

Koncept članstva u bh. bibliotekama: od samoupravljanja k participaciji

Concept of Membership in BIH Libraries: From Self-Management Towards Participation

Emina Adilović

Sarajevo, Bosna i Hercegovina / Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

emina.adilovic3004@gmail.com

Informacije o članku / Article Info

Primljen / Received 30. 9. 2020.

Prihvaćen / Accepted 3. 11. 2020.

Dostupan online / Available online: 15. 12. 2020.

Ključne riječi / Keywords:

Bosna i Hercegovina, član/ica, demokratija, ljudska prava, participatorno bibliotekarstvo, učesničko samoupravljanje

Bosnia and Herzegovina, democracy, human rights, member, participatory librarianship, participatory self-management

Sažetak / Abstract

Cilj ovog rada jeste propitati mogućnosti i domete učesničkog modela djelovanja bh. biblioteka u periodu samoupravnog socijalizma za potrebe reosmišljavanja načina poslovanja i odnosa s korisnicima/cama biblioteke kroz novi, participativni pristup. Učesničko djelovanje u prijeratnim bh. bibliotekama i teorijske postavke participatornog bibliotekarstva mogu poslužiti kao polazna tačka za promišljanje modela uključivanja korisnika/ca biblioteke u svojstvu njenih članova/ica. Rezultati ovog rada nastojat će pokazati da učesnički bibliotekski model uvijek zavisi od pojedinih društveno-političkih aspekata državnog uređenja, polazi od različitih metodologija i načina suradnje, ali i da određena vrsta shvatanja učešća dalje implicira širi građanski angažman ili pak verifikaciju postojećeg društvenog stanja. Važnost je ove analize u boljem razumijevanju dvije vrste učesničkog pristupa u bibliotekama koji zbog redefiniciranja odnosa s korisnicima/cama mogu polučiti različite oblike društvenog djelovanja i upravljanja.

The aim of this paper is to examine the possibilities and scope of the participatory model of BIH libraries in the period of self-governing socialism for the purpose of rethinking the way of doing business and relations with library users through a new, participatory approach. Participatory activities in pre-war BIH libraries and theoretical assumptions of participatory librarianship can serve as a starting point for considering the current model of involving library users in their capacity as its members. The results of this paper will try to show that the participatory library model always depends on certain socio-political aspects of government, starting from different methodologies and ways of cooperation, but also that certain type of understanding of participation further implies wider civic engagement or verification of the existing social situation. The importance of this analysis is in a better understanding of the two types of participatory approaches in libraries that, due to redefining relationships with users, can lead to different forms of social action and management.

1. Uvod: Participativna kultura

Kulturne ustanove u savremenom tehnološkom dobu preoblikuju institucijske načine funkcionisanja i djelatničke aktivnosti u skladu s tendencijama informacijsko-komunikacijskog okruženja. Prilagođavanje informacijskim potrebama korisničkih zajednica nije inovativni postupak vezan samo za prakticiranje kulture u tehnološkom okruženju, već su modifikacije takvih praksi oduvijek ovisne o promjenama socijalnih zahtjeva i dio su “šireg, općeg svjetonazora, takvog koji je razvijan pod utjecajem niza društvenih, proizvodnih, tehnoloških, posljednjih sociokulturnih, mentalnih i inih promjena” (Kodrić Zaimović 2017, 42). Vodeći se profesionalnim postulatom o službi zajednicama, kulturne ustanove trebale bi djelovati shodno preferencijama skupina društva za jednakopravnost pristupa infor-

1. Introduction: Participatory culture

Cultural institutions in the modern technological age are reshaping institutional ways of functioning and working activities in accordance with the tendencies of the information and communication environment. Adapting to the information needs of user communities is not an innovative process related only to the practice of culture in the technological environment, but modifications of such practices have always been dependent on changes in social requirements and they are part of “broader, general world view, one that has been developed under the influence of a number of social, productional, technological, consequently socio-cultural, mental and other changes” (Kodrić Zaimović 2017, 42). Guided by the professional postulate of community service, cultural institutions should act in accordance with the preferences of society's groups for

macijama. U praksi su često primjetne prepreke, jer nužni i zahtijevani napredak biva zatopljen pod utjecajem onoga što Ivan Illich (1972) prepoznaje pod “poustanovljenim vrijednostima”, kao odgovarajućih normativnih kodifikacija vrijednosti za prethodne razvojne periode.¹

Pitanje odnosa tehnologije, znanja, ustanova i proizvodnje – bilo robne ili sadržajne u nematerijalnom, digitalnom i uslužnom smislu, mijenja se dinamično u brojnim i međusobno povezanim aspektima društvene stvarnosti. Tome su podložne i forme kulturnih obrazaca posljednjih desetljeća, bivajući obilježene stanovitom promjenom u pristupu konzumaciji sadržaja; naglašava se potreba za participativnim djelovanjem kao zamjenom za dotadašnji preovladavajući konzumeristički aspekt kulturne industrije. Enciklopedija informacijskih nauka participatornu kulturu definira kao kulturu “u kojoj se vrednuju umjetnički izrazi i građanski angažman orijentisani na stvaranje i dijeljenje nečije kreacije” (Martinovic, Freiman i Lekule 2015, 2160).

Prije nego što je doživio svoj procvat u XXI stoljeću, participativni oblik proizvodnje kulturnog sadržaja bio je vezan za tada dominantne medije poput novina, radija i televizije.² Participatorna kultura pojavljivala se najčešće u kombinaciji s djelovanjem zajednice i njenom proizvodnjom medijskog sadržaja u sklopu subkulturnih pokreta. Tako će primjerice Richard Barbrook u knjizi “Znanje u digitalnom dobu” iznijeti pojedinosti aktivističkog djelovanja na piratskom radiju '80-ih godina prošlog stoljeća u Velikoj Britaniji: “Punk je bio prilično usmjeren na to ‘uništavanje spektakla’ (...) Nije to bila samo stvar ljubavi prema bendu. Bilo je to i sviranje vlastite muzike, izdavanje vlastitog fanzina, snimanje svog filma. (...) Dobivši sredstva od Vijeća, osnovali smo Spectrum Radio kako bismo omogućili izbjeglicama i imigrantskim grupama da naprave program za svoje zajednice.” (Barbrook 2019, 92–93).

¹ Nastojeći raskrinkati neke mitove o percepciji institucija – poput onih o znanju i obrazovanju, školovanju i proizvodnji – Illich zastupa mišljenje da se poustanovljivanjem vrijednosti pasivizira i porobljava društvo; ono pokazuje svoju manipulativnu ulogu udaljavanjem znanja od spoznaje i istraživanja. Illich razdvaja znanje i učenje – ono nije rezultat poučavanja, naročito kada je institucionalizacijom otuđeno od njegovih korisnika. Baziranjem svojih premisa na mitu da “proces neizbežno proizvodi vrednosti i da, prema tome, proizvodnja nužno stvara potražnju” (Illich 2012, 25), pojedine kulturne, obrazovne i informacijske ustanove upadaju u zamku udaljavanja i odbijanja postojećih i potencijalnih korisnika od vlastitih usluga.

² U televizijskom serijalu “Big Thinkers”, Henry Jenkins navodi podatke o porijeklu, začecima i historiji pojavnih oblika participatorne kulture. Sredinom 19. stoljeća u štampariji Tory srednjoškoleci su proizvodili publikacije. Takva amaterska grupa postavila je temelje za *fandom* naučnu fantastiku u 20. stoljeću, za radio, amaterski radio, kroz *zine* pokrete i punk rock, indie pokrete oko Seattlea pa sve do uspona digitalnih medija. (Edutopia 2013)

equal access to information. In practice, obstacles are often noticeable, because the necessary and required progress is suppressed under the influence of what Ivan Illich (1972) recognizes as “established values”, as appropriate normative codifications of values for previous developmental periods.¹

The issue of the relationship between technology, knowledge, institutions and production – whether commodity or content in the intangible, digital and service sense – is changing dynamically in many and interconnected aspects of social reality. The forms of cultural patterns of the last decades are also subject to this, being marked by a certain change in the approach to the consumption of contents; the need for participatory action is emphasized as a replacement for the earlier predominant consumerist aspect of the cultural industry. The Encyclopaedia of Information Sciences defines participatory culture as a culture “in which artistic expressions and civic engagement oriented towards the creation and sharing of one’s creation are valued.” (Martinovic, Freiman and Lekule 2015, 2160)

Before its flourishing in the 21st century, the participatory form of cultural content production was tied to at that time dominant media such as newspapers, radio and television.² Participatory culture has appeared frequently in combination with community action and their production of media content within sub-cultural movements. For example, Richard Barbrook in the book “Znanje u digitalnom dobu” (Learning in the age of digital reason) will give details of activism on pirate radio in the 1980s in the UK: “Punk was pretty focused on the ‘destroying the spectacle’ (...) It wasn’t just a matter of love for the band. It was also playing your own music, publishing your own fanzine, making your own movie. (...) After receiving funding from the Council, we established Spectrum Radio to enable refugees and

¹ In an effort to expose some myths about the perception of institutions — such as those about knowledge and education, schooling, and production — Illich argues that restoring values will pacify and enslave society; it shows its manipulative role by distancing knowledge from cognition and research. Illich separates knowledge and learning – it is not the result of teaching, especially when it is alienated from its users by institutionalization. By basing its premises on the myth that “the process inevitably produces values and, therefore, production necessarily creates demand” (Illich 2012, 25), some cultural, educational and information institutions fall into the trap of distancing and rejecting existing and potential users from their own services.

² In a television series “Big Thinkers”, Henry Jenkins provides information on the origins, beginnings, and history of manifestation forms of participatory culture. In the mid-19th century period, high school students produced publications at Tory Printing House. Such an amateur group laid the foundations for fandom science fiction in the 20th century, for radio, amateur radio, through zine movements and punk rock, indie movements around Seattle all the way to the rise of digital media. (Edutopia 2013)

Kao pripadnik subkulturne scene, fan punk muzike i The Sex Pistolsa, Barbrook njeguje participatornu kulturu kroz osnivanje časopisa i *community* radija koji je davao pripadnicima/icama zajednice priliku da učestvuju u kreiranju medijskog sadržaja ispunjavajući tako nedostatke i društveni jaz između javnog i privatnog sistema emitiranja.

