

Uvodnik / Editorial / Éditorial 1 - 12

ISH FILES

Članki / Articles / Les articles

La quête d'identité; "die Judenfrage" et la production de l'identité ethnique dans un pays sans Juifs

(Stikanje za identiteto; »die Judenfrage« in produkcija etnične identitete v deželi brez Judov - Povzetek)

Drago B. Rotar..... 15 - 27

Socialno-antropološki pogledi na romologijo v Sloveniji

(Socio-anthropological Views on Romology in Slovenia - Abstract)

Alenka Janko Spreizer 29 - 63

Etnografija lokalnih turizmov; primer povezovanja ribištva in turizma v Izoli

(Ethnography of Local Tourism; Connections between Fishery and Tourism in Izola - Abstract)

Nataša Rogelja 65 - 83

Neposredni športni prenos in TV gledalec, I. del

(Live Sport TV Coverage and its Viewer, Part I – Abstract)

Vlado Kotnik 85 - 133

Drago B. Rotar

***LA QUÊTE DE L'IDENTITÉ; »DIE JUDENFRAGE«
ET LA PRODUCTION DE L'IDENTITÉ ETHNIQUE DANS
UN PAYS SANS JUIFS¹***

Résumé / Povzetek:

Distančno oz. izključevalno razmerje do judaizma in Judov je konstitutivno notranjekrščansko razmerje in je potemtakem med najbolj stalnimi in neogibimi značilnostmi "krščanske civilizacije". Paradoks antisemitizma brez Judov, s katerim se srečamo v zgodovini slovenskega, pa ne zgolj slovenskega, nacionalizma pravzaprav "evropeizira" ali "okcidentalizira" Slovence na najbolj temeljni ravni. Vendar se to razmerje, ki je bilo že v XIX. stoletju načeto z laicizacijo zahodnih družb (z vsemi konflikti, nasilji in sprenevedanji, ki jih poznamo iz zgodovine), v slovenskem primeru prelamlja še skozi zaslon provincializma in ponarejenosti kulture.

Mots clés / Ključne besede:

Literatura, nacionalizem, antisemitizem, produkcija identitete, zgodovina

Alenka Janko Spreizer

SOCIALNOANTROPOLOŠKI POGLED NA SLOVENSKO ROMOLOGIJO*

Povzetek

Avtorica v prispevku analizira slovensko romologijo, kakor jo opredeljujejo akterji sami ob zgledih iz raziskovalnih projektov o Romih, ki so jih izvajali v Sloveniji v letih od 1960 do 1962 in naprej ter ob pregledu občasnih objav romskih problematik⁴³ od leta 1991 dalje.

Analiza romologije v pričujočem besedilu uporablja konceptualno orodjarno iz študijev etničnosti in nacionalizma oziroma se naslanja na formalistični model

⁴³ Z »romskimi problematikami« mislimo na objave, ki jih slovenski romologi prezentirajo za romologijo, oba izraza pa sta problematična zaradi svoje neeksplicitnosti. Raba izraza »romologija«, ki ji ponekod rečejo tudi »ciganologija«, je tako zlorabljena, da jo v sodobnejših romskih oziroma ciganskih študijih opuščajo ali pa jo uporabljajo le kot metaforo za tradicionalistične in anahronistične študije o Romih oziroma Ciganih. Pojemovna zveza »romska problematika«, ki jo v romološkem diskurzu uporabljajo včasih kot sinonim za romologijo, implicira, da »romologom« predstavljajo problem Romi oziroma vsi problemi v zvezi z njimi. Ker avtorica dokaže, da njihova stališča, ki jih predstavljajo za znanstvena, niso primerljiva s sedanjim epistemološko izrisanim poljem študijev o Romih, se zdi izraz »romska problematika« manj zavajajoč od izraza »romologija«. Z Georgesom Canguilhemom lahko rečemo, da je sedanja slovenska romologija kvečjemu »znanstvena ideologija«, pri čemer naj bi znanstvene ideologije bile »diskurzi z znanstveno pretenzijo, ki jih oblikujejo ljudje, ki so na tem področju šele dozdevni ali domišljujoči si znanstveniki« (Canguilhem 1987:15). Tudi pojem »problematika« v *Slovenskem slovarju knjižnega jezika* vsebuje semantično navezavo na različne vede in znanost. Avtorica v članku prikaže, da slovenska romologija, ki jo predstavlja v nadaljevanju članka, nima lastnosti znanstvenega *logosa*; izraz »romologija« je po mnenju avtorice zavajajoč, saj se neposredno navezuje na *logos*; pojem »romska problematika« pa se zdi v nekaterih kontekstih tega prispevka ustrežnejši od »romologije«, ker je za razliko od slednjega povezanost z *logosom* pri prvem pojmu le implicitna. Vsekakor pa bi tu le nakazani problem zahteval bolj poglobljeno analizo.

