

# Translation from Croatian into English

---

**Nežić, Anja**

**Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad**

**2015**

*Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj:* **University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Rijeci, Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:186:639864>

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

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2024-02-27**



*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences - FHSSRI Repository](#)



UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Anja Nežić

**TRANSLATION FROM CROATIAN INTO ENGLISH**

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the B.A. in English Language and

Literature and Croatian Language and Literature at the University of Rijeka

**Supervisor:**

**Prof. Sintija Čuljat, Ph.D.**

September 2015

## **Abstract**

Translation is a process of transferring a text with its full meaning from a source language to a target language. This thesis will be focused on translating three different texts originally written in Croatian (source language) into English (target language). It will offer a brief analysis of problems, potential mistranslations and all other issues that occurred in the process of translating. Finally, the thesis will suggest solutions to problems found and provide elaboration for each of it.

Key words: translation, translation issues, mistranslations, Croatian into English

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	4
Source text 1 .....	5
Workflow 1 .....	10
Target text 1 .....	14
Source text 2 .....	20
Workflow 2 .....	29
Target text 2 .....	33
Source text 3 .....	43
Workflow 3 .....	47
Target text 3 .....	50
Conclusion .....	54
Bibliography .....	55

## **Introduction**

This thesis puts in focus three texts of different genres, topics and levels of formality. All three of them will be translated from Croatian (source language) into English (target language). Translation is nowadays one of the most powerful tools for establishing communication between people from different nations and cultures. In today's globalized world English is considered to be the dominant language; it is official language of the majority most important world institutions and organizations. Even though all kinds of translations into English happen on a daily basis, there are still numerous issues that may appear while translating. I have also come across some of these issues and had to solve them. Because of that, this thesis will provide elaboration and explanation of those issues and my solutions (all in workflows). No matter how complex an issue is, translator must find a way and transfer the meaning from the source language into the target language.

This thesis consists of three parts:

1. Source texts
2. Workflows
3. Target texts

## Source text 1

### NEMA PREDAJE

**PIŠE MILJENKO JERGOVIĆ 'Ti mene nosiš' film je bez usporedbe u suvremenoj hrvatskoj kinematografiji**

Autor: Miljenko Jergović

Objavljeno: 30.05.2015

**Jukin film neće preporoditi kinematografiju, niti pogasiti umne brzoglasce po kojim premijerna publika čekira svoje fejsbuk statuse. Bit će to samo jedan sjajan film, koji će pokazati da Zagreb može ponijeti velike ljudske priče**

Tri međusobno upletene priče, u tri različita vremenska toka, o ženama i muškarcima iz tri društvene klase, povezane su regionalno uspješnom hrvatskom sapunicom, dramatičnog naslova: "Zatočenici sreće". Šminkerica je udana za sitnog dilera i kriminalca, koji se želi popraviti.

Redateljica ima dementnog oca, oplićalih sjećanja, koji povremeno odluta u grad. Producentica je nevjerna svome nevjernom mužu. Ali je središnji lik u priči djevojčica, kći prvog para, mala muškobanja, koja želi postati nogometni menadžer i napamet uči **Mamićev** govor na tiskovnoj konferenciji. Dora je anđeo nad filmom, pa ga i otvara riječima svog idola: "Skoncentrirajte se!" Ujedno, Dora je jedini lik s planom za budućnost. Svi drugi žive zarobljeni u svojim životnim okolnostima, u nepopravljivim karakterima ili u svojoj bliskoj smrtnosti. Dora je budućnost u svijetu i gradu bez budućnosti.

Oštra, surova i krvava priča, snažnih, trgajućih emocija od kojih bi pucala filmska vrpca kad bi je bilo, ali bez ijedne sentimentalne scene, bez laži utjehe. Pritom, sve je u ovom filmu vrlo obično:

i majka koja gura dijete u kolicima, i koja počinje bijesno psovati kad na nju slučajno, izlazeći iz haustora, natrči druga žena, i muž koji vara ženu s nižim osobljem, i maksimirski stadion koji odjekuje mržnjom, i Zagreb, leden i pod snijegom. Iz te prijeteće običnosti, privatne i društvene, izbija savršeno međusobno nerazumijevanje. Osim što žive u različitim vremenskim tokovima, ljudi se ne prepoznaju ni kada se slučajno sretnu. Oni su zatočenici iluzije o mogućoj sreći. Nje, međutim, neće biti.