Nerijetko, digitalno tehnološko okruženje dodatno naglašava, usložnjava procese pojavne stvarnosti prenoseći ih u virtualno, te potcrtava stvarnosne težnje, pojave i aktivnosti. Iako mrežno ustrojeno društvo pojam participacije gotovo isključivo vezuje za implikacije internetske kulture, jasno je kako učesničko djelovanje korijene ima u vremenu prije nastanka informacijsko-komunikacijskih tehnologija prilagođavajući se različitim medijskim kanalima i načinima diseminacije informacija. “Prosumerizam uključuje i proizvodnju i potrošnju, a ne fokusiranje na jedno (proizvodnja) ili drugo (potrošnja). *Prosumerizam* je oduvijek bio važan, ali niz nedavnih društvenih promjena, posebno onih povezanih s internetom i Webom 2.0 (ukratko, web koji je generirao korisnik, npr. Facebook, YouTube, Twitter), dao mu je još veću važnost” (Ritzer i Jurgenson 2010, 14). Iako se najčešće veže za postmoderni period, oblik kulture koji akcenat stavlja na korisničko učešće u kreiranju sadržaja stariji je od digitalnih medija, pojave interneta i novih informacijsko-komunikacijskih tehnologija. Aktualizacija učesničkog djelovanja u kreiranju kulturnog i medijskog sadržaja, pak, nastaje u digitalnom, umreženom dobu, jer komunikacija, aktivnosti i funkcionisanje pojedinaca na mreži počivaju upravo na suradničkom modelu proizvodnje znanja.

2. Participativna kultura u bibliotekama

Prijelaz na Web 2.0 tehnologije i prevazilaženje Web 1.0 okruženja jedan je od reprezentativnijih primjera takve kulminacije jer čini osnovu za nadogradnju ne toliko tehničkih, odnosno hardverskih komponenti, koliko načina na koji krajnji korisnici i developeri softvera koriste mrežne tehnologije. Participacija nadjačava osnovni princip Web-a 1.0 baziran na preuzimanju sadržaja i njegovom pasivnom konzumiranju. Tim O’Reilly u tekstu “What Is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software” iznosi značajke i osnovne razlike između dvije verzije mrežnih tehnologija: upravo se Web 2.0 odlikuje učesničkim doprinosom korisnika interneta, njihovim stvaranjem sadržaja, interaktivnim označavanjem i kategorizacijom web sadržaja, društvenim softverima i blogovima (O’Reilly 2007). Takav naglašeno participatorni

immigrant groups to create a program for their communities.” (Barbrook 2019, 92–93). As a member of the sub cultural scene, as a fan of punk music and of The Sex Pistols, Barbrook nurtures a participatory culture through the establishing of journal and *community* radio which gave community members the opportunity to participate in the creation of media content, thus filling the insufficiency and social gap between the public and private broadcasting system.

Often, the digital technological environment further emphasizes, complicates the processes of manifestation reality by transferring them to the virtual, and underlines the real aspirations, phenomena and activities. Although a networked society almost exclusively links the concept of participation to the implications of Internet culture, it is clear that the participation has the roots in the time before the occurrence of information and communication technology, adapting to different media channels and ways of disseminating information. “Prosumerism involves both production and consumption, not focusing on one (production) or the other (consumption). *Prosumerism* has always been important, but a number of recent social changes, especially those related to the Internet and Web 2.0 (in short, a user-generated web, e.g. Facebook, YouTube, Twitter), gave it even more importance.” (Ritzer and Jurgenson 2010, 14) Although most often associated with the postmodern period, the form of culture that emphasizes user participation in content creation is older than digital media, the emergence of the Internet, and new information and communication technologies. The actualization of participatory activities in the creation of cultural and media content, on the other hand, occurs in the digital, networked age, because communication, activities and functioning of individuals on the network are based on the collaborative model of knowledge production.

2. Participatory culture in libraries

The transition to Web 2.0 technologies and overcoming the Web 1.0 environment is one of the most representative examples of such culmination because it forms the basis not so much for upgrade of technical or hardware components, but for the ways in which end users and software developers use network technologies. Participation prevail the basic principle of Web 1.0 based on content downloading and his passive consumption. Tim O’Reilly in text “What Is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software” outlines the features and basic differences between the two versions of network technologies: Web 2.0 is characterized by the participatory contribution

pristup u kreaciji sadržaja na mrežnim medijima mijenja poimanje samog toka informacija, odnosa između proizvođača i primaoca, naglašavajući *prosumeristički* pristup. Vladan Joler u šestoj epizodi “Ubrzavanje medija” emisije “U mreži” ističe: “Ako pogledamo danas, svaki čovjek ima mogućnost da postane medij. Svaki korisnik YouTube-a je mala televizija za sebe.” (SHARE Foundation 2018). U takvom naglašeno participatornom okruženju čije se implikacije prelijevaju iz mrežnih mjesta u nevirtualne prostore, kulturne ustanove pokušavaju uhvatiti korak s učesničkim zahtjevima i ponuditi nove oblike pristupa i izgradnje kolekcija. U praksi su najčešće vidljivi primjeri muzejskih i arhivskih akcija u kojima građani/ke imaju priliku priložiti i donirati dio porodične kulturne baštine, dokumente sjećanja na pojedini događaj i period³ ili prosto participirati u skupljanju građe za muzej.⁴ Bez obzira na to što ovakve prakse muzeja u XXI stoljeću sve više postaju načini revidiranja profesionalnog djelovanja i u Bosni i Hercegovini, biblioteke kao jedan od tipova informacijskih i kulturnih ustanova još uvijek nisu pokazale spremnost za otvaranje k suradničkom djelovanju korisnika/ca i primjenu participatornog modela. Felton Thomas, direktor Javne biblioteke Cleveland u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama, na seminaru “Biblioteke i muzeji u eri participatorne kulture” propitao je “koncepte granica i zidova te predložio da biblioteke i muzeji predviđaju svoje granice na poroznije načine” jer “biblioteke i muzeji tradicionalno uživaju jedinstven položaj i posebnu odgovornost unutar društava širom svijeta” te ne smiju biti obezvrjednene nesprennošću za prilagodbu savremenom participatornom okruženju (Mack 2011, 3–7). Zato je osvjetljavanje participatorne dimenzije biblioteke kao javnog prostora značajno da bi se uopće mogao sagledati njen položaj u djelovanju od šireg socijalnog značaja.

Biblioteka, kao kulturna i informacijska ustanova koja slijedi općeprihvaćene društvene ciljeve i načela stručnog rada na osnovu kojih odabire, nabav-

of Internet users, their content creation, interactive tagging and categorization of web content, social software and blogs (O’Reilly 2007). Such a strongly participatory approach in the creation of content on online media changes the perception of the flow of information, the relationship between producer and recipient, emphasizing the approach of *prosumerism*. Vladan Joler in the sixth episode of “Ubrzavanje medija” (Accelerating the Media) of the show “U mreži” (In the network) points out: “If we look today, every man has the opportunity to become a medium. Every YouTube user is a small television for themselves.” (SHARE Foundation 2018). In such emphasized participatory environment whose implications spill over from web sites into non-virtual spaces, cultural institutions try to keep pace with participant demands and offer new forms of access and building collections. In practice, most visible examples are museum and archive actions in which citizens have the opportunity to enclose and donate a part of family cultural heritage, documents of remembrance of a particular event and period³ or simply participate in collecting material for the museum.⁴ Despite the fact that such museum practices in the 21st century are increasingly becoming ways to revise professional activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, libraries as one of the types of information and cultural institutions have not yet shown readiness to open to collaborative user activities and apply of a participatory model. Felton Thomas, Director of the Cleveland Public Library in the United States at the seminar “Biblioteke i muzeji u eri participatorne kulture” (Libraries and Museums in the Era of Participatory Culture) questioned “the concepts of borders and walls and suggested that libraries and museums foresee their borders in more porous ways” because “libraries and museums traditionally enjoy a unique position and special responsibility within societies around the world” which must not be devalued by an unwillingness to adapt to a modern participatory environment (Mack 2011, 3–7). Therefore, illuminating the participa-

³ Osnovan u Sarajevu 2017. godine, Muzej ratnog djetinjstva izgradio je kolekciju od prikupljenih ličnih predmeta i videosvjedočenja o ratu 1992–1995. godine (Muzej Ratnog Djetinjstva...).

⁴ Jedan od primjera participacije u prikupljanju građe općenito može se posmatrati kroz Muzej loše umjetnosti koji broji više od 600 umjetnina pronađenih na buvljacima i smetlištima, dok je dio zbirke izgrađen i od umjetničkih slika koje su poslali ljudi “Art Too Bad to Be Ignored” (Museum Of Bad Art...). Sličnu praksu možemo pronaći i u bh. kulturnim i informacijskim ustanovama; Historijski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine 2018. godine pozvao je građane i građanke da se priključe akciji prikupljanja fotografija, predmeta, videozapisa i “dobrih priča” kako bi dali svoj doprinos dopunjavanju muzejske zbirke “Opkoljeno Sarajevo” kao “relevantnoj podlozi i polju za bilježenje i arhiviranje priča o umjetnosti i kulturi pod opsadom”. (Izložba “NSK Sarajevo” 2018).

³ Founded in Sarajevo in 2017, the War Childhood Museum has built a collection of collected personal items of video testimonies about the war in 1992–1995. (War Childhood Museum...).