etničnosti, ki je bil razvit v antropologiji (Eriksen 1993; Šumi 2000) ter na romske študije (Acton 1974, 1989, 1997a, 1997b, 1998, Hancock 1979, 1987, 1997a, 1997b, 1999, Acton in Mundy 1997) na drugi strani. Romologijo bere skozi lastno etnografsko evidenco, zbrano na terenu v letih od 1995 do 2000 in jo umešča v polje vednosti o Ciganih oziroma Romih, kakršna se predstavlja v sodobnejšem antropološkem pisanju od osemdesetih let dvajsetega stoletja naprej (Lemon 2000, Mirga 1987, 1992, Okely 1983, 1994a, 1994b, 1997, 1999, Piasere 1985, 1986, 1989, 1994, Stewart 1997a, 1997b, 1999, Silverman 1988, Sutherland 1975 [1986], Van de Port 1998, Williams 1984, 1989).

Posamezni raziskovalci romskih problematik v Sloveniji trdijo, da v Sloveniji obstaja daljša romološka znanstvena tradicija. Zapisano je bilo, da se začenja z Miklošičevimi filološkimi raziskavami romskih narečij, nadaljevala naj bi se prek Trdine in Koštiala do pionirske raziskave *Izolati Ciganov in kalvinistov v Prekmurju* v letih 1960-1962; sestavljajo jo še sporadične objave posameznih monografij in člankov do devetdesetih let (Šiftar 1970, 1978, 1988, 1989a, 1989b; Štrukelj 1977, 1980, 1989; Zdravec 1989) ter raziskave v devetdesetih letih (Šiftar 1994, 1996, 1999, Štrukelj 1991, 1996, 1997, 1999, Tancer 1991, 1994, 1998, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c, Žagar 1998; *Romi na Slovenskem 1991, Izboljšanje položaja Romov v srednji in vzhodni Evropi 1999*). Zatrjevanje o veličini slovenske romologije je zbudilo raziskovalno radovednost, podrobno branje romologije pa je omogočilo diagnosticiranje njene kompleksne problematike: tradicionalistično konceptualiziranost in rabo zastarelih, anahronističnih analitskih konceptov; neinformiranost glede sodobnih elaboracij v romskih oz. ciganskih študijih, ki so prezentni v anglofonem in frankofonem prostoru; neskončno perpetuiranje že kar arhetipskih romoloških tematik, ki se v skrajnosti iztečejo v rasistični in diskriminatorni diskurz o Romih in odnosu do njih. Članek nima filoloških ambicij in se ne posveča proučevanju Miklošičevih filoloških raziskav romskega jezika, pač pa analitično pretresa romologijo, ki je nastala v okviru raziskave *Izolati Ciganov in kalvinistov v Prekmurju* (1962). Študija velja med slovenskimi romologi še vedno za sodobno in temeljno, lahko bi rekli skorajda za nedotakljivi fetiš, saj se po letu 1962 še niso lotili njenega kritičnega branja, četudi je romologija v devetdesetih letih doživela nekakšno revitalizacijo.

