of an Institute committed to the empirical sociology of religion, which combined dialectical and positivistic methodologies. I was amazed, when once Dr. Vrcan connected Marxist dialectics with the structural – functionalist notion of *dys-functionality*. He was astonished, when he heard me still use the Marxian concept of *surplus value*. Dr. Vrcan developed his empirical sociology of religion with the help of his many students in a large number of books and articles. He was in continual discourse with outstanding scholars in Western Europe, particularly Italy, and in Eastern Europe, particularly the Soviet Union. As committed Marxist, Professor Vrcan had at the same time the deepest respect for religion, particularly for the Roman Catholic and the Greek Orthodox Paradigms of Christianity. It is true; Dr. Vrcan had some problems with the Catholic teaching on sexual morality, e.g. Paul VI's Encyclical *Humanae Vitae*. He had the impression, that to follow Catholic sexual morality meant to have no sex at all, but rather to live in celibacy, being married or not. Dr. Vrcan worried deeply about religions crises and final fate in Modernity. Like Professor Bošnjak, so was also the Co-director Dr. Vrcan of the opinion, that our course was a successor to



Srdan Vrcan, Berta Dragičević
and Marko Oršolić at the seminar
Future of Religion

the Korčula Summer School, which in his perspective had been closed, because of a lack of hospitality on the side of the population, and that it was our main task to develop a critical, or dialectical theory of religion, through which *good religion* could be rescued. Already in 1977, Professor Vrcan took my wife Margie and myself through the mountains around Dubrovnik. He loved these mountains, and the city, and the country – all six republics. He was deeply hurt in his feelings, when later on in one summer, still before the war, some people burned down the forest on the mountains above Dubrovnik. It was a bad omen for him.

Professor Vrcan was the most honest scholar, I had ever witnessed, and all my colleagues agreed with me. Being a committed Marxist Professor of sociology, Vrcan would never shy away from open criticisms of deficiencies in the Yugoslav or Soviet Government. That then gave him also the moral right to criticize deficiencies in the West as well. Crises he saw in the East as well as in the West.

Professor Vrcan had a deep longing for making good things, which had gone wrong in the past. One year, Professor Vrcan brought as Co-director into our course

on the *Future of Religion*, an outstanding scholar from Germany. Later on I found out, that the scholar's father had been an Ustasha General, who after he had come back from a visit to Benito Mussolini, and had landed at a beach near Dubrovnik, had been caught by the partisans, and had been court-martialled, found to be guilty of treason, and executed on the spot. Professor Vrcan wanted to bring the son home to Yugoslavia. He used our extra-territorial course as a means to do so. The German scholar gave an excellent lecture, if also somewhat on the Right. All went well with him in our course. But when Professor Vrcan took the German scholar to his own University in Split, the students were less hospitable and rejected him. But Professor Vrcan had done his best, to make something good. Dr. Vrcan remembered always from his partisan days an attack on a monastery, where monks were armed and fighting on the Ustasha side. When the partisans stormed the monastery, they also killed monks, who were in the monastic hospital, and who had no weapons on him. This one monk remained an ethical problem for Professor Vrcan's most sensitive conscience. It had always been a great question for how secular humanists would deal with such questions of conscience, after once they had left religion behind.

One day I visited with Professor Vrcan several monasteries in Dubrovnik. We wanted to invite some of the monks, particularly the Jesuits, as well as the Bishop and the clergy to join our discourse on the future of religion. They usually hesitated to come, because they thought we were all communists, and thus engaged in discourse avoidance. As we left the monasteries, Professor Vrcan remarked that the life of the monks was too poor and miserable. I answered that after all the monks had taken a vow of poverty and were as such the better communists. But Dr. Vrcan insisted with great sympathy that the monks were poorer than their vow allowed for, and I had to agree.

Once, Professor Vrcan invited me to come to the University of Zagreb, and to speak to the Sociology Department. At this occasion, he also introduced me to a circle of priests, who were open to discourse and cooperation with the socialist Tito-Government, and were also willing to come to our course on the *Future of Religion* in the IUC. During the lunch with the priests, one of them, who had just had brain operations, continually fell asleep. But whenever he woke up again, he injected into our discourse one important thought from the great Pope John XXIII: *What we need is a culture of love!* Professor Vrcan could not have agreed more.

One day Professor Vrcan invited us, to come to his city of Split. It was a day, on which President Tito came to Split. Tito came with two Limousines, one for himself and one for his little dog. His wife had house arrest, because she had conspired with Serb Generals, who leaned toward Russia, and were now incarcerated. Tito, already high in age and short of breath, had still red hairs. People stood along the road, when Tito came and jubilated rather spontaneously. The people forgave the beloved people's tribune his weaknesses, because he had liberated them from European fascism, and he had kept them independent from the Soviet Union. That was something to be grateful for.

While we were celebrating President Tito's presence in Split, eating fish all night long in his hotel, Professor Vrcan told us some events from the city's history. When the Roman Emperor resigned from power – which has happened very seldom in history – and divided his Empire into two parts between his two sons, he retired to Split, and build himself there a retirement palace, as well as a burial place, When the Christians came into power a few years after the death of Diocletian, they had completely forgotten, that he was the Emperor, who had stopped officially their persecutions in 305, and pulled his body out of the grave, and fed it to the fish in the Adria, and transformed his palace into a cathedral, which still stands today.

As the night proceeded, Professor Vrcan also told us the tragic story of the Jews in Split. During the Second World War masses of Jews had fled to Split, because the city was under Italian occupation, and the Italians were less Anti-Semitic than the Germans, and thus could be bribed into concessions. When Italy surrendered to the Allies, the Germans took over the fascist occupation of Split. They shot the Italian officers, because they had given their weapons to the Yugoslav partisans. The partisans warned the Jews of Split, that they would be transported to Auschwitz. But most of the Jews did not believe the partisans, and when the SS thousands of them called them went to the market place of Split, and from there was lead into the mountains, never to be seen again. They never arrived in any concentration- or death-camps. They simply disappeared into thin air. Professor Vrcan was horrified by traditional religious Anti-Semitism, – and there had been enough of it in Eastern Europe – as well as of modern biological and anthropological Anti-Judaism, and all the fascist atrocities connected with it.

Professor Vrcan admired and encouraged us greatly, when we continued to come to Dubrovnik after the war started. We had to arrive by ship, passing by Split,

because the people-owned and self-managed JAT Airline did not function any longer, and the Dubrovnik Airport tower had been demolished by Serbian troops. Shortly before the war started, I saw the striking crews leaving their planes standing on the airfield in Belgrade with all doors open in the midst of heavy rains, and from my window in the JAT Hotel in the center of Belgrade I could see Croatian and Serbian and other officers coming to and going from the still Yugoslav military headquarter in great haste. During the war, we met in Dubrovnik in the basement of Hotel Argentina, which was continually under sniper fire from the mountains above. We had a room in the basement of Hotel Argentina right beside the room for UN forces, which observed and monitored the struggle between the Serbian and the Croatian forces in the mountains above Dubrovnik. From Hotel Argentina we saw the Serbian fleet approaching Dubrovnik from Cavtat, Professor Vrcan found it, nevertheless, somewhat amusing that in the middle of the war zone, we studied Immanuel Kant's *Eternal Peace* and the project of a peaceful world republic. At the same time, Professor Vrcan was also frightened for us, because once on my way from the IUC Building to the Monastery down at the beach, I walked into a mine field against a possible Serbian invasion. The Croatian solders did not see me, because they had their afternoon coffee hour. After much shouting, they found the maps of the minefield, and fished me out of my dilemma. At the occasion I saw that the soldiers were wearing rosaries on their shoulders. A few days later, I went on the radio, or maybe also on television, and asked that the rosaries would be removed. It was not that I was against rosaries – I have one myself – it was rather that I was against pulling God down into human conflicts. Professor Vrcan was in full agreement. He was very happy and grateful, that I could bring money and medicine to the wounded and sick of Dubrovnik, independent of their ethnicity, sometimes twice a year. Throughout the war Professor Vrcan and I were very saddened, when we heard that high bourgeois Germans were sailing on their luxury yachts up and down the Dalmatian coast, and observing the war asked without any empathy with the suffering people the idiotic question: how can something like that still happen at the end of the 20th century? Like Professor Vrcan, I continued to recognize and love all our resource persons and participants, no matter which ethnic group they came from or belonged to. We were happy, when finally, long after the war was ended, and the first Serbian students arrived again in our course: after a long time of alienation, hate, and destruction. We welcomed them wholeheartedly.

Professor Vrcan suffered much physically, and even more so psychologically during and after the war. But that did not hinder him from bravely continuing his research in the sociology of religion, and to remain enormously productive. I cherish his wonderful letters, which he wrote to me up to the end of his life, appreciating our work, and agreeing with our philosophy, that there can not be any peace among nations without peace among the world religions, and that there can be no peace among the world religions without discourse among them on the basis of mutual knowledge about each other's interpretation of reality and orientation of action. We cannot honor the great most scholarly and humane humanist more than bravely to continue our discourse in gratitude to him.

A Greeting from Novi Sad

By Fuada Stanković

University of Novi Sad

132

The IUC was very different and precious institution from its foundation. I have thought like that from the beginning of my involvement in its activities. But after a long personal experience (more than 40 years) of university work and involvement in different academic networks, this opinion was more and more confirmed.

The uniqueness of the IUC is in the way how its activities are run. Academic freedom in choosing a topic, resource persons and students for any school/conference was unique. Executive Board would confirm courses and conferences but as the rules were well known, I do not recall any case that the applicants coming from academic side were not accepted. One of the factors of independence was also a self-supporting system. Each resource person had to find financial support for him/her and other colleagues and also for the students. The only continuous and sustainable support grants for students as far as I remember were coming from the Open Society Institute (Soros Foundation) in Budapest.