⁴ One example of participation in collecting material in general can be seen through the Museum of Bad Art counts more than 600 works of art found at flea markets and junkyards, while part of the collection is also built from art paintings sent by people “Art Too Bad to Be Ignored.” (Museum Of Bad Art...). A similar practice can be found in B&H cultural and information institutions; in 2018, the History Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina invited citizens to join the action of collecting photographs, objects, videos and “good stories” in order to contribute to the addition of the museum collection “Sarajevo under Siege” as “a relevant base and field for recording and archiving stories of art and culture under siege”. (Izložba “NSK Sarajevo” 2018)

lja, obrađuje, sređuje, čuva i daje na korištenje bibliotečku građu te pruža raznolike usluge trenutnim i potencijalnim korisnicima putem organiziranih službi, izložena je utjecajima društvenih promjena. Takve preinake mogu se odnositi na tehnološki napredak, informacijsko-komunikacijske tehnologije i zahtjeve umreženog društva, ali i na šire socijalne, individualne promjene koje uvjetuje digitalno okruženje. “Mnogi od spomenutih noviteta Weba 2.0 primjenjivi su u bibliotekama i mogu znatno doprinijeti kvaliteti pružanja njihovih usluga.” (Macan 2009, 226). Participatorni habitus oslikava se i u odnosu korisnika prema informacijskim potrebama, te ustanovama zaduženim za pružanje takvih usluga.

Podjednako kao što se participacija ne veže samo uz savremeno tehnološko okruženje, ideja učešća korisnika/ica u aktivnostima biblioteka također nije nov koncept. Ipak, pojačano zanimanje za mogućnosti i varijacije suradničke proizvodnje informacija u medijskim prostorima, na mreži i oko drugih posrednika sadržaja, u vremenu kada “pojedinici mogu nositi ekvivalent čitave enciklopedije na svojim mobilnim uređajima i kada ljudi mogu koristiti platforme društvenih medija za razmjenu informacija, analizu podataka, stvaranje novih saznanja i povezivanje sa zajednicama od interesa” (Mack 2011, 3), diktira ponovno propitivanje pozicije, misije biblioteke te njenog odnosa s korisnicima. Ovakvim promišljanjima treba pridodati i specifičan, trenutni tehnološki kontekst kako bi bila detaljnije i iznova prilagođena postojećim društvenim aktuelnostima. Tehnološki razvoj fluidnih i promjenljivih struktura biblioteka te često nedovoljno ozbiljno shvaćeni i nejasno artikulirani apeli korisničkih zajednica, u konačnici, “doprinosu stvaranju promjenljivih očekivanja od muzejskog i bibliotečkog iskustva” (Mack 2011, 3).

Participatorna kultura i učesnički pristup izgradnji bibliotečkih kolekcija i organizaciji aktivnosti također uslovljavaju preispitivanje razlika, povezanosti i istovremeno razgraničavanja univerzalnih stručnih i profesionalnih principa s jedne strane, te njihove pojavne oblike u raznolikim građanskim zajednicama koje impliciraju i diferencirane pristupe aktivnostima informiranja i omogućavanju razvijanja znanja s druge strane. Lankes podsjeća na to da su se bibliotekari, bez obzira na vremensko razdoblje, “uvijek trudili postići iste stvari i držali se iste kao temeljne vrijednosti... Pitanje je, dakle, kako mi kao bibliotekari trebamo primijeniti svoje vjekovne temeljne vrijednosti u današnjem društvu kako bi pomogli društvu s previše informacija i nedovoljno vremena.” (Lankes 2011, 226). Drugim riječima, kako bi

tory dimension of the library as a public space is important in order to be able to see their position in activities of wider social significance.

The library, as a cultural and information institution that follows the generally accepted social goals and principles of professional work on the basis of which it selects, acquires, processes, arranges, preserves and makes available library materials, and provides various services to current and potential users through organized services, is exposed to the influences of social change. Such modifications may relate to technological advances, information and communication technologies and the requirements of a networked society, but also to the wider social, individual changes conditioned by the digital environment. “Many of the mentioned Web 2.0 innovations are applicable in libraries and can significantly contribute to the quality of their services.” (Macan 2009, 226) Participatory habitus is also reflected in relation to which users perceive information needs, and institutions in charge of providing such services.

Just as participation is not only linked to the modern technological environment, and the idea of user participation in library activities is not a new concept. However, increased interest in the possibilities and variations of collaborative production of information in media spaces, online and around other content intermediaries at a time when “individuals can carry the equivalent of an entire encyclopaedia on their mobile devices and when people can use social media platforms to share information, analysing the data, creating new knowledge and connecting with communities of interest” (Mack 2011, 3), dictate re-examination of the position, mission of the library and its relationship with users. Such considerations should add a specific, current technological context in order to be more detailed and re-adapted to existing social actuality. The technological development of fluid and changing library structures, and often insufficiently taken and vaguely articulated appeals of user communities, ultimately, “contribute to the creation of changing expectations from the museum and library experience” (Mack 2011, 3).

Participatory culture and a participatory approach to the construction of library collections and the organization of activities also require a re-examination of differences, connections and at the same time demarcation of universally scientific and professional principles on the one hand, and their manifestations in diverse civil communities that imply differentiated approaches to information activities and enable the development of knowledge on the

se dugovjekovna profesija prilagodila savremenim zahtjevima, neophodno je komparirati i povezati nepromjenjive zakonitosti biblioteka i bibliotekara te ih modificirati u skladu s trenutnim dešavanjima pitajući se pri tome koje univerzalije vrijedi nastaviti njegovati, kako ih uskladiti s promjenjivim varijablama i u skladu s kojim principima.

S tim u vezi, potrebno je promisliti o redefiniranju pojma informacijskih usluga i službi. Najčešća dilema tiče se pristupa provođenju usluga; trebaju li biblioteke tek pružiti pristup informacijskim izvorima ili umjesto toga trebaju staviti akcenat na osposobljavanje korisnika za samostalno pretraživanje i pronalaženje informacija. Ukoliko se opredijelimo za dvostruki pristup, ovisno o zahtjevima svakog korisnika ponaosob te svijesti da je informacijska pismenost podjednako važna kao i informacijsko usluživanje u primarnom smislu, ostavlja se prostor za druga promišljanja koja se tiču učešća zajednice u procesu usluživanja: “Zapravo, ako ne izgradite sisteme koji se mijenjaju i dopuštaju članovima zajednice da vode njihovu evoluciju, osuđeni ste na to da ih stalno trebate revidirati i obnavljati, a i dalje riskirate otuđivanje članove svoje zajednice” (Lankes 2016, 57). Na taj način olakšava se i rukovođenje kolekcijama i smanjuje potreba za njihovim mijenjanjem i rekonstrukcijom kako bi se više vremena ostavilo za osmišljavanje drugih projekata, naprednih aktivnosti u prostoru biblioteke te širenje percepcije, utjecaja i znanja što proizilaze iz javne sfere. Govoreći o participativnom modelu u kontekstu nove bibliotečke paradigme koja sugerira prisniji odnos korisnika s bibliotekom, bibliotekarom i njegovu brigu za potrebe svih članova zajednice, Lankes (2016, 5–8) ističe da se građanin/ka treba afirmirati i kao aktivni član biblioteke na isti način na koji je i član zajednice. Da bi se biblioteka u svijesti građana konstituirala kao značajan segment zajednice, on mora osvijestiti vlastiti status unutar bibliotečkog prostora koji isključuje njegovu poziciju kao pasivnog recipijenta. Naime, građanin/ka nikada za sebe neće reći da je korisnik/ca ili klijent/ica određene zajednice, već se smatra njenim članom koji aktivno učestvuje u dešavanjima i voljno daje svoj doprinos.

3. Model učesničkog upravljanja bibliotekama u Bosni i Hercegovini

Da bi postojala kooperativnost u smislu pragmatičnog i učesničkog djelovanja između biblioteka i onih koji se koriste uslugama njenog javnog prostora, uvodi se distinkcija značenja pojmova *korisnik/član* biblioteke. Dok je dugi niz godina u svjetskoj

other hand. Lankes recalls that librarians, regardless of time period, “always strived to achieve the same things and adhered to the same as core values ... The question, therefore, is how do we as librarians need to apply our age-old core values in today’s society to help a society with too much information and not enough time.” (Lankes 2011, 226). In other words, in order to adapt the long-standing profession to modern requirements, it is necessary to compare and connect the immutable laws of libraries and librarians, and their modification in accordance with current events, wondering which universals should be worth to continue to nurture, how to harmonize them with changing variables and in the harmony with what principles.

In that connection, it is necessary to consider redefining the concept of information services and utilities. The most common dilemma concerns the approach to service delivery; whether libraries have yet to provide access to information resources or should instead focus on training users to search and retrieve information independently. If we decide for a dual approach, depending on the requirements of each individual user and the awareness that information literacy is as important as information service in the primary sense, there is room for other considerations regarding community participation in the service process: “In fact, if you don’t build systems that change and allow community members to guide their evolution, you’re doomed to constantly need to revise and renew them, and you still risk alienation of your community members” (Lankes 2016, 57). This facilitates the management of collections and reduces the need to change and reconstruct collections in order to leave more time for designing other projects, advanced activities in the library space and spreading the perception, influence and knowledge that arise from the public sphere. Speaking about the participatory model in the context of a new library paradigm that suggests a closer relationship between the user and the library, the librarian and their care for the needs of all community members, Lankes (2016, 5–8) points out that the citizen should be affirmed as an active member of the library in the same way as is a member of the community. In order for the library to be constituted in the minds of citizens as a significant segment of the community, it must be aware of its own status within the library space, which excludes its position as a passive recipient. In fact, a citizen will never say for himself/herself that he/she is a user or client of a certain community, but is considered as a member who actively participates in events and willingly gives their contribution.

bibliotečkoj znanosti i praksi kao ustaljeni termin preovladavao pojam *korisnik biblioteke*, bh. tradicija bibliotekarstva nakon Prvog svjetskog rata bilježi isprva njegovo drugačije poimanje. Nastajući uglavnom kao privatna inicijativa i njegujući pritom pojam *člana* zbog odgovornosti i mogućnosti koju on sa sobom nosi, bh. biblioteke za vrijeme Kraljevine Jugoslavije pored biblioteka pri vjerskim ustanovama i kulturnim društvima karakterističnim za vrijeme Austro-Ugarske monarhije, javljaju se u izraženo učesničkom obliku: “Članom je moglo postati svako lice bez obzira na pol i godine samo ‘ako nije odano kakvom poroku ili neuglednom životu’. Ulozi su bili različiti, zavisno od statusa samog člana (redovni, utemeljivač, dobrotvor), a obaveze iste, između ostalog, da redovno prisustvuju skupovima, sjedaljkama, koncertima i predavanjima.” (Bašović 1986, 30). Tako se iz citata može zaključiti da je prvi period razvoja javnih biblioteka u Kraljevini Jugoslaviji obilježen učesničkim pristupom primjenjujući model člana zajednice i na one koji se koriste uslugama biblioteke postajući tako njihovim članovima.

