

Marjan Hočevar

PROBLEM PROSTORSKO-OKOLJSKE TRAJNOSTNOSTI V RAZMERAH NARAŠČAJOČE FLUIDNOSTI DRUŽBENIH RAZMERIJ

Vpliv zmanjševanja prostorskih ovir na spreminjanje ozemeljske organizacije družb je bil stalnica sociološkega teoretiziranja in raziskovanja od sredine osemdesetih let prejšnjega stoletja. Dinamizacija in fleksibilizacija časovno-prostorskih ritmov v vsakodnevnem življenju sta dolgoročno vplivali na spremembe v organiziranosti in strukturiranosti družb. Anthony Giddens je »raztezanju družbenih sistemov v času in prostoru« pripisal ključno vlogo pri pojasnjevanju prežemanja strukture in delovanja v visoko modernih družbah (koncept *strukturacije*).¹ »Prostorski obrat« v sociologiji, ki je sledil Giddensovemu eksplicitnemu poudarku elementov prostora in časa pri pojasnjevanju družbenih sprememb modernih družb, je sovpadal z začetnimi, tako afirmativnimi kot kritičnimi tematizacijami omrežij, globalizacije in telekomunikacijsko-informacijske revolucije (Castells 1989, 1996; Harvey 1991; Mlinar 1992). Konec devetdesetih let prejšnjega stoletja je sledil (pričakovani) milenijski razmah preučevanja prostorske mobilnosti in tematiziranja »konca teritorialnih družb« (Urry 2000, 2006; Kaufmann 2004).

V tem času so se množila tudi dela neprostorskih sociologov – generalistov, ki so bolj ali manj trajno zaznamovala preučevanje t. i. nove, pozne ali visoke modernosti, zlasti hitrost, radikalnost in intenzivnost družbenih sprememb. Stalni repertoar ključnih besed s časovno-prostorsko konotacijo (*buzz words*), kot so nestanovitnost, neustaljenost, nomadizem, nestabilnost, prekarost, začasnost, občasnost, večdomicilnost, ubikvitarnost, je avtorjem omogočal visoko citiranost njihovih del. Zygmunt Bauman je z uvedbo sintagme »tekoča modernost« morda še najbolj slikovito orisal naraščajočo fluidnost družbenih razmerij in vlogo nestanovitnega posameznika v njih.

Gre za nekakšno kaotično nadaljevanje modernosti, kjer se človek lahko premika z enega družbenega položaja na drugega na fluiden način. No-

1. Delo *The constitution of Society: Outline of the theory of Structuration* (1984) velja za eno zadnjih in najbolj vplivnih sintetičnih socioloških del t. i. *grand theory* v sociologiji, ne glede na številne kritike o teoretskem eklekticizmu.

madizem postane splošna značilnost »tekočega modernega« človeka, saj teče skozi svoje življenje kot popotnik, ki spreminja kraje bivanja, delovna mesta, zakone, vrednote in včasih več – politično ali spolno usmerjenost – in se izdvaja iz tradicionalnih podpornih omrežij, medtem ko se je osvobodil omejitev ali zahtev, ki so mu jih prejšnja omrežja nalagala (Bauman 2000:8).