I had personal experience in organizing course with the title “Enterprise in Socialism” in 1991. From today’s view this topic sounds strange and irrelevant. But in those times Eastern/central Europe was just starting transition and there was quite a number of Western scholars who were active on these issues, mostly those interested in self-managed market economies...So, I thought it would be interesting to discuss “socialist enterprise” at the turn of two eras in an interdisciplinary context and within substantial changes of the global environment in place. My colleague Professor Chris Gunn from Hobart William College (USA) had a same interest to co-organize this course. It happened that during participating in General UNESCO Conference in Paris where I met a person involved in support of education programmes, I managed to get several thousand dollars to support travel and accommodation for small

number of students from East/Central Europe and Yugoslavia and even two postgraduate students from China who were studying in Novi Sad. It was a very interesting seminar.

Thinking of that period, it came to me that we could divide history of IUC into three main parts. First, from its establishment in early 70s until the beginning of the wars in the former Yugoslavia in early 1990s, second period during the war in Croatia and the whole Yugoslavia torn into pieces, and the post-war time ...

In the first period it was an institution completely out of the system because it was international and independent – rare case in a socialist country led by a communist party. As the result, legal problems were always present. But IUC has survived. During the war it seemed that it was the end of the IUC. The building and the books in flames, the region divided and occupied by existential questions of pure survival. But as universities always survived difficult times during the history, it happened with the IUC as well. Thanks to wonderful people, devoted individuals, a few of them among founders of the IUC, and the spirit of academia being able to bring back the light of knowledge, understanding and tolerance.

The third period started with the celebration of the 30th Anniversary of the IUC. Most of us came back to Dubrovnik with the idea to help it to keep going.

Today IUC is at the same beautiful spot of the world heritage with some old friends still there but many new young course directors as well, facing challenges of the new era and continuing to be a wonderful academic and intellectual meeting place.

When I ask myself what were the leading factors of IUC development through the challenging times I can choose two of them: wonderful individuals and the beautiful Dubrovnik environment.

Berta and Dubrovnik – Sweet Memories

By Bart van Steenberghe

University of Utrecht

134

These days, I looked in old photo albums and found out that my first course at the IUC in Dubrovnik was in 1975. I came there in late February of that year with a group of six Dutch students and we stayed there for a whole month. In the Netherlands it was cold and miserable, whereas in Dubrovnik the sun was shining most of the time. Those were the days.

I am aware that many things have changed in the meantime. Especially the early nineties were dramatic for both Dubrovnik and the IUC, but looking at those pictures of the seventies and eighties (I think I was course director there for 11 or 12 times), it strikes me how much is still the same. It seems that that horrible past of the early nineties has been wiped out completely.

My pictures of the city, the hotel we stayed in (Lero), the IUC–building and the classrooms were very much as they are today and that is a good thing. Dubrovnik and the IUC are there to stay forever.

The most stable factor of all this is the eternal presence of Berta Dragicevic. She was there already in 1975 and she still is there. Directors, staff, teachers, students come and go, but not Berta.

It also strikes me that Berta in all those years hardly has changed. Comparing recent pictures of her with those of the seventies I was surprised to see how she hardly has become any older. She was and still is that charming, aristocratic, Mediterranean lady who believes in the IUC and who can transmit her enthusiasm for that institution to others. She is the acting director, the perfect hostess, the PR–manager and above all the mother of the IUC and let us hope and pray that she will remain that for the next decades.

Naturally I have dozens of memories of my courses at the IUC, but here I shall limit myself to one.

I think it was in the spring of 1976, when I was co-director together with Johan Galtung of a course on “Models for the Future”, when at the same time an important conference took place in the IUC–building with many VIPs from Central and Eastern Europe.

It was the time of ‘the Limits to Growth’, the discovery of the global problematique concerning environmental degradation, the depletion of non-renewable resources, the unlimited economic growth etc. It was an exciting period not in the last place for people like me, futurists who were wondering whether humankind would and could survive in the long run.

It was also the period of the Club of Rome, an informal group of top politicians and industrialists from all over the world, who spread the message of this new danger, or better, challenge.

The charismatic leader of that Club of Rome was Aurelio Peccei, whom I had met before at a few occasions. I remember very well that one day he came up to me and said, well Bart, I am discussing here all the time about the future of humankind with old men. I am aware that that is important, for they are in charge and have the power to change things, but they will be dead in the period we are talking about. I very much would like to talk with young people for they have to live in that future we are envisioning.

Well, I said I am here for a course with some 20 students and I am sure they would love to discuss with you. We tried to find a date which was not easy for his and our calendars were pretty full and even more difficult was to find a place, for all conference– and classrooms were occupied. In the end we decided to meet in my hotel room in Lero.

It was a memorable evening; the room was fully packed since also some students from other courses joined us. Aurelio, sitting somewhat uncomfortable at the end of my bed really enjoyed it very much, as he told me afterwards. He was more charismatic and enthusiastic than ever; the students felt that and listened to but also discussed with him until the middle of the night.

Well, for me that is the IUC at its best, a meeting place for young and old, for people from all over Europe, to discuss the problems of the era we are living in.

I am aware that there are nowadays similar places and events. In some sense the IUC has lost its unique position it had in its early period. There are nowadays all over Europe exchanges, summer–schools, international courses etc. for students and

teachers and that is a very good thing. I do think however that in at least two ways the IUC is still unique.

Firstly, the social climate is informal and 'horizontal' so to speak. The first director, Johan Galtung, introduced the idea that we are no longer students and professors (which suggest a sort of hierarchy) but resource persons and participants and all people involved play both roles at some time of the course.

Secondly, I mockingly have used the word 'total institution' for the Dubrovnik courses. Since we do not only meet in the classroom of the IUC, but also at breakfast and dinner in the hotel (always Lero for all participants) in the old town for lunches, disco's, shopping, on terraces and beaches, the meetings and discussion are permanently going on often until deep into the night. In Dubrovnik you cannot escape the contact with others.

It is a sort of pressure cooker, for in that one week or better ten to twelve days we are where everything has to happen for the participants: listening to lectures, asking questions, preparing meetings, writing reports about them, presenting your own (student) paper, participating in workshops, playing games like the writing of a European social charter in a session of the European Parliament, developing scenarios in a future creating workshop etc.

It is always a very busy period for all participants and the only disadvantage of this is that the time of new loves as we had so many in the former century, with more relaxed courses of three to four weeks, seems to be over.

The number of children born out of marriages started as love affairs in Dubrovnik is rapidly decreasing, but that is the only regretful thing I can think of when reflecting on my more than 30 years of experience with this unique institution.

For Berta

By Paul Stubbs

Institute of Economics, Zagreb

My memories of the IUC are difficult to distil down into one particular incident or moment. In a booklet of fragments I, too, offer, fragments. My IUC experience began virtually, in a sense, as the School of Social Work Theory and Practice which I first attended in 1994 had been temporarily moved that year to the School of Public Health in Zagreb because of security concerns in Dubrovnik. Yet the spirit of Dubrovnik and of the IUC was there. I have many rich recollections of later editions of that course in Dubrovnik itself: from being welcomed with a song, through many friendships and collaborations formed and sustained. I acted as course director of one programme in 1999, I think, which had a special focus on Global Social Policy, using the opportunity to invite many old friends from my previous work in the UK who also became enchanted with Dubrovnik.

I am currently a course director of one of the longest standing and most vibrant and popular of IUC courses, that on 'Inclusion and Exclusion in European Societies', held every two years and attended by some 50 participants from all over Europe. Attending every course since 2000, it occurs to me how far the IUC has succeeded in its mission of breaking down divisions as I watch students from the Ukraine, Croatia, Serbia, Romania, and Turkey debate and discuss with students from the Czech Republic, the (always multi-cultural) Dutch students and others in ways in which national origin appears to matter less and less in terms of ideas and styles of debate. Perhaps I am too adjusted to my adopted region so that I still complain about a Calvinist work ethic which means I never stop from about 8:30 in the morning until 10 o'clock at night, mentoring, supporting, and encouraging participants who have, often, never presented in English in public before. I still remember the shock of arriving on the first morning my usual (professorial) 15 minutes late to find a room completely full and the first lecture already in progress. For all my complaints, this

course keeps me young and sometimes even 'up to date' as in the 2008 edition when the participants quickly ignored our rather formal online discussion board opting to create a group on 'facebook' instead. It was also, this year, a course in which film makers almost outnumbered 'normal' participants, but we were proud to be able to testify on both Croatian television and radio as to the 'special' qualities of the IUC: its inter-disciplinarity; its lack of formal hierarchy; its mission of reconciliation and respect for diversity; and, above all, its role as an ambassador for a beautiful city.

I thank all those associated with the IUC for the warm welcome I receive whenever I come there. If Zagreb is my adopted home then the IUC and Dubrovnik is my home away from home. Thank-you Berta for all your devotion to the IUC project which you helped to form and have nourished over the years. May we long continue to meet, by choice and by accident, somewhere near *Kamenice* konoba. Did I ever tell you about a famous French sociologist who I took there to try the *kamenice*/oysters even though he was sure they could not possibly be as good as those in his beloved Paris. Three days later, I had to ask what time the konoba opened so he could have eight more before his flight home?

Perhaps the most humorous but also most telling anecdote was of a conference organised with the International Labour Office and the World Health Organisation on Emerging Global Markets in Social Protection and Health in September 2002. The only available hotel for all participants was in Babin Kuk and we explained carefully that the best way to the IUC each day was by public transport as a private coach would have to travel a greater distance. We bought the bus tickets for everyone and explained everything. Even so, on the first morning it was clear that here were many senior people from international organisations who had not used public transport for a while. They had, perhaps, gotten rather too used to being met at the airport, taken to the hotel, and seeing the world through the windows of white jeeps. In true IUC spirit, no-one complained and, indeed, many saw it as a metaphor for the issues we were discussing and some became truly adventurous and realised they could use the bus at other times, not only when the sessions began and ended!