Ako se izuzme praksa doniranja knjiga, iskustvo bh. bibliotekarstva pokazalo je da tek odnedavno, posljednjih dvadeset godina nakon rata, nastaje općenito manjak percepcije biblioteka kao prostora u kojima bi se korisnici/ice osjećali pozvanima da učestvuju i djeluju kao punopravni članovi/ice. Zato je na ovom mjestu značajno napraviti distinkciju između određenih koncepata anglosaksonskog bibliotekarstva koji nisu primjenjivi na ovdašnji kontekst; pored toga što ne funkcionišu kao mjesta povjereništva klijenata, bh. biblioteke nisu razvile koncept djelovanja na isti način kao Sjedinjene Američke Države ili Velika Britanija. Disproporcija u percipiranju također proizilazi iz nužnosti ispunjavanja drugih, temeljnih uslova obrazovanja bibliotekara, kritičke pedagogije i svijesti o društvenoj odgovornosti kao profesionalnom načelu. Razvoj bh. bibliotekarstva između dva svjetska rata vezuje se uz oformljavanje “javnih narodnih biblioteka nastalih iz naslijeđa društvenih biblioteka izdržavanih ulozima svojih članova, a kao rezultat naraslih ideja o prosvjećivanju širokih slojeva naroda” (Bašović 1986, 9). Pored učešća u izgradnji bibliotečkih zbirki i pomoći u finansiranju, članovi biblioteka u Kraljevini Jugoslaviji, a kasnije i u Socijalističkoj Federativnoj Republici Jugoslaviji, odnosili su se prema njima kao saučesničkom projektu baziranom na angažmanu članova zajednice / biblioteke, što također pruža mogućnost profesionalnog, kulturnog i političkog usavršavanja. Drugim riječima, članovi

3. Participatory library management model in Bosnia and Herzegovina

In order to have cooperation in terms of pragmatic and participatory action between libraries and those who use the services of its public space, a distinction of the meaning of the terms *user / member* of the library is introduced. While for many years in the world of library science and practice the term *library user* prevailed as an established term, the BIH tradition of librarianship after the First World War initially records its different understanding. Emerging mainly as a private initiative and nurturing the term member because of the responsibility and opportunity it carries with itself, BIH libraries during the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, in addition to libraries at religious institutions and cultural societies characteristic during the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, appear in a highly participatory form: “Any person, regardless of gender and age, could become a member only ‘if they are not loyal to some vice or infamous life’. The stakes were different, depending on the status of the member (regular, founder, benefactor), and the obligations were the same, among other things, to regularly attend gatherings, sittings, concerts and lectures.” (Bašović 1986, 30). That’s how, from the quotation, it can be concluded that the first period of development of public libraries in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was marked by a participatory approach, applying the model of a community member and to those who use library services by which they are becoming their members.

With the exception of the practice of donating books, the experience of BIH librarianship has shown that only recently, in the last twenty years after the war, there has been a general lack of perception of libraries as spaces where users would feel invited to participate and act as full members. Therefore, at this point it is important to make a distinction between certain concepts of Anglo-Saxon librarianship that are not applicable to the local context; in addition to not functioning as client trust places, BIH libraries have not developed the concept of operating in the same way as the United States or the United Kingdom. The disproportion in perception also originates from the necessity of fulfilling other, more fundamental conditions of librarian education, critical pedagogy and awareness of social responsibility as a professional principle. The development of BIH librarianship between the two world wars is linked to the formation of “public national libraries created from the legacy of public libraries supported by the roles of their members, and as a result of growing ideas about education of broad stratum of the peo-

biblioteka u bh. kontekstu počevši od 1920-ih godina pa sve do '90-ih godina nisu doprinosili održavanju biblioteka samo razvojem njihovog fonda već i koristeći njihov prostor i resurse za ličnu, profesionalnu i zajedničku nadogradnju u čemu se ogledao doprinos široj zajednici.

Društveno upravljanje u narodnim bibliotekama pokazalo je pozitivne rezultate. Predstavnici društvene zajednice u organima upravljanja ovih institucija, gdje su god birani u te organe javni radnici s dovoljno afiniteta prema ovom poslu, odigrali su značajnu ulogu u usmjeravanju rada narodne biblioteke. Mjesto koje ovakva ustanova zauzima u sredini u kojoj djeluje i njena uloga u toj sredini često su zavisili koliko od aktivnosti ustanova i kadra koji je zaposlen u njoj toliko i od djelovanja predstavnika društvene zajednice u organima upravljanja u bibliotekama. (Čulić i Grubačić 1965, 10)

Ovakav pristup bio je posebno izražen u periodu samog početka socijalističke Jugoslavije, gdje je samoupravni model u bibliotekama bio dio socijalističke revolucije kroz širenje klasne svijesti – sakupljanjem i čitanjem relevantne, marksističke i uopće ljevičarske literature.

3.1. Između participacije i samoupravljanja: Ko je član?

Ipak, za razliku od savremenog participativnog modela koji se propituje u ovom radu, tadašnji suradnički model prije da ne proizilazi iz zahtjeva struke, već iz ideologije društvenog uređenja. Državni ideološki aparat funkcioniše kontrolišući druge društvene formacije i institucijske prakse poput “obrazovnog aparata, religijskog aparata, porodičnog aparata, političkog aparata, sindikalnog aparata, informativnog aparata, ‘kulturnog’ aparata” (Altiser 2009, 37). Ovakvi aparati represije međusobno su uvezani i ovisni jedni o drugima, jer kao zajedničkog sadržioca imaju “krovni državni (represivni) aparat” (Altiser 2009, 36). Uvidi u njihovu međusobnu uslovljenost mogu se odnositi i na bibliotečku profesiju koja je najviše vezana uz informativni i kulturni aparat. Bez obzira na to što počiva na učesničkom djelovanju članova biblioteke, ovakvom modelu nisu u fokusu prava svih skupina – izuzeti su oni *s porocima*, što bi se danas moglo čitati i kao marginalizirani i manjinski, već legitimacija društvenog uređenja Jugoslavije koje je počivalo na konceptu samoupravnog socijalizma. Međutim, u participativnom bibliotekarstvu, promjena percepcije ne može biti obavezujuća, a sudjelovanje ne smije biti ishod prisile ili obaveze koju nameće državno uređenje. Umjesto takvog pristupa, trenutna bh. društvena situacija izi-

ple” (Bašović 1986, 9). In addition to participating in the construction of library collections and financial assistance, members of libraries in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and later in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, treated them as an accomplice project based on engagement of members of community / library which also provides professional, cultural and political training opportunities. In other words, library members in the BIH context from the 1920s until the 1990s contributed to the maintenance of libraries not only by developing their holdings, but also by using their space and resources for personal, professional and joint upgrading which reflected the contribution of the wider community.

Social management in public libraries has shown positive results. Representatives of the social community in the governing bodies of these institutions have played, wherever public workers were elected to these bodies with sufficient affinity for this job, a significant role in directing the work of the public library. The place that such institution occupies in the environment where it operates and its role in that environment often depended as much on the activities of institutions and staff employed in it as on the activities of community representatives in governing bodies in libraries. (Čulić and Grubačić 1965, 10)

This approach was especially expressed in the very beginning of socialist Yugoslavia, where the self-governing model in libraries was part of the socialist revolution through the spread of class consciousness – by collecting and reading relevant, Marxist and leftist literature in general.

3.1. Between participation and self-management: Who is the member?

However, unlike the modern participatory model that is questioned in this paper, collaborative model of that time does not arise from the requirements of the profession, but from the ideology of social organization. The state ideological apparatus functions by controlling other social formations and institutional practices such as “the educational apparatus, the religious apparatus, the family apparatus, the political apparatus, the trade union apparatus, the information apparatus, and the ‘cultural’ apparatus” (Altiser 2009, 37). Such apparatuses of repression are interconnected and dependent on each other, because, as a common denominator, they have “main state (repressive) apparatus” (Altiser 2009, 36). Insights into their interdependence can also refer to the library profession, which is mostly related to the information and cultural apparatus. Regardless of the fact that it is based on the participation

skuje da se o radu na sistemskim promjenama spram profesionalizacije i obrazovanja te praksi kontinuiteta promoviranja učesničkog aspekta demokratizacije, promisli iz pozicije koja bi promovisala uključivanje kao dio savremenih demokratkih praksi, što bi onda dalo osnove za promjenu svijesti o važnosti percipiranja bibliotekara, ali i samih korisnika/ca kao članova/ica.

Anthony Molaro (2012) u članku “Just Whom Do We Serve?: Patrons? Users? Clients? The name foreshadows the interaction” pojašnjava daljnju, partnersku implikaciju pojma *član*: “Za mene ovo znači partnerstvo – jednake članove istog tima. Sviđa mi se ideja da je članstvo društveno i aktivno. Zato smjelo proglašavam: ti ljudi u biblioteci su članovi biblioteke sa svim pravima i privilegijama koje im pripadaju.” U slučajevima kada korisnik biblioteke sudjeluje pasivno u kontaktu s osobljem biblioteke ili njenim drugim članovima, takav odnos rezultira tek floskularnim poimanjem javnog prostora biblioteke zbog toga što se korisnik ne osjeća obaveznim, odgovornim akterom javnog prostora u biblioteci. Da bi javni prostor funkcionisao kao mjesto susreta i debate, nemoguće je izostaviti udio koji na sebe trebaju preuzeti članovi i članice biblioteke. Pored stava bibliotekara i institucijskog viđenja, nužno je i uključivanje svijesti o potencijalnim prilikama te poziciji onih koji koriste javni prostor biblioteke. “Pošto ne možete ljude naučiti nečemu osim ako nisu voljni da uče, to znači da moraju biti voljni da učestvuju” (Lankes 2016, 53). Spoznaja o pravu na participaciju uslov je za njeno sprovođenje, ali bez obzira na to, pogrešno bi bilo misliti da biblioteke ne trebaju pomoći korisnicima da javni prostor unutar nje percipiraju kao potencijalnu javnu sferu i zbog toga raditi na promociji vlastitih usluga i razvoja sistema koji praktično, a ne samo teorijski, pružaju mogućnost za participaciju. Tako se pitanje sudjelovanja građanstva – kao nužne pretpostavke demokratskog poretka, pojavljuje neodvojivo i od demokratskih odgovornosti javne biblioteke za uključivanje građana u javnu sferu. U tom kontekstu, proizvodnja znanja i participacija, neminovno, svoju vezu prelamaju preko demokratije s jedne strane, te težnje za uživanjem ljudskih prava s druge strane.