Toda implicitno tematiziranje razmerja med prostorsko in socialno bližino² kot tudi iskanja njunega idealnega razmerja je staro toliko kot sociologija. Binarne prisposobe prehoda iz mehanske v organsko solidarnost in iz *gemeinschaft* v *gesellschaft* so konec devetnajstega stoletja napovedovale prostorske posledice tako v delitvi dela kot v načinih človeškega združevanja in osamosvajanja. Na račun večje (osebne) svobode se je zmanjšala (socialna) varnost. Prostorska in socialna bližina v mestih sta obratno sorazmerni, medtem ko sta na podežlju premo sorazmerni. Industrijska urbanizacija je torej še predstavljala soliden in obvladljiv analitični instrumentarij za preučevanje standardnih in tudi trajnejših vzorcev sprememb v kulturi (npr. »urbane osebnosti«) in strukturi (npr. neenakosti). Sedanji procesi postindustrijske globalizacije, informatizacije, virtualizacije in ubikvitarne dostopnosti pa relativizirajo, vendar hkrati zamegljujejo binarno logiko pojasnjevanja družbenih posledic prostorske bližine in oddaljenosti. Lastnosti fizičnega prostora, kot sta npr. mestni in podeželski, vse manj pojasnjujejo produkcijske in potrošne načine, kulturne razlike in celo strukturne neenakosti. Komplementarnost fizičnosti in virtualnosti, tj. dostopnost do fizičnih krajev in inkluzivnost v virtualnih tokovih, zmanjšujeta prostorski determinizem in povečujeta družbeno fluidnost. Če fluidnost razumemo afirmativno, v kontekstu povečevanja dostopnosti zaradi zmanjševanja prostorskih ovir s pospeševanjem dinamičnega prepletanja družbene in prostorske mobilnosti, potem bi ta pojav prvič v zgodovini človeškega združevanja (in osamosvajanja posameznika) lahko pomenil razreševanje dileme bližine in oddaljenosti. Če pa fluidnost obravnavamo kritično, v kontekstu prevlade »hipermobilnosti« ali »diktata mobilnosti«, to je nenehnih sprememb na račun fizičnoprostorske ustaljenosti, sorazmerne trajnosti in diskontinuitete lokaliziranih (komunitarnih) družbenih vezi, slika ni več nujno progresivna. Na več ravneh in v različnih kontekstih se postavljajo dileme meja časovno-prostorske dinamike in temeljnih pogojev trajnostne družbene

-
2. Klasični »veliki teoretiki«, kot so Durkheim, Weber in Marx, so fizični prostor obravnavali večinoma kot »odvisno spremenljivko« v družbenih procesih. Izjema je bil Georg Simmel, ki je v jedro svojega tematiziranja postavljaj element »prostorske metrike«, kar je bilo v tistem času pojmovano kot sociološko obrobno ali celo trivialno. K predhodnikom »prostorsko mobilnostnega« obrata v sociologiji sodi še Pitrim Sorokin s konceptualnim povezovanjem družbene (vertikalne) in prostorske (horizontalne) mobilnosti (1927). Več o prostorskem in mobilnostnem obratu v sociologiji glej v Hočevar (2017).

integracije. Avtorici in avtorji v tej številki o razmerju med dinamiko in kontinuiteto razpravljajo z vidika tematskih perspektiv prostorske fragmentacije, urbanizma, produkcije prostora, prostorskega načrtovanja, migracij in izobraževanja.

Navidezno se zdi, da se s temi dilemami vračamo nazaj, h klasičnemu sociološkemu lamentiranju o naravi skupnosti in lokalnosti, le da v razpravo vnašamo element samoomejevanja ob siceršnji globalni brezmejni mobilnosti pri izbiri življenjskega sloga.³ Razprave o statiki in dinamiki družbene (skupnostne, komunalne) organiziranosti ter delovanja v prostoru torej spet postajajo aktualne, vendar pa so »ponujene« rešitve protislovne. Toda klasična sociološka dilema je bila izrazito antropocentrična in se je nanašala le na časovno-prostorske tipologije družbene organizacije v prostoru brez upoštevanja omejitev v okolju ali celo ob predpostavki popolnega človeškega obvladovanja narave. Čeprav tudi razprave o razmerju med naravo in kulturo niso nove,⁴ je presenetljivo malo znotrajdisciplinarnih povezav med prostorskimi (urbanimi, ruralnimi) in okoljskimi sociologi,⁵ več pa med disciplinami in v čezdisciplinarnih okoljskih študijah. Očitno je, da sodobna celostna dilema prostorske, okoljske in časovne organizacije družbe presega pojasnjevalne zmožnosti, ki jih ponuja klasična sociološka perspektiva. Ker pa je, kot hudomušno navaja John Urry, sociologija v svojem bistvu sintetična in »parazitska« veda, upanje prinaša »sociologija onkraj družb«. Ta se v prihodnosti lahko zarije tudi v naravno okolje in iz drugih, bolj redukcionističnih naravoslovnih disciplin črpa ideje o razreševanju trajnostnosti, vključno z dilemo trajnostne organiziranosti družb v času in prostoru.