### **Čudo u mraku**

“Ti mene nosiš” je film komplicirane ali vrlo precizne i jasne strukture (jasne za svakog gledatelja koji za vrijeme projekcije ne čekira mailove, ne surfa po internetu i ne jebe ale po fejsbuku), traje dva i pol sata, ni minute više ili manje nego što bi trebao trajati, i predstavlja svojevrsnu zagonetku unutar hrvatske kinematografije. Ne samo da takvoga filma u posljednjih dvadeset i pet godina - a ni mnogo, mnogo prije toga - nije bilo, nego nije bilo zamislivo da bi ga mogle ponijeti i izdržati zagrebačke vizure, hrvatska društvena stvarnost i suvremenost. “Ti mene nosiš” podsjeća na francusku trilogiju **Krzysztofa Kieslowskog** - kojem u jednoj sceni stoji i mala posveta: kod Kieslowskog lik pokušava ubaciti bocu u kontejner, kod Juke je pokušava izvaditi iz kontejnera. Osim vrlo precizno razrađene priče i strukture, te snažne ukorijenjenosti u lokalni ambijent, Juka s Kieslowskim dijeli osjećaj nekoga pomirenog beznađa i za naše filmske i književne prilike sasvim neočekivane finoće u stradanju i u podnošenju stradanja. Također, i umijeće da se u igranom filmu pogodi ton dokumentarca.

U jednoj sceni Dora vani pjeva, dok je otac s dječakom u zahodu. Rekao joj je neka pjeva, da zna kako je tu. Obična životna situacija, možda, ali dramatika života je sačinjena od takvih običnih situacija. Veliki pisci ih znaju transformirati u književni tekst. U kazalištu one su, obično,

nemoguće. U filmu ih ima samo kod velikih redatelja, koji su pred sobom imali još mnogo veće glumce. Takva se scena, naime, ne da mehanički odglumiti, jer ju je nemoguće pretvoriti u dramsku situaciju. Pretvorena u dramsku situaciju dramatična scena života postaje scenska laž. Ona se, možda, dogodi, donesu je iznimni glumci, kao da svijetu donose nevidljivi dar: mlada **Helena Beljan** i bivši vođa Dinamovih navijača **Goran Hajduković-Čupko** život su u toj sceni donijeli na film. Kako? Ja to ne znam. Ali to je film. Čudo u općem mraku.

**Lana Barić**, kćerka imenom Ives, i **Voja Brajović**, otac kojem odlaze sjećanja, pa svake večeri u kćeri vidi mladu ljubavnicu, koju bi izbacio iz kuće, jer nije zgodno, on je oženjen, glumački su par formiran u već vrlo udaljenim epohama. On, zavodnik i junak pokreta otpora, iz zlatnog doba jugoslavenskog filma i kazališta, ona, briljantno darovita glumica iz vremena kašljucavih kazališta i kilavog filma. Ono što igraju, opet je život, i ona vrsta nepodnošljive bliskosti, kakvu najprije znamo iz **Hanekeova** novomilenijskog klasika "Ljubav".

Lana Barić posjeduje čistu neposrednost naturščika, Voja Brajović, osmijehnut i lunatičan, glumi jednu od onih velikih životnih uloga, koje glumac vrlo lako i odbije. Trebao bi plesati gol na stolu, u sceni koja napisana djeluje nepodnošljivo brutalno i na neki način samoubilački po onoga koji je treba odigrati, ali bi, živo odigrana, trebala biti vrhunac filma, ali i vrhunac neke divne, nesentimentalne nježnosti. Pred tim prizorom, i scenama koje slijede, gledatelju zastaje srce. Svejedno je li svoje stare roditelje vidio gole, je li ih vidio ispražnjene od sjećanja, pretvorene u neka druga, privremena i djetinjasta stvorenja, gledatelj po nečemu zna da je ovo istina.

### **Anonimne javne face**

Film "Ti mene nosiš" sestre Juka (uz Ivonu, producentica Anita) gradile su i snimale šest godina. Način na koji su film iznijele svakako je besprimjeran u hrvatskoj kinematografiji. Protiv sebe su



imale sustav, i u sustavu hrvatsko filmsko stado, hribare ljudskih duša i sve brljave, nasrtljive arsene i antone, koji su učinili sve, ali baš sve - osim upotrebe vatrenog oružja - da ih onemoguće i ozloglase, a **Ivonu Juku** da ridikuliziraju, predstave kao jadnicu, ili kao opasnu agresivku, koju bi trebalo smjestiti u specijalnu ustanovu. Kružili su mailovi po Hrvatskoj i po regiji, dopisivali su se, na temu Ivonina lika, članovi strukovnih društava, i sve je teklo gotovo javno, bez straha da bi netko zdrav i normalan, netko tko pritom i nije, niti kani biti, abonent HAVC-a, mogao razotkriti to veselo društvo. Ali kome ih razotkriti kada su ti ljudi u suštini anonimni, čak i kada su javne face? Oni tako lako uspijevaju biti zaboravljeni. (Eto, recimo, tko se još sjeća ministrice kulture, te do maloprije slavne nadhribarice ljudskih duša?) Promatraču sa strane ne preostaje drugo nego da čuva njihove mailove, kao bezvrijedne suvenire s mora, sve dok mu jednoga dana ne dosade i ne delitne ih, upitavši se zašto ih je uopće i čuvao.