Dodatna zahteva po kritičnem reflektiranju slovenske romološke produkcije se je izoblikovala tudi zaradi skorajda kulturnih avtoritet, h katerim so informatorji na terenu vedno znova napotili avtorico, pa tudi zato, ker posamezni romologi sami povzdigujejo romologijo v vrh »zakladnice romologije« (Tancer 1994:28) in kar grandomansko vrednotijo dosežke romologije, ko jih primerjajo s »svetovnimi«; njihovim navedbam se lahko očita vsaj neupoštevanje sodobne in na novo reflektirane teoretizacije v okviru romskih študijev.

Avtorica pokaže, da v slovenski romologiji prevladujejo že presežena in v antropoloških krogih kritizirana razsvetljenska pojmovanja o univerzalnem razvoju civilizacije (Stocking 1987:19, povzeto po Jones 1997:41). V romologiji so prezentne konceptualizacije »kulture« in »etničnosti«, ki so do današnjih dni interpretirane »rasno«. Konceptualizacije rase so na eni strani povezane z antropološko

tradicijo 19. stoletja in anatomskimi študiji iz tega obdobja, ki praktično do danes implicirajo, da so mentalne in kulturne lastnosti determinirane z »raso« in se neposredno reflektirajo v fizični strukturi. Na drugi strani so konceptualizacije »rase« povezane z etnološko tradicijo, ki jo je spodbujalo romantično gibanje v poznem 18. in zgodnjem 19. stoletju in ki je dajala poudarek na filologijo ter nacionalno genealogijo. Članek analizira konceptualizacije v slovenski romologiji, ki jih navdihuje socialni oziroma kulturni evolucionizem, ki je postavil evolucijski okvir in prispeval k rekonfiguraciji obstoječih rasnih kategorizacij znotraj prostorske ter časovne hierarhije napredovanja, pogosto izraženega kot tekmovanje, »naravna selekcija«. Avtorica prikaže načine ohranjanja konceptualizacij »kulture« in »etničnosti«⁴⁴, ki jih romologi razumejo idiosinkratično; v slovenski romologiji prevladuje linearni progresivizem z morganovsko obarvanim izrazoslovjem, ki nenehno umešča ljudi, ki so jih opredeljevali za Cigane, na nizko stopnjo v lestvici razvoja civilizacije, med »vsestransko zaostale večje skupine ljudi« (Šiftar 1962:1) ter analizira hkratne rabe anahronističnih konceptov »rasa«, »etnična skupina«, »etnos«; rabe pravno statusnih konceptov kot so »etnična skupnost« in »narodnost« ter konjunkture v strokovnem in političnem diskurzu, kakršen je značilen za manjšinsko pravo in državno oblast.

Tudi po revitalizaciji romologije se ohranijo tradicionalistično koncipirane problematike, kakor da ne bi bilo v teoriji etničnosti in nacionalizma epistemoloških prelomov npr. v okviru t.i. nove etnografske evidence, in kakor da novejša raziskave niso privedle do novih reflektiranih teoretizacij v polju romskih študijev in antropologije Ciganov. V slovensko romologijo niso bili privedeni izsledki sodobnih romskih študijev, z izjemo nekaterih zgolj bibliografskih navedb, zlasti pa je slovenska romologija obšla socialno ali kulturno antropologijo Ciganov. Manjkajo torej izsledki, ki so prevladujoči zlasti v zahodnem anglofonem in frankofonem prostoru. Omenjeni študiji so v sedemdesetih začeli na novo organizirati raziskovalno perspektivo in na novo reflektirati problemsko polje, v osemdesetih in devetdesetih pa so doživeli razmah. Slovenski romologi ne reflektirajo spremenjene perspektive kljub sicer redkim posameznim navedbam avtorjev iz sodobnejših romskih oziroma ciganskih študijev, kar bi lahko bralca napeljalo na misel, ali jih nemara namenoma ne ignorirajo zaradi svoje samozadostnosti.