Sociologija skuša razumeti naravo družbenega življenja, kako se iz oči v oči in na daljavo družbene povezave naključno omogočajo in realizirajo. Tega se loti tako, da se hrani s spoznanji in pristopi, ki so jih drugod predlagali ali zavrgli, zlasti s takimi, ki razkrivajo materialne svetove, od katerih je družbeno življenje odvisno in ki jih nenehno reproducira (Urry 2005: 19).

V pričujočem posebnem sklopu tretje številke Družboslovnih razprav avtorici in avtorji z različnih konceptualnih in tematskih perspektiv obravnavajo protislovna procesa: trajnostnosti (kontinuitete) in fluidnosti (sprememb) v družbeno-prostorskem kontekstu.

-
3. Seveda ob predpostavki, da imamo sposobnost telesne mobilnosti (nehendikepiranosti), pri tem pa tu sploh ne problematiziramo vprašanja neenakosti pri izbiri življenjskega sloga.
 4. Spomnimo se ekonomskih razprav Rimskega kluba o mejah rasti v zgodnjih sedemdesetih letih prejšnjega stoletja (D. Meadows idr. 1972).
 5. Več o povezovalni »agendi« v sociologiji in sociologije z naravoslovjem glej v Walker (2005) in Lidskog idr. (2015).

V prvem članku Drago Kos ob braudelovskih »pravilih nove zgodovine«, ki obdelujejo dolgotrajne družbene transformacije, s selektivno analizo izbranih prostorsko časovnih fragmentov preizprašuje družbene posledice erozije prostorskega determinizma. Globalizacija, ki ukinja prostorske ovire, v prvi plan potiska lokalno specifične krajevne in političnosistemske značilnosti krajev. Kraji morajo zaradi globalizacijskega »krčenja« tekmovati s kraji na nekoč oddaljenih območjih sveta. Čeprav so učinki odpiranja navzven, na ljudi in ekosistem kraja, pozitivni (npr. pri investijah, turizmu), običajno ne gre za trajnejše obdobje, temveč po logiki fluidne tekmovalnosti že kmalu pridobi primat neki drug kraj ali območje. Avtor tudi ob prikazu slovenskih primerov opozarja, da morajo biti razprave o prostorskih učinkih postmoderne fleksibilizacije nujno usmerjene tako, da bomo sposobni prepoznati ločnico med potencialnimi emancipatornimi in dolgotrajnejšimi učinki globalnega odpiranja prostora ter nevarnimi tradicionalističnimi regresijami, ki lahko ogrozijo ta projekt.

Članek Matjaža Uršiča pozornost usmerja h konceptu fluidnega prostorskega načrtovanja, ki je sicer nujen mehanizem za zagotavljanje nenehne večsmerne izmenjave in ustrezne analize, predelave ter uporabe izmenjanih informacij med različnimi deležniki v sodobnem procesu prostorskega razvoja. Ker pa gre za izrazito komunikacijsko odprt in participativno podprt proces s številnimi in heterogenimi deležniki iz različnih okolij in z različnimi interesi, takšno postopanje lahko povzroča odmik od oblikovanja trajnostno naravnanih prostorskorazvojnih politik. Kot ugotavlja avtor, je ideja fluidnosti v prostorskem načrtovanju sorodna konceptu »dialektičnega utopizma«, ki je ena redkih možnosti za uspešno obvladovanje nestabilnosti, ki izhajajo iz učinkov globalizacije in fleksibilne akumulacije kapitala. Bistvo dialektičnega utopizma je v odpovedi točno določenih utopičnih ciljev načrtovanja in v prehodu na utopizem, ki je mišljen kot proces, in ne končna materializirana prostorska forma.

Primož Medved se z utopistikami sreča pri obravnavi (zgodovinskih) konceptualnih izvorov in sodobnejših praktičnih zasnov trajnostnega urbanizma. Pri tem preinterpretira splošnejše prepričanje Immanuela Wallersteina, da so trajnostne (urbane) utopistike močno vezane na socialistične ideje distributivne enakosti. Utopistike namreč odpirajo prostor realnim možnostim, ki bi lahko nadomestile obstoječo, vendar dolgoročno nevzdržno prevlado globalnega kapitalističnega reda. Avtor v osrednjem delu besedila na osnovi sodobnega nabora indikatorjev trajnostnega urbanizma v trajnostnih sooseskah preverja hipotezo o idejni pionirski vlogi utopičnih socialistov. Ob upoštevanju zgodovinskega konteksta ugotavlja močno povezanost med bistvom današnjega razumevanja trajnostnega urbanizma in več kot dvesto let starimi vizijami utopističnih socialistov. Pri tem izpostavi statične sestavine njihovih idejnih zasnov, zlasti elementov prostorskega

determinizma v obliki tradicionalne lokalne avtarkije in nizke stopnje avtonomije posameznika, ki bi bile za sodobne razmere družbenoprostorske dinamike neuresničljive in zato tudi netrajnostne.