Naravno, Ivona Juka nikome ništa neće dokazati. Nema ni konačne pravde u valjanosti njezina filma, neće biti publike koja će je iznijeti na rukama, niti će za nju biti velikih svjetskih festivala, lako će mala varoš utišati glasove koji se čuju u danima oko premijere. Ono što sestre Juka imaju protiv sebe jest to što je Zagreb mali i zatvoreni grad, negdje u istočnim i južnim europskim provincijama, a Hrvatska je mala zemlja, kao stvorena za one koji ne podnose ništa što je doista veliko. Čak ni samo formalno veliko: recimo, film od dva i pol sata. Ali Zagreb je velik u dva i pol sata Ivoninog filma - grad s onim istim kontejnerom za boce kao u Parizu - socijalno raslojen, moćan u svojim privatnim tragedijama i osjećajima, moćan na zastrašujućim tetovažama po tijelu Gorana Hajdukovića-Čupka, i na njegovom sleđenom licu.

Zagreb je velik u onim rijetkim trenucima - a film Ivone Juke jedan je od njih - kada ga umjetnik velike naracije uspijeva artikulirati, i učiniti gradom u svom njegovom zlu, u nesreći, smrti i neutješnoj ljepoti. Ali već u sljedećem trenutku, on će biti mali, i po mjeri svoje vječne

osrednjosti, koju će stado braniti i po cijenu tuđeg života i dostojanstva. Sve pod geslom: nema predaje, nema izdaje! Kada se to dogodi, kada se grad iz Ivoninog filma ponovo smanji, doći će, opet, vrijeme da se obračunavaju s njom, i da nam objašnjavaju kako njezin film zapravo ne vrijedi ništa.

### **Pakao sitnih duša**

Umjetnike koji nemaju problema sa sredinom u kojoj žive lako je prepoznati. Njihove knjige, filmovi, slike, simfonije, ne vrijede ništa. Zašto bi se, za miloga Boga, umjetnošću i bavio onaj koji nema nikakvih problema? Nakon što je snimio svoj prvi film, s kojim je pobijedio u Veneciji, jedan veliki redatelj nije mogao skupiti novce za drugi. Strefio ga je infarkt, obračunao se s rodnim gradom, i jedva snimio drugi, s kojim je pobijedio u Cannesu. Tako je postao jedan od najvažnijih europskih redatelja, i mogao je dalje snimati što god hoće. Kao da je u času nestalo sve njegove moći, jer je fizički prerastao grad iz kojeg je potekao. Možda će sestre Juka i sljedeći film stvarati šest ili sedam dugih godina. I opet će prolaziti kroz rat i kroz pakao sitnih duša, koje pucketaju kao balončići na koverti. Ali drukčije ne ide. Talent se krvavo plaća, a lako gubi.

## Workflow 1

### No Surrender

Source text 1, *Nema predaje*, is a semi-formal column written by Croatian author and journalist, Miljenko Jergović. The column is a mixture of a movie review (written about Ivona Juka's movie, "You Carry Me") and subjective, personal commentary on the political and cultural situation in Croatia. The target audience of the article is a wide population that uses Internet and is at least to some extent familiar with the mentioned movie. The column was not extremely difficult to translate, but there were some ambiguous sentences and lexemes that do not even exist in the standardized Croatian language, but were author's inventions. Those lexemes are transformed into the target language lexemes with regard to their approximate meaning.

The very first problem that occurred while translating this text was a syntagm *umni brzoglasni*. As I never heard those two words in a combination and was not familiar with some similar fixed phrases in none of the languages (nor source language, i.e. Croatian, or target language, i.e. English) I decided to translate it with regard to the context and the intended message. The syntagm was used to enhance the fact that certain information on movie are going around so I decided to translate it as *let slip nuggets of information*.

Phrase *sitni diler* posed a few problems as well. The main concern was whether I should ignore adjective *sitni* and simply translate the phrase as *stockjobber, dealer* or *drug dealer* (Bujas, 2011) or I should be precise and include the adjective in my translation. As there is some sort of a difference between *diler* and *sitni diler* (a person who primarily sells cocaine or crack) and as I decided to use American English in this thesis, the lexeme *clocker* meaning *a drug dealer, especially one who sells cocaine or crack* (Oxford Dictionaries) fitted perfectly.

There were several more lexical problems. First to be mention is the adjective *oplićala*. In the original text that adjective was used with the noun *sjećanja*. Bujas (2011) offered no solutions, but Hrvatski jezični portal defined *oplićati* (v.) as *to become shallower*. Therefore, based on the proximity of meanings, I decided to translate the adjective as *impoverished*.

