

# Women Philosophers in Communist Socialism: The Case of Croatian Women Philosophers in Years 1945-1989

---

**Boršić, Luka; Skuhala Karasman, Ivana**

*Source / Izvornik:* **European Journal of Analytic Philosophy, 2023, 19, S3 - 32**

**Journal article, Published version**

**Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)**

<https://doi.org/10.31820/ejap.19.1.2>

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:261:091714>

*Rights / Prava:* [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2025-01-23**



*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[Repository of the Institute of Philosophy](#)



## WOMEN PHILOSOPHERS IN COMMUNIST SOCIALISM: THE CASE OF CROATIAN WOMEN PHILOSOPHERS IN YEARS 1945–1989

Luka Boršić<sup>1</sup> and Ivana Skuhala Karasman<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Philosophy, Zagreb

Original scientific paper - Received: 14/04/2022 Accepted: 05/9/2022

### **ABSTRACT**

*The text presents an analysis of the situation with women philosophers in Croatia during the communist socialist period (1945 – 1989). The analysis is concentrated on two aspects: receiving doctorate degrees in philosophy and publications. Our analysis shows that during that period, women philosophers were proportionally approximately on the level of today's women philosophers in western countries, including present-day Republic of Croatia by both criteria, i.e. the number of doctors of philosophy and the number of publications. Communist socialism was beneficial for women philosophers in two ways. First, administratively, it removed obstacles from women's employment at universities and scientific institutes. Second, communism and socialism, being themselves philosophical and socio-philosophical doctrines, offered a set of new topics, investigations, and elaborations for further development. These factors made it possible that in Croatia, which at the time was economically and educationally much less developed than most of today's western countries, proportionally the same number of women philosophers had an academic post as today in the western world (including today's Croatia). We also analysed seven major philosophical journals published at the time and found that between 1945 and 1989, in percentage, 15,4% of the texts were authored by women. The proportion of women authorship is 0,2. This is an impressive number if we think that at that time the proportion*

*of women authorships was higher than in today's JSTOR, bearing in mind the differences in publication procedures then and now.*

**Keywords:** *women philosophers; communism; Croatia; Praxis.*

## 1. Introduction

In our paper “Selfless Women in Capitalism?” (Boršić and Skuhala Karasman 2019) we argued that capitalism was not amicable to women. The essence of the argument is as follows: The first premise is that women are (supposed to be) selfless. According to the second premise, capitalism is based on selfishness. From this it follows that capitalism is not a suitable “habitat” for women. Of course, many objections might be raised, and many counterexamples brought against blunt generalizations as these premises might indicate. However, we hope to have successfully argued that, from a broader perspective, our premises accurately capture the essence of capitalism and the traditional role of women, and therefore, our conclusion is justified.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, one could ask the opposite question: does it imply that communism and socialism were good for women, provided that communism and socialism are understood as the opposite of capitalism?<sup>2</sup> To ask such a question is by no means new. One of the earliest attempts to answer this question was given in an early book by Barbara Wolfe Jancar, *Women under Communism* (Wolfe Jancar 1978). In the book Wolfe Jancar gave a negative answer to the above question: she argued that communism was not particularly successful in emancipating women. In her words:

First, Marxism, as an ideology of economic revolution has provided wanting as a conceptual vehicle for feminism (...). Second, a central issue in female liberation, which to

---

<sup>1</sup> Our argument remains unaffected by the ongoing debate between essentialism and social construct theory. Regardless of whether women are taught to be selfless or have a biological inclination towards it, the conclusion remains unchanged.

<sup>2</sup> Socialism is understood as a broader term than communism: communism is an extreme form of socialism. Moreover, socialism is better understood as an economic system whereas communism as a political system: socialism can exist in a broad spectrum of political systems. In the communist Yugoslavia, especially colloquially, both terms—communism and socialism—were often used interchangeably.

date no country has resolved, is the nature and scope of the family in industrial society (...). Third, while communism has been successful in implementing the feminist demands of the nineteenth century for women's entrance into the productive work force and public life, it has failed to modify the nineteenth-century program to meet twentieth-century conditions and attitude created by such factors as the threat of nuclear war, the pill, and the impact of technology (...). (Wolfe Jancar 1978, 219–220)

However ground-breaking and loaded with information this book was, it has received mostly mixed reviews: it was accused of historical incompetence and blatantly anti-communist bias (Stites 1979), of “facile generalization” (Ruthchild 1981, 102), and sloppy handling the evidence (Shapiro 1981; Papanek 1980).

Since this publication more than forty year ago, there has been a lot of discussion dealing with the question of how communism and/or socialism treated women. One of the most recent and detailed study is “What has Socialism even done for Women?” by Kristen Rhogheh Ghodsee, a University of Pennsylvania based anthropologist and “ethnographer of Eastern Europe”—who has dedicated a significant part of her career to this question—and her former student, Julia Mead (Ghodsee and Mead 2018). Their recent and lengthy publication gives a detailed overview of several aspects of women's position in former communist states. Here we shall quote some relevant conclusions of their research.

Indeed, other surveys conducted across the region before 1989 confirmed the idea that even if their husbands could support them, women wanted to work at least part time. The problem was that in many countries, women were forced to work full time, and women's income was necessary to meet a family's needs. Women were also concentrated in sectors of the economy that weren't paid as well as those dominated by men. Men and women did receive equal wages if they held the same positions, but women were often funnelled into agriculture and light industry or concentrated in white-collar and service professions such as law, medicine, accounting, and teaching. Men went into mining, construction, engineering,

and other physical or technical jobs more highly esteemed in the planned economy. Finally, the state-socialist policy of granting women extended maternity leaves—and the fact that mothers were almost always the ones to stay home when children were too sick to attend school—meant that men were more likely to be promoted into higher managerial and executive positions. Men were only imagined as workers, not parents, but women were always seen as both workers and mothers. (...) Although women were concentrated in less well-paid sectors of the economy, their jobs guaranteed them access to housing, education, health care, paid vacations, kindergartens, and their own independent pension funds. Furthermore, in some countries women could retire five years earlier than men in recognition of women's domestic labors. (Ghodsee and Mead 2018, 115–6)

Although the socialist state never fully eradicated patriarchy in the home, or explicitly dealt with issues of sexual harassment or domestic violence, it did strive to provide (to a greater or lesser extent depending on the era and country) some semblance of social security, economic stability, and work-life balance for its citizens. The radical lesson is that the state intervened and did some good things on behalf of women, things that markedly changed their lives—day cares, abortion, canteens, etc. Feminist activism, the way it looks in the West with painted signs and rallying cries, did not achieve these things. Bureaucrats did.

Few would argue that life under socialism in Eastern Europe was good, generally. Consumer shortages and travel restrictions circumscribed many lives. At various times, in various places, political violence cut lives short and fractured families. And yet, by most every measure, women had a degree of education, economic independence, and legal standing that their Western peers would not have until much later and once won, always seem on the verge of losing. Reviewing the limited successes of the state-socialist past is in no way a call to recreate the failed experiments of the

twentieth-century Eastern European regimes. But we must be able to take stock of their accomplishments for what they were, to learn from them, and to move forward. (Ghodsee and Mead 2018, 131–2)

For those who come from a former communist or socialist country, the conclusions of Ghodsee and Mead ring true with accuracy. Moreover, in several interviews we conducted before writing this text our interlocutors confirmed having had similar experiences as described by Ghodsee and Mead.

However, we believe that asking about “women in communism” is too broad and partially subjective to provide informative answers. To avoid uninformative generalizations, we have decided to focus on a specific and small group of women, namely “women philosophers”. Our aim is to examine the status of women in philosophy during communist and socialist governments.