Osrednja tematika prispevka Klemna Ploštajnerja in Marka Hočevarja se nanaša na marksistično kritiko inherentne nestabilnosti fizičnega prostora v kapitalizmu. Družbena, prostorska, okoljska in ekonomska trajnost naj zagotavlja, da zadovoljevanje sedanjih potreb ne ogrozi zmožnosti prihodnjih generacij pri zadovoljevanju njihovih potreb. Ker kapitalizem usmerjajo nikoli razrešena notranja protislovja, mora ta s »prostorskim krpanjem« nenehno začasno premeščati krizne tendence kapitala. Negotovo bivanje, nestabilnosti rabe in materialnosti prostora ter stalni procesi razlaščenja onemogočajo oblikovanje stabilnih družbenih odnosov podpore in solidarnosti. Nestabilnost fizičnega, simbolnega in družbenega prostora posledično onemogoča organizacijo prilagajanja okoljskim spremembam in njihove ublažitve.

Samo Pavlin dilemo fluidnosti in trajnostnosti tematizira na primeru visokošolskega izobraževanja. Visokošolski sistemi, kot jih poznamo v zahodnem svetu, so skozi zgodovino oblikovali trdno, trajno strukturo institucij in načel delovanja, ki pa v zadnjih desetletjih postajajo naraščajoča tarča pritiskov javnosti in zaposlovalcev po bolj in konstantno prilagodljivem ter odzivnem kurikulumu. Družbena fluidnost se v tem smislu kaže na ravni visokošolskega sistema samega, trga dela, delodajalskih organizacij, profesij in na ravni posameznika. V tem smislu visokošolski sistem težko ohranja svojo vlogo tradicionalnega generatorja trajnejših poklicnih standardov, kritičnega razmišljanja ter artikulacije razumevanja družbenih in profesionalnih standardov. Avtor sklepa, da bo zaradi trenja med fluidnostjo zaposlitev in narave dela ter do sedaj trajnostno zasnovanim izobraževanjem v prihodnje večjo pozornost treba nameniti razumevanju dialektike med informacijsko-procesnim in situacijskim učenjem pri razvoju kompetenc v zgodnji zaposlitveni karieri. To je povezano s spreminjanjem tradicionalnega poslanstva visokošolskih sistemov. Pri tem je še posebej pomembno upoštevati odnos med telesom, prostorom, učnimi objekti in prostori ter učno tehnologijo.

Zadnji prispevek, avtoric Simone Zavratnik in Sanje Cukut Krilić, obravnava fluidno naravo sodobnih čeznacionalnih begunskih tokov. Avtorici izhajata iz ambivalentnosti digitalnega sveta, ki za begunce ne pomeni le opolnomočenje, temveč istočasno tveganje popolnega systemskega nadzora njihovih teles v obliki »digitalnih odtisov« s poti in njihovega življenja nasploh. Osredotočata se zlasti na vlogo sodobnih tehnologij v obliki pametnih telefonov, ki beguncem oz. migrantom omogočajo hipno informiranje o poteh in hitro odzivanje na institucionalne ovire na željenih destinacijah, obenem pa naprava z beleženjem njihovih aktivnosti ogroža njihov status. Pametni telefon je ključni označevalec

sodobnega begunca, njegova posest pa je v prispevku problematizirana skozi vladne politike legitimiziranja in tradicionalne percepcije o »pravem beguncu« s strani javnosti. Avtorici zastavita vprašanje neobstoja digitalnih pravic beguncev. Zagovarjata tezo, da fluidna, nestanovitna narava sodobnih migracij, ki se bo po vsej verjetnosti po intenzivnosti in obsegu še stopnjevala, zahteva trajnejšo zakonsko ureditev digitalne (ne)sledljivosti migrantov, ki bi bila primerljiva s siceršnjimi pravicami državljanov na področju digitalnih svoboščin.