Bez obzira u kojoj mjeri biblioteka promiče nove oblike suradnje s članovima, te kako se postavlja spram njihovih potreba, gledište bibliotekara služi kao katalizator ili inhibitor mogućih promjena ovisno o tome da li će ignorirati nužnost novih praksi ili će ih osvijestiti i prihvatiti. Iako prema Evropskoj konvenciji o ljudskim pravima (2010) među te-

of library members, this model does not focus on the rights of all groups, people with vices, which today could be interpreted as marginalized and minority, are excluded, and the legitimacy of the social structure of Yugoslavia was based on the concept of socialist self-management. However, in participatory librarianship, a change in perception cannot be binding, and participation must not be the result of coercion or obligation imposed by governmental system. Instead of such approach, the current BIH social situation requires the work on systemic changes towards professionalization and education and the practice of continuity to promote the participatory aspect of democratization, to be considered from a position that would promote inclusion as part of modern democratic practices, which would then provide a basis for changing awareness of the importance of perceiving librarians, but also the users as members.

Anthony Molaro (2012) in the article “Just Whom Do We Serve?: Patrons? Users? Clients? The name foreshadows the interaction” clarifies further, partner implication of the term *member*: “To me this means partnership – equal members of the same team. I like the idea that membership is social and active. That is why I boldly declare: these people in the library are members of the library with all the rights and privileges that belong to them.” In cases when the library user participates passively in contact with the library staff or its other members, such a relationship results only in a platitude understanding of the public space of the library because the user does not feel obliged, responsible participant of public space in the library. In order for the public space to function as a place of meeting and debate, it is impossible to omit the share that library members should take on. In addition to the attitude of librarians and institutional views, it is necessary to include awareness of potential opportunities and the position of those who use the public space of the library. “Since you can’t teach people something unless they are willing to learn, that means they have to be willing to participate” (Lankes 2016, 53). Cognition of the right to participate is a condition for its implementation, but regardless, it would be wrong to think that libraries should not help users to perceive public space within it as a potential public sphere and therefore work to promote their own services and develop systems that practically and not just theoretically provide an opportunity for participation. Thus, the issue of citizen participation – as a necessary assumption of the democratic order, arises inseparably from the democratic responsibilities of the public library for the inclusion of citizens in

meljna ljudska prava, između ostalih, spada “pravo na primanje i prenošenje informacija”, potrebno je dodatno objasniti vezu ljudskih prava i viđenja bibliotekara spram misije informiranja. Primijećeno je u praksi da se ovoj sprezi ne posvećuje onoliko pažnje koliko je potrebno za poštivanje svih njenih osobenosti i pojedinačnih sprovođenja. U slučajevima kada je bibliotekar detaljno upoznat s ljudskim pravima i njihovim ogledanjem u vlastitoj profesiji, primijećen je nedostatak njihove “apstrakcije u aktualne realnosti” (Samek 2007, 34) zbog čega se ostaje na teoretiziranju i diskutiranju o njihovom odnosu, ali ne i na teorijskoj praksi upražnjavanja i prilagođavanja lokalnom kontekstu.

Ako se u bh. kontekstu pokuša promisliti o čvršćoj konekciji između Univerzalne deklaracije o ljudskim pravima (1948) i bibliotečke profesije, često se dolazi u ćorsokak nedovoljno jasnih poveznica jer “skoro bez iznimke polje ljudskih prava se veže za pravnu profesiju” (Madacki 2007, 1). Čak ukoliko u sklopu institucijskih praksi nisu dokraja određene ili sprovedene pravne obaveze profesije, promjena kreće od bibliotekara okrenutog k poštivanju ljudskih prava. U Univerzalnoj deklaraciji o ljudskim pravima u Članu 19 stoji: “Svako ima pravo na slobodu mišljenja i izražavanja, što obuhvata i pravo da ne bude uznemiravan zbog svog mišljenja, kao i pravo da traži, prima i širi informacije i ideje bilo kojim sredstvima i bez obzira na granice.” Tako, primjerice, održavanje prava na intelektualne slobode, koje spada među osnovne vrijednosti i krovne zadaće bibliotekara, struka u praksi često ne samo da ne podrazumijeva već i ne sprovodi ovakav princip, pa se na njemu možda i najreprezentativnije provlači i pitanje odnosa između participacije i ljudskih prava.

3.2. Participativnost, univerzalnost i neutralnost

Iako zalaganje za intelektualne slobode u okviru bibliotekarstva nije dovedeno u pitanje uopće kao početni princip društveno odgovornog djelovanja profesije, to ne znači da u samom odnosu između ovog tipa ljudskih prava i zahtjeva koje postavlja participacija ne dolazi do prijepora: “Kako je vrijednost intelektualne slobode bibliotekarstva i informacijskih nauka utemeljena u eri koja je cijenila individualizam, stoga nije iznenađujuće da se intelektualna sloboda ne slaže s kolektivističkim vrijednostima poput društvene odgovornosti. Praktikanti iz bibliotekarstva i informacijskih nauka moraju pronaći način da primijene ove sukobljene vrijednosti, svaku opterećenu istorijskim značajem, u kontekstu naše današnje kulture” (Ratcliffe 2020, 21). Druš-

the public sphere. In this context, knowledge production and participation inevitably break their connection through democracy on the one hand, and the pursuit of human rights on the other.

Regardless of the extent to which the library promotes new forms of collaboration with members, and how it responds to their needs, the librarian's view serves as a catalyst or inhibitor of possible change depending on whether they ignore the necessity of new practices or if they will become aware of practices and accept them. Although, according to the European Convention on Human Rights (2010), fundamental human rights include, among others, the “right to receive and transmit information”, the connection between human rights and librarians' views towards mission of information needs to be further explained. It has been noticed in practice that this connection is not given as much attention as is necessary to respect all its peculiarities and individual implementations. In cases when the librarian is thoroughly acquainted with human rights and their reflection in its own profession, the lack of their “abstraction in current realities” was noticed (Samek 2007, 34) which is why it remains on theorizing and discussing their relationship, but not on the theoretical practice of practicing and adapting to the local context.

If in the BIH context one tries to think about a stronger connection between the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and the library profession, one often comes to a dead end with insufficiently clear connections because “almost without exception the field of human rights is linked to the legal profession”. (Madacki 2007, 1) Even if the legal obligations of the profession have not been fully defined or implemented as part of institutional practices, the change starts from a librarian faced towards respecting human rights. Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states: “Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression, including the right not to be harassed because of their own opinion, as well as the right to seek, receive and transmit information and ideas by any means and regardless of borders.” Thus, for example, maintaining the right to intellectual freedoms, which is one of the basic values and general tasks of librarians, the profession in practice often does not only imply but also does not implement this principle, so in it, the question of the relationship between participation and human rights perhaps pulls through the most representatively.

tvena odgovornost u kontekstu ovog rada uvjetuje participaciju i uključivanje članova/ica biblioteke u kreiranje bibliotekskih kolekcija kako bi se radilo na sprovođenju društvene pravde. Međutim, kako tvrdi Caitlin Ratcliffe, društvena odgovornost razlikuje se od pojma intelektualnih sloboda jer je “intelektualna sloboda liberalna vrijednost dok je socijalna pravda progresivna vrijednost” (Knox 2020, 3). Bibliotekarstvo, ustoličeno u doba težnje za posmatranjem ličnosti koja se izdvaja iz kolektiva jer se tu gubi njena pojedinačnost te se zbog toga zajednica treba podrediti individualnim interesima, nužno i poimanje intelektualnih sloboda veže uz slobodu pojedinca. S druge strane, društvena pravda nije na ovakav način ustoličena u individualizmu jer pravda kao progresivna vrijednost pažnju usmjerava na članove/ice različitih društvenih skupina.

Zbog razlikovanja s intelektualnim slobodama, može se pomisliti da društveno odgovorno djelovanje bibliotekara/ki nema slične implikacije kao ovaj segment ljudskih prava jer se ne tiče prevage pojedinca nad kolektivom. Individualizam razvijen u XVIII stoljeću vremenom postaje uvučen u koncepciju kapitalističkog poretka temeljenog na individualističkom materijalizmu “u kojem su pokretačke snage posjedovanje, pristup ‘informacijama’ i zabavi kako bi se pojedinac učinio fizički ugodnim u društvu koje, iako propovijedava individualizam, zahtijeva cijena usklađenosti za ove željene stvari” (Gorman 2015, 15). Društvena odgovornost profesije ne isključuje individualističke zahtjeve, ali im pristupa na temeljitiji i svrsishodniji način tako što, počevši od omogućavanja pristupa znanju pojedinaca, ima veći, društveni cilj u sklopu kojeg ne zanemaruje međudjelovanje pojedinca i zajednice, individualnih prava i sloboda i općeg socijalnog stanja, te razvoja subjekta kao fundamenta za demokratizaciju društva. Podrška pravima različitih identitarnih skupina uslov je izgradnje civilnog društva. Pri tome, marginalizirane grupe zahtijevaju poseban tretman u smislu potenciranja učešća i jednakosti zbog problema njihovog odnosa spram dominirajućih grupa.