Another problematic item was the noun *muškobanja*. The dilemma was whether to use a phrase *mannish woman* or a single lexical item *tomboy* (Bujas, 2011). Because it fitted better in a sentence, is more descriptive and can be easily understood, I opted for a phrase *mannish woman*.

One of the often used words was *lik*, used in phrases such as *centralni lik* or *jedini lik*. Bujas (2011) offered several equivalents like *character*, *personage* or *figure*. *Personage* is not so common in English texts dealing with cinematography topic, *figure* pertains not only to movie industry, but also economy, math, statistics, etc. *Character* is the most frequent solution for *(filmski) lik* and was my final decision.

I came across a few syntactic problems as well. The sentence *Iz te prijeteće običnosti, privatne i društvene, izbija savršeno međusobno nerazumijevaje* was not neutrally ordered, i.e. written in S-V-O order and I decided to reorder it so the target language sentence now is: *A perfect mutual misunderstanding gushes out from that menacing ordinariness, both private and social*.

Semi-formality of the text posed a few problems too. One of the examples is the colloquial, vulgar phrase *jebati ale*. After looking up the right meaning of the phrase (it is a phrase that mostly appears on various Internet forums) I decided to translate it like *to kill time*. The chosen equivalent expresses *to spend time doing something that is not important while you are waiting for something else to happen* (Hornby, Ashby, McIntosh, Turnbull & Wehmeier, 2005) which is also the approximate explanation of the syntagm in the original text.

Lexeme *vizure* in *zagrebačke vizure* was not an easy one to translate. Bujas (2011) offered *vista*, *view* and *aspect* and I did not find any of them as an appropriate substitute for *vizure* (because the term in the original text refers more to mental than physical aspects). In the end I went for *perspectives* because that term covers an attitude towards something and does not exclude physical boundaries or limitations.

When translating *dijeli osjećaj* (*Juka s Kieslowskim dijeli osjećaj*) I was in a dilemma between *share a feeling* and *have in common*. In the end, *share a feeling* prevailed because it is less general than the other. In the original text *dijeli osjećaj* was used for a specific feeling shared between the two authors and not some large set of similarities between them that would be better covered under the *have in common*.

*U filmu ih ima samo kod velikih redateljja, koji su pred sobom imali još mnogo veće glumce* is a sentence that works perfectly in Croatian, but does not look so good when translated literally into English. Because of that, I decided to reorder it a bit and transform *great directors* into a subject of the sentence: *Only great directors who worked with even greater actors can place them in a movie*.

*Kašljucava kazališta* is one of the phrases coined by Jergović exclusively for the purpose of his column (or at least I could not find it in any dictionary as a fixed phrase). The phrase I used in my translation was *hacking theatres*. The phrase was coined to depict theatres lack of character, low level of professionalism and determination. Due to that, my proposal is *faltering theatres*.

There were, on the other hand, examples when I did not opt for a literal translation, but rather completely changed the word order, separated a long sentence into two sentences or substituted a verb with a noun. That happened in the example *a Ivonu Juku da ridiculiziraju, predstave kao*

*jadnicu, ili kao opasnu agresivku, koju bi trebalo smjestiti u specijalnu ustanovu.* This was originally the second part of a long sentence, but I transformed it into a separated unit. Instead of translating *ridikuliziraju* as *ridicule*, I changed it into *turn into a laughing stock*. The whole sentence is now *To turn Ivona Juka into a laughing stock, poor woman or dangerous assailant who needs to be placed in a special institution.*

*Nadhribarica* was another Jergović's lexical invention. Referring to a Croatian author Hrvoje Hribar who was involved in a cultural affair with the former Croatian Minister of Culture, Jergović coined a completely new word that appeared as a great problem to me. After brainstorming, I decided to go for a descriptive translation - *Hribar's protector*.

*Sitne duše, koje pucketaju kao balončići na koverti* was another problematic phrase. It was used to describe *sitne duše* and define them as really suggestible, hesitant and as people who do not know their mind. My decision was to render it as *narrow minds which turn with the wind*.

## Target text 1

### NO SURRENDER

**WRITES MILJENKO JERGOVIĆ “You Carry Me” is a movie without comparison in the contemporary Croatian cinematography**

Author: Miljenko Jergović

Published: 30 May 2015

**A movie by Juka will not regenerate cinematography or stop letting slip nuggets of information by which premiere audience checks their Facebook statuses. It will be just one brilliant movie that will show how Zagreb can present great human stories**

Three mutually intertwined stories, placed in three different time passages, about women and men from three social classes, are all connected with a regionally successful Croatian soap opera dramatically named “Prisoners of Happiness”. A make-up artist is married to a clocker and a criminal who wants to mend his ways.