Članek opozarja, da velja omenjeni *topos* romologije postaviti v kontekstualni okvir nacionalizma v Sloveniji. Ni namreč naključje, da se je o »slovenski romologiji« začelo govoriti ob procesih osamosvajanja in bolj eksplicitno po osamosvojitvi ter po tem, ko je bilo v ustavi Republike Slovenije določeno, da

⁴⁴ Barth (1969:13) je generalizacijo tradicionalnih načinov klasificiranja ljudstev v človeški vrsti izrazil v enačbi rasa = jezik = kultura. Siân Jones (1997) pojasnjuje, da je bilo zliivanje pomenov kulture in jezika s pomeni biološke rase v 19. stoletju kombiniran produkt številnih precej različnih teoretskih pristopov: 1) lingvističnega pojma rase, ki je bil osrednji v »etnoloških« in komparativnih filoloških tradicijah; 2) rasnega determinizma fizično »antropološke« tradicije, ki je prevzela neposredno, fiksno korelacijo med fizično obliko in strukturo ter mentalnimi in kulturnimi sposobnostmi; 3) razširjenega prisvajanja lamarkijanskega predloga, da bi pridobljene kulturne karakteristike lahko postale podedovane, kar je služilo krepitev nerazločnega povezovanja rase z nacionalnimi, kulturnimi in lingvističnimi skupinami; 4) socialno darvinistične koncepcije o vzporednem odnosu med kulturno in fizično evolucijo. Jones pojasnjuje, da so ti teoretski pristopi prispevali k distribuciji odnosov med ločnicama fizične in kulturne različnosti pri klasifikaciji ljudstev; po Jonesovi je evidentno, da so odnosi med koncepti rase, jezika in kulture v 19. stoletju bili vse prej kot nekomplirani (Jones 1944:43-44).

pravni položaj Romov določa poseben zakon. Tudi prva poglavja o slovenski romologiji kot posebni vedi so bila zapisana po letu 1991 (Tancer 1994), kar napeljuje na misel, da je bilo omenjeno polje s strokovnimi pretenzijami prej v funkciji slovenskega etničnega nacionalizma, ki si je bolj prizadeval za invencijo tradicije slovenske romologije, kakor da bi šlo za kakšna globlja eruditska prizadevanja. Avtorica dokaže, da v slovenski romologiji kljub epistemološkim prebojem v etničnih študijih in študijih nacionalizma ter kljub na novo reflektirani problematiki znotraj romskih študijev in romskega nacionalizma praktično ni prišlo do pomembnejših vsebinskih ali konceptualnih sprememb v obsegu romoloških problematik. S pomočjo branja dekonstrukcije zgodovine romskih študijev (Willems 1997, Willems, Lucassen 1998) ter ob branju epistemološko orientiranih poglavij iz romskih študijev pokaže, da ima romologija t.i. slovenskih romologov manj znanstveno tendenco in prej soglaša z oblastnimi politikami, kar lahko prispeva h kolonialnemu odnosu do Romov, ne pa k njihovi emancipaciji. Osnovni problem je namreč, da strokovni romološki diskurz tako v šestdesetih letih, kamor romologi postavljajo začetek sodobne romologije, kakor tudi v devetdesetih, ko romologijo revitalizirajo, praktično sovпада z diskurzom državne oblasti. Gre za to, da se pri strokovnem pisanju o Romih sistematično uporablja pravne statusne kategorije, kot so »manjšina«, »etnična skupina«, »avtohtonost« ipd. predpostavljajoč, da gre za znanstvene, analitske kategorije. Ob tem se zdi, da je skrb romologov za aktualno in sodobno teoretizacijo romologije postranskega pomena in da je tako v šestdesetih kakor v devetdesetih letih v ospredju skrb za »pomoč« Romom. Slednja se manifestira na način, da odvezuje to skupino ljudi od akterske vloge in jih potiska v odvisni položaj.