Nakon sloma real-socijalizma '90-ih godina, između modernističkih naracija o kraju historije, trijumfa liberalnog kapitalizma i postmodernističkih fantazija o kraju velikih naracija – *multikulturalizam* u novom okruženju iznova dobija na društvenoj atraktivnosti, kao globalni politički projekat – bilo da se sve intenzivnije ispoljavajuće raznolikosti afirmiraju u formi novog građanstva (Kymlicka 1995) ili da ih se, pak, gleda s nepovjerenjem (Huntington 1993). Multikulturalizam postaje credo globalizaci-

3.2. Participation, universality and neutrality

Although advocacy for intellectual freedom in librarianship has not been questioned at all as an initial principle of socially responsible profession, this does not mean that there is no dispute in the very relationship between this type of human rights and the demands of participation: “As the value of intellectual freedom in librarianship and information science is founded in an era that valued individualism, it is therefore not surprising that intellectual freedom does not agree with collectivist values such as social responsibility. Practitioners from librarianship and information science must find a way to apply these conflicting values, each burdened with historical significance, in the context of our culture today.” (Ratcliffe 2020, 21) Social responsibility in the context of this paper conditions the participation and involvement of library members in the creation of library collections in order to work on the implementation of social justice. However, as Caitlin Ratcliffe argues, social responsibility differs from the notion of intellectual freedom because “intellectual freedom is a liberal value while social justice is a progressive value” (Knox 2020, 3). Librarianship, established in the age of striving to observe a person who stands out from the collective because it loses its individuality and therefore the community should be subordinated to individual interests, necessarily links the notion of intellectual freedom to the freedom of the individual. On the other hand, social justice is not established in this way in individualism because justice as a progressive value directs attention to members of different social groups.

Due to the differences with intellectual freedom, it can be thought that socially responsible actions of librarians do not have similar implications as this segment of human rights because it is not about the superiority of the individual over the collective. Individualism developed in the 18th century eventually became involved in the concept of a capitalist order based on individualistic materialism “in which the driving forces are possession, access to ‘information’ and entertainment to make the individual physically comfortable in a society that, although preaches individualism, demands the price of conformity for these desired things” (Gorman 2015, 15). The social responsibility of the profession does not exclude individualistic demands, but approaches them in a more thorough and practical way by starting from providing access to knowledge to individuals. It has a larger, social goal within which it does not neglect the interaction of individual and community, individual rights and freedom and gen-

ranog svijeta – u njega se najbolje upisuje logika novog vremena fluidnosti, brzine i rasplinjavanja prostora i vremena – u susretima različitih kultura, upoznavanju drugog i prevazilaženju granica. Uskoro su se u javnim bibliotekama počele puniti literaturom o multikulturalizmu, bibliotekari su iščitavali priručnike, a on je postao neodvojiv fenomen ne samo za politiku i demokratsko društvo već i za biblioteke – s migrantima, LGBT+ pokretom, zahtjevima za prava crnaca, vjerskih manjina i sl., čini se kako on nikad nije bio aktuelniji i življi – a istovremeno, samo mrtvo slovo na papiru.

Bez preciznijeg određenja pojma kulture suženo je razumijevanje pozicije biblioteka i obaveza bibliotekara u multikulturalnom okruženju. Značenje kulture u savremenom okruženju znatno je otežano tim prije jer su joj se povijesno gledano mijenjala, dodavala i usložnjavala određenja, a Raymond Williams smatra da je kultura jedna od dvije ili tri najkompleksnije riječi u engleskom jeziku (Williams 1985). Kontinuirano širenje opsega pojma *kultura* dovelo je do zanemarivanja izvornog značenja latinske riječi *colere* kao rasta u agrikulturnom smislu, a istovremeno do potenciranja modernih konotacija ideje ljudskog progresa. Ne postoji konsenzus oko toga da li svi materijalni i duhovni proizvodi spadaju pod kulturu, a baveći se upravo tim pitanjem, ideja kulture koncem dvadeset i prvog stoljeća postaje kompleksnija nego ikada prije jer je postmoderna naglasila okrenutost aktuelizaciji marginaliziranih perspektiva.

Biblioteka ne mora eksplicitno provoditi hegemonijske odnose, primjerice, nad marginaliziranom populacijom, jasnim politikama i misijama u kojima nema pomena njihovoj podršci, već upravo onako kako to čine i pojedine druge institucije – ne dozvoljavajući pristup ili služenje javnim dobrima, kao ni jednakopravne mogućnosti učestvovanja u društvenom životu. Kako bi se unutar vlastitog javnog prostora otvorio procjep u koji upadaju sve mogućnosti osnaživanja marginaliziranih, dovoljno je da biblioteka ograniči participaciju i poticanje prava nedominantnih grupa korisnika/ica. Pitanje participacije uslovljeno je društvenom pravdom, a specifično u slučaju biblioteka, informacijskom pravdom koja podrazumijevajući tri aspekta i uloge u kojima se mogu pronaći korisnici/ce – kao *tragači, izvori i subjekti informacija* – naglašava potrebu i podupire uključivanje članova/ica.

Da bi se tretirali pravedno kao tragači informacija, osobe bi trebale imati jednak pristup informacijama: to se naziva distributivna

eral social status and development of the subject as a foundation for the democratization of society. Support for the rights of different identity groups is a condition for building civil society. In doing so, marginalized groups require special treatment in terms of emphasizing participation and equality due to the problem of their relationship towards the dominant groups.

After the collapse of real socialism in the 1990s, between modernist narratives about the end of history, the triumph of liberal capitalism and post modernist fantasies about the end of great narratives – *multiculturalism* in the new environment has regained its social attractiveness, as a global political project – whether the more intensely expressed manifestations of diversity are established in the form of a new citizenship (Kymlicka 1995) or they are looked at with distrust (Huntington 1993). Multiculturalism is becoming the credo of a globalized world – it best inscribes the logic of a new time of fluidity, velocity and dissolving of space and time – in meeting of different cultures, getting to know each other and overcoming the borders. Soon, shelves of public libraries began to fill with literature on multiculturalism, librarians were reading manuals, and it became an inseparable phenomenon not only for politics and a democratic society, but also for libraries – with migrants, LGBT+ movement, requests for rights of black people, religious minorities, etc., it seems that it has never been more current and alive – and at the same time, just a dead letter on paper.

Without a more precise definition of the concept of culture, the understanding of the position of libraries and the obligations of librarians in a multicultural environment is narrowed. The definition of culture in the modern environment is much more hampered, because, looking historically, its designation was changing, adding and becoming complicated, and Raymond Williams (1985) considers culture to be one of the two or three most complex words in the English language. The continuous expansion of the scope of the term *culture* has led to the neglect of the original meaning of the Latin word *colere* as growth in the agricultural sense, and at the same time to emphasize the modern connotations of the idea of human progress. There is no consensus on whether all material and spiritual products fall under culture, and dealing with this very question, the idea of culture in the late twenty-first century becomes more complex than ever before because post modernism has emphasized turning to actualizations of marginalized perspectives.

pravda. Da bi se tretirali pravedno kao izvori informacija, osobe bi trebale imati jednake šanse da doprinesu proizvodnji i pružanju znanja: to se naziva učesnička pravda. Da bi se tretirali pravedno kao subjekti informacija, osobe bi trebale biti pošteno prikazane u cjelokupnom nizu informacija: to se naziva pravda prepoznavanja. (Mathiesen 2015, 207).

Iako se baziraju na različitim segmentima profesionalnog djelovanja, tri aspekta informacijske pravde imaju zajedničku nit i međusobno su uslovljena jer proizilaze jedan iz drugog na način da pristup, participacija i prepoznavanje zajedno čine objedinjen koncept društveno odgovornog djelovanja podrške kulturnoj raznolikosti. Tako, nastavlja Mathiesen, distributivna pravda “pridonosi pravdi prepoznavanja stvaranjem informacijskog okruženja koje je dobrodošlo svim ljudima i pružanjem informacija potrebnih za ispravljanje lažnih podataka i stereotipa. Informacijske usluge mogu podržati participativnu pravdu pružajući mogućnosti marginaliziranim pojedincima i skupinama da se izraze. Pravo sudjelovanja može pridonijeti distributivnoj pravdi pružanjem više izvora relevantnih informacija za zajednicu i davanjem svih članova zajednice – posebno onih čiji su interesi često zanemareni – glas u dizajniranju i provedbi informacijskih usluga kako bi se osigurala relevantnost i djelotvornost tih usluga.” (Mathiesen 2015, 207–208).

Kako bi distributivna pravda bila ostvarena kroz mogućnost pristupa informacijama svim članovima/icama tako da ruši stereotipe o drugom i drugačijem, potrebno je da u procesu iznošenja participativne pravde marginalizirane skupine uzmu učešće u procesu podrške informacijskoj pravdi kroz vlastite izvore, ali i participiraju u procesima izgradnje kolekcije.

Dominantni diskursi sredstva ne usmjeravaju k podršci društvene različitosti i njima sljedbene jednakosti, jer su oblici univerzalnosti uvijek hegemonijski nastrojani (Laclau 1999). Tezu koju Ernesto Laclau i Chantal Mouffe razvijaju u svom fundamentalnom djelu “Hegemonija i socijalističkoj strategiji” jeste ideja o tzv. agonističkoj demokratiji kao obliku radikalne demokratske politike. Za razliku od liberalnog poimanja demokratije koja je u svojoj osnovi zasnovana na univerzalnom konsenzusu koji počiva na razumu, agonistički shvaćena demokratija dovodi u pitanje mogućnost racionalno utemeljenog konsenzusa u ime imanentnosti sukoba unutar društvenih odnosa na kojima političko počiva. Na taj način, agonistička demokratija, pre-

The library does not have to explicitly conduct hegemonic relations, for example, over marginalized populations, clear policies and missions in which there is no mention to their support, but just as some other institutions do – not allowing access to or service of public goods, nor equal opportunities to participate in social life. In order to open a gap within its own public space, which includes all the possibilities of empowering the marginalized, it is enough for the library to limit the participation and encourage the rights of non-dominant groups of users. The question of participation is conditioned by social justice, and specifically in the case of libraries, information justice, which includes three aspects and roles in which users can be found; as *seekers*, *sources* and *subjects of information*, emphasizes the need and supports the involvement of members.