The director has a demented father with impoverished memories who from time to time wanders away in the city. The producer is unfaithful to her unfaithful husband. However, the central character of the story is a girl, daughter of the first couple, little mannish woman who wants to become a football manager and is learning by heart a speech **Mamić** gave at a press conference. Dora is an angel above the movie and she opens it by saying: “Concentrate!” At the same time, Dora is the only character with a plan for the future. All others are living trapped in their life’s circumstances, in their irremediable roles or in their near-future mortality. Dora is the future in a city and world without future.

Harsh, brutal and bloody story of strong, tangled emotions that would, if there has been a film tape, cut right through it, without any sentimental scene, without false consolation. In the process, everything in this movie is very usual: a mother pushing a baby carriage who starts cursing furiously when another woman, accidentally bumps into her while leaving her doorway, and a husband who is cheating on his wife with a lower personnel member, and the Maksimir stadium echoing hatred, and Zagreb, cold and covered in snow. A perfect mutual misunderstanding gushes out from that menacing ordinariness, both private and social. Except the fact that they are living in different time flows, people do not recognize themselves even when they come across one another. They are prisoners of an illusion about possible happiness; however, it will never realize.

### **Miracle in the dark**

“You Carry Me” is a movie of complex, but really precise and clear structure (clear for every spectator who while watching it does not check their mail box, does not browse the Internet nor kills time on Facebook). It lasts two and a half hours, not a single minute more or less that it should last, and represents a peculiar riddle in Croatian cinematography. Not only that there has been no such movie in the last twenty-five years, nor many, many years before that, but it has also been impossible to imagine that Zagreb’s perspectives, Croatian reality and contemporariness could even cope with it. “You Carry Me” reminds us of **Krzysztof Kieslowski’s** French trilogy, and one scene is even dedicated to him: in Kieslowski’s film a character is trying to pop a bottle in a container, while in Juka’s movie a character is trying to take it out. Except for the precisely elaborated story and structure and strong inveteracy in the local setting, Juka and Kieslowski share a feeling of reconciled hopelessness and an exquisiteness of suffering and resilience to suffering, absolutely unexpected in our film and literary



circumstances. Moreover, they also share the ability to achieve a documentary tone in a feature movie.

In one scene Dora is singing outside while her father is in the toilet with a boy. He told her to sing so he could know she is there. As common as this life situation may be, the dramatics of life is composed of such commonalities. Great authors know how to transpose them into a literary text. In theatre they are usually impossible. Only great directors who worked with even greater actors can place them in a movie. Namely, such scene is impossible to be mechanically acted out because it cannot be transformed in a dramatic situation. Transformed into dramatic situation, a dramatic life scene becomes a scenic lie. It is likely to happen. An extraordinary actor can render it as if they are giving the world an invisible gift: through that scene young **Helena Beljan** and former leader of Dinamo supporters' **Goran Hajduković-Čupko** have brought real life in a movie. How? I do not know. But that is movie. A miracle in the universal dark.

**Lana Barić**, daughter named Ives, and **Voja Brajović**, father who is losing memories so every night he sees in his daughter a lover whom he wants to kick out of the house because it is not appropriate and he is married, are a theatrical couple formed in the most distant epochs. A seducer and a resistance movement hero from a golden period of a Yugoslav movie and theatre and a brilliantly talented actress from a period of faltering theatre and feeble movie. And again what they are playing is life and a sort of unbearable closeness, familiar from **Haneke's** new millennium classic "Love".

Lana Barić has that pure immediateness of a nonprofessional actress, Voja Brajović, a smiling lunatic, is playing one of those great life roles which an actor is very likely to refuse. He is supposed to be dancing naked on the table in a scene that, when written, seems unbearably brutal

and in some way suicidal for the one who has to play it, but it should turn at the same time into a climax of the movie graced with some beautiful, unsentimental gentleness. On seeing this spectacle and the scenes that follow, our hearts stop-and-go. No matter whether we have seen our old parents naked, or cleared from memories, transformed into temporary and childish creatures, we somehow do know that this is the truth.

### **Anonymous public faces**

Sisters Juka (along with Ivona, the producer Anita) had been creating and shooting “You Carry Me” for six years. The manner in which they have carried it out is by all means unprecedented in Croatian cinematography. They had a system standing against them: the Croatian movie herd, Hribars of human souls and all chatty, pugnacious Arsens and Antons who had done everything, truly everything – except for using firearms – to thwart their project and bring them into disrepute. They had done everything to turn Ivona Juka into a laughing stock, poor woman or dangerous assailant who needs to be placed in a special institution. E-mails were circulating around Croatia and the region. Members of professional associations were exchanging information on Ivona’s personality, and the whole correspondence flowed almost entirely in public, without fear that some prudent person not intending to be a season-ticket holder in CAC, might uncover that merry bunch. But why to disclose them when they are basically anonymous even when they enjoy the status of public figures? They succeed to be forgotten so easily. (Say, who remembers the Minister of Culture, not so long ago Hribar’s famous protector?) Observers do not have many options but to keep their e-mails like worthless vacation souvenirs until the day when they decide to delete them while wondering why they had kept them at all.