## **2. A Few Contextual Remarks**

To make our investigation as accurate and precise as possible, we decided to concentrate our research on a limited region. The main reason for doing territorially limited research is that there has never been one single uniform communist socialism. It is certainly true that all communist socialist countries shared some basic communist socialist tenets and doctrines; however, it is also a well-known truism that these countries differed a lot in their application of these basic political and economic tenets. Different countries not only differed among themselves, but they also had diverse kinds of communist socialism in different periods of their own history. Moreover, various levels of political and academic liberty, different burdens of historical heritages, and different social structures have various impacts on the role and appreciation of philosophy in society. Thus, to make research such as ours as precise and informative as possible, it is necessary to focus on a specific region and specific period.

Our focus will be on the Socialist Republic of Croatia (SRC), our native country, in the period between 1945 and 1989. In that period Croatia was

a constitutive part of Yugoslavia, which was organized as a federation of six semi-autonomous “republics”. After the end of World War II both Yugoslavia and Croatia changed their administrative appellatives several times, but after the constitutional reforms of 1963 the official titles were “Socialist Republic of Croatia” and “Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia” (SFRY). Both political entities—Yugoslavia as a conglomerate of six “republics” and Croatia as one of the “republics”—during that period had a continuous, non-democratic, one-party government. The ruling party was the communist party, from 1952 called the “League of Communists” to be distinguished from the Russian “Communist Party”. In the period between 1945 and 1989 the Yugoslav communist regime had several phases, some of the crucial moments being the following: the rapprochement with the Soviet Union in 1948, teetering between the Eastern Block and NATO which resulted in the foundation of the neutral Non-Aligned Movement in 1961, growing nationalistic tensions in the 1970s, the death of the life-long *de facto* dictator of Yugoslavia, Josip Broz Tito, in 1980, and subsequent political and economic crises which resulted in the dissolution of SFRY in 1990s. Without going deep into political and historical intricacies of its very turbulent and complicated history, it should suffice to mention the following moments.

First, although Yugoslav communist government, like all communist governments in post-World War II Europe was one-party system with very limited political freedom, the particular communist government in Yugoslavia was in some respects more liberal and open than the rest of the communist governments in the world. One of the most obvious signs of this more liberal approach was the fact that Yugoslavia was never under the “iron curtain”: at some moments, the Yugoslav passport was one of the most valuable documents in the world because it enabled people to travel both East and West without major restrictions. Further, from the 1950s and after the break from the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia advocated a type of political and economic system called “socialist self-management”. The specific “Yugoslav path” of the socialist self-management was based on the following principle:

The legislation rendered the workers’ collective of a single enterprise a sovereign body, able to debate and vote upon fundamental factory matters through the workers’ council,

elected among its members. The workers' council met once a month and elected a management board—a professional administration, headed by an enterprise director concerned with day-to-day management. To prevent the alienation of the management from the work collective, three-quarters of this board had to consist of manual workers; the members were reelected on a yearly basis and could serve a maximum of two terms in that position. The enterprise director was nominated by the party for a four-year term but had to be approved by the workers' council as well. (Musić 2011, 233–234)

This model of “workers' self-management” was also applied to universities, particularly the University of Zagreb which was the dominant university in the post-war Croatia (Šarić 2020). This means that university faculty and staff was understood as “workers in science”. A beneficial consequence of this approach was that women in academia had equal rights and duties as men. From several interviews we had with our older female colleagues who were faculty members during the communist times we learned that this equality among men and women was not just a dead letter: not only in theory, but also in practice they had equal opportunities to advance in their careers, had equal salaries as their male colleagues, and participated in governing bodies of their institutions— however, in smaller number.

Second, in the SFRY, Croatia, together with Slovenia, was culturally and economically the most developed region. However, this statement should be taken with some caution. Despite fast industrialization, Yugoslavia was still underdeveloped. For instance, in 1978 around 40% of population was employed in “the primary sector of the economy” (industry involved in the extraction and production of raw materials, such as farming, fishing, forestry, and mining, etc.). Moreover, in 1921, in Yugoslavia, around 40% of men and 60% of women were illiterate, while in 1971 around 8% of men but still more than 20% of women were illiterate. This doubtlessly significant progress in general education was success of the Communist regime, of which it took its deserved pride. However, comparatively, the situation in Yugoslavia in the late 1970s corresponded to the economic situation in the US in 1910, in France in 1901, and in Italy in 1951 (Haladin and Štokalo 1978, 135–137).



### 3. Women Philosophers in the Socialist Republic of Croatia

We will explore the position of women philosophers in the Socialist Republic of Croatia from two perspectives. First, we will explore the situation with feminism in the SRC. Second, we will explore the available data about women philosophers in the SRC.

Here, a methodological remark is in order. In the SRC, feminism was initially a practical and activist movement that was built upon the respect women earned during the World War II as anti-fascist fighters. The anti-fascist feminist movement(s) continued fighting for women's better position in society, education, jobs, health care, etc. after the end of the world war. However, from the early 1970s there was an even growing disappointment with the achievements of these organizations. To explain, and perhaps to justify this disappointment, it was necessary to develop a theoretical background. This explains, at least partially, some peculiarities of Croatian feminist theory from the 1970s onwards, understood a philosophical approach rather than political activism: the activist feminism of the 1950s and 1960s received a more theoretical, i.e. philosophical foundation in the 1970s and onwards. As such, it became a topic of special interest for women philosophers, both as a field of research and as an incentive, particularly to women philosophers, to develop their own theories.

#### 3.1. Feminism in the Socialist Republic of Croatia – An Overview

Croatia had the longest history of feminism in the Eastern Europe. The movement for women's emancipation in Croatia started in urban areas around *fin-de-siècle*, and initially it did not have a firm philosophical foundation: it was a straightforward fight for women's basic rights. This fight was primarily concentrated on women's rights to education—since until the end of the twentieth century Croatia had limited political independence and rare and very basic democratic options, political life was of no particular interest.

During World War II women played a significant role in the anti-fascist resistance and in the Partisan movement: after the end of the WWII in 1945, important contributions of women's fighters in the war were

recognized by the main political factors in post-war Yugoslavia (Sklevicky 1984). The inauguration of the main women's organization, the "Anti-Fascist Women's Front" (Antifašistički front žena, AFŽ) in 1942, was welcomed by the speech given by the main Commander of the National Liberation Army and Partisan movement of Yugoslavia, and later life-long ruler of Yugoslavia, Josip Broz Tito in which he gave special praise to women and publicly recognized their contribution to the cause. After the War, the Anti-Fascist Women's Front continued its work under this name till 1953. From 1953 till 1990 the organization was renamed several times (in 1953, 1961, 1975, 1979, and 1985), however it was known under its normative title as the "Conference for the Social Activity of Women in Croatia". Its main activities included not only dealing with social problems (e.g., organizing help for employed mothers, organizing kindergartens and child-care institutions) and health-related issues, but also played a very important role as an important educational institution for women after World War II (Dijanić 2015, 293–302). Even before the fall of communism this organization was recognized as particularly progressive in promoting women's rights outside Yugoslavia, even in Western countries. As an example of this recognition, we will quote the conclusion of the text on the Conference for the Social Activity of Women in Croatia published by the US based *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* from 1983:

In 1974 the CSAW [Conference for the Social Activity of Women] had helped to resolve the debate between economic efficiency and social welfare in the interests of women (...). (...) few women's movements anywhere can boast of having achieved such an ideal, and the road to more broadly based women's organizations in the socialist countries is not now, and will not soon be, an easy one. Meanwhile, using the laws on the books to stimulate other social groups to respond to the needs of women, in the way the CSAW did, may be a plausible strategy. Indeed, this may be going on right now, locally, in socialist societies. It is in the interest of all women, East and West, to know more about it. (Dobos 1983)

Women's active participation in World War II provided them with the highest level of legal equality. Yugoslav constitution of 1946 guaranteed women's equality in matters of employment and payment (art. 24 and 25), political participation (art. 33), education (art. 38) and marriage (art.