To be treated fairly as information seekers, persons should have equal access to information: this is called distributive justice. To be treated fairly as sources of information, individuals should have an equal chance to contribute to the production and provision of knowledge: this is called participatory justice. To be treated fairly as subjects of information, persons should be fairly represented in the full range of information: this is called justice of recognition. (Mathiesen 2015, 207).

Although based on different segments of professional activity, the three aspects of information justice have a common thread and are mutually conditioned because they arise from each other in such a way that access, participation and recognition together form a unified concept of socially responsible action in support of cultural diversity. Thus, Mathiesen continues, distributive justice “contributes to the justice of recognition by creating an information environment that is welcome to all people and by providing the information needed to correct false data and stereotypes. Information services can support participatory justice by providing opportunities for marginalized individuals and groups to express themselves. The right to participate can contribute to distributive justice by providing more sources of relevant information for the community and providing all members of the community – especially those whose interests are often neglected – voice in the designing and implementation of information services to ensure the relevance and effectiveness of those services.” (Mathiesen 2015, 207–208).

In order for distributive justice to be achieved through the possibility of access to information for

ma Mouffe, priznaje “permanentnost antagonističke dimenzije sukoba” (Mouffe 2016, 27), pa je i polje politike prije polje moći i antagonizma nego deliberacije. Stoga, kako je konfiguracija “odnosa moći oko kojih je strukturano društvo (...) borba između suprotstavljenih hegemonijskih projekata koji nikada ne mogu biti racionalno izmireni” (Mouffe 2016, 28), potreban je institucionalni, demokratski okvir koji će omogućiti da takav pluralizam nikad ne završi u dihotomiji prijatelj/neprijatelj, već kompatibilan s demokratijom samom.

Ako bismo prihvatili tezu kako/da demokratija “izražava širok raspon vrijednosti koje se tiču socijalne pravednosti, dostojanstva i vrijednosti svakog ljudskog bića, egalitarizma i poštovanja različitih ideja” (Gorman 2015, 196), bibliotekari, kao aktivni sudionici demokratskih procesa, daju doprinos promicanju ljudskih prava na vlastiti način usredotočujući se na “aspekte vrijednosti nad kojima možemo imati određenu kontrolu: pristup bibliotečkim resursima i uslugama.” (Gorman 2015, 161). Usluge pri tome nisu shvaćene jednostrano, već ih čine različiti segmenti aktivnog profesionalnog djelovanja kako bi se biblioteke približile idealu društvene pravde. Naglašavanjem zajedničkih vrijednosti na kojima počivaju bibliotekarstvo i demokratija želi se demitologizirati gledište o načelu neutralnosti profesije jer ona, umjesto da u konačnici omogući jednakopravnost, paradoksalno, u krajnjem ishodu ima upravo isključivanje. Candise Branum (2008) će u tekstu “The Myth of Library Neutrality” navesti neke od mogućih razloga zbog kojih je mit o neutralnosti zaživio među bibliotečkom profesijom, a glavni se tiče “transformacije bibliotekarstva u naučnu i akademsku disciplinu” koja je potisnula samu njenu pragmatičnu sprovedbu (1). Bibliotekarstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini nakon Drugog svjetskog rata, bez obzira na različite kurseve za bibliotečke radnike i razvijen samoupravni model, nastavlja se suočavati s problemima nedostatka kvalifikovanog kadra. “Polovinom 1972. godine Savjet Filozofskog fakulteta u Sarajevu, na inicijativu Odsjeka za opštu književnost, razmatrao je mogućnost školovanja bibliotečkog kadra u okvirima svojih postojećih odsjeka. (...) Statutom Filozofskog fakulteta u Sarajevu, iz 1972. godine, formiran je Odsjek za opštu književnost, scenske umjetnosti i bibliotekarstvo...” (Bašović 1977, 29–30). Uvođenjem studija bibliotekarstva rješava se problem manjka kvalifikovanog kadra, ali se istovremeno transformacijom u akademsku disciplinu naglašava jenjavanje učesničkog modela koji je zbog društvenog konteksta i mišljenja da je samoupravno društvo postiglo svoj

all members by breaking down stereotypes about the other and different, it is necessary for marginalized groups to take part in the process of supporting information justice through their own sources, but also to participate in building processes of collection.

The dominant discourses of the means are not directed towards the support of social diversity and their consequent equality, because the forms of universality are always hegemonic (Laclau 1999). The thesis that Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe develop in their fundamental work, “Hegemonija i socijalistička strategija” (Hegemony and Socialist Strategy) is the idea of the so-called agonistic democracy as a form of radical democratic politics. Contrary to the liberal conception of democracy which is basically based on a universal consensus that rests on reason, agonistically understood democracy calls into question the possibility of a rationally grounded consensus in the name of the immanence of conflict within the social relations on which the political rests. In this way, agonist democracy, according to Mouffe, admits “the permanence of the antagonistic dimension of conflict” (Mouffe 2016, 27), so the field of politics is more a field of power and antagonism than liberation. Therefore, as the configuration of “power relations around which society is structured (...) is a struggle between opposing hegemonic projects that can never be rationally reconciled” (Mouffe 2016, 28), an institutional, democratic framework is needed that will allow such pluralism never to end in a friend / enemy dichotomy, already compatible with democracy itself.

If we were to accept the thesis that democracy “expresses a wide range of values concerning the social justice, dignity and worth of every human being, egalitarianism and respect for different ideas” (Gorman 2015, 196), librarians, as active participants in democratic processes, contribute to the promotion of human rights in their own way by focusing on “aspects of values over which we can have some control: access to library resources and services” (Gorman 2015, 161). Services are not understood one-sidedly, but are made up of different segments of active professional activity in order to bring libraries closer to the ideal of social justice. By emphasizing the common values on which librarianship and democracy are based, the aim is to demythologize the view of the principle of neutrality of the profession, because instead of ultimately enabling equality, paradoxically, in the end result, it exactly has exclusion. Candise Branum (2008) will state in the text “The Myth of Library Neutrality” some of the possible reasons why the myth of neutrality came to life among the

cilj, dosegao tačku opadanja. Posmatrajući stanje u bh. kontekstu bibliotečke profesije u periodu od završetka rata, potrebno je poraditi na istraživanju i demitologizaciji neutralnost bibliotekara posebno iz ugla društvenih i profesionalno odgovornih akcija koje bi se suprotstavile konzervativnom načinu obavljanja bibliotečkih poslova. Taj pristup, podjednako kao i učesnički model u bibliotekama samoupravnog socijalizma, ipak potpada pod tradicionalno bibliotekarstvo, jer participacija kao demokratska praksa podrazumijeva aktivno djelovanje, promicanje jednakopravnosti i istovremeno borbu protiv univerzalizma.

S druge strane, kontrakturni pravci, koji su često vezani za participativni model, odupiru se superiornim klasama, njihovoj težnji za univerzalizmom i neutralnosti u "društvu spektakla". Prema Guyu Debordu, ideološki aparat u neposrednoj je vezi s težnjama k univerzalizmu: "Čim ideologija – ta apstraktna pretenzija ka univerzalnom i sve iluzije vezane za nju – stekne priznanje u uslovima univerzalne apstrakcije i delotvorne diktature iluzija koji preovlađuju u modernom društvu, ona više nije volontaristička borba fragmentarnog, već njegov trijumf" (Debord 2006, 55).

Zaključak

U ovom radu nastojala se ispitati hipoteza da učesničko djelovanje u prijeratnim bh. bibliotekama može poslužiti kao polazna tačka za razvijanje trenutnog modela uključivanja korisnika/ca biblioteke u svojstvu njenih članova/ca. Na početku rada bilo je potrebno pojasniti širi društveni kontekst, zahtjeve i polazišta participatorne kulture općenito. Nakon toga pokušale su se objasniti postavke učesničkog djelovanja u bh. bibliotekama od '20-ih do početka '90-ih godina dvadesetog stoljeća kroz koncept samoupravnog shvatanja učesništva u socijalističkim državama. Potom su teorijske postavke i ideje novog, savremenog participatornog bibliotekarstva komparativnom analizom dovedene u vezu s prijašnjim modelom, pri čemu se došlo do nekoliko zaključaka.

Iako oba modela polaze od naglašenog koncepta članstva, među njima se uočavaju određene razlike. Dok učesnički samoupravni model polazi od zahtjeva državnog uređenja i njemu sljedbenog kulturnog aparata, participatorno bibliotekarstvo počiva na pojmu participacije kao jednom od osnovnih načela demokratskog uređenja. Naime, oviseći o socijalističkom uređenju, koncept članstva u prijeratnim bh. bibliotekama imao je za cilj legitimaciju postojećeg društvenog uređenja samoupravnog socijalizma,

library profession, and the main one concerns the "transformation of librarianship into a scientific and academic discipline" which has suppressed its very pragmatic implementation (1). Librarianship in Bosnia and Herzegovina after the Second World War, despite various courses for librarians and a developed self-management model, continues to face problems of lack of qualified staff. "In mid-1972, the Council of the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo, at the initiative of the Department of Literary Studies, considered the possibility of educating library staff within its existing departments. (...) By the Statute of the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo, from 1972, the Department of Literary Studies, Theatre Studies and Library Sciences was established..." (Bašović 1977, 29–30). The introduction of library sciences studies solves the problem of lack of qualified staff, but at the same time the transformation into an academic discipline emphasizes the weakening of the participatory model which, due to the social context and the opinion that self-managing society has achieved its goal, has reached a point of decline. Observing the situation in the BIH context of the library profession in the period since the end of the war, it is necessary to work on researching and demythologizing the neutrality of librarians, especially from the angle of social and professionally responsible actions that would oppose the conservative way of doing library work. This approach, as well as the participatory model in the libraries of self-managing socialism, still falls under traditional librarianship, because participation as a democratic practice implies active action, promotion of equality and at the same time the fight against universalism.