Of course, Juka will not prove anything to anybody. There is no final justice in the merit of her movie, no audience that will hail her, nor will she attend world film festivals. Small town will easily silence the voices heard around the premiere. What sisters Juka have against them is the fact that Zagreb is a small and out-of-the-way city, somewhere in the eastern and southern European provinces, and Croatia is a small state, perfect for those who cannot tolerate anything that is really great. Not even something only formally great: for example, a movie that lasts two and a half hours. But Zagreb is great in two and a half hours of Juka's movie – the city with the same bottle container as the one in Paris – socially stratified, powerful in its private tragedies and emotions, in frightening tattoos that cover the body of Goran Hajduković-Čupko, and on his frozen face.

Zagreb is great in those rear moments – and Juka's movie is one of them – when an artist with the ability of great narration succeeds to articulate it and render it a city in the entirety of its depravity, misfortune, death and inconsolable beauty. At the very next moment, it will be small and compliant with its eternal mediocrity which will be defended by the herd even at the cost of somebody else's life and dignity. Everything under the motto: No surrender, no treason! When that happens, when the city from Juka's movie dwindles, once again the time will come for getting even with her and finding fault with her movie.

### **Hell of narrow minds**

Artists that do not have problems with the community in which they live are easy to recognize. Their books, movies, pictures, symphonies are worthless. Why would a person be an artist, for God's sake, if they do not have any problems? After making his first movie which won in Venice, one great director could not gather money for his second movie. He got a heart attack,

got even with his hometown and barely made his second movie which won in Cannes. He became one of the most important European directors and is now able to direct whatever he wants. As if his power instantly waned because he physically outgrew the city from which he originated. Maybe sisters Juka will be creating their next movie six or seven long years as well. And they will once again cope with straits and hell of narrow minds which turn with the wind. But there is no other way. Talent is paid in blood, but so easily wasted.

## Source text 2

### Recenzija knjige - Thomas Piketty: Kapital u 21. stoljeću

**Ne mora se nužno dogoditi da nove generacije bogatih svoj prihod unedogled povećavaju naslijeđenim kapitalom i rentom, piše Zvonimir Šikić komentirajući knjigu 'Kapital u 21. stoljeću'. On smatra da upravo ova knjiga može pokrenuti realizaciju ideje o progresivnom oporezivanju ekstremnih prihoda i nasljedstava na globalnoj razini**

Zvonimir Šikić Objavljeno 00.30, 20.06.2014.

*Autor je profesor na Fakultetu strojarstva i brodogradnje u Zagrebu*

#### 1. Nasljedni kapitalizam

Svijet je prilično odmakao na svom putu prema plutokraciji. Francuski ekonomist T. Piketty u svojem *magnum opusu* „*Kapital u 21. stoljeću*“ jasno dokumentira ogromnu koncentraciju prihoda i bogatstva u rukama uskoga sloja ekstremno bogatih.

Ne radi se tu samo o ekstremno bogatima nego sve više o ekstremno bogatim nasljednicima. To nas (prema Pikettyju) vraća u „nasljedni kapitalizam“ u kojem je rođenje važnije od rada i talenta.

Kao što je početkom 20. stoljeća Amerika prva krenula u novom smjeru, uvođenjem poreza na prihod i nasljedstvo (da se ne bi pretvorila u „*zemlju nasljednika poput Europe*“), tako je i danas prva na povratnom putu u nasljedni kapitalizam.

Naravno, taj put unazad nije moguć bez radikalne promjene zakona, tj. nije moguć bez političke podrške. U Americi, koja je otišla najdalje, najbolje vidimo kako se osigurava ta podrška: jedna od dvije najvažnije političke stranke (uz nezanemariv dio druge) skoro je potpuno posvećena

obrani interesa bogate elite. Iako se republikanci svojski trude da se prikažu u drugom svjetlu, većini američkih građana to je ipak jasno (možda im nije jasno koliki su razmjeri te posvećenosti).

G. W. Bush smanjio je poreze na prihod od rada sa 39.6% na 35%, no mnogo je radikalnije smanjio poreze na prihod od kapitala, sa istih 39.6% na svega 15%. Još je radikalnije smanjio poreze na nekretnine (bile one male šupice ili pravi dvorci); njih je naprosto ukinuo. Službeni plan republikanskog kongresa je potpuno ukidanje poreza na prihode od kapitala. Po tom planu, oni koji žive isključivo od nasljedstva ne bi plaćali nikakav porez.