Podatki o avtorju

izr. prof. dr. Marjan Hočevar, visokošolski učitelj
Katedra za analitsko sociologijo
Center za prostorsko sociologijo
Fakulteta za družbene vede, Kardeljeva ploščad 5, 1000 Ljubljana
Email: marjan.hocevar@fdv.uni-lj.si

Marjan Hočevar

THE ISSUES OF SPATIALLY ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY IN THE CONDITIONS OF INCREASINGLY FLUID SOCIAL RELATIONS

The impact the reduction of spatial obstacles has on changing the territorial organisation of societies has been a regular feature in sociological theoretical reflections and research from the 1980s onwards. In the long term, the dynamization and flexibilization of the spatial and temporal rhythms in people's everyday life lead to changes in the organisation and structure of societies. Anthony Giddens attributed to the »stretching of social systems in time and space« a key role in explaining structure and agency in high modern societies (with his *structuration* concept).¹ The »spatial turn« in sociology, which followed Giddens' explicit emphasis on the elements of space and time in explaining social changes in modern societies, coincided with the first, affirmative as well critical, discussions about networks, globalisation, and the telecommunications and information revolution (Castells 1989, 1996; Harvey 1991; Mlinar 1992). In the late 1990s an (expected) millennial boom of research into spatial mobility followed, as well as discussions about the »end of territorial societies« (Urry 2000, 2006; Kaufmann 2004).

The same period also saw a marked increase of studies by non-spatial generalist sociologists, which more or less permanently marked the study of new, late (or high) modernity, especially the radical and intensive nature of social change. A constant repertoire of keywords (»buzzwords«) with a temporal and spatial connotation, e.g. inconstancy, unsettledness, nomadism, instability, precarity, temporariness, occasionalness, multiple domiciles, ubiquitousness, has brought these authors and their works high citation counts. By introducing the syntagma of »fluid modernity«, Zygmunt Bauman perhaps most strikingly described the increasing fluidity of social relations, and the role of the erratic individual in them.

1. Giddens' *The constitution of Society; Outline of the theory of Structuration* (1984) is considered one of the last and most influential synthetic sociological works of the so-called »Grand theory« in sociology, regardless of the numerous criticisms about theoretical eclecticism.

It is a kind of chaotic continuation of modernity, where a person can shift from one social position to another in a fluid manner. Nomadism becomes a general trait of the 'liquid modern' man as he flows through his own life like a tourist, changing places, jobs, spouses, values and sometimes more—such as political or sexual orientation—excluding himself from traditional networks of support, while also freeing himself from the restrictions or requirements those networks impose. (Bauman 2000: 8).

However, implicit questioning of the relationship between spatial and social nearness,² as well as seeking for an ideal relationship between them, is as old as sociology itself. In the late 19th century, binary metaphors of the transition from mechanical to organic solidarity, and from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft* (community to society), anticipated the spatial consequences for both the labour division and the ways people associate and emancipate themselves. For the benefit of people's greater (personal) freedom, their (social) security is reduced. In the towns the spatial and social nearness are inversely proportional, while they are directly proportional in the countryside. The industrial urbanisation thus still provided a solid and manageable analytical instrumentation for studying standard as well as longer lasting patterns of change in culture (e.g. »urban personalities«) and structure (e.g. inequality).

The present processes of post-industrial globalisation, informatisation, virtualisation, and ubiquitous accessibility relativise, but at the same time also obscure the binary logic of explaining the social consequences of spatial nearness and distance. The attributes of physical space, e.g. the urban or rural space, increasingly fail to explain production and consumption modes, cultural differences, or even structural inequalities. The complementary nature of the physical space and virtuality, i.e. the accessibility of physical spaces and inclusiveness of virtual flows, reduce spatial determinism and increase social fluidity. If we view fluidity positively, in a context of increased accessibility thanks to the reduction of spatial obstacles and by accelerating a dynamic interweaving of social and spatial mobility, then for the first time in the history of human associations (and the emancipation of the individual) this phenomenon may offer a solution for the dilemma of nearness and distance. But if we view fluidity critically, in a context