26) (Constitution of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia, January 31, 1946). This means that, from the political, i.e., the communist perspective, the general attitude was that the "women's question" was resolved within a broader question, i.e., the question about workers' equality, once and for all. On the other hand, the pre-World War II feminist movements were perceived as "bourgeois" and insufficient: women's fights for rights to vote, equal education, etc. as it was conducted in the pre-World War II non-communist milieu, were described as "anti-men" rather than "anti-class" fights and, thusly, not only limited in their scope but also wrongly directed. Nominally, the communist labour movement demanded equality for women at work and income, the abolition of classes and private property, the fight against economic, social and political inequality of women and freedom for women as well as for men (Dijanić 2015, 184 and 571).

However, from the 1970s, the Yugoslav, including Croatian, feminists argued that the ideals of feminism were only proclaimed and not truly achieved: the real equality between man and women was never fully actualized. Zsófia Lóránd in her book *The Feminist Challenge to the Socialist State in Yugoslavia* from 2018 convincingly showed that the new feminist ideologies in Yugoslavia were born out of disappointment with the promises given by the left (Lóránd 2018).

The position of women philosopher Blaženka Despot is especially noteworthy in this context. Blaženka Despot was the most influential Croatian, and probably Yugoslav feminist woman philosopher of the time. In several publications she argued that the communist regime, despite its proclaimed equality, was built on patriarchal foundations and because of that it was ideologically impossible for a woman to achieve real equality.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Blaženka Despot was born in Zagreb in 1930. Right after her high-school graduation, at 18, she got married, but the marriage soon ended in divorce. In that marriage, her only child, daughter Iris, was born. After the divorce, she worked in a factory, and then as a clerk in various institutions. In addition to her work, she studied philosophy at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb, where she graduated in 1954. She worked as a teacher in Ogulin, and later in Zagreb. At the same time, she taught sociology as an adjunct at the Pedagogical Academy in Karlovac and Zagreb. In 1964 she was elected an assistant professor in sociology at the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture in Zagreb. She received her master's degree at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Ljubljana in 1968, her thesis being Socialism and Technology. At the same faculty, in 1970, she defended her doctoral dissertation *Humanity of Technical Society*. She received a prestigious German scholarship from the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung. In 1974 she was appointed associate professor at the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine University of Zagreb, and in the 1980 she was appointed professor at the same Faculty. In 1977 she founded the Department of Social Sciences at the Faculty of Veterinary

She particularly accused the Yugoslav socialist approach to “women’s question” as being inefficient because it remained blind to particularities of women’s question – the particularities that were obfuscated by the underlying and powerful patriarchal substrate. For example, in her text “Women Issue and Feminism” she wrote (our translation):

Marx’s idea of human emancipation and freedom that transcends political emancipation procured an opportunity to subordinate the “women’s question” to the question of the emancipation of the proletariat. However, with the dictatorship of the proletariat, the real-socialist countries strengthen the state, create statism as a dictatorship of generality over particularities. This generality abruptly abolishes all particularities, starting from the “women’s question” and the laws of the market all the way to democracy as civic heritage. Not recognizing patriarchy as the autonomous basis of the “women’s question”, women remain below the level of emancipation of their own class of proletarians before the abstract generality of the instrument of freedom—the dictatorship of the proletariat. (Despot 2004, 186)

Despot also argued that the Yugoslav socialist system did not allow women to truly participate in “workers’ self-management” because they did not have time to do so due to the unpaid domestic work. They had to take care of children and manage the household in their private time which made that job invisible. In communism, women often worked double: first at their jobs outside home and then, traditionally, at home. They did twice as much work, were paid for only one, and had no time for any social or political engagement. So, in principle everything was allowed, however, in practice little was possible: this is also reflected in the fact

---

Medicine in Zagreb. In 1989 she started working at the Institute of Social Research in Zagreb in the Education and Youth Research Center where she remained until her retirement in 1993. She died in Zagreb in 2001.

In 1971 she published her first book, *Humanity of Technical Society*. The period between 1975 and 1980 was the most fruitful period of her career. In 1976 her book *Plädoyer for Leisure* was published. In those years she published numerous articles, discussions, and translations. The books *Women’s Issues and Socialist Self-Government* and *Emancipation and New Social Movements* have been published in 1987. For our topic, it is important to mention her lecture “Die Möglichkeit der Begründung des marxistischen Feminismus”, which she gave in Ludwigsburg. She was an active member of the group *Women and Society*, very engaged in feminist debates. Her last book, *‘New Age’ and Modern*, was published in 1995. Blaženka Despot has always been a vigorous but not uncritical promotor of Marxist feminism (Bosanac 2008; Despot 2004).

that throughout Yugoslav's history there were only a few women at higher political posts (e.g., Savka Dabčević-Kučar, Milka Planinc, Anka Berus, Latinka Perović). Blaženka Despot wrote about this unfavourable situation of women in Yugoslavia (our translation):

The patriarchal and traditional society of Yugoslav people retains in its spirit all these [patriarchal] relations even after they had already been legally and even de facto overcome. This retention is especially evident in relation to the “nature of women”. Women’s position in their abstract naturalness, independent of the “history of industry and exchange” is also visible in the low participation of women in politics, self-managed bodies, science, and creativity. The production of “economic varieties”, from “warehouse workers to architects” has left women mostly as “warehouse workers”. The condition for getting out of this situation is regaining free time, which economically independent women have less not only than men, but also than women economically dependent on their husbands. Women are particularly interested in science, technology that realizes “human history as the true natural history of man,” the principles of the “mind,” “happiness,” and solutions that lead to a “complete reconstitution of humanity.” (Despot 2004, 171)

To a certain degree, Croatian women felt betrayed, the initial promises of uncompromised equality were not kept. Expectedly, the communist government opposed those voices, as well as, more generally, denied the dominant “patriarchal consciousness” as an integrative part of the socialist system. To strengthen their position, the Yugoslav Constitution of 1974 restated and re-guaranteed equality for women in every aspect of work and life (art. 154, 160, 165). Moreover, art. 162 guaranteed special protection of the work post and work conditions for women, youth, and people with disabilities (The Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia). However, the everyday practice was too burdened and shaped by deeply rooted traditionalist patriarchy: although there were some improvements, women generally felt that advancing in business, politics, science, and academic work was harder than for men. However, we should not forget that women in the SFRY were guaranteed some rights that women in Western Europe had yet to fight for some time.

Here we should mention a philosophically tangentially relevant phenomenon of Yugoslav feminism: the magazine *Start*. From 1969, the controversial biweekly magazine *Start* was published. It began as a Yugoslav imitation of *Playboy*: it was (in)famous for photos of half-naked and naked women. In 1973 *Start* became more political. And what might be unthinkable today, several prominent Yugoslav feminists wrote for *Start*: Vesna Kesić, Slavenka Drakulić, Jasenka Kodrnja, Bojana Pejić, Žarana Papić and Maja Miles, covering mostly feminist topics. The magazine also published interviews with Western feminists such as Simone de Beauvoir, the American writer Erica Jong, the French philosopher Élisabeth Badinter, sex educator and feminist Shere Hite, and the American feminist journalist Gloria Stein. Besides keeping its pornographic and semi-pornography *imaginarium*, the magazine regularly published texts promoting women's health, information about gynaecological issues, assisted reproduction, childbirth, abortion, etc. The last issue came out in 1991. However bizarre from today's perspective a feminist collaboration with the magazine *Start* may look, from the perspective of the time, the magazine's relative financial independence offered some intellectual liberty otherwise unavailable in other state-controlled publications. Moreover, it opened a visual and verbal space for discussing pornography in a variety of ways (Lóránd 2018, 158–161).