Konsekvenca takšnega stanja je, kakor bo prikazano skozi analizo, reproduciranje arhetipskih in mitologiziranih podob o Romih, ki jih je izoblikovala že tradicionalna romologija, ki datira v 18. in 19. stoletje in je v veliki meri utemeljena na rasnih teoretizacijah in verovanju v rasne tipologije. Posledica odsotnosti sodobne znanstvene refleksije je generiranje rasizmov, ki v sedanjem slovenskem nacionalnem prostoru in v političnih rabah veljajo za naravno dejstvo, namesto da bi prikazali npr. mehanizme izključevanja, jih reflektirali in nanje kritično opozarjali. Ob takšnem pomanjkanju kritičnosti lahko teoretizacije, ki so prepoznane v akademskih intelektualnih prostorih za znanstveni rasizem, zlahka živijo svoje vigorozno življenje tako v študentskih in amaterskih romologijah različnih prostovoljskih društev kakor tudi v romskih politikah znotraj slovenske nacionalne države. Zastavlja se vprašanje, ali ima romologija sploh kakšne sodobnejše znanstvene pretenzije – čeprav se vseskozi njeno sodobnost in veličino znanstvenih dosežkov prejucicira –, ali pa gre pri tem le za demonstracijo moči posameznih romoloških avtoritet?

Navedene konstatacije (ki so vodile branje romološke produkcije, njihovo preverjanje pa je bil hkrati programski načrt raziskovanja) so sicer utemeljene z obsežno dokumentacijo iz etnografije o romološki vednosti (primerjaj Janko Spreizer 2001:156-256); mestoma lahko dokažemo omenjene trditve le z izbranimi primeri.

Abstract

The author analyses Slovenian Romology as it has been defined by Slovenian Romologists, on the basis of research projects about Roma conducted in Slovenia from 1960 to 1962 and onwards, and with respect to several articles on Romani issues⁴⁵ that have been sporadically published from 1991 until today.

The analysis of Romology in this text observes Slovenian Romology through concepts taken from the anthropological field of ethnicity and nationalism, or rather, the formalist model of ethnicity proposed by Eriksen (1993) and Šumi (2000) on the one hand, and Romani studies (Acton 1974, 1989, 1997a, 1997b, 1998, Hancock 1979, 1987, 1997a, 1997b, 1999, Acton in Mundy 1997) on the other. The anthropological fieldwork and newer theories deriving from social anthropology of Gypsies, as it is represented in contemporary anthropological writings from 1970s and 1980s onwards, make up the framework for critical reading of Slovenian Romology (Lemon 2000, Mirga 1987, 1992, Okely 1983, 1994a, 1994b, 1997, 1999, Piasere 1985, 1986, 1989, 1994, Stewart 1997a, 1997b, 1999, Silverman 1988, Sutherland 1975 [1986], Van de Port 1998, Williams 1984, 1989).

Individual researchers of Romani issues in Slovenia claim that there exists a long scientific Romological tradition in this area. Philological researches of Romani language conducted by Franc Miklošič are considered the very beginning of Slovenian Romology. The Romological writings of Trdina and Koštial are regarded as the continuum of this “scientific” field, while the project *Izolati Ciganov in kalvinistov v Prekmurju** conducted between 1960 and 1962 is viewed as the outset of the contemporary scientific endeavour. Additionally, the Slovenian Romological field is made up of sporadic articles and monographs from the 1970s on (Šiftar 1970, 1978, 1988, 1989a, 1989b; Štrukelj 1977, 1980, 1989; Zadravec 1989) as well as researches conducted after 1991, when the constitutional act of political independence of Slovene national state took place (Šiftar 1994, 1996, 1999,