On the other hand, counter-cultural directions which are often tied to the participatory model resist to superior classes, their pursuit of universalism, and neutrality in a "society of spectacles". According to Guy Debord, the ideological apparatus is directly related to the aspirations towards universalism: "As soon as ideology – that abstract pretence towards the universal and all illusions related to it – gains recognition in the conditions of universal abstraction and effective dictatorship of illusions that prevail in modern society, it is no longer a voluntaristic struggle of the fragmentary, but it is its triumph." (Debord 2006, 55).

Conclusion

In this paper, an attempt was made to test the hypothesis that participatory action in pre-war BIH libraries can serve as a starting point for developing the current model of inclusion of library users in its capacity as its members was. At the beginning

gdje su biblioteke predstavljale samo jedan od tipova institucija u kojima se sprovodio širi politički i idejni projekat, gdje zajednica upravlja društvenim dobrima postavljajući određena ograničenja o tome ko, zaista, može postati članom ili članicom biblioteke, *filtrirajući* nepoželjne, skrajnute i socijalno neprihvaćene skupine. Participatorno bibliotekarstvo, s druge strane, imajući u vidu težnje k demokratizaciji koja počiva i na uključivanju manjinskih, marginaliziranih i zanemarivanih skupina, promiče multikulturalizam kroz koncept informacijske pravde. Kako bi se poduzeli konkretni koraci u praksi za participaciju članova/ica u biblioteci, potrebno je promisliti o utjecaju neutralne pozicije i ideje univerzalizma kao zamke kada se promišlja o jednakosti.

Stoga je ideja participatornog bibliotekarstva u savremenom bosanskohercegovačkom kontekstu, što se ovim radom nastojalo i pokazati, značajan segment njegove dalje demokratizacije naspram konzerviranja u samodovoljne i monolitne zajednice identiteta. Participatorni pristup, koji je, za razliku od učesničkog samoupravljanja – povijesne činjenice, odsutan iz prakse tekućeg bh. bibliotekarstva, u ovome slučaju poslužio je kao obrazloženje potrebne prakse kojoj se treba težiti u savremenom bh. društvu, gradeći aktivnije građanstvo kao inkluzivno društvo znanja, uvažavajući njegovu internu i lokalnu specifičnost, heterogenost i pluralnost.

of the paper, it was necessary to clarify the broader social context, requirements and starting points of participatory culture in general. After that, attempts were made to explain the settings of participatory activity in BIH libraries from the '20s to the early '90s of the twentieth century through the concept of self-management understanding of participation in socialist countries. Then, the theoretical assumptions and ideas of the new, contemporary participatory librarianship were brought into comparison with the previous model by comparative analysis, where several conclusions were made.

Although both models start from the emphasized concept of membership, certain differences can be noticed between them. While the participatory self-management model starts from the requirements of state organization and the cultural apparatus that follows it, participatory librarianship is based on the notion of participation as one of the basic principles of democratic organization. In fact, depending on the socialist system, the concept of membership in pre-war BIH libraries aimed to legitimize the existing social system of self-management socialism, where libraries represented only one of the types of institutions in which the wider, political and ideological project was implemented where the community manages social goods adding specific restrictions on who, indeed, can become a member of the library by *filtering* out undesirable, marginalized and socially unacceptable groups. Participatory librarianship, on the other hand, bearing in mind the aspirations for democratization based on the inclusion of minority, marginalized and neglected groups, promotes multiculturalism through the concept of information justice. In order to take concrete steps in practice for the participation of members in the library, it is necessary to consider the impact of the neutral position and the idea of universalism as a trap when contemplating about equality.

Therefore, the idea of participatory librarianship in the contemporary context of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which this paper endeavoured to show, is a significant segment of its further democratization versus conservation into self-sufficient and monolithic communities of identity. The participatory approach, which, unlike participatory self-management – a historical fact – is absent from the practice of current BIH librarianship, in this case served as an explanation of the necessary practice to be pursued in modern BIH society, building a more active citizenship as an inclusive knowledge society, respecting its internal and local specificity, heterogeneity and plurality.

Literatura / Bibliography

- Altiser, Luj. 2009. *Ideologija i državni ideološki aparati*. Loznica: Karpos.
- Barbrook, Richard, i Petar Jandrić. 2019. "Kako biti moderan: Pustolovine situacionističkog socijaldemokrata na radiju, u društvenim igrama i na internetu" U *Znanje u digitalnom dobu: Razgovori s djecom jedne male revolucije*, Jandrić, Petar (ur.), 91–122. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk.
- Bašović, Ljubinka. 1977. *Biblioteke i bibliotekarstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini 1945–1975*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Bašović, Ljubinka. 1986. *Biblioteke i bibliotekarstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini 1918–1945*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo.
- Branum, Candise. 2014. *The Myth of Library Neutrality*. <https://candisebranum.wordpress.com/2014/05/15/the-myth-of-library-neutrality/>. Datum pristupa 12. 5. 2020.
- Čulić, Branko, i Kosta Grubačić. 1965. *Narodna biblioteka Bosne i Hercegovine (1945–1965)*. Sarajevo: Narodna biblioteka SR BiH u Sarajevu.
- Edutopia. "Henry Jenkins on Participatory Culture (Big Thinkers Series)" Youtube. 7. 5. 2013. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1gPm-c1wRsQ>. Datum pristupa 12. 5. 2020.
- Evropski sud za ljudska prava. *Evropska konvencija o ljudskim pravima*. 2010. https://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention_BOS.pdf. Datum pristupa 17. 4. 2020.
- Generalna skupština Ujedinjenih nacija. *Univerzalna deklaracija o ljudskim pravima*. 1948. https://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/cnr.pdf. Datum pristupa 15. 5. 2020.
- Gorman, Michael. 2015. *Our Enduring Values Revisited: Librarianship in an Ever-Changing World*. Chicago: ALA editions.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72 (3): 22–49.
- Ilić, Ivan. 2012. *Dole škole*. <https://sites.google.com/site/vrediuciti/ivan-ilic/dole-skole>. Datum pristupa 17. 5. 2020.
- Izložba "NSK Sarajevo". 2018. <http://efm.ba/2018/03/27/izlozba-nsk-sarajevo/>. Datum pristupa 24. 6. 2020.
- Knox, Emily. 2020. "Intellectual Freedom and Social Justice: Tensions Between Core Values in American Librarianship" *Open Information Science* 4 (1): 1–10. doi: 10.1515/opis-2020-0001.
- Kodrić-Zaimović, Lejla. 2017. "Participatorna kultura i baštinske ustanove: Problemi i mogućnosti dizajniranja djelotvorne korisničke platforme" *Pregled: časopis za društvena pitanja* 58 (2): 41–60.
- Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Laclau, Ernesto, i Chantal Mouffe. 2001. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Lankes, R. David. 2016. *The New Librarianship Field Guide*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Lankes, R. David. 2011. *The Atlas of New Librarianship*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Macan, Bojan. 2009. "Tehnologije Web 2.0 i njihova primjena u knjižnicama: iskustva Knjižnice Instituta Ruđer Bošković s posebnim osvrtom na njezin Blog" *Kemija u Industriji* 58 (5): 226–228.
- Mack, Deborah L. 2012. *Libraries and Museums in an Era of Participatory Culture: A Partnership Project of the Salzburg Global Seminar and the Institute of Museum and Library Services, October 19 23, 2011: Session 482 Report*. Washington, DC: Institute of Museum and Library Services. https://www.ims.gov/assets/1/AssetManager/SGS_Report_2012.pdf. Datum pristupa 21. 6. 2020.
- Madacki, Saša. 2007. "Toni Samek: Bibliotekarstvo i ljudska prava: Vodič za dvadeset prvo stoljeće. Oxford: Chandos Publishing, 2007" *Bosniaca* 12 (1): 128. [elektronski izvor] <http://bosniaca.nub.ba/index.php/bosniaca/article/view/188/188>. Datum pristupa 29. 5. 2020.
- Martinović, Dragana et al. 2015. "Social Aspects of Digital Literacy" U *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Third Edition*, Khosrow-Pour, Mehdi (ur.), 2158–2166.
- Mathiesen, Kay. 2015. "Informational Justice: A Conceptual Framework for Social Justice in Library and Information Services" *Library Trends* 64 (2): 198–225, doi: 10.1353/lib.2015.0044.
- Molaro, Anthony. 2012. *Just Whom Do We Serve? Patrons? Users? Clients? The Name Foreshadows the Interaction*. <https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2012/03/28/just-whom-do-we-serve/>. Datum pristupa 14. 4. 2020.
- Mouffe, Chantal. 2016. *O političkom*. Zagreb: Politička kultura.
- n.d. *Museum Of Bad Art – Art Too Bad to Be Ignored*. museumofbadart.org/. Datum pristupa 10. 6. 2020.

- n.d. *Muzej Ratnog Djetinjstva – Djetinjstvo u Ratu | Knjiga | Muzej*. djetinjstvooratu.com/muzej/. Datum pristupa 6. 6. 2020.
- O'Reilly, Tim. 2007. "What Is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software" *International Journal of Digital Economics* (65): 17–37.
- Ratcliffe, Caitlin. 2020. "Why Intellectual Freedom? Or: Your Values Are Historically Contingent" *Open Information Science* 4 (1): 11–28. doi: 10.1515/opis-2020-0002.
- Ritzer, George, i Nathan Jurgenson. 2010. "Production, Consumption, Prosumption: The Nature of Capitalism in the Age of the Digital 'Prosumer'" *Journal of Consumer Culture* 10 (1): 13–36. doi: 10.1177/1469540509354673.
- Samek, Toni. 2007. *Librarianship and Human Rights: A Twenty-First Century Guide*. Cambridge: Chandos Publishing.
- SHARE Foundation. "U MREŽI – Ubrzavanje medija (6. epizoda)" Youtube, 14. 1. 2018. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IMOH9egk9Sw&list=PLeeEdHH7vHVnvDm8lQhYJLCyEOoHkc2jH&index=7&t=104s>. Datum pristupa 15. 4. 2020.
- Williams, Raymond. 1985. *Keywords: a Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.