

Admir Mulaosmanović  
Institute for History Sarajevo

**Brubaker**, Rogers 2004: *Ethnicity without Groups*. In: R. Brubaker, *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 7-27.

Brubaker's chapter *Ethnicity without Groups* (as a whole book, I suppose) is first-class literature for historian who wants to achieve depths of anthropological and social theories with attempt to understand social processes and ways of social grouping. Especially, this chapter is important for those scholars who are devoted to detailed scrutiny of paths which are taken for building collective consciousness. Even more, throughout this chapter we can clearly comprehend how analytical discourse helps us to see some "natural and primordial phenomenon" as a discursive frame or practical category, what is rather nearer to the truth.

In this chapter author leads us, through analytical overview, from social categories to groups, ethnicity, race and nation. He emphasizes and underlines most relevant topics which are involved in construction of collectiveness (organizations, incumbents, institutions) and levels of reached collective homogenization (category, groupness, group). By this approach Brubaker undoubtedly enforced "postmodernist sensibility which emphasizes the fragmentary, the ephemeral, and the erosion of fixed forms and clear boundaries" and join to constructivist stances. That's why Brubaker went to "uncritically adopt categories of ethnopolitical practice as our (it can be understood as scholars, A. M.) categories of social practice". He, in very clear manner, distinguishes those two ways of re/thinking and he doesn't take-for-granted vernacular categories and commonsense understandings because it will improve reification of mutual consciousness of social category. Quite opposite, he tries in his approach, not to doubling vernacular categories, and enforces them, but to give them scientific explication which is nearer to essence. Brubaker, therefore, reject to adopt concept of habitus, defined as "...understandings about nature of reality", as a scientific explication of reality. He understands it (habitus), as a nature of constructing

consciousness which should be presented by that terminology. In subchapter *Ethnicity at Work in Transylvanian Town* Brubaker shows how theory can be verify in practice.

One stance and author's attitude is very important for my work. This is significance of event. It is not my obsession (event, structure, habitus), but my belief that through those terms and their understandings I can explain my theoretical background and give solid cradle for my empirical work. Braudel, for example, and his terminology gives something different corner of view then Brubaker about event. For Brubaker, event helps in grouping: "Certain dramatic event, in particular can galvanize group feeling and ratchet up pre-existing levels of groupness". Here, on this stance we can compare thinking of Braudel and Brubaker about matter of event. Brubaker treat groupness as an event, something that *happens*. Event can galvanize, homogenize, and change. For Braudel, event has different essence (braudelian event is measured by time, not by its burden) and can not be so dramatic that it can change the structure (considering that we talk about collective psychology, we should think about psychological structures).

Also, it is possible to import Bourdieu and his theory on HABITUS (The habitus is a set of dispositions which incline agents to act and react in certain ways and provides the structure for such ordinary behavior such as communications, /Gains, 2002/). Habitus is, then, psychological structure, taken in commonsense understanding manner. "Habitus encompasses the history, beliefs, and rituals that are so well integrated in practice as to be forgotten and taken-for-granted by the individuals within a community" (Gains, 2002). Dramatic event, or set of dramatic events, will erode this subconscious? Is it possible? Can we understand habitus as a structure which can be changed? Can we imagine individual who will rethink shared collective values after *some dramatic event*. Yes, and that's way I try to put *braudelian event* in somewhat different environment. I'm trying to band together few different time fluctuations (quick time, long duree) and meanings they can carry. Meaning in some dramatic event (quick time) can be so powerful that it can break structure (long duree). It can be so powerful that it can change habitus. At the end, it is all about changes, individual and collective, fast and slow.

**Literature:**

**Gaines**, Elliot, 2002: Building Community Through Stories About Real Events: The Habitus Of Broadcast Journalism. In: Mark Orbie, Trevy McDonald, and T. Ford-Ahmed (eds.) Building Diverse Communities Through Research. Hampton Press.