2. The classical »great theoreticians« like Durkheim, Weber or Marx largely treated physical space as a »dependent variable« in the social processes. An exception was Georg Simmel, who at the heart of his questioning placed the element of »spatial metrics«, something that was considered sociologically marginal or even trivial at the time. Among the forerunners of the »spatial mobility turn« in sociology we may count Pitrim Sorokin and his conceptual linking of social (vertical) and spatial (horizontal) mobility (1927). See more about the spatial and mobility turn in sociology in Hočevar (2017).

of »hypermobility« or a »dictate of mobility«, i.e. constant changes due to the continuity of the physical space, the relative durability and the discontinuity of localized (community) social ties, then the picture is no longer progressive. At several levels and in different contexts, dilemmas concerning the limits of spatial dynamism and the basic conditions of sustainable social integration will emerge. In this volume the authors reflect on the relationship between dynamism and continuity from the viewpoint of thematic perspectives of spatial fragmentation, urbanism, spatial production, spatial planning, migrations, and education.

Seemingly, these dilemmas take us back to the classical sociological lamentations about the nature of the community and localness, but we introduce an element of self-restriction in the discourse, confronted with the otherwise global, infinite mobility in choosing a lifestyle.³ The discussions on the static or dynamic nature of social (community, communal) organisation and operation in physical space have thus become topical again, but the solutions »on offer« are contradictory. However, the classical sociological dilemma was distinctly anthropocentric and referred only to the temporal and spatial typology of social organisation in space, without considering the environment's limitations, and even with assuming man's total control over nature. Although discussions about the relationship between nature and culture are far from new,⁴ there are surprisingly few intradisciplinary connections between spatial (urban, rural) and environmental sociologists,⁵ but quite more connections between the disciplines, and in transdisciplinary environmental studies. Obviously, the contemporary comprehensive dilemma of spatial, environmental, and temporal organisation of society exceeds the explanatory capabilities provided by the classical sociological perspective. However, as John Urry mentions roguishly, sociology is in its essence a synthetic and »parasite« science, and hope comes from a »sociology beyond societies«. In the future, this sociology may dig into the natural environment and it draws its ideas about solving sustainability, including the dilemma of the sustainable organisation of societies in time and space, from other, more reductionist natural sciences.

Sociology seeks understanding of the nature of our social life, how social connections face-to-face and at a distance are contingently enabled and performed. And it does this through scavenging from insights and

-
3. Assuming, of course, that we possess the ability of physical mobility (no handicaps), and without questioning in any way the issues of inequality in choosing a lifestyle.
 4. Think of the economic discussions of the Roman Club about the limits of growth in the early 1970s (Meadows et al. 1972).
 5. See more about the connective »agenda« in sociology and sociology with the natural sciences in: G. Walker (2005) and in R. Lidskog et al. (2015).

approaches thrown up/out elsewhere especially revealing the material worlds which social life both depends upon and iteratively reproduces. (Urry 2005: 19).

In the present special section of the third volume of *Družboslovne razprave*, the authors analyse the contradictory processes of sustainability (continuity) and fluidity (changes) in the social and spatial context from different conceptual and thematic viewpoints.

In the first article, Drago Kos uses Braudel's »principles of the new history«, which treat long-term social transformations with a selective analysis of chosen spatial and temporal fragments, to re-examine the social consequences of the erosion of spatial determinism. Globalisation does away with spatial obstacles and brings to the forefront the locally specific and politically systemic features of places. Due to the globalisation shrinkage places must compete with others, located in once remote areas of the world. Although the effects of opening up are positive for the people and the environment (e.g. investment, tourism), they are usually short-lived as the logic of fluid competitiveness soon confers the leading position to another place or area. Using among others illustrative examples from Slovenia, the author warns that the discussions on the spatial effects of post-modern flexibilization must be aimed at enabling us to discern between the potential emancipatory and long-term effects of the global opening up of spaces, and the dangerous traditionalist regressions that may threaten the project.