### **3.2. Data About Women Philosophers in the Socialist Republic of Croatia**

Only in 1901 were women first admitted as full-time students to a university in Croatia (Luetić, *Prve studentice Mudroslovnog fakulteta kr. Sveučilišta Franje Josipa I. u Zagrebu* 2002). On the one hand it looks late, however, if we think about the circumstance, it is within the decade in which the University of Vienna awarded the first doctoral degree to a woman. In the second half of the 19th century, high schools for women started opening their doors only in some of the more developed parts of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, of which Croatia was a part. Initially, the schools were private institutions that ran within women's societies, such as "Wiener Frauenerwerbsverein" ("Viennese Association for Providing Job for Women"), founded in 1866 (Frauenerwerbverein, Wien). Universities were more persistent in obstructing women to enter their doors. The closest university that allowed women to study as regular students and obtain

doctoral degrees in Central Europe was the University of Zurich: the first female doctoral student was admitted in 1866 (History of the University of Zurich n.d.). The University of Vienna admitted women quite late: only in 1897 the first doctorate was awarded to a woman.

In Croatia, until the end of the 19th century, many women were either completely uneducated or severely under-educated. Only about 55% of women attended the “obligatory” four-year basic elementary education and only about 1% of women continued their education in a public school (“Volksschule”) (Ograjšek Gorenjak 2006). In 1892 the first high school, a “gymnasium” for women was opened in Zagreb. Women were for the first time admitted to the University of Zagreb as “guest/extramural students” without the right to get a doctoral degree in 1895 and only in 1901 women were admitted as full-time students. However, within a few years before the start of World War I, the total number of female students surpassed 10% of the total student body (Luetić 2006). Most of the female students came from middle- and upper-class families, who were economically independent and often did not calculate their odds about future academic careers. If they wanted to get a job after graduation, they were usually employed as high-school teachers. In this context it is understandable that most of the women who fought for women’s emancipation were concentrated on promoting education: Natalie Wicherhauser, Marija Jambrišak, Jagoda Truhelka, Camilla Lucerna, Štefa Iskra, Milka Pogačić to name some of the most famous Croatian women intellectuals of the time who participated in founding the “Lyceum for Women” in Zagreb and later taught at it.

Between two World Wars only four women obtained a doctorate in philosophy: Elza Kučera (1883–1972, obtained her PhD degree from the University of Zurich in 1909), Ivana Rossi (1892–1963, obtained her PhD degree from the University of Zagreb in 1916), Marija Brida (1912–1993, obtained her PhD degree from the University of Zagreb in 1937), and Elly Ebenspanger (1904–1942 obtained her PhD degree from the University of Zagreb in 1939). Elza Kučera spent her life working as a librarian, Ivana Rossi was a high school teacher, and Elly Ebenspanger was killed in the Auschwitz camp due to her Jewish heritage. None of these women, with the exception of Marija Brida, had an academic career.

#### 4. Doctoral Degrees in Philosophy in the Socialist Republic of Croatia 1945-1989

After World War II there was a significantly bigger influx of students into institutions of higher education. This was also the case with philosophy students. According to available evidence from various almanacs and encyclopaedias, we compiled a list of all doctoral titles awarded in the period 1945-1989 in philosophy.<sup>4</sup> In that period, only two universities issued PhD degrees: the University of Zagreb and the University of Zadar (translation of all the doctoral titles is ours):

name	PhD year	thesis title	institution <sup>5</sup>
<b>men</b>			
<b>Rudolf Supek</b>	1952	The phenomenology of the pathological forms of imagination	PhF
<b>Branko Bošnjak</b>	1956	History of philosophy as a discipline. The problem of methodology and its subject	PhF
<b>Gajo Petrović</b>	1956	The philosophy of Plehanov (the place of G. V. Plehanov in the history of philosophy)	PhF
<b>*Vuko Pavičević</b>	1957	The relationship of value and reality in modern German idealistic axiology	PhF
<b>Ivan Focht</b>	1958	Hegel's doctrine on the death of art	PhF
<b>Danilo Pejović</b>	1958	The foundations of Nicolai Hartmann's ontology	PhF
<b>Vanja Sutlić</b>	1958	The essence and alienation of man in Marx's and existentialist philosophy	PhF
<b>Ivan Kuvačić</b>	1960	The philosophy of Edward George Moore	PhF
<b>Milan Kangrga</b>	1961	The ethical problem in Karl Marx. The critique of moral consciousness	PhF
<b>Čedomil Veljačić</b>	1962	A comparative investigation of Indian and European philosophy. Antiquity.	PhF
<b>Davor Rodin</b>	1964	Dialectics in Hegel and Marx	PhF
<b>*Miroslav Krešić</b>	1965	Idola Fori: negative influence of language on thought	PhF
<b>Franjo Zenko</b>	1965	The personalism of Emmanuel Mounier	UZD
<b>*Miodrag Cekić</b>	1966	The role of subject in epistemology of the classical and modern German philosophy	PhF

<sup>4</sup> The main sources we used are eight books entitled Bibliography of doctoral dissertations of the University of Zagreb published between 1976 and 1991 as well as various encyclopaedic and online sources. We compared our results with Tomislav Bracanović's analysis (Bracanović 2003). In four cases there are discrepancies between our and Bracanović's results.

<sup>5</sup> Abbreviations are the following: PhF – Faculty of Philosophy and Social Sciences of the University of Zagreb; FPS: Faculty of political science of the University of Zagreb, UZD – University of Zadar.



<b>Ivan Babić</b>	1966	The socio-political philosophy of John Dewey and its influence on political science in the USA	FPS
<b>*Tine Hribar</b>	1969	The concept of time in Marx	FPS
<b>Danko Grlić</b>	1969	The fundamental idea of Friedrich Nietzsche	PhF
<b>*Rasim Muminović</b>	1970	The philosophy of Ernst Bloch. The gnoseological and ontological foundations	PhF
<b>*Ivan Urbančič</b>	1970	The ontological concept of the system of production and needs in Marx's philosophy or Marx's metaphysics	FPS
<b>*Vladan Švacov</b>	1971	The possibility of the interpretation of dramatic expression based on existentialist ontology	PhF
<b>Eduard Kale</b>	1972	The problem of labor division in the social theory of Karl Marx: a methodological approach	FPS
<b>Ivan Prpić</b>	1972	Critique of the concept of state in Karl Marx's theory till 1845	FPS
<b>*Borislav Gojković</b>	1974	Merleau-Ponty or the measure of ambiguous existence: the relationship between the thought and non-thinking	PhF
<b>Božidar Gajo Sekulić</b>	1974	Philosophy and proletariat in Karl Marx's works	PhF
<b>Hotmir Burger</b>	1975	The problem of science in Marx's works	PhF
<b>Marijan Cipra</b>	1975	Metamorphoses of metaphysics: spiritual and scientific concept of the history of philosophy	PhF
<b>Branko Despot</b>	1975	The philosophy of Vladimir Dvorniković	PhF
<b>Zvonko Posavec</b>	1975	The historical origin of dialectics: a study on development of dialectics in Plato's <i>Republic</i> and <i>Parmenides</i>	FPS
<b>Josip Marinković</b>	1976	The educational role of philosophy courses in high schools	PhF
<b>*Dimitar Dimitrov</b>	1976	The paradox of the theory of activist art	PhF
<b>Vjekoslav Mikecin</b>	1979	The foundations of antinomies in modern Marxist thought	PhF
<b>Boris Kalin</b>	1980	Lectures in logic in high school: the role of logic in forming critical thinking	PhF
<b>Dimitrije Savić</b>	1980	The critique of philosophy in Karl Marx	FPS
<b>Petar Tepić</b>	1981	The historical meaning of the critique of religion in Marx and Nietzsche	FPS
<b>Damir Barbarić</b>	1982	Plato's <i>Laws</i> as philosophical foundation of politics	FPS
<b>Neven Sesardić</b>	1982	Physicalism	PhF
<b>Lino Veljak</b>	1982	The philosophy of praxis of Antonio Gramsci	PhF
<b>Gvozden Flego</b>	1983	Fromm's and Marcuse's understanding of alienation	PhF