In the IUC I find I can share the passion I have for my chosen vocation as a social theorist and researcher, free from the stresses and hierarchies of my normal work environment, meeting new friends and forming collaborations which truly endure. It is a special place. Long may it prosper.

A Quarter Century of Victimology in Dubrovnik: A Personal View of People I Met

By Zvonimir Paul Šeparović

University of Zagreb

The Inter–University Centre Dubrovnik is and has been unique educational international organisation that offers seminars and studies with leading academics and specialists from all over the world. Being one of the founders of one of the oldest courses, in Victimology, with a years–long tradition, I met many people and have had very interesting experiences here around. Let’s start from the top: The founder of the Centre, Professor Ivan Supek, and Berta Dragičević, Executive Secretary of the IUC.

A group of scholars, led by Professor Ivan Supek, physicist, philosopher, and scientist of global reputation, at that time Rector of the University of Zagreb, came together in Dubrovnik in 1970 from many parts of the world and agreed to the concept of an intellectually independent and academically autonomous international institution devoted to cooperation among universities. Founded in 1971 at the height of the Cold War, the IUC became one of the most important venues for the exchange of ideas by scholars from both the East and the West. Over the years, more than 60.000 scholars and students have participated in the Centre’s courses and conferences. Mrs. Berta Dragičević was an institution herself. From the very beginning of the IUC in 1971 and up till now she has belonged to Dubrovnik and to the IUC. She was formerly Deputy Mayor of Dubrovnik and a member of Dubrovnik’s City Council since 1993, and is a descendent of family members who were on Dubrovnik’s City Council in the 13th century. Berta stayed all the time in Dubrovnik and never stopped to work hard for the IUC, radiating tolerance, liberal thoughts, friendship and human understanding. There was no problem in the functioning of the Centre that would not be readily resolved by this great lady of Dubrovnik and of the Centre.

We, the Victimology group, have been one among many, having our post-graduate course on *Victimology, Victim Assistance and Criminal Justice* since 1984. We are proud that this year, May 11–23, 2009, we are going to have and to celebrate our 25th post-graduate course. The idea started in 1983 at our friendly meeting at Uhlandstrasse 11, Moenchengladbach (at that time West) Germany. Professor Gerd Ferdinand Kirchhof (Germany), Professor Paul Friday (USA) and I agreed to start our post-graduate studies in Dubrovnik. It was our cordial friendship and collegialship, but also love for the discipline that was the Victimology, a new social science in which we have already been deeply involved. From Dubrovnik and the IUC Victimology conference we brought to the world the Draft of the *Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power GA Res. 40/34*, which was adopted by UN General Assembly in November 1985. It was a substantial moral victory, a *Magna Carta for Victims*, as it has been appropriately called by Minoru Shikita of the United Nations. It was borne at IUC in Dubrovnik, proposed by Irvin Waller (Canada) and LeRoy Lamborn (USA).

As a result of our studies many articles and books have been published. Let me mention one: Zvonimir Paul Šeparović & Wanda Jamieson (Eds.): *Domestic Violence, Selected papers given at the International Workshop on Domestic Violence held 1988, IUC Dubrovnik*.

Over the years, more than 1000 students and scholars participated in the Victimology courses and conferences. Some of the students later became professors, like Ksenija Turković and Ivo Josipović (Croatia), Otmar Hagemann and Peter Schaefer (Germany), just to mention a few. In early days, the Victimology course was attended by Elmar G. M. Weitekamp (Tuebingen, Germany), and he is now principal director of the course and the key person in running Victimology in Dubrovnik. In the 80s, Dubrovnik was a world centre of the victimology movement, and the *World Society of Victimology* (WSV) held its Executive Committee's annual meetings in connection with the IUC courses. The best scholars of the area of victimology participated in our conferences, including scientists like Jan van Dijk, Luik. Huilsman, and Franz Willem Winkel (Netherlands), John Freeman and Dame Helen Reeves (UK), Koichi Miyazawa and Hidemichi Morosawa (Japan), Roy Whitrod and Chris Sumner (Australia), Michael Diaz and K. Chokalingam (India), Sarah Ben David (Israel), Ester Kosovski (Brazil), Hans Joachim Schneider and Guenther Keiser

(Germany), John Dussich (USA), the President of WSV, Maria de la Luz Lima Malvido (Mexico), Nils Christie (Norway), Alfredo Guarino and Armando Saponaro (Italy), Matti Joutsen (Finland), Saleh Abdel-Motaal (Egypt), Rika Snyman (SouthAfrica), and many more.

These people of the big world, the world of science, have recognized a gem like Dubrovnik. They fell in love with the City. Many of them have reacted when Dubrovnik was subjected to an aggression of unprecedented magnitude in early 90s. The city, which ranks among the most valued cultural heritages protected by UNESCO, was attacked from sea and land, and the aggression culminated in the worst and most devastating attack on 6 December 1991, which included the destruction of the IUC building, which was directly hit by shells and completely burnt out, with only the walls remaining. *“There were banners all over the city proclaiming Dubrovnik a World Heritage Site under protection of UNESCO, but they were ignored,”* Berta Dragičević recalled. *“The IUC archives were saved, but 30,000 books, many irreplaceable, were reduced to ashes.”*

Professor Gerd F. Kirchhoff wrote letters to the Secretary General of EU, in Strasburg, and to his minister Hans Friedrich Genscher (Germany), expressing his deep concern for the political situation of Yugoslavia: *“As representative of the WSV I believe strongly that the Council of Europe is obliged to prevent victimization of Slovenian and Croatian citizens,”* wrote Professor Gerd Kirschhof, who did not miss a single one of all 25 Victimology courses in Dubrovnik, before and after the war.

“Those who have enjoyed the warm hospitality and ancient treasures of Dubrovnik, especially the many scholars from around the world who have attended the IUC, can send funds for medical supplies and humanitarian relief to the people of that stricken city through the initiative of Professor Ørjar Øyen (University of Bergen, Norway), the present Director General of the IUC,” wrote Nigel Young, professor of Peace Studies at Colgate University, reminding us of the plight of the people of Dubrovnik and far-reaching concern they have elicited.

Very strong support was given by many citizens' groups, like the association “Friends of Dubrovnik” (“Amici di Dubrovnik”–, Terni, Italy), led by my good friend Marcello Marcellini, distinguished Italian lawyer who was a frequent visitor of Zaton and Dubrovnik also during the war time. In his letter to Mr. Butros B. Ghali, he wrote: *“The siege of Dubrovnik is still continuing. The people in the town live like in an*

enormous prison. We hope that the U.N. will stop as soon as possible this crime against the peace and humanity.”

At that time, Berta Dragičević and Professor Kathleen Wilkes wrote a letter from the ruins of the wrecked building of the IUC, which was in flames for days. Professor Wilkes was the president of the IUC’ Executive Committee and a British scholar from a well-known and influential family; she had stayed in the city under siege, hoping that her presence and her testimony would help the city and the Centre. They wrote to their colleagues and friends around the world.

Kathleen Vaughan Wilkes (1946–2003) was a philosopher who took her subject far beyond the confines of academic journals and the traditional classroom. Kathy was a bold academic forging philosophical links with Eastern Europe. She travelled extensively in Eastern and Central Europe, Russia and China, putting scientists together. But, Kathy fell in love with Dubrovnik. Throughout the 1980s she became the mainstay in the philosophy of science seminar of the IUC. When war broke out, Professor Wilkes remained in Dubrovnik throughout the horrific bombardments of 1991, leaving the city only on brief trips to seek assistance, particularly medical resources. While I was struggling as Minister of Foreign Affairs of Croatia for the recognition of Croatia, while attending the peace conference in The Hague, Lord Carrington, who was chairing the conference, mentioned to me that he received a letter from the IUC Dubrovnik signed by Kathleen V. Wilkes asking him for safety and peace in Dubrovnik. Kathy Wilkes wrote: *“But Dubrovnik should be safe. The self-styled “Duke of Chetniks”, Seselj, has announced that after the war he wants to live in the rector’s Palace; so he won’t bomb Dubrovnik. (I think that Hitler had the same reason for not bombing Oxford).”* Kathy also joined an Appeal of the *Forum of Women and Mothers* of Dubrovnik together with Berta Dragičević. In recognition of courage and assistance, Professor Wilkes was made a honorary member of the Croatian army, and a honorary citizen of Dubrovnik. For this and her contributions to philosophy, she was awarded a doctorate honoris causa by Zagreb University. I am proud that I met her in Dubrovnik and that we have lived at the same time, fighting for the same values: peace and science, humanity and tolerance, and especially a care for the victims, as Katy Wilkes did.

On 8 December 1991, two days after the Serbian chetniks had been bombing Dubrovnik and had totally destroyed the IUC building in Don Frana Bulića 4,

Dubrovnik, I wrote, as Minister of Foreign Affairs of Croatia, to the presidents of EU countries:

Dear Sir, Dubrovnik is almost totally destroyed. I urge you to do everything in your power to bring the end of the wanton destruction of Dubrovnik, city on the World Heritage Listing. Enclosed please find letters of appeals from Mr. Pero Poljanić, Mayor of Dubrovnik, and British citizen dr. K. V. Wilkes, the executive director of IUC in Dubrovnik. Dr. Wilkes has remained and continues to stay in Dubrovnik despite a very grave danger to her life due to the Yugoslav and Serbian Army monstrous attacks on Dubrovnik. The world has a clear duty to stop the aggression on Croatia and prevent destruction of great city like Dubrovnik.

In the same capacity I wrote to the Security Council of the UN, NATO, and UNESCO and to Lord Carrington, stating, among other things the following:

According to latest news Dubrovnik – the town under UNESCO protection – is being shelled with a vengeance... We are herewith urging you to take immediate action in order to save Dubrovnik, Vukovar and the other Croatian towns that are now encircled and exposed to incessant shelling and bombing and to brutal and ruthless destruction that has no equal in recent history.