⁴⁵ The term “Romani issues” comprises publications, represented by Slovenian Romologists as “Romology”. Both notions - “Romani issues” and “Romology” - are somewhat misleading due to their non-explicitness. The use of the term “Romology”, somewhere termed Gypsyology as well, is highly abused and it is abandoned in newer Romani or Gypsy studies or it is used metaphorically for denomination of traditionalistic and anachronistic studies on Roma or Gypsies. The term “Romani issues” occasionally used within the Romological discourse as a synonym for “Romology”, implies that the Roms are perceived as an issue by Slovenian Romologists and that all problems connected with Roma are subject of Romology as well. The author proves that assertions made by Romologists and presented as scientific, can not be compared with the contemporary epistemological field of Romani studies. For this reason the term “Romani issues” is less misleading than the concept of “Romology”. In Georges Canguilhem’s words, the contemporary Slovenian Romology is at its best a mere “*scientific ideology*”, whereby “*scientific ideologies*” would be “*discourses with scientific pretensions, shaped by people, who are in this field not earlier than would-be or imagined scientists*” (Canguilhem 1987:15). In *Slovene Dictionary of Literary Language* the notion “issues (problematika)” consists of semantic meanings tied to a scientific field and knowledge. Slovene Romology analysed in this article could not be tied to *-logy*, i.e. with the scientific subject of studies. Therefore the notion of “Romology” is misleading, because it is tied to *-logy*; the term “Romani issues” seems in some contexts to be a more proper term than “Romology”, because the connection to the subject of study is only implicit. Nevertheless, this is only a raw sketch of the problem and it undoubtedly demands a more detailed analysis.

* *Isolates of Gypsies and Calvinians in Prekmurje*

Štrukelj 1991, 1996, 1997, 1999, Tancer 1991, 1994, 1998, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c Tancer 1994, Žagar 1998, *Romi na Slovenskem(1991)*, *Izboljšanje položaja Romov v srednji in vzhodni Evropi (1999)***).

The author's main focus on Romology is mostly due to constantly repeated statements about the grandeur of Slovenian Romology. A closer reading of Romology reveals that this field is traditionally conceptualised and based on anachronistic concepts. Slovenian Romology is not familiarised with the contemporary topics of Romani studies and the anthropology of Gypsies, which are part of Anglophone and Francophone academia. Consequently, an archaic and archetypal Romological repertoire is perpetuated and the discourse of Slovene Romology is veering to racism and the discrimination of the Roma.

The philological studies of the Romani language by Franc Miklošič are not discussed here. The article rather analyses Romology originating from the research project on *Isolates of Gypsies and Calvinists in Prekmurje* (1962). Among the Slovenian Romologists this study is still considered as both fundamental and contemporary – it could even be regarded as an untouchable fetish, since it has never been critically evaluated despite the fact that Slovenian Romology underwent a period of considerable revitalisation during the 1990s'.

An additional request for critical observation of Slovenian Romological knowledge was based upon the fact that the Romology experts seemed to have gained a reputation of a cult. During her fieldwork, the author was constantly referred to the Romologists by several informants. The Romology experts also exert Slovenian Romology in "Romological treasury" (Tancer 1994:28). Slovenian Romology is grandiosely overvalued when compared to "world's Romology". Criticism of Slovenian Romology is also more than justified for not paying any attention to the contemporary Romani studies and for the sake of ignoring the contemporary anthropological knowledge.

The author demonstrates that in Slovenian Romology the predominating notion is the one of universal development of civilisation prevailing in the Enlightenment Period, which was rigorously criticised at least by contemporary anthropologists (Stocking 1987:19, Jones 1997:41). The notions of "culture" and "ethnicity" are widely used in Slovenian Romology and are today interpreted in terms of race. On the one hand, the concept of race can be traced back to the anthropological tradition and anatomical studies from the 19th century, implying that mental and cultural characteristics are determined by race and are seen as a direct reflection of one's physique. On the other hand, the concepts of race were also closely connected with the ethnological tradition stimulated by the Romantic Movement in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, which place stress on philology and national genealogy. The article analyses conceptualisations of Slovenian Romology, inspired by socio-cultural evolutionism, which postulated the frame of evolution and