<b>*Muhamedin Kullashi</b>	1983	Lefebre's contribution to Marxist philosophy	PhF
<b>*Milenko Perović</b>	1984	Value systems and moral consciousness of the petit bourgeois	PhF
<b>*Miroslav Prokopijević</b>	1984	Understanding and rationality: theory of language and action as a part of critical theory of society by Jürgen Habermas	PFS
<b>Veselin Golubović</b>	1985	Yugoslav philosophy from dogmatic to creative Marxism: the critique of Stalinism 1950–1960	PhF
<b>Žarko Puhovski</b>	1985	The political philosophy of Frankfurt school from 1932–1945	PhF
<b>*Milan Uzelac</b>	1985	The philosophy of play of Eugen Fink	
<b>Antun Vujić</b>	1985	The problem of foundations of science in Karl Popper's philosophy	PhF
<b>Ozren Žunec</b>	1985	The Ancient Greek theory of <i>mimesis</i> and its contemporary significance	PhF
<b>Milan Galović</b>	1986	Scheler's phenomenological analysis of social Being	FPS
<b>Goran Švob</b>	1988	Frege's conceptual alphabet and the foundations of modern logic	PhF
<b>Zvonko Šundov</b>	1988	The historical thought of Lukacs's <i>History and class consciousness</i>	PhF
<b>Ante Čović</b>	1989	The problem of World in Marx's initial and early works and its actuality	PhF
<b>women</b>			
<b>Heda Festini</b>	1964	The anthropological problems of the positive existentialism of Nicola Abbagnano	PhF
<b>Gordana Bosanac<sup>6</sup></b>	1967	The essential properties of information and their practical verification in work organization	PhF
<b>Branka Brujić</b>	1974	The critical theory of society by H. Marcuse and the historical thought	PhF
<b>Ljerka Schiffler</b>	1974	Nikola Vitov Gučetić	PhF
<b>Erna Banić-Pajnić</b>	1984	The role and significance of some elements of Hermetic philosophy in works of Croatian renaissance philosophers	PhF
<b>Nadežda Čačnović-Puhovski</b>	1985	The aesthetics of German romanticism	PhF
<b>Mihaela Girardi-Karšulin</b>	1987	The philosophical thought of Frane Petrić	PhF

<sup>6</sup> Gordana Bosanac's doctoral thesis belongs, properly speaking, to the area of "communicology". However, it was a compromise that Bosanac, who was a philosopher by education and vocation, had to

Here, we should also mention several men and women who were active philosophers in the SRC but who did not receive their PhDs from Croatian Universities or received PhDs before 1945 and continued working after the war. These are:

name	PhD year	title of the thesis	institution
<b>men</b>			
<b>Pavao Vuk-Pavlović</b>	1921	Cognition and epistemic theory: a methodological essay with special emphasis on the problem of the obvious	PhF
<b>Vladimir Filipović</b>	1930	The problem of value: historical and systematic critical discussion	PhF
<b>Predrag Vranicki</b>	1951	The problems of the social sciences	University of Belgrade
<b>Ante Pažanin</b>	1962	The problem of philosophy as exact science in Edmund Husserl's phenomenology	University of Köln
<b>Goran Gretić</b>	1975	The problem of absolute knowledge in Hegel's <i>Phenomenology of Spirit</i>	University of Köln
<b>Nenad Mišćević</b>	1981	Theories of communication intention - Austin, Grice, Strawson	University of Ljubljana
<b>Josip Talanga</b>	1985	Judgments about future and <i>fatum</i>	University of Bonn
<b>women</b>			
<b>Marija Brida</b>	1937	Life-experience relationship	PhF
<b>Blaženka Despot</b>	1970	The humanity of technical society	University of Ljubljana
<b>Zlata Knezović</b>	1972	Ethics and existence in Simone de Beauvoir	University of Strasbourg
<b>Rada Iveković</b>	1972	On Buddhist philosophy	University of New Delhi

The asterisk indicates the persons who were never employed at any Croatian scientific institution or university and/or had very few or no contacts with philosophical events in Croatia at the time.

---

make to keep her job in the Department of Sociology of the Institute of Social Management (Maskalan 2021). The majority of Bosanac's publications are more philosophically oriented and thusly, we listed her among philosophers in our list.

The first women philosopher employed at one of the Croatian universities was Marija Brida (1912–1993). She worked from 1961 at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Zadar. Heda Festini (1928–2018) started her teaching career in 1961 at the same university, at the Pedagogical Academy. The first women philosopher employed at the University of Zagreb was Branka Brujić (1931–2020). From 1962 she taught philosophical anthropology and ethics in the newly established Faculty of political science.<sup>7</sup>

Before 1989, there were also other women philosophers who were active in philosophy and/or employed at various faculties of Croatian universities but did not (yet) get their PhD degrees:

- Genoveva Slade: 1978–1990 employed at the Institute of Philosophy, no PhD,
- Azra Šarac: 1967–1969 employed at the Institute of Philosophy, no PhD,
- Dunja Tot: 1970–1976 employed at the Institute of Philosophy, no PhD,
- Ljiljana Filipović: received her PhD from the University of Zagreb in 1995,
- Gordana Škorić: received her PhD from the University of Zagreb in 1998,
- Vanda Božičević: received her PhD from the University of Zagreb in the 1990s.

As a special example, besides Blaženka Despot, about whom we wrote above, it may be worthwhile to mention the case of Zlata Knezović (1934–2016). She graduated with a degree in philosophy and Croatian language and Yugoslav literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb in 1961. In 1975 at the same Faculty, she graduated with a degree in French language and literature. After having received a French scholarship, she went to the Department of Philosophy at the Université des Sciences Humaines in Strasbourg and, in 1972, she received her doctoral degree after defending the thesis *L'éthique de l'existence chez Simone de Beauvoir*. This text is presumably the first monograph written on the philosophy of

---

<sup>7</sup> More details about these women and other Croatian women philosophers can be found at the webpage of our Research Centre for Women in Philosophy ([cizuf.ifzg.hr](http://cizuf.ifzg.hr)).

Simone de Beauvoir in France and outside France. Simone de Beauvoir herself read Knezović's thesis and sent a letter of approval to Knezović. The manuscript of the thesis has never been published. Knezović did not stay in France: she came back to Croatia and spent the rest of her career working at the Croatian Institute of History (formerly the Institute for the History of the Croatian Workers' Movement) in Zagreb until her retirement in 1999. In her later career she published little on feminist topics: just one shorter article on de Beauvoir and two shorter texts on Simone Weil. Most of her publications were dedicated to some aspects of the history of Communism around and after World War II.

Our data show that, in the period from 1945 until 1989, there were 43 men and 11 women, holding PhD degrees, active in philosophy across various Croatian academic institutions. In other words, of 54 active philosophers 26% were women. In these numbers we did not include men and women who hadn't yet obtained their doctoral degrees but were employed at universities as assistants, etc.

## 5. Women's Publications in Croatian Philosophical Journals 1945–1989

Now let's look at a different criterion: journal publications as indication of women's participation in philosophical activities of the time. In the period between 1945 and 1989, in Croatia, there were seven, broadly speaking, academic journals specialized in philosophy (Bracanović 2007).<sup>8</sup> These were:

- *Praxis*, published from 1964 until 1974 with two separate editions: Yugoslav edition and international edition;
- *Bilten za nastavu filozofiju (Bulletin for teaching philosophy)*, published from 1969 until 1976;<sup>9</sup>
- *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine (Contributions in the Research of Croatian Philosophical Heritage)*, published from 1975, ongoing;

<sup>8</sup> Here "academic" primarily means that these journals were published by an academic institution. At the time peer-review process was still rudimentary and consisted, mostly, in editor's reading and commenting on the manuscript.