The Centre survived. It remained an independent international scientific institution, for years supported by the considerable power of its 250 members. Ørjar Øyen and Berta Dragičević in the publication issued on the occasion of the IUC's 30th anniversary in 2002 claim that this extraordinary international phenomenon in the heart of Dubrovnik survived the years of Communist rule and the war, when the building was destroyed (it has been restored since the war) and many other difficulties. One of these is the constant defence of the independent status of this non-governmental institution, which is at its core a spiritual creation consisting of 250 members universities first and foremost, but also of its participants, the students and professors whose exceptional loyalty to the Centre over the years is well known in Dubrovnik and among its many members. The Victimology courses now have a veteran status and have been taking place for over 25 years, such as also the Philosophy of Science program started by late Ivan Supek, the founding father of the Centre. WSV is now having its postgraduate courses in Mito, Japan, San Salvador, Pretoria, South Africa, Fresno, USA, but the first one and long lasting one is this at the IUC in Dubrovnik. Our thank goes to the long-time Director General of the IUC,

professor Ørjar Øyen from Norway, who has been showing genuine interest in victims problems and supported our seminars and conferences. But, last but not least, we are thankful to the Lady of the Centre and of the city of Dubrovnik, Mrs. Berta Dragičević, who has been instrumental in bringing it into life, in running the Centre, fighting for its independence and recognition at home and abroad, with her wisdom and always a friendly smile and wise advice. Due to her tolerance and liberal mind, this noble-woman has made history with her tireless guidance of the IUC in Dubrovnik. Thank you, Berta!

A Very Unexpected Revelation

By Ivan Urlić

University of Split

May 1996, the beautiful springtime in Dubrovnik. Clear skies, blue sea, flowers and Mediterranean perfumes were creating a very special atmosphere. That period of the year was especially chosen for the “School of Psychotherapy of Psychoses”. We, the organizers, Slađana Štrkalj-Ivezić, Joško Vuletin and myself, are Croatian psychiatrist, especially interested in comprehensive treatment of psychoses.

The inspiration to organize the School we obtained in 1994 Washington D.C. at the 11th International Symposium for the Psychotherapy of Schizophrenia, that was focusing on ‘Psychotherapy and Comprehensive Treatment’, organized by David Feinsilver. The idea was resonating in all three of us and, returning home, to Croatia still in war, we decided to start our School in the framework of the Inter-University Centre in Dubrovnik.

The first date was May 1995. The war in ex-Yugoslavia was still not over, but there were no major war activities that could be perceived from outside. But, our wish to counteract the war, to be constructive in the middle of the war destructions, and to show it even to our colleagues from abroad was obviously so intensive that we denied the reality. Our colleagues from abroad were telling us that for them it was too dangerous to come to a war zone for the professional event. Postponing the date for the next autumn didn’t encourage our participants due to the liberation action of the Croatian army in August of same year. So, the first School took place in May 1996.

It is traditional that in the activity of the School, the second day in the afternoon, I take colleagues that are interested in Dubrovnik history on a tour. Entering monasteries displaying Renaissance and Baroque art, one of the oldest pharmacies in Europe, Rector’s palace, the Cathedral with Titian paintings, one of the oldest

Sinagogues in Europe, fountains, churches, palaces, the beautiful historic city made out of white Dalmatian stone, walled and for more than thousand years an independent republic, the visitors were deeply impressed. The more it was painful to see some palaces burned down by recent war deeds and siege, and many stone carvings damaged, but in the process of being repaired.

The participants were fascinated by the exceptional cultural heritage and beauty of the town from one side, and from destruction and damages caused by Serbian and Montenegro invaders from the other, as well as with reparatory efforts.

It happened that the group that visited the old town was about 10 minutes late for the large group meeting. After some courteous phrases regarding our late-coming and impressions from the visit of the old town, a long silence followed.

Very silently some sighs, then tears of the colleague from Switzerland brought some more tension in the group, steering curiosity. Why she was crying?

“I heard about Dubrovnik”, she said, “and I was very intrigued by the invitation to come to the School, but I was deeply scared because of the war situation. We Swiss are not accustomed to war. That was happening only to the others. I couldn’t accept to come last year, but this year I didn’t find courage to decline the invitation once more. I was feeling very frightened, but I didn’t want to show my fears to my husband, not to disturb him. Several days ago we were sitting in our home near the fireplace and I said that I would like our house in the town to be inherited by one of our sons, and the house in mountains by the other ... My husband was astonished and asked me whether I was scared about going to Dubrovnik, in the war zone ... Now, what I am feeling is deep admiration for this exceptional town, its war scars, your determination to organize this School and to go forward, and feeling shameful because of my fears caused by living in safety ...”

After another deep but short silence our colleagues from abroad, as well as Croatians, could talk about their feelings regarding not only historic meaning and beauty of Dubrovnik but about this very thick symbolic meaning regarding freedom and a worth of sacrifices and fighting for it. That message was reinforced by this live encounter. Since then, these tears and words of appreciation for our culture and love for freedom are touching my feelings and memories in a profound way.

My Encounters with the IUC: The Unfinished Story

Alan Uzelac

University of Zagreb

The story about my encounters with the IUC has two parts, both of them particularly important for my life. Now, reflecting on the history of events that have connected me with this institution, I have realised that it would in no way be overstated to say that the IUC was among several rare places that have decisively determined my development in the two stages of my life, the stages that are of particular importance for the development of every scholar: the stage of initiation into academic community of teachers and researchers, and the stage when, after a long process of academic maturing, one starts to feel that he might offer something to the international community of scholars and scientists. My many memories from these two periods cannot be compressed into several hundred words. The only thing I can do is to provide a short account of several episodes from these two different periods.

My first encounters with the IUC courses started in fact some time before I first visited Dubrovnik. This was in mid 1980's, during the final years of my undergraduate study at the University of Zagreb, when certain rumours started to circulate among the group of young ambitious students, friends and colleagues – the rumours about a vibrant place to which some of the most advanced students were invited to listen to the topical discussions of the *crème de la crème* of the European and world science, mingle with their professors and enjoy the exceptional environment of the beautiful Dubrovnik in a friendly and co-operative atmosphere. I listened to the reports of the eye-witnesses and envied them. Therefore, it was for me a big and exciting event when late Gajo Petrović, a great philosopher and one of my favourite professors, offered me to attend his course. During the several weeks that I spent at the IUC courses in the period of about four or five years, I have realised that the great stories about the IUC were almost understated. As a student of social

sciences who has only been listening about Habermas or Luhmann, encounters with them at the IUC were incredible, enlightening experience. The interdisciplinary, intercultural and international contacts with other students and professors brought many new insights and new friends. The courses brought new knowledge, and the opportunity to discuss and present my views helped me (and many other young students) to feel less as passive observers, and more as active, almost important participants. The experience of talking and presenting our views before such an audience was for us an indispensable opportunity to train our abilities to conduct a frank, open and dynamic, yet tolerant dialogue with people of other backgrounds and experiences. Last but not least, the environment of the IUC and Dubrovnik in the late 1980's was exhilarating. I remember the debates that extended long into the night, continuing in the corridors and lobbies of the IUC Dormitory; I remember the IUC library with its plenitude of books, many of them offering most recent insights from the topical centres of academic excellence. All this gave me and some of my close friends who had this splendid opportunity to participate in the IUC courses the new incentives and motivation to continue in our academic and professional development.

In the 1990's, as painfully and all too well known, the IUC activities were discontinued and the IUC books and the Dormitory disappeared in the smoke of war. Yet, the memories remained, as well as my wish to return again to the academic Arcadia of the early period of my professional development. This only happened after a hiatus of more than ten years, in the beginning of 2000's when I was again invited to the IUC courses by some colleagues, this time as guest lecturer and participant. I was delighted by the opportunity to refresh the old memories. Yet, the time was different, and so was I. Being an occasional guest did not completely satisfy my wishes to maintain a permanent link with the Centre, and I felt that I owe Dubrovnik and the IUC more of my personal efforts. Thus, it was not very difficult for Viktorija Knežević – my former excellent student and current excellent lawyer from Dubrovnik – to encourage and persuade me to submit a proposal for a new course that I would organise. This is how the Private and Public Justice course was born. I also joined another course – Divided Societies – as a co-director. My link with the IUC was in such a way strengthened, though the challenge continued – the challenge of being a worthy contributor to the academic excellence that the IUC always stood for. Now, after three courses that I have helped putting on track, and after editing

two academic books that have arisen out of these courses, I cannot but be eternally grateful to all of those who helped build, and re-build the IUC. In particular, my gratitude goes to the small, but able team of friendly people in the IUC Secretariat, lead by Berta Dragičević. Organising a course or conference at the IUC is not an easy task; but, the splendid environment of the IUC will always return by the ultimate reward for all the efforts: the opportunity to push yourself to the limits and share the best you can offer with the other members of the global academic community.

Through Your Eyes Only

– on the production of inter-cultural understanding

– a peripheral Inter-University Centre experience

By Kirsten Weber

Roskilde University

We were late. It was hard to tell just *how* late or how *too* late. But traffic had been bad out of Sofia, and on top our rented Lada station car had coughed its way around a few detours. We had not come along with the rest of the party, I assume we must have been touring it on our own.

The party was composed of the then Inter-University Centre Executive Committee and a considerable delegation from the university of Sofia. We got there slightly hectic and very cold – the weather had made its October turn to winter the very day before. The company we joined was well into inspecting and discussing the interesting location: an impressive villa with a striking display of folklore, anthropological findings as well as modern artefacts, furniture and the like. Any formal guided tour was obviously over and done with and our colleagues were musing individually or in focussed conversation over the beautiful effects. To be frank we were puzzled. Our host, the vice-rector of the University of Sofia, moved about in the house as if at home. The atmosphere was next to domestic and yet each and every object was obviously unique and probably most valuable. Surely nobody could actually *live* there?