Matjaž Uršič's article draws attention to the concept of fluid spatial planning, which is a necessary mechanism to ensure continuous multi-directional exchange and adequate analyses, processing and use of the information exchanged between the different stakeholders in a contemporary process of spatial development. Because this is a distinctly communicatively open and participation supported process, with numerous, heterogeneous stakeholders from different environments and with different interests, the approach may cause a deviation from establishing sustainable spatial development policies. In the author's opinion, the idea of fluidity in spatial planning is akin to the concept of »dialectical utopianism«, one of the rare options to successfully manage the instabilities arising from the effects of globalisation and the flexible accumulation of capital. The essence of dialectical utopianism lies in renouncing exactly determined utopian goals in planning, and in the transition to utopianism, which is considered to be a process, not a final, materialised spatial form.

Primož Medved encounters utopian visions in dealing with the (historical) conceptual origins and contemporary practical concepts of sustainable urbanism. Here, he reinterprets Immanuel Wallerstein's general belief that sustainable (urban) utopias are strongly connected with socialist ideas of distribution equality.

Utopias indeed open a space for real options, which may replace the existing supremacy of the global capitalist order that is unsustainable in the long term. Based on a contemporary selection of indicators of sustainable urbanism in sustainable neighbourhoods, the core of the article is dedicated to verifying the hypothesis about the ideological pioneer role of the Utopian Socialists. While considering the historical context, Medved finds a strong connection between the essence of today's understanding of sustainable urbanism and the over two hundred years old visions of utopian socialists. He points out the static elements of their ideological concepts, especially the elements of spatial determinism in the form of traditional local autarchy, and the low levels of the individual's autonomy, which are unfeasible and therefore non-sustainable in the contemporary conditions of social and spatial dynamism.

The central theme of the article by Klemen Ploštajner and Marko Hočevar deals with Marxist criticism of the inherent instability of physical space in capitalism. Social, spatial, environmental, and economic sustainability is to ensure that satisfying our present needs does not threaten the ability of future generations to satisfy their own needs. Since capitalism is driven by never resolved inner contradictions, it must continuously resort to »spatial patching« in order to temporarily bridge capital's crisis-tendencies. Insecure living, the instability of the use and materiality of space, and the continuous processes of expropriation prevent the formation of stable social relations, support, and solidarity. The instability of the physical, symbolic, and social space consequently prevents people from organising their adaptation to environmental change and its alleviation.

Samo Pavlin discusses fluidity and sustainability with the example of higher education. In the course of history, the higher education systems, as we know them in the western world, have established a firm and permanent structure of institutions and principles of operation, but in recent decades these have become the target of pressures from the public and employers for a more and constantly adaptable and responsive curriculum. In this sense, social fluidity shows at the level of the higher education system itself, the labour market, employer organisations, professions, and at the level of the individual. In this sense, the higher education system finds it hard to preserve its traditional role of generator of durable professional standards, critical thinking, and the articulation of understanding social and professional standards. Pavlin comes to the conclusion that due to the tensions between the fluidity of employment, the nature of the job and the until now sustainably conceived education, greater attention will have to be paid in the future to understanding the dialectics between information processing and situation learning in the development of competences in the individual's early employment career. This relates to the changing traditional mission of the higher

education system. What is particularly important is to take account of the relations between the body, space, teaching objects and places, and teaching technology.

The final article by Simona Zavratnik and Sanja Cukut Krilić deals with the fluid nature of contemporary transnational refugee flows. The authors start from the ambivalence of the digital world, which for the refugees means not only empowerment, but at the same time entails the risk of complete systemic control over their bodies in the form of »digital footprints« from their journey and life in general. The article focuses in particular on the role of modern technologies like smartphones, which provide the refugees and migrants with instant information about routes and quick responses to institutional obstacles at the desired destinations, but at the same time the device registers their activities and endangers their status. The smartphone is the key marker of the contemporary refugee, its possession is questioned in the article through government policies of legitimizing, and the public's traditional perceptions of what a »real refugee« is. The authors question the non-existence of digital rights for refugees. They advance the thesis that the fluid, instable nature of contemporary migrations, which will most likely continue to intensify and expand, requires a more permanent legal system for the digital (non-) traceability of migrants, which would be comparable to the existing rights of citizens in the field of digital liberties.

Information about the author

izr. prof. dr. Marjan Hočevar, Associate Professor
Chair of Theoretical Sociology
Centre for Spatial Sociology
Fakulteta za družbene vede, Kardeljeva ploščad 5, 1000 Ljubljana
Email: marjan.hocevar@fdv.uni-lj.si