Da politika uspješno obavlja ovaj posao vidimo i po tome da je 1979. godine 1% najbogatijih u Americi uprihodilo 17% ukupnih prihoda od kapitala, dok se 2007. godine to popelo na 43%. Zašto se politika u Americi (a slijedi je i ona u ostalom razvijenom svijetu) sve više kreće u tom smjeru? Odgovor je, nažalost, vrlo jednostavan. Veliko bogatstvo lako kupuje veliki politički utjecaj i to ne samo kroz velike donacije političkim strankama i njihovim kampanjama (iako je i to prevažno, što pokazuje tragikomična odluka američkog vrhovnog suda da su neograničene i tajne donacije političkim strankama neotuđivo pravo slobode govora).

Mnogi političari zapravo žive unutar potpuno izoliranih balona koje napuhuju razni *think-tankovi* i utjecajni mediji financirani od šačice mega donatora. Zato nije neobično da u zlatnoj izolaciji takvoga balona mnogi počinju misliti da je ono što je dobro za bogatu elitu dobra i za sve ostale (ako je meni i mojima korisno, ako se ponavlja često i uporno, ...).

Ima li nade da se taj trend promijeni ili da se bar ne proširi cijelim svijetom? Mnogi Amerikanci takvu promjenu vide kao antiameričku, a sve je više Europljana vidi kao antiliberalnu. Samo neliberalni socijalisti (ili još gore komunisti) mogu zazivati „*državu koja bi progresivnim*

*oporezivanjem enormnih bogatstava efikasno spriječila nepravedno zgrtanje novca i stvaranje uskoga sloja ekstremno bogatih i politički utjecajnih ljudi čiji je glavni cilj povećanje vlastite moći“.*

Neku nam nadu pruža činjenica da ovo nije citat nekog lijevog radikala nego T. Roosevelta iz 1910. godine, kada je Amerika po prvi put zaglibila u nasljedni kapitalizam. U 20. stoljeću (zahvaljujući mnogim „Rooseveltima“) uspješno mu se othvala, te je i Europi pokazala pravi put. Valjda će smoći snage da to učini još jednom.

Nažalost, odluka američkog vrhovnog suda o tajnim i neograničenim donacijama političkim strankama nije dobar znak, jer demokraciju nedvojbeno gura prema plutokraciji (no nadajmo se da još postoje političari koji svoj posao doživljavaju kao javni, a ne samo kao privatni).

## **2. Jane Austen i kapitalizam**

Kako funkcionira kapitalizam? Piketty nam daje sljedeći odgovor: ključan je odnos kapitala  $K$  i prihoda  $P$ , tj. omjer  $K/P = \beta$ , pri čemu je kapital svaka imovina koja donosi povrat (zemlja, kuće, strojevi, gotovina, obveznice, dionice itd.). Povijesnom analizom francuske, britanske i američke ekonomije Piketty je ustanovio da je  $\beta$  u 18. i 19. stoljeću bio visok. Neposredno prije Prvog svjetskog rata imao je vrijednost 7 u Francuskoj i Britaniji, te 5 u SAD (6 na jugu i 3 na sjeveru). U sljedećih 50 godina  $\beta$  pada ispod 4, da bi u zadnjih 30 godina ubrzano rastao dostižući vrijednosti s početka 20. stoljeća.

Pravi značaj rastućeg  $\beta$  postaje jasan kada se uoči njegova veza sa stopama rasta prihoda od kapitala  $k$  i ukupnoga prihoda  $p$  (kojeg čini i stopa rasta prihoda od rada). Naime, očito je da konstantnost omjer  $K/P$  (tj. konstantantnost od  $\beta$ ) znači da je  $k=p$ , njegov pad znači da je  $k<p$ , a njegov rast da je  $k>p$ . Ubrzani rast od  $\beta$  znači ne samo da je  $k>p$ , već i to da se  $k$  sve više

udaljava od  $p$ . (Za one koji se ne boje malo matematike evo i jednostavnih izvoda tih očitih činjenica: Iz  $K = \beta P$  slijedi  $dK = \beta dP + Pd\beta$  odakle (dijeljenjem) slijedi  $dK/K = dP/P + d\beta/\beta$ . No,  $dK/K = k$  i  $dP/P = p$ , pa je  $k = p + d\beta/\beta$ . Konstantni  $\beta$  znači  $d\beta = 0$ , tj.  $k = p$ . Rastući  $\beta$  znači  $d\beta > 0$ , što znači  $k > p$ , jer je  $\beta$  omjer pozitivnih brojeva. Ubrzano rastući  $\beta$  znači rastući  $d\beta$ , što znači da se  $k$  sve više udaljava od  $p$ .)