Sensibly my colleague and partner addressed Berta Dragičević for enlightenment on the situation. Personally I must have found myself in no position to make such a demand, latecomer that I was, and a “hang-around” too. I was an accompanying partner of an executive committee member, in an IUC context I was merely another colleague, present in the excursion solely on the basis of the ever reliable inclusiveness of the IUC settings. I chose to turn to another woman – clearly neither a local celebrity nor an international visitor. She was very slim, very dark and, it seemed to me, very young – early twenties it turned out later, a brilliant student of English literature. Her presence was, I was about to learn, part of a student’s social

praxis duty, defined as an around-the-clock honorary job of translation and general accommodation.

“What is this place, please? Does your vice-rector live here?” I asked directly, and I was answered by what can only be characterized as ... a giggle. The house was, of course, national property, and the vice-rector ... “But don’t you *know*? She is the daughter of our war minister”. Indeed: how could anyone not *know*? This spontaneous answer implicitly informed me that the vice-rector did not exactly inhabit this formidable art collection – but that all the same it was her natural habitat. And that it was probably not in her capacity of vice-rector that she exercised domesticity. With governmental consent we were being shown Bulgarian art and antique collections that were in fact not publicly accessible.

Everybody else in the company was probably quite aware of the status of the location and familiar with the micro-politics of national meritocracy under Communism. It might well go with travelling in Academia across Eastern and Western Europe at the time. It was the mid eighties, I should add. Personally I was not socialized into such worldly wisdom. To my narrow Scandinavian mind an art collection must be either private or public, and if the latter: consequently accessible. I did not particularly wonder that our hosts wanted to present us with the most exquisite collections, but the private and domestic organization of their display had puzzled me. Of course no formal guided tour would comprise this kind of information. The basically natural order of things were, however further established when, as a result of a conversation on aesthetic preferences, the party was offered an excursion to a closed collection of Impressionist art, this time in Plovdiv.

Don’t get me wrong, it was not that I did not know anything. I guess I was and am as well informed as most of us, quite a political animal if you care to know. But one can know a lot and yet experience very little – and vice versa. Even when the world is there on a silver platter, other people will help you recognize the fact.

Angela – for her it was, the giggling student – later became a friend. During the stay in Bulgaria she translated not only linguistically, but also culturally, sights and events and broadened my Nordic welfare state horizon considerably. Through museums, monasteries and mountain dwellings presented by our hospitable hosts did she accompany the learned party. And Sofia, the streets of central Sofia, so like Copenhagen in the 1950es. Seeing Bulgaria with the help of her eyes I began to see us, the visiting crowd, through her eyes also. The cultivated conversation on the

latest opera performances in Europe or the preferable Shakespeare productions, including heartfelt arguments about the least deplorable translations of the latter ... these conversations exposed a traditional common cultural comprehension across Eastern and Western academic everyday lives. Affected as the conversations may have been on either side, Angela was clearly as yet an aspiring academic, she was peripheral and she did not embody European cultural practices in this version. Neither did I, for that matter, even if Shakespeare happens to be a central element in my academic heritage. Compared to my IUC experience at the time, none of my critical and interdisciplinary social sciences practices cut much ice here. This was evident for instance when a respected Oxford professor announced over dinner that her sex was as insignificant to her research findings as the colour of her socks. Considering the – to this day – mono-gendered nature of the academic field in question (philosophy) this was probably correct and the fervour of the remark appeared superfluous. Angela giggled again – probably at the thought of Oxford professors in coloured socks – and in response the whole party laughed out loud. In accordance with a general IUC spirit an underlying awareness of academic trends, currents and controversy, were respectfully managed. Tension resulted in “comic relief”. Absolutely Shakespearian, actually.

In retrospect Angela and I shared an outsider’s perspective on the grand organization of the event “Inter-University Centre goes to Bulgaria”. My own investment in the IUC at the time was strictly on the basis of specific scientific purposes, I did not know much about the governing bodies. And as for Angela, she was just performing the duty allotted to the excellent and duly select student. She was young, of course, and possessed eagerness and a drive to communicate the history and culture of her native country. I dare say my need of enlightenment almost fully compensated my status as older or as a Scandinavian researcher. In the context she and I were, each in our way, peripheral. On leaving I gave her my left over travel fiction – among them a hard cover Fay Weldon!

The narrative of our encounter refers of course to a special level and a subjectively perceived corner of the social event these cold October days in the 1980ies. Over time it has become steadily more well established as a “true fiction”, meaning that in my remembrance Angela is getting younger and younger, I am myself getting more and more naive and the precious collections of the Bulgarian

nation is getting beautifuller and beautifuller. Such is the manner in which events integrate themselves into our subjective biographies!

In reality, of course, the Inter–University Centre executive committee was just having a meeting. At the time it met once annually in Dubrovnik and once annually in a member university, this time in Sofia. It must have been dealing with the usual varied high–level bouquet of courses and seminars, questions of organization and financing, characteristic of the booming activities of the pre–war years. Gender studies and critical social science of course then as now being at the heart of the inter–disciplinary centre identity and abundantly present on all annual grand posters. Probably nobody except Angela and me – and my partner – will remember that we were also there.

Almost every year from then on, before and after the war, I have met with fascinating colleagues from all over the world in and around the Inter–University Centre. Many relations are long lasting and many gained status as friends. I have come to know inhabitants of Dubrovnik and I have learned of their experience of the war.

Angela never came to the IUC – but you may say that the IUC came to her, and remained a horizon kept alive by at least an annual postcard from Dubrovnik. For among all acquaintances, for more than twenty years Angela has stayed in touch without any calls of academic duty. Duly stimulated by her original success in enlightening this ignorant Scandinavian woman about culture and everyday life in Bulgaria under Communism, she sought out for herself a fellowship to study at Roskilde University, Denmark. I did not see much of her during her two stays of six months each at our “international cultural studies”, the English version of our interdisciplinary humanist basic education. I have no idea what the professors of English language and literature in Sofia University thought of the academic experience that Angela brought back with her – that of problem based, project organized studies, interdisciplinary research traditions as well a strong commitment to the social implications of science. I know that she worked with Fredric Jameson’s cultural theory and that Gregory Bateson’s concept of meta–communication was a great inspiration to her. The latter she later translated into Bulgarian.

In Denmark Angela stayed at the house of philosophy professor Arne Thing Mortensen in the centre of Roskilde, the medieval capital of Denmark. A lively house full of international students forever cooking national dishes and confronting

national cultural and scientific traditions. Facing the stern and unforgiving Nordic architecture of Roskilde Cathedral – built in the 1170's representing traits of Roman as well as Gothic style – so very different from the rich religious architecture of Angela's homeland, and, as she wryly commented, a "suitable inspiration for atheists like yourself". Danish cultural heritage through her eyes! Dubrovnik would have been much more in her line of aesthetics! Anyway eventually she returned to Sofia, completed her degree, established herself a living by translating a variety of genres, and married Vladimir who is an administrative officer in the orthodox church.

Angela visited me this summer, the summer of 2008, accompanied by her 15 year old son, Vladimir Jr. I really must see to it that our next get together is in Dubrovnik.

The IUC and the Course on Divided Societies

Mitja Žagar

University of Ljubljana

Since my early childhood I was admiring a painting of a beautiful sunset in Dalmatia showing a sailing boat sailing from the old port of Dubrovnik that was hanging on the wall in the apartment of my old aunt. The sun was glaring in the city walls and white sails, bringing to them reddish tones and reflections. When as a child of ten I actually came to Dubrovnik for the first time with my aunt who showed me the old town with the old port and the walls, the new port of Gruž, some islands and neighbouring towns, I found Dubrovnik – especially its old town and the Lokrum Island – even more magical and immediately fell in love with it. Ever since, I love to return there.

In time I have added new favourite spots (houses and palaces, churches, parks, bays, cliffs, etc.) and events (evenings and walks in Stradun, summer festivals, etc.) in Dubrovnik that bewitched me and have made my desire to return to this town stronger. However, probably the strongest (surely in institutional terms) and dearest connection with Dubrovnik became the IUC – briefly in the late 1980s and finally in the 1990s. The true turning-point was the international conference that in the beginning of the 1990s addressed issues of ethnic relations, cooperation, competition and conflict that in the context of escalating Yugoslav crises were becoming even more relevant and important. This conference – as a part of the UNRISD Project on Ethnic Conflicts and Development, coordinated by Rodolfo Stavenhagen – brought to Dubrovnik a number of prominent scholars in the field of ethnic studies of the time, such as Otto Feinstein, Kumar Rupensinghe, Rodolfo Stavenhagen, Valery Tishkov, Crawford Young, etc. At the time of the conference, when we continued informal discussions on the balcony of the old Hotel Imperial in the nights we were already able to hear echoes of shootings somewhere in the far distance in mountains, indicating future tragic developments in the region. However,

already at that time Silva Mežnarić, one of key organizers of the conference, initiated the idea to prepare future conferences on these relevant topics at the IUC and, possibly, to develop a graduate course. In these discussions also the idea of the *International Colloquium on Ethnicity: Conflict and Cooperation* was discussed that was realized by Otto Feinstein who managed to initiate the participation of several hundred scholars in a series of conferences and projects from all over the world in the 1990s. Otto Feinstein started also the *Journal of Ethno-Development* that became an important instrument for the presentation and dissemination of ideas and research findings produced by the members of the *International Colloquium*.*

Although the war in Croatia postponed the development of a course at the IUC, the idea has not been forgotten. Silva Mežnarić continued to play the central role in its realization and with the input of Heribert Adams and Kogila Moodley the course on *Divided Societies* was developed. In addition to Silva, Kogila and Heribert, Rodolfo Stavenhagen, Otto Feinstein and I agreed to become course co-directors, while latter additional colleagues joined us. From the mid 1990s the course on *Divided Societies* became one of the regular spring courses at the IUC that was occasionally also accompanied by parallel conferences on selected topics. The only time that the course was cancelled or better replaced by a conference later that year was in 1999, when the international intervention in Kosovo made it impossible for participants to fly to Dubrovnik.