<sup>9</sup> We have omitted this journal from our analysis because it was more of an informal journal meant to support high-school teachers in their preparation for philosophy and Marxism classes.

- *Marksističko obrazovanje (Marxist education)*, published from 1978 until 1989;
- *Filozofska istraživanja (Philosophical investigations)*, published from 1980, ongoing;
- *Godišnjak za povijest filozofije (Yearbook of the history of philosophy)*, published from 1983 until 1991;
- *Synthesis philosophica*, published from 1986, ongoing.<sup>10</sup>

In the following tables, we list the data about the number of publications sorted by gender distribution.<sup>11</sup> We did not differentiate between “main articles”, “book reviews”, “comments” etc., i.e., each paper is treated equally. There are very few papers which have more than one author, so, in principle, one paper is one author. In rare cases in which there are more than one author, we treated the text as equally shared by each author, e.g., if there were two women authoring the text, then we added the number “2” to our sum.

---

<sup>10</sup> In our analysis we did not include the journal *Naše teme (Our themes)*. This influential journal was first published from 1957 and lasted until 1990. Initially it was subtitled “Young people’s journal of social events”, and later, more seriously, “Journal of social questions”. It was an interdisciplinary journal that included many authors from practically all social sciences and humanities, among them there were also many men and women philosophers. The reason for not including this journal in our analysis is twofold. First, it was published by an office of the “League of Communists of Croatia” and not by an academic institution. Second, we did not find any data about any sort of peer-review process. Thusly, we did not consider it a properly academic journal.

<sup>11</sup> In our research we assumed the sex-gender identity according to first names and personal acquaintance with the authors. We assumed that a person with a female first name and/or whom we personally know as a woman is, by gender, female, and a person with a male first name and/or whom we personally know as a man is, by gender, male. We are not aware that there is a discrepancy between biological sex and gender among the Croatian philosophers whose work was analysed.

*Praxis, Yugoslav edition*

year	issue	F	M
1964.	1–2	0	45
1965.	1–6	10	105
1966.	1–6	10	88
1967.	1–6	10	114
1968.	1–4	3	52
1969.	1–6	6	94
1970.	1–6	12	92
1971.	1–6	12	68
1972.	1–6	5	52
1973.	1–6	18	65
1974.	1–5	2	51

*Praxis, international edition*

year	issue	F	M
1965.	1–4	3	42
1966.	1–4	3	48
1967.	1–4	2	63
1968.	1–4	3	71
1969.	1–4	4	57
1970.	1–4	0	41
1971.	1–4	2	40
1972.	1–4	1	29
1973.	1–4	8	32
1974.	1–2	0	20

*Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske  
filozofske baštine*

year	issue	F	M
1975.	1	3	9
1976.	2	8	9
1977.	3	3	7
1978.	4	5	9
1979.	5	8	13
1980.	6	4	7
1981.	7	3	7
1982.	8	3	8
1983.	9	5	9
1984.	10	7	10
1985.	11	7	8
1986.	12	4	10
1987.	13	4	11
1988.	14	4	14
1989.	15	5	13

*Marksističko obrazovanje*

year	issue	F	M
1978.	1–4	7	29
1979.	1–4	11	31
1980.	1–4	4	27
1981.	1–4	5	12
1982.	1–4	3	24
1983.	1–4	3	29
1984.	1–4	4	21
1985.	1–5	11	18
1986.	1–4	6	20
1987.	1–4	8	36
1988.	1–4	5	22
1989.	1–4	4	21

*Filozofska istraživanja*

year	issue	F	M
1980.	1–2	18	27
1981.	3–5	10	36
1983.	6–7	8	29
1984.	8–11	19	87
1985.	12–15	28	125
1986.	16–19	50	155
1987.	20–23	39	169
1988.	24–27	34	147
1989.	28–33	37	186

*Synthesis Philosophica*

year	issue	F	M
1986.	1–2	1	14
1987.	3–4	5	43
1988.	5–6	7	51
1989.	7–8	8	57

*Godišnjak za povijest filozofije*

year	issue	F	M
1983.	1	0	7
1984.	2	0	11
1985.	3	3	15
1986.	4	0	5
1987.	5	2	9
1988.	6	0	13
1989.	7	1	17

So, if we put the data altogether, we get the following numbers from the six analysed journals:

- In *Praxis*, in both Yugoslav and international edition, there were published 1269 papers authored by men and 114 papers authored by women, i.e., 8% of the papers were authored by women. The proportion of women's authorship is 0,09.
- In *Contributions in the Research of Croatian Philosophical Heritage*, 144 papers authored by men were published and 73 authored by women, i.e., 34% of the papers were authored by women. The proportion of women's authorship is 0,51.
- In *Marxist education*, 290 papers were authored by men and 71 were authored by women, i.e., 20% of the papers were authored by women. The proportion of women's authorship is 0,25.



- In *Philosophical investigations*, 961 papers were authored by men and 243 authored by women, i.e., 20% of the texts were authored by women. The proportion of women's authorship is 0,25.
- In the *Yearbook of the history of philosophy*, 77 papers were authored by men and 6 authored by women, i.e., 7% of the texts were authored by women. The proportion of women's authorship is 0,08.
- In *Synthesis philosophica*, 165 papers were authored by men and 21 authored by women, i.e., 11% of the papers were authored by women. The proportion of women's authorship is 0,13.

In sum, in Croatia, in the period between 1945 and 1989, there were 2906 philosophical papers published by men and 528 published by women. In percentage, this means that 15,4% of the texts were authored by women. The proportion of women authorship is 0,2.<sup>12</sup>

If one investigates the tables more carefully, there is a disproportion among the journals: whereas in *Praxis* the proportion of women authors was low (0,09), in *Contributions in the Research of Croatian Philosophical Heritage* the proportion of women authors was significantly higher (0,51). This can be explained as follows. The journal *Contributions in the Research of Croatian Philosophical Heritage* was published by the Institute of Philosophy. Not long after its foundation in 1967, there have been several women philosophers employed there: Erna Banić-Pajnić (from 1970), Mihaela Girardi Karšulin (from 1971), Ljerka Schiffler-Premec (from 1967), Genoveva Slade (from 1968), Azra Šarac (from 1968), and Dunja Tot-Šubajković (from 1970): women philosophers outnumbered men in the same period 7 to 5! The publication of these women philosophers in the Institute's journal contribute to the high ratio between women and men authors.

The employment of female philosophers at Croatian universities began in the early 1960s. In comparison, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the mathematician Vera Popović Šnajder (1904–1976) became the dean of the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo as early as 1951. In Serbia Ksenija Atanasijević (1894–1981) became the first female university professor

---

<sup>12</sup> We should be noted that at the time journals in the SRC barely had any peer-review process, which most often consisted in the editor-in-chief reading and commenting on submitted texts and then publishing them. Moreover, these journals were much oriented toward the local and regional philosophical community rather than toward scholars around the world.

to be appointed to the Arts Faculty, Department of Philosophy at the University of Belgrade already in 1924. The Slovenian philosophers Alma Sodnik (1896–1965) became a professor of philosophy at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Ljubljana in 1946. Why did Croatian women philosophers lag behind their colleagues in other parts of the SFRY in terms of employment at universities? For the moment, we can guess that the reason may be combination of the notorious absence of women in philosophy in general, and the conservative character of Croatian universities, or Croatian philosophers, in particular. As a contrast, already after World War II women educated in natural sciences did get positions at the University of Zagreb. An example may be medical biochemist Marijana Fišer-Herman (1897–1994) who started working at Faculty of Pharmacy in early 1950s. Although there were no legal obstacles to employing women, the philosophical community in Croatia was obviously slower in letting women into academia than in other parts of the SFRY.