** A special conference on Roma (Gypsies) in Slovenia was organised on March 7, 1991, by the *Institute of Ethnic Studies* in co-operation with the *Office for the Nationalities* and the *Institute of Education*. The conference bearing the title »*Improvement of the Status of Roma in Central and Eastern Europe – a challenge for a Minority law*« was in Murska Sobota, April, 11, 12, 1997.

contributed to the reconfiguration of the existing racial categorisations in the spatial and temporal hierarchies of progress, often expressed as competition or rather “natural selection”. The author’s analysis demonstrating how the concepts of “culture” and “ethnicity”⁴⁶ are preserved, are interpreted by Slovenian Romologists in a idiosyncratic way. In Slovenian Romology linear progressivism underlined by Morganiian notions and terminology is present, whereby people denominated as Gypsies are posed at the lower stage of development of civilisation, as well as among “universally behindhand bigger groups of people” (Šiftar 1962:1). The article analyses conjunctures in discourse of experts and in political discourse, typical of the discourse of minority law and state authority, and additionally argues simultaneous uses of anachronistic concepts of “race”, “*ethnie*” and “ethnic group”, and the uses of categories from minority law terminology, such as the terms “ethnic community” and “nationality”.

Even after the revitalisation of Slovenian Romology, the traditionalistic conceptualisations have persisted, as though the epistemological turning points in the ethnic theory, such as in new ethnographic evidence, had never taken place (Barth 1969). The old theories have persisted as if the new reflectivity in the theorisation of Romani studies and the anthropology of Gypsies (Houseman 1994) had never occurred. Neither new Romani studies and their epistemology nor the anthropological monographs of Gypsies prevailing in the Western Anglophone and Francophone science, are known to Slovenian Romologists. Western Gypsy or Romani studies have organised their scientific perspective and formed their theoretical background on the basis of the contemporary social science originating in the 1970s, (Acton, 1974, Liégeois 1976, Sutherland 1975 (1983), Cotten (Gropper) 1975). In the anthropology of Gypsies the new “experimental ethnography” (Piasere 1994:28-35) was established in the 1980s’ and 1990s’. Slovenian Romologists very rarely mention Western scientists and even in these occasional instances the newly articulated epistemological perspectives have no impact on the production of Slovenian Romology. Therefore it could be claimed that Slovenian Romologists ignore Western Romani studies and the anthropology of Gypsies, most probably because they greatly overrate their own self-sufficient studies.

The article calls the attention to the fact that Romology should be read within the contextual frame of Slovene nationalism. In other words, the term “Slovenian

⁴⁶ Barth (1969:13) expressed the generalisation of traditional classification of people in human species in the equation of “race = language = culture”. Siân Jones (1997) explains, “*that the conflation of culture and language with notions of biological race in the 19th century was the combined product of a number of quite different theoretical approaches: (1) The linguistic notion of race, which was central to the “ethnological” and comparative philological traditions; (2) the racial determinism of the physical “anthropological” tradition which assumed a direct, fixed correlation between physical form and structure, and mental and cultural capabilities; 3) the widespread adoption of the Lamarkian proposal that acquired cultural characteristics could become inherited, which served to reinforce a vague correlation of race with national, cultural and linguistic groups; 4) the Social Darwinist conception of a parallel relationship between cultural and physical evolution. Although all these theoretical approaches did contribute to a dissolution of the boundaries between physical and cultural diversity in the classification of peoples, it is evident that the relationship between race, language and culture in the 19th century thought was far from straightforward*«. (Jones 1944:43-44).

Romology” became widely used in the period when the Slovenian state gained independence and the formal status of the Romani population was defined constitutionally. At that time their legal status was said to be defined by a special law. First chapters on Slovenian Romology were written after 1991 (Tancer 1994) and this fact only reveals that the expert pretensions in this field of knowledge have served more in favour of the Slovenian ethnic nationalism striving for the “invention of tradition” of Slovenian Romology, rather than having exhibited a deeper scholar endeavour.

The author proves that in Slovenian Romology, in spite of all the epistemological breakthroughs in ethnic studies and studies of nationalism and despite new reflectivity in the field of Romani studies and of Romani nationalism practically nothing has changed: newer and more important changes in the knowledge of Romani studies and in modifications of concepts have not been made by Slovenian Romologists.