However, before I describe our course and its development – which hopefully will continue as a permanent accredited (post)graduate course of the IUC also in the future – I would like to write a few words about my first visit to Dubrovnik after the bombardment. My heart was torn by images of burning town and I just had to see how the town survived it. As soon as the airport was reopened I flew there. On the way to Dubrovnik I was told that the town of Cavtat was still blocked off due to

* More on the *International Colloquium on Ethnicity: Conflict and Cooperation*, *Journal of Ethno-Development* and their contribution to the development of ethnic studies and diversity management see e.g., Žagar, Mitja. Diversity management – evolution of concepts. In: Brezigar, Sara (ed.), Lavskis, Peter (ed.), Solem, Knut Erik (ed.), Žagar, Mitja (ed.). *International, constitutional, legal and political regulation and management of ethnic pluralism and relations, including prevention, management and/or resolution of crises and conflicts as components of diversity management: thematic issue*, (Razprave in gradivo/Treatises and Documents: Journal of ethnic Studies, No. 52, 2007). Ljubljana: Inštitut za narodnostna vprašanja/Institute for Ethnic Studies, 2007, 2007, No. 52, pp. 6–37.

mines. When for the first time I saw the old town from the road my feelings were mixed. I still remember my relief when I realized that the old town survived, while at the same time I was sad to see the damage. The full extent of destruction was only obvious when I came there... damaged houses, churches and monasteries in the old town, destroyed Hotel Imperial and one of the saddest scenes, destroyed building of the IUC. I was devastated and I cried being afraid that it would take years before the damage to the building could be repaired and unsure about the future of the IUC. However, the fact that I saw people working on the repairs and reconstruction of the old town raised my hopes... and I was enthusiastic to learn that the IUC survived, that its leadership was eager to restart with its activities that most collaborators agreed with plans for its revival and decided to participate in them. I was especially glad that our course on *Divided Societies* was one of the first new additions in this context.

As it is the case with all long-term projects our course on *Divided Societies* also evolved in the past decade and half. Our goal was and is to follow current developments in ethnic studies and related disciplines, paying special attention to the region of South Eastern Europe and other societies world-wide that can be described as divided societies. The main characteristics of divided societies are persistent divisions (established along diverse division lines, such as ethnicity, language, religion, possibly class, etc.) and cleavages that influence daily reality, life of people and historic developments in these environments that – in turn – reproduce and perpetuate the mentioned divisions and cleavages. Considering recent historic developments in the Balkans, the course focuses on ethnic dimensions of divided societies, however, taking into account also other dimensions. Since the establishment of the course some years we established a specific thematic focus and/or promoted specific approaches, while sometimes we chose a more general approach and did not determine subtitles. However, all the time the course is promoting interdisciplinary approaches and is (re)examining key concepts and phenomena as well as their potential impacts (including the possible impact of scholarly work and civic society) on processes and future developments in ethnically diverse societies. From its relatively modest beginnings the course grew into a permanent cooperation among individual scholars, who act as the course co-directors and/or lecturers/resource persons, as well as institutions from Europe and the USA. Although the composition of co-directors has been changing in time, I would stress that the course would not have survived and developed as successfully

without the central role and initiative of Silva Mežnarić, whom we could declare its founding mother. Of course, I am proud that I was among founding members and that I am a part of this team from the very beginning (although – for different reasons – my involvement has not been always as intense and my contribution not always as substantial and helpful as I would like it to be).

Recognizing that the topic and phenomenon of divided societies have remained relevant and that over the years their social relevance in and impact on contemporary diverse societies have not decreased but rather increased, it was decided that the main title of the course *Divided Societies* should become permanent – thereby manifesting its tradition, stability and permanency. However, additional subtitles have been added to the main title in the past and they might be added in the future to reflect a specific focus and central topics planned in individual years. The established tradition that reflects the stability and continuity of the course is the practice that the course co-directors establish the provisional program and a possible subtitle for the next year's course already by the end of the current course taking into account proposals and interests of co-directors and faculty as well as suggestions and criticism of participants of the current course. It is worth mentioning that in the addition to the course co-directors a permanent nucleus of the faculty and students has been established that have participated in several courses, while a good portion of graduate students express their interest to participate in the course next year or in the coming years again. As an important part of the evolution of the course we could mention also the fact that in the meantime some of the former students have become a part of the permanent faculty and co-directors and, thereby, have contributed and continue to contribute to its development. Namely, being invited to reflect the current developments of the theory, diverse disciplines and fields as well as recent and current developments in contemporary diverse and divided societies in different parts of the world (although the main focus remains South Eastern Europe) every co-director, resource person and member of the faculty as well as graduate students who present their research and papers and students who participate in discussions are contributing to the course, its development and richness by bringing in diverse and new topics, information, their research data and findings, specific approaches, methods and angles, their perceptions and interpretations that they consider relevant for the study and understanding of the phenomenon of divided societies.

However, we are aware that relevant and rich course programs that include topics interesting for students and useful for their graduate studies, the faculty that can ensure quality teaching and respond to specific needs and interests of the students as well as the opportunities for the participating students to present their papers and test (preliminary or final) results of their research are only some reasons for the popularity of the course. Additional, possibly equally important attractions for the students and faculty are the wonderful location and everything that Dubrovnik and South Dalmatia have to offer at the end of April – including possibilities for interesting field trips to the Balkans, Central and Eastern Europe as well as the prestige of the IUC and its consortium of more than hundred respected universities throughout the world. The program of the IUC offers to the students and faculty also possibilities to learn about other courses and conferences that are there simultaneously and just before or after the course on *Divided Societies*, to participate in at least some parts of these courses and conferences as well as opportunities to meet and interact with participants, students and faculty of other courses who might share the same or similar interests – hopefully resulting in long-lasting or permanent cooperation and networks that might be beneficial for their future academic development and professional careers.

As I mentioned, in an attempt to holistically address the phenomenon of diverse societies each of the co-directors and members of the faculty of the course tries to include and present their newest research and findings on ethnicity, ethnic relations and differentiations, divisions and cleavages, social mobilization, civic society and civic education, diversity and diversity management. My personal contribution has focused on constitutional, legal and political dimensions of ethnic relations, their regulation and management – especially in the Balkan countries, the protection of (national) minorities, democratization, civic society and civic education as well as diversity management and the prevention, management and resolution of crises and conflicts. In addressing those issues I have tried to present and explain my current research work and findings as well as my experiences and insight of working with some international organizations (such as the Council of Europe, OSCE, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, UN), governmental institutions and bodies of different countries (e.g., ministries of culture, education, foreign affairs, governmental offices and councils of national minorities, etc.), local governments and nongovernmental organizations. With the students and faculty I have shared my

teaching experiences from different undergraduate and graduate programs in several countries and environments – usually also using interactive approaches, methods and forms, such as simulations, role plays and workshops. In many ways this course has been an important opportunity to test, review and evaluate new developments – including the development and evolution of peace and conflict studies as well as the elaboration and development of diversity management in the late 1990s and early 2000s, benefiting also from research findings of diverse European and international research projects (such as the 6th Framework Programme Project MIRICO – *Human and Minority Rights in the Life–Cycle of Ethnic Conflicts*).

In conclusion I should stress once again that our course on *Divided Societies* and its success should be observed as the common project and process to which many have contributed; its success to a large extent depends on the readiness and efforts of all participants – the students, faculty and co-directors. However, we should not underestimate the role and input of the IUC, which offers not only excellent facilities and stimulating working environments, necessary assistance with the logistics and spread of information, but also stimulates synergies of diverse – traditional and/or occasional – courses and conferences that constitute the IUC's program every year. In a way we could say, that the IUC with its consortium of universities and all individual courses and conferences are intertwined and interdependent: success and evaluation of individual courses and conferences depend on the success and evaluation of the IUC, while – simultaneously – the success of the IUC to a large extent derives from the success, quality and positive evaluation, promotion and broader impact of individual courses and conferences.

The Building in Don Frana Bulića 4 and the Spirit of IUC

By Krunoslav Pisk

Director General of IUC, Ruđer Bosković Institute, Zagreb
University of Dubrovnik

The relations between IUC and the University of Zagreb have been very complex in many segments, from personal to legal issues. The thing is that University of Zagreb is not only one of the founders of IUC (Academician Ivan Supek as Rector of University of Zagreb launched the idea of the Centre in 1970), but according to the IUC Constitution from 1971 (prepared by Academician Eugen Pusić) the University of Zagreb also took upon itself the obligation to secure the space and personnel for the operation of IUC. In 1972 the City of Dubrovnik generously offered to the University of Zagreb (as then the only juridical entity) the use of the building of the former Teachers College, in Don Frana Bulića 4, for the work of IUC.*

At that time, the University of Zagreb also established the Centre for Postgraduate Studies located in the same building. The latter started its work with national postgraduate studies in spring 1972 and the IUC's first international programmes started in spring 1974. At the very beginning the national programmes were the basis on which the international programmes were developed.

Ever since, the IUC programmes, courses and conferences, were growing steadily, in number and size, and very soon constituted the majority of offerings in the building.

The IUC thus became identified with the building in Don Frana Bulića 4 which hosted thousands of postgraduate students and professors many of whom became "addicted" to the place.

Unfortunately, during the aggression upon Dubrovnik, on December 6, 1991, the IUC building was hit by incendiary shells and burnt down with the whole inventory.

* Statements by Academician Ivan Supek and Academician Eugen Pusić follow this article as attachments. These Statements were written in 2002, as a result of my discussions with Ivan Supek and Eugen Pusić in an attempt to clarify some historical facts.

However, it was fortunate that the IUC spirit survived the destruction. Already in spring 1992 the Croatian Government started the reconstruction and refurbishment of the IUC building in Don Frana Bulića 4, and the main part of the building was completed in the fall of 1993 when the IUC operation returned to its home (in the meantime ,the reduced number of activities was organised in some other spaces in town).