This unfortunate combination is also obvious from the data on journal publications. In that period the most important and influential, as well as internationally recognized journal was *Praxis*. It was a journal dedicated to the special, Yugoslav, interpretation of Marxist philosophy and it was edited by mostly Croatian philosophers of the time. The publisher was the Croatian Philosophical Society and had two editions: Yugoslav and international. The founders of the journal were philosophers Branko Bošnjak, Danko Grlić, Milan Kangrga, Rudi Supek, Gajo Petrović, Predrag Vranicki, Danilo Pejović and Ivan Kuvačić. The first editors were professors from the University of Zagreb Gajo Petrović and Danilo Pejović. Of the 48 members of the editorial board, only two were women: Ágnes Heller from Budapest and Zagorka Pešić-Golubović from Belgrade. The idea behind the journal was to re-establish the creative potential of Marxism that was thought to have been stalled in practice in other communist countries of the time (Supek 1969).

As for feminist topics, *Praxis* did not publish many texts dealing with it: it was taken for granted, as we showed before, that the “women’s question” had been resolved within “workers’ socialist self-management”. We found only two exceptions: the first is Rudi Supek’s review of Vera Stein Erlich’s book *Porodica u transformaciji: studija u 300 jugoslavenskih sela* (*Family in Transformation: A Study in 300 Yugoslav Villages*) published in

1964, and an article by Erna Pajnić on Simone de Beauvoir (“Simone de Beauvoir”) published in 1971. Both texts argued that women’s position in socialism of the day was better than before. These are the only two articles dealing exclusively with the topic of women in modern society.

As for women philosopher writing for *Praxis*, the most prolific was Blaženka Despot who published six longer articles and twenty book reviews. Interestingly, although she was a regular contributor, she neither formally nor informally belonged to the circle around it. In general, women philosophers have published more book reviews than original articles in *Praxis*. We can witness a similar marginalization of women philosophers in the case of the Korčula philosophical Summer School which was a part of the Praxis movement. Once a year the Summer School organized discussions with foreign contemporary philosophers such as Ernst Bloch, Henri Lefebvre, Herbert Marcuse, Jürgen Habermas, Erich Fromm, H. G. Gadamer etc. on current philosophical, political, and social topics. Unsurprisingly, out of 224 participants in the Summer School at Korčula, there were only 9 women: 5 of them from the SFOY (Blaženka Despot, Mirjana Gros (historian), Nadežda Čačinović-Puhovski, Zagorka Pešić-Golubović, Olga Kozomara (sociologist)) and four coming outside the SFRY (Annie Kriegel (France), Ágnes Heller (Hungary), Rose Sommerville (USA), and Sheila Allen (UK)).<sup>13</sup>

However, when looking at the publication numbers, we got the following results: in the period between 1945 and 1989 more than 15% of the texts were authored by women which makes the proportion of women’s authorship slightly less than 0,2. If we take these numbers as comparanda

<sup>13</sup> However, we should mention that there are some testimonials which shed a more favourable light on the *Praxis* philosophers and their relationship with women philosophers. Lóránd writes: “The relationship with the *Praxis* professors was very encouraging for the Zagreb women. Slavenka Drakulić remembers Kuvačić as a ‘wonderful professor’, who gave them books off the official reading lists. Later, they started to get hold of readings on their own: Rađa Iveković went to study in Italy, and ‘Vesna Pusić I think went to the US and she brought us books’. Nadežda Čačinović was also part of the *Čovjek i sistem* group, and she was attending the Korčula summer schools of Praxis and was publishing in the journal too: ‘We were discussing possibilities of change, the economic and legal frameworks of socialism. Rudi Supek and Eugen Pusić were there, and the group held its meetings on the island of Vis’. Praxis therefore had quite some influence on the beginnings of the new feminism in Yugoslavia, even though the relationship was not always as smooth as these accounts suggest. Biljana Kašić, while emphasising the support from Supek and Kuvačić, also added: “the Praxis philosophers did not take feminism seriously, and at the meetings women did not comment much”. Vesna Kesić remembers “a very bad encounter with Mihajlo Marković, who said it is OK that we come and talk about feminism but asked us: “could you please look more feminine”.” (Lóránd 2018, 32)

and look at more recent research on women's publications we get the following results.

Women represent 12% of total single-authored papers in JSTOR prior to 1990 (West et al. 2013). When we move to even more recent time, to the period 2004–2015, in the United States, we get the following data. In all years and for all journals, the percentage of female authors is extremely low, in the range of 14–16%. Moreover, the percentage of women authors is less than the percentage of women faculty in different ranks and at different institutions, which comprise around 22% (Wilhelm, Conklin, and Hassoun 2018).

In a recently published study “The Past 110 Years: Historical Data on the Underrepresentation of Women in Philosophy Journals”, Hassoun et al., on page 716, give the chart in which they show the results of their research. Hassoun et al. took into consideration eighteen philosophy journals and isolated 23204 articles, with 2265 total women authorships (Hassoun et al. 2022, 687). Their research shows that the proportion of women authors in philosophy from 1900 till the early 1960s stays very low—around 0,05. In comparison, in all scientific fields the proportion is twice as much: around 0,1. From the 1960s till the early 1990s women's authorship was on significant rise in all scientific fields including philosophy: in philosophy it rose from 0,05 to approximately 0,18 in comparison to all fields in which it rose from 0,1 to 0,25. However, in the period between 1990 till late 2000 women's authorships in philosophy remained relatively flat, unlike other disciplines during that period which continued rising, reaching almost 0.3 (Hassoun et al. 2022, 716).

Philosophy is doubtlessly one of the academic disciplines in which the gender gap has always been particularly wide. According to the most recent report of the British Philosophical Association about 30% Senior Lecturers, 21% Readers and 25% Professors in the 41 UK philosophy departments are occupied by women in 2021 (Beebee and Saul 2021, 6–7). In Germany only about 15% of higher academic jobs in philosophy in the period of 2005–2016 are taken by women (Herfeld, Müller, and von Allmen forthcoming). In Spain around 12% of philosophy professors and about 25% of faculty are women (Torres González 2020). In Greece women occupy 29% of faculty at various philosophy departments and

faculties (Iliadi, Stelios, and Theologou 2018). In present day Croatia, around 26% of women have tenured positions at philosophy departments in 2022 (Boršić forthcoming). For many countries data are either lacking or hard to find. However, it seems safe to assume that underrepresentation of women in philosophy is typical for most of the world, not only in contemporary Western philosophy.<sup>14</sup> In comparison to these numbers, 26% of women philosophers employed and active in Croatian universities and other scientific institutions from 1945 till 1989 is formidable.

## 6. Conclusion

During the communist socialist period of the SRC, i.e., in the period 1945–1989, women philosophers were proportionally approximately on the level of today’s women philosophers in western countries, including present-day Republic of Croatia—if we are to judge by the number of doctors of philosophy and the number of publications. Communist socialism was beneficial for women philosophers in two ways. First, administratively, it removed obstacles from women’s employment at universities and scientific institutes. To paraphrase Ghodsee’s above quoted words, half a century ago the communist bureaucrats raised women’s participation in institutional employment to the level of today’s employment in capitalism. Second, communism and socialism, being themselves philosophical and socio-philosophical doctrines, offered a set of new topics, investigations, and elaborations for further development. This was especially interesting to women since both doctrines insisted on the equality of labour division across societal strata and sexes—moreover, such studies in communist and socialist themes were heavily supported by the communist government. These factors made it possible that in Croatia, which at the time was economically and educationally much less developed than most of today’s western countries, proportionally the same number of women philosophers had an academic post as today in the western world (including today’s Croatia). As for the number of publications, it is impressive that at that time the proportion of women authorships was higher than in today’s JSTOR, bearing in mind the differences in publication procedures then and now.