The anthropological reading of the Gypsy Studies deconstruction (Willems 1997, Willems, Lucassen 1998) and its history, and the reading of epistemologically oriented chapters of Romani Studies illustrates that the Romology of the so-called Slovenian Romologists has only minor scientific ambitions and consolidates the despotic policy of the state, which could lead to a colonial attitude towards Roma rather than their emancipation.

As it has been implied, the main problem is that the Romological discourses in the 1960s’, when the contemporary Slovenian Romology is said to have its roots, and in the 1990s’, when it reached the phase of its revitalisation, concur almost entirely with the discourse of the state authority. One of the main problems is the systematic use of legal categories, such as “minority”, “ethnic group” and “autochthonous” etc., supposing that these concepts are scientific, analytical concepts.

Furthermore, it seems that the aspiration for a contemporary and topical theorisation of Romology is of secondary importance. In the 1960s’ as well as in the 1990s’ the Romologists’ primary concern was the issue of how to “help” the Roma manifesting itself in the way that releases this group of people from their active role in society and forcing them in a dependant position.

Consequently, as the analysis will show, the archetypal and mythical images of Roma elaborated in the traditional Romology from 18th and 19th centuries are still being reproduced. To a certain extent, they are founded on racial theorisation and beliefs in racial typologies. The absence of the contemporary scientific reflectivity results in the generating of racisms, which are, in the contemporary Slovenian national space and in political discourse, being perceived as a “natural fact”. Instead of, for instance, pointing to mechanisms of exclusion and critically observing them, Slovenian Romology generates racism. The absence of scientific criticism results in similar theorisation, attributed as scientific racism, which easily live their vigorous life in students’ and amateurs’ Romologies as in different nongovernment voluntary organisations and as Romani policies within the Slovenian national state.

Finally, the crucial question is whether Romology exhibits any kind of modern scientific pretensions – although the modernity and grandeur of the scientific achievement of Slovenian Romology is constantly perceived – or it does nothing but expose the power of several Romological authorities?

The statements quoted from the article (which lead the reading of the Romological production, while their verification presented the action plan of the research project) are well grounded on wide documentation from the ethnography of Romological knowledge (compare Janko Spreizer 2001:156-256); while some assertions may be proven in accordance with individually selected cases.

Translated by Manca Gašperšič

Vladislav Vlado Kotnik

NEPOSREDNI ŠPORTNI PRENOS in TV GLEDALEC (1. del)

Povzetek:

Članek *Neposredni športni prenos in TV gledalec* odpira široko problematiko razmerja med neposrednim TV športnim prenosom kot specifično komunikacijsko formo televizije in TV gledalcem. Osnovni namen proučevanja je bil pogledati v samo kompleksno strukturo prenosov tekem alpskega smučanja kot TV športa, predvajanih na TVS 2. Raziskovanje temelji na določenih teoretskih konceptih (Vogrinc – koncept TV komunikacijskega razmerja, Goldlust – koncept dekonstrukcije športnega prenosa, Whannel – koncept transformacije prenosa in ideologije, drugi), ki so podprti z analizami konkretnih prenosov.

Ključne besede:

neposredni TV prenos, TV prenos alpskega smučanja, televizijski šport

Abstract:

Live Sport TV coverage and its viewer is an essay revealing the wide area of relation between live sports coverage as a specific television form of communication, and the TV viewer. The main goal of the article was to look into the complex structure of live coverage of alpine skiing as televised sport, broadcasted by the Slovenian National Television. The research was based on the theoretical concepts (Vogrinc – the concept of TV communication relation, Goldlust – the concept of deconstructing the forms of sports television, Whannel – the concept of the transformation of sport by the television and ideologies, others) supported by concrete analyses based on numerous telecasts.

Key words:

live TV coverage, TV coverage of alpine skiing, sporting telecast