At that time, the authorities of the University of Zagreb opened the issue of space and its costs related to IUC programmes. This basically reflected their disagreement with the IUC international academic independence which they tried to diminish in different ways. However, the participants and professors from the University of Zagreb were greatly attached to the IUC basic mission, i.e., the existence of IUC as an independent free-haven meant quite much to them. The basic issue for the IUC authorities was that the space in Don Frana Bulića 4 should be available without costs for professors and students in the IUC programmes according to the IUC Constitution. Already earlier but in particular at this time the building in Don Frana Bulića 4 symbolised the IUC and its continuity in spite of the war destruction.

Later on, some time in 2002 in accordance with Croatian legislation the University of Zagreb transformed the previous right to use the building according to the donation from the City of Dubrovnik into its property and registered it accordingly in the official real estate records.

Following long negotiations and discussions between the authorities of the University of Zagreb and IUC and also the Croatian Ministry of Science regarding mutual relations and rights to use the space in Don Frana Bulića 4 agreements were signed between the three parties in 2006.

Fortunately, IUC actually successfully continues its mission in Dubrovnik and registers solid growth and development with numerous offerings taking place in Don Frana Bulića 4.

Notwithstanding the eventual developments and possible future changes referring to the ownership of the respective building the spirit of IUC lives in Don Frana Bulića 4.

Attachment I

Statement on the Founding and Operations of the Inter–University Centre for Postgraduates Studies in Dubrovnik

The need for inter–university post–graduates studies was stressed at various international inter–university conferences in the late sixties. At the meeting of the International Association of Universities in Montreal (September 1970), I advocated the proposal on postgraduate studies and research projects based on inter–university cooperation. I also proposed the form of the Inter–University Centre for Humanities and Social Sciences in Dubrovnik. The proposal was accepted and later on Professor Alfvén extended the idea to natural and technological sciences, which was approved.

As Rector of the University of Zagreb I sent out in June 1970 invitations to a number of universities inviting them to participate in the foundation meeting for Inter–University Centre for Postgraduate Studies in Dubrovnik. The foundation meeting was held from 26 to 31 August 1971 in Dubrovnik and it adopted “the Constitution of the Inter–University Centre for Postgraduate Studies in Dubrovnik” and so the IUC Dubrovnik was established.

The IUC Dubrovnik is planned and established with the goal to organise cooperation among universities on the principle of full equality and to secure the institutional form for postgraduate studies and research projects organized by IUC members.

Due to the lack of a legal provision (in the then Yugoslavia and Croatia) for the registration of an international institution such as IUC Dubrovnik, the University of Zagreb (as one of the IUC members) took upon itself the role of the host – the legal entity which would offer necessary space and equipment and also administrative service necessary for the performing of basic functions of the IUC Dubrovnik. It was agreed that the expenditures for participants (professors and students) were to be secured from different sources (primarily through contributions of members, international donations, contracts on cooperation ...)

Following the establishment of the IUC Dubrovnik as an international institution (explained above) the City of Dubrovnik in February 1972 signed “The Agreement on the transfer of the rights of use of real estate property” by which the use of respective properties (under the present address Don Frana Bulića 4 in Dubrovnik) is transferred to the University of Zagreb exclusively for the need of founding and operations of the Centre for Postgraduate Studies in Dubrovnik as foreseen by the above act on the founding of the IUC Dubrovnik.

I am certain that the thirty years long operations of the IUC Dubrovnik have fully justified its aim and existence and that it is important that it continues its activities. The Croatian universities can find (as confirmed by the thirty years long practice) sufficient space for holding postgraduate studies through the structure and organization of the IUC Dubrovnik and there is no need to establish new and/or parallel institutions on the same location (Don

Frana Bulića 4 in Dubrovnik) which was donated exclusively for the needs of the IUC Dubrovnik as international institution.

Zagreb, 22 July 2002

Academician Ivan Supek

Attachment II

Statement on the Founding and Legal Status of the Inter-University Centre for Postgraduate Studies in Dubrovnik

At the time of the founding of the Inter-University Centre I held the position of President of the Committee for international cooperation of the University Assembly of the University of Zagreb and in this capacity I participated in the establishment of the Centre.

The legal existence of the Inter-University Centre requires two preconditions: as first, the setting up of mutual relations between the founding institutions and member institutions, and as second, the integration of the Centre into the legal system of the country in which it exists and operates, that is, the legal system of the former SFR of Yugoslavia, presently Croatia.

The first question was solved by the adoption of the Constitution of the Inter-University Centre at the foundation assembly in August 1971 which determined the Centre as an interuniversity institution, i.e., an institution of all member universities in which each single member has the equal position. The second question remained open. The acceptance and registration of the Inter-University Centre as institution with international elements was within the authority of the then Federal Executive Council and they never gave the necessary agreement.

In the thirty years of its operation the Inter-University Centre won great reputation in the world. In one period the number of its member universities reached 240. The Centre became an important part of the cultural and social capital of Croatia and it should be preserved and further developed.

With this aim I consider it necessary to do what was not possible earlier, that is, to integrate the Inter-University Centre also formally into the legal system of the Republic of Croatia through its transformation in an independent institution and its registration according to the Croatian law. It is only with such a status that the Centre could be the bearer of rights which are indispensable for its operations and also could normally operate in relation to its partners in the country and abroad, primarily in relation to the University of Zagreb.

Such a status would also secure the normal regime of the Centre's financing through the budget of the Republic of Croatia referring to the financing of higher education and science and through contributions of its member universities.

Zagreb, 27 July 2002

Academician Eugen Pusić

Berta Dragičević: Ambassador of a Modern Academic Centre and an Ancient Maritime Republic

By Peter Fischer–Appelt

Honorary Member of IUC
University of Hamburg

1

The first time I travelled to Dubrovnik was in August 1965. I came with three friends from the University of Bonn driving down the Adria magistrale in two cars. Beyond the Bay of Zaton – years later a miraculous place of Berta’s and Hinko’s hospitality – we expected to glide directly into the area of the glorious City when the road suddenly turned left and took us a long way into and out of a deep fjord called Dubrovačka Rijeka. No bridge saved time and costs to be spent for a ten kilometres detour. What a magnificent idea of nature to guard an Elysian settlement from attack at the single open site of the coastal area!

Then we circulated around the slopes of Mount Srđ and found ourselves from one moment to the next driving a race with yellow streetcars alongside Luka Gruž and further up a hill through Danče with a final countdown to Pile, quite a dangerous terminal for trams (until a catastrophic crash in 1969). The road, however, made a sharp left turn and curved us underneath a mighty fortress named Minčeta through a gorge like moat up to a small plateau where we became absorbed in a gorgeous view of the shimmering Bay of Lokrum. Before we could cast our eyes round the majestic scenario we were filtered into a stream of traffic leading us straight on along the slopes and out of Ploče, the eastern suburb of the Old City. Adieu Dubrovnik!

Libertas: We saw the flag of the ancient Republic of Dubrovnik waving on top of Fort Lovrjenac when we found a parking lot by a flight of steps crossing the main road at the corner of today’s Od Bosanke and Zagrebačka. Did this unbeatable motto, beyond its historic elements of independence, integrity, and virtue, include also a sense of “be welcome, leave soon”? Obviously, this was and is still the intrinsic message of the one–way street system in the urban area of the City of Dubrovnik. Yet,



Berta Dragičević and Peter Fischer-Appelt, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the IUC, in 1997

could it be, that this message at the same time would reflect a hidden attitude of the inhabitants of ancient Ragusa, a traditional scepticism against visitors, an imbedded precaution of an old harbour republic once fearing introduction of infectious diseases and contagious political or social-revolutionary ideas, a self-defence against spies of rival states like the out striding Republic of Venice, a prudent stand in view of the incalculable despotism of the Ottoman Empire, a protection from the jealous neighbours behind the Herzegovinian and Montenegrin mountains? In one word: Libertas as a message of caution, if not anxiety?

2

If ever a sublime disposition like this prevailed in once independent maritime city republics, Berta Dragičević is in person and function a veritable denial of anxiety and a genuine example of receptiveness. Those many thousands of professors, students, journalists, and visitors who walked through the door of her office in the Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik received, each and every one, a heartfelt

welcome, a word of personal anchoring in a mutual context, a special gesture of hospitality and an offer of assistance in whatever matters. Her judicious conduct of the IUC operations, her communicative handling of a worldwide network of partners, her capturing way of performing official and social functions, her professional preparation and support of the IUC meetings, her loyalty to seven directors general and numerous other officials in charge were at any time the primary guarantee for keeping the IUC in stability. Not the highest regard for any one else in the academic and administrative business of the IUC can hide the fact that in an institution working on the basis of a temporary presence of volunteers, Berta Dragičević over a long period of thirty-five years carried the major part of the burdens of daily responsibilities in peacetime and in particular in wartime.

Independence and integrity are the labels of her personality and her judgment. Her family tradition goes back over centuries to the urban patriciate of Dubrovnik – to no advantage in the period from 1945 to 1990. A graduate of the University of Zagreb and by professional education a lawyer she was appointed Executive Secretary of the Inter-University Centre in 1972 by Academician Ivan Supek, then Rector of the University of Zagreb, after he had established the Centre on the request of 28 representatives of international universities and university organisations. In 2007, on her final retirement in her previous capacity, the IUC Council awarded Berta Dragičević the status of Honorary Member of the Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik and elected her Secretary General on a part-time basis.

Like her mother, who through all her working life held an important position at Atlas Travel Agency, Berta had to come to terms with the strained egalitarian though discriminating society of her youth. Like her mother who developed into an encouraging example and dependable stronghold for the daughter with two young children at home Berta became an eloquent example of democratic engagement within a newly emerging civil society when she successfully stood for membership in the City Council and, over and above that, was elected Deputy Mayor for International Relations of the City of Dubrovnik. And no doubt, by saving, under the hail of bullets, parts of the archives from the burning IUC building she showed the same unshakeable will to survive, as the mother had the unwavering pride to order her coffee every afternoon at Gradska Kavana even at times of shelling.