---

<sup>14</sup> As for India, Professor Bindu Puri from Jawaharlal Nehru University, in a Youtube interview, declared that women are very underrepresented in Indian universities in general (Puri 2021). A similar conclusion may be drawn from the recent book written by Jana Rošker on Taiwanese and Chinese women philosophers (Rošker 2021).

If we return to the initial question—whether socialist communism was more beneficiary to women than capitalism—our investigation suggests that, in the case of women philosophers, the situation with academic publications and employment in the Socialist Republic of Croatia was significantly better than in the contemporary capitalist countries.

## Acknowledgments

This paper is an outcome of the project “Croatian Women Philosophers in the European Context” financed by the Croatian Science Foundation (HrZZ-UIP-2017-05-1763).

## References

- Beebee, Helen, and Jennifer Saul. 2021. “New BPA / SWIP report: Women In Philosophy in the UK, 2021.” *British Philosophical Association*. 15 November. Accessed November 20, 2021. <https://bpa.ac.uk/2021/11/15/women-in-philosophy-uk-2021-report/>.
- Boršić, Luka. 2022. “Zašto je tako malo žena u filozofiji?” *Filozofska istraživanja*, 42 (3): 503-520. <https://doi.org/10.21464/fi42306>
- Boršić, Luka, and Ivana Skuhala Karasman. 2019. “Selfless women in capitalism?” In *Selflessness in business*, edited by Dominika Ochnik, 115–128. Wilmington: Vernon Press.
- Bosanac, Gordana. 2008. “Mjesto i značenje Blaženka Despot u suvremenoj hrvatskoj filozofiji.” *Filozofska istraživanja*, 625–637.
- Bracanović, Tomislav. 2003. “Doktorske disertacije iz filozofije u Hrvatskoj (1880–1989).” *Prolegomena*, 277–288.
- . 2007. “Filozofski časopisi u Hrvatskoj u 20. stoljeću.” In *Hrvatska filozofija*, edited by Damir Barbarić and Franjo Zenko, 41–60. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska. *Constitution of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia, January 31, 1946*. Accessed May 29, 2022. [http://www.arhivyu.gov.rs/active/en/home/glavna\\_navigacija/leksikon\\_jugoslavije/konstitutivni\\_akti\\_jugoslavije/ustav\\_fnrj.html](http://www.arhivyu.gov.rs/active/en/home/glavna_navigacija/leksikon_jugoslavije/konstitutivni_akti_jugoslavije/ustav_fnrj.html).
- Despot, Blaženka. 2004. *Izabrana djela Blaženke Despot*. Edited by Gordana Bosanac. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu – Ženska infoteka.

- Dijanić, Dijana. 2015. "Društveno-kulturalni aspekti položaja žena: Antifašistička fronta žena (1945.–1953.)." *Doctoral Thesis*. Zagreb: Hrvatski studiji Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:111:071782>.
- Dobos, Manuela. 1983. "The Women's Movement in Yugoslavia: The Case of the Conference for the Social Activity of Women in Croatia, 1965–1974." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 47–55. *Frauenerwerbverien, Wien*. Accessed May 20, 2022. <https://fraueninbewegung.onb.ac.at/node/598>.
- Ghodsee, Kristen R., and Julia Mead. 2018. "What Has Socialism Ever Done for Women?" *Catalyst*, 101–133. <https://catalyst-journal.com/2018/09/what-has-socialism-ever-done-for-women>.
- Haladin, Stjepan, and Vladimir Štokalo. 1978. "Aktualna pitanja socijalno-klasne strukture i slojevitosti jugoslavenskog društva." *Marksističko obrazovanje*, 132–156.
- Hassoun, Nicole, Sherri Conklin, Michael Nekrasov, and Jevin West. 2022. "The Past 110 Years: Historical Data on the Underrepresentation of Women in Philosophy Journals." *Ethics*, 680–729. <https://doi.org/10.1086/718075>.
- Herfeld, Catherine, Jan Müller, and Kathrin von Allmen. forthcoming. "Why Do Women Philosophy Students Drop Out of Philosophy? Some Evidence from the Classroom at the Bachelor's Level." *Ergo, an Open Access Journal of Philosophy*. Accessed 11 20, 2021. <https://catherineherfeld.weebly.com/>. *History of the University of Zurich*. Accessed May 30, 2022. <https://www.uzh.ch/cmsssl/en/about/portrait/history.html>.
- Iliadi, Simoni, Spyridon Stelios, and Kostas Theologou. 2018. "Is the Lack of Women in Philosophy a Universal Phenomenon? Exploring Women's Representation in Greek Departments of Philosophy." *Hypatia*, 700–716.
- Lóránd, Zsófia. 2018. "The Feminist Challenge to the Socialist State in Yugoslavia." <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-78223-2>.
- Luetić, Tihana. 2002. "Prve studentice Mudroslovnog fakulteta kr. Sveučilišta Franje Josipa I. u Zagrebu." *Povijesni prilozi*, 167–207.
- . 2006. "Počeci visokoškolskog obrazovanja za žene u Hrvatskoj i usporedba sa stanjem u susjednim zemljama." *Historijski zbornik*, 59 ed.: 61–68.

- Maskalan, Ana. 2021. "In memoriam Gordana Bosanac (1936 – 2019)." *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine*, 91–99.
- Musić, Goran. 2011. "Yugoslavia. Workers' Self-Management as State Paradigm." In *Ours to Master and to Own*, edited by Immanuel Ness and Dario Azzellini, 230–253. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Ograjšek Gorenjak, Ida. 2006. "Otvaranje ženskog liceja u Zagrebu." *Povijest u nastavi*, IV ed.: 147–176. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/10580>.
- Papanek, Hanna. 1980. "Women Under Communism, A Review." *Sex Roles*, 769–773.
- Puri, Bindu. 2021. "Conversations with Philosophers – Dr. Bindu Puri." *Collective for Women Philosophers in India, Documented Dialogues*. <https://youtu.be/u1VapgrgU6s>.
- Rošker, Jana S. 2021. *Female Philosophers in Contemporary Taiwan and the Problem of Women in Chinese Thought*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cabridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ruthchild, Rochelle. 1981. "Barbara Wolfe Jancar, "Women Under Communism" (Book Review)." *Science and Society*, 100–102.
- Shapiro, Jane P. 1981. "Book Reviews: Barbara Wolfe Jancar, Women under Communism." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 296–298.
- Sklevicky, Lydija. 1984. "Organizirana djelatnost žena Hrvatske za vrijeme narodnooslobodilačke borbe 1941–1945." *Povijesni prilozi*, 83–127. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/107492>.
- Stites, Richard. 1979. "Reviewed Work: Women Under Communism by Barbara Wolfe Jancar." *Russian History*, 129–130.
- Supek, Rudi. 1969. "Filozofi na Korčuli." *Praxis*. 640–642.
- Šarić, Tatjana. 2020. "The University of Zagreb and the League of Communists of Croatia: Actions and Influences (1959–1965)." *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest*, 307–335. "The Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia." *World Statesmen.org*. Accessed May 22, 2022. <https://www.worldstatesmen.org/Yugoslavia-Constitution1974.pdf>.
- Torres González, Obdulia. 2020. "The Data on Gender Inequality in Philosophy: The Spanish Case." *Hypatia*, 646–666. doi.org/10.1017/hyp.2020.39.
- West, Jevin D., Jennifer Jacquet, Molly M. King, Shelley J. Correll, and Carl T. Bergstrom. 2013. "The Role of Gender in Scholarly Authorship." *PLoS ONE*, 22 July, 8 ed. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0066212.



- Wilhelm, Isaac, Sherri Lynn Conklin, and Nicole Hassoun. 2018. “New data on the representation of women in philosophy journals: 2004–2015.” *Philosophical Studies*, 1441–1464. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-017-0919-0>.
- Wolfe Jancar, Barbara. 1978. *Women Under Communism*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.