There were opportunities of leisure with Berta and Hinko, her husband who passed away some years ago, a strong swimmer with the stamina to cross the Bay of



Zaton twice a day forth and back. We shared barbecue with the Katić family, relatives of Berta's who lived next to her summer house on a beautiful piece of land. There were illuminate concerts in the atrium of the Rector's Palace with the stars twinkling on the black Steinway of Ivo Pogorelić, illustrious theatre performances on the stage of Fort Lovrjenac with Hamlet's "to be or not to be" or in front of Skočibuha Palace with Ivo Vojnović's "Dubrovačka trilogija" reminding an international audience of the ever topical question: is there any third way of existence to either sacrificing or satisfying one's life? Is there a compromise in political, social and family life, a compromise to live together prudently in strength and dignity?

25th Anniversary of IUC in 1997: Ivo Šlaus, Eugen Pusić, Ørjar Øyen, Ivan Supek, Lise Kjølørød, Henrik Birnbaum, Peter Fischer-Appelt, Berta Dragičević, Hylke Tromp, Istvan Teplan, Gwyn Prins, Marianna Brinbaum, Gvozden Flego, Luc Reyhler

As each time and each individual has to find a sound and convincing answer to those perpetual questions Berta Dragičević implemented the historical Ragusan compromise into the somewhat shaky organizational nature of the Inter-University Centre. She hardly ever influenced the decision-making of academic bodies by principal remarks, rather she observed, reflected, and reported the real development of courses within the space the institution offered to member universities.

The first surprising fact was that neither course directors nor the IUC itself made substantial moves to establish a series of postgraduate study courses finishing with a diploma or a masters degree. The intention well stipulated in the IUC Constitution was unworkable. Neither was the Inter-University Centre of Postgraduate Studies (this being its founding name) a university entitled to award degrees nor had it achieved a legal status to employ and oblige professors to run degree courses. Nor had it secured an annual financial income to pay for such operations on a long-term basis. Even the founding father Ivan Supek did not fully realize the deficient status of the IUC at the time when he released it to the academic world.

Berta witnessed that the IUC, as if guided by an invisible hand, made a virtue out of necessity. When the veil lifted part by part from the four weeks' courses of the seventies, the IUC revealed its true nature as being a modern version of Plato's Academy: a centre of learning more or less without the goals of professional education, a centre of discourse and inquiry instead of a school of curricular activities, a centre of transdisciplinary perspectives of queries including their basic, ethical and societal components.

Literally in all electoral periods of the Executive Committee new members, rightly convinced of their responsibility to steer the IUC activities under changing conditions, asked continuously the same question: why not introduce a system of degree courses to make the institution more attractive to students in a credit-point regulated academic world? Berta remained silent, hoping that somebody would explain the real nature of a flourishing and unique academic institution: we are attractive precisely because students can come across with their undeclared or unanswered questions posed in an interdisciplinary context of their subject matters; their universities can easily mark credit points on the basis of an IUC certificate and a course description as for example American universities do. Thus, instead of

inventing and steering the programmes of the Centre, we need to secure favourable conditions to keep the space open for volunteering scholars who love to come to Dubrovnik with their own programmes and attract students from many parts of the world thirsting to make enquiries about the latest international state of knowledge. Some additional practical remarks of an experienced head of the Secretariat usually clarified the niche in which the IUC operates successfully.

4

The challenges to achieve, secure and protect the Centre in its academic, structural and physical nature were numerous. For Berta Dragičević it was a learning experience to support Johan Galtung, the first Director General (1973–76, peace studies, Oslo), in attracting a series of high-level courses in the designated core areas, philosophy and social sciences. She enjoyed working with Siegfried Korninger (1977–87, Anglicist, former Rector of the University of Vienna) who incorporated the same spirit of attentiveness as expressed by the capturing design of the Austrian-style building at Frana Bulića 4 in Pile. While they administered a flourishing programme extending to medicine, mathematics, natural and technical sciences the IUC at the same time had to take a stand against lurking political concerns about an alleged misuse of the freedom of space within which the IUC operated. After standing the test Berta went through war and conflict with an imperturbable Director General Ørjar Øyen (1987–96, sociology, former Rector of the University of Bergen, Chair of the IUC Council 1972–81).

It was neither silent admiration nor envy of success when purposive accusations of an unfulfilled mission of the Centre were raised as early as August 1989 by a new ambitious leadership of the founding university. Hurrying ahead of a Croatian national independence, a will to establish a new international policy seemed to become a consistent motivation with the aim of making the IUC either conform to this policy or be replaced by a new Croatian Centre. Thus, in the times to come, Berta and the IUC Secretariat, consisting of loyal employees of the University of Zagreb, came under fire from above and on tinder from below. When after the devastating events of December 6, 1991, the restored IUC building was topped out already in August 1993 – a determined achievement of the Republic of Croatia added to by a fair contribution of IUC supporters – the venue was designated to obtain a new

function. A building once in 1971 given by the City of Dubrovnik to the University of Zagreb with the purpose to be used by and shared with the Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik, well-known as “The IUC Building”, reappeared now under the officially preferred name “The ICCU Building”, meaning the home of an alternative organisation, the “International Center of the Croatian Universities (ICCU)”.

Berta and her associates were holding their breath. Could it be true that the management of the alma-mater institution was willing to diminish the international visibility of a world-known Centre contributing to Croatia’s fame? And was it not contre coeur of Zagreb University itself to discontinue the reliable cost-benefit support scheme for the IUC anchored in the IUC Constitution and developed over a period of two decades in order to compensate an up to fifty percent participation of scholars and students from the University of Zagreb by bearing the overhead costs of the Centre? There was a sigh of relief when the matter apparently advanced to a political level of anticipated European observation so as to urge the Ministry of Science and Technology to earmark the respective funds of the University of Zagreb to continue support at least for a small Secretariat of Berta’s position and two associates, furthermore for the library and three to four class rooms of the former teachers college. The international support at this time was invaluable, in particular by the foundations of George Soros, who met with Berta in the IUC and started out from Dubrovnik with the idea, as he often pointed out, to found the Central European University in Budapest.

Then, under the Directors General Hylke Tromp (1996–98, law, University of Groningen), Helmut Moritz (1999–2002, geodesy, University of Graz) and Ivo Banac (2002–05, history, Yale University), the University of Zagreb repeatedly invited the IUC to sign the Charter of a Center for Advanced Academic Studies (CAAS) which it had established in 1998 on the premises of Don Frana Bulića 4. The IUC bodies, however, declined the invitation to bring the IUC under the roof of an institution being under full authority of the senate of a member university. In 2007, the experienced union leader Krunoslav Pisk (DG since 2005, physics, former Director of the Ruđer Bošković Institute, President of the IUC Association) settled the dispute by identifying, isolating, and tackling its financial rationale. He negotiated and signed, consented by the Executive Committee, two “Cooperation Agreements”: one between the Ministry and the IUC Association, the legal base of the IUC, to extend the existing infrastructure support scheme by including a share for maintenance; one



City of Dubrovnik Award to IUC
in February 1998 (from the left:
Ivo Šlaus, Ivan Supek, Berta Dragičević,
Peter Fischer-Appelt)

between the University of Zagreb and the Centre regulating the use of the IUC premises including the payment for maintenance. Our memory carries a successful cooperation with the University of Zagreb into the future.

5

Berta's memory is a narrative of Dubrovnik's aura reflected in the faces, voices, and gestures of enthusiastic visitors to the City and in particular to the Inter-University Centre. She is the single one representative of the IUC who met and spoke with most of the hundreds of world-known scientists contributing to the academic prestige of the Centre. It is an endless film unwinding from the spools of her recollection if she talks about Nobel prize winners like Werner Heisenberg, Linus Pauling, Edmond Fisher, David Baltimore, Hannes Alfvén or Joseph Rottblat, if she remembers scholars like Sir Alfred Ayer, Richard Bernstein, Jacques Derrida, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Johan Galtung, Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, Jürgen Habermas, Agnes Heller,

Robert Jungk, Leszek Kolakowski, Samuel Kripke, Hans Küng, Thomas Luckmann, Niklas Luhmann, Paul Ricoeur, Richard Rorty or Rudolf Siebert, not to mention all the magnificent scholars who came from the neighbouring Balkan area itself.

She knows the students of the seventies and eighties who came back to Dubrovnik as course directors and resource persons with their own academic events in the nineties and in the present decade. When the directors general and their deputies had to stick to duties in their home universities, Berta in courtyard receptions under the four famous chestnut trees greeted hundreds of courses with her charm and her devotion to every participant. She mirrored and still mirrors somehow the spirit of 1.600 courses and conferences organized at the IUC in thirty-five years, of a sworn though pluralistic community of tens of thousands of scholars and students who would never have liked to miss the unique intellectual openness and academic strength of a place like the Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik.

Given some mainstreams of modern thought whispering in her time through the class rooms of the Centre: hermeneutic, analytic, dialectic philosophy, the connotations of her personality can be threefold. The rhetoric phenomenon Berta would always be adopted with affection by the successors of Gadamer since she represents perfectly “ein hermeneutisches Universum”. Analytical thinkers would rather identify the brain phenomenon B.D. because it functions systemically as an “interface” of cultural tradition and capacity building for the future. Dialectic and political philosophy, however, would admire the diplomatic phenomenon emerged from the heritage of republican tradition, an ambassador of a modern academic centre and an ancient maritime city state. And yet, in all her facets she is nothing more than an endearing and upright human being.

LAYOUT AND PRINT

Durieux d.o.o., Zagreb

PHOTOGRAPHS

IUC Archive, Dubrovnik