To je način na koji radi Pikettyjev model. Dakle, ubrzano rastući  $\beta$  zapravo znači da razdioba ukupnog prihoda (tj. razdioba BND-a) sve više ide u korist kapitala. Uzmemo li u obzir i činjenicu da prihod od kapitala dijeli mnogo manji broj (bogatih) individua nego prihod od rada, očito je da će individualna razdioba bogatstva postajati sve neravnomjernijom, tj. prihodovna nejednakost će sve više rasti.

Piketty nudi i povijesna objašnjenja opisanih trendova. Rast omjera  $\beta$  (kapital/prihod) od industrijske revolucije do Prvog svjetskog rata u Francuskoj i Britaniji rezultat je visokih prinosa na neprekinuto akumulirani kapital, u političkom okruženju sklonijem kapitalistima nego radnicima (SAD su u tom razdoblju iznimka, jer je akumulacija naslijeđivanjem još uvijek relativno mala budući se radi o „mladoj“ zemlji).

U društvima s visokim  $\beta$ , kakva su bila viktorijanska Engleska i „la belle époque“ Francuska, probitačnije je bilo usredotočiti se na pronalaženje bogatog supruga i supruge, ili nekog drugog načina naslijeđivanja, nego na rad. Razlika između blistave karijere temeljene na učenju i radu i ugodnog života koji je nudila ženidba ili udaja za bogatog nasljednika ili nasljednicu stalna su tema literature toga vremena.



Honore de Balzac i Jane Austen napisali su nezaboravne stranice o brutalnosti, komičnosti i besmislenosti takvog svijeta. (Američka ekonomija je kasnila sa svojim  $\beta$  pa stoga i s odgovarajućom literaturom, no Henry James je to majstorski nadoknadio.)

Junacima i junakinjama Jane Austen obrazovanje je tek sredstvo za poboljšanje bračnih perspektiva. Rad gotovo nikada nije opcija, osim ako je u pitanju uistinu puko preživljavanje. Mjera socijalnog statusa nije blistava karijera nego blistava renta.

Volim tu literaturu kao i njene nezaboravne ekranizacije, no uvijek sam o njoj mislio kao o slici nekih potpuno sporednih društvenih zbivanja. Zahvaljujući Pikettyju vidim koliko sam bio u krivu.

### **3. Djeca rastućeg i padajućeg $\beta$**

U „*la belle époque*“ razdoblju kapitalizma (koje je trajalo od Pariške komune do Prvog svjetskog rata) vlasnici kapitala mogli su očekivati  $k=5\%$  povrata na svoje investicije, uz zanemarive poreze. Rast gospodarstva u tom razdoblju iznosio je jedva  $p=1\%$ . Ta značajna razlika omogućavala im je da si reinvestiranjem tek dijela dobiti osiguravaju sve veći udjel u ukupnom bogatstvu, uz rasipno luksuzni životni stil po kojem je razdoblje dobilo ime.

Ni neminovna i obično uravnomjerujuća smrt nije sprečavala ovaj trend, jer se i nasljeđivalo uz zanemarive poreze. Nasljedstva su činila 25% ukupnog godišnjeg prihoda. Čak 90% ukupnog bogatstva bilo je naslijeđeno, a svega je 10% bilo uštedeno od novostvorenog prihoda.

Dvadeseto stoljeće (točnije razdoblje od Prvog svjetskog rata do 80-tih) donosi ogromne promjene. Vidjeli smo da omjer kapitala i prihoda  $\beta$  u tom razdoblju ubrzano pada u cijelom razvijenom svijetu. Piketty to objašnjava ogromnim fizičkim uništavanjem kapitala u oba

svjetska rata, te visokim porezima na velike (najčešće kapitalne) prihode i velika nasljedstva. Naravno, sve u svrhu podrške ogromnim ratnim troškovima.

Poslije drugog svjetskog rata taj se trend održava relativno visokom inflacijom koja pogoduje kapitalom siromašnim dužnicima (a šteti kapitalom bogatim vjerovnicima) i općom političkom atmosferom koja je sklona radnicima u eri stalne sovjetske opasnosti (koju Piketty začudo ne spominje). Svi ti faktori bitno su umanjili akumulaciju kapitala, a s tim i udio kapitalne dobiti u prihodu, tj. smanjili su  $\beta$ .

To je razdoblje poznato kao zlatno doba kapitalizma: *Golden Age*, *les trente glorieuses*, *Wirtschaftswunder*. Europska gospodarstva i Japan rasla su najbrže u svojoj povijesti sustižući SAD nevjerojatnom brzinom. Bio je to klasični, gotovo školski primjer konvergencije. Kapitalni prinosi bili su relativno niski, porezi visoki, a razdioba bogatstva pomakla se od kapitala prema radu. Distribucija prihoda bila je ravnomjernija.

Bilo je to uistinu zlatno doba za kojim često uzdiše moja poslijeratna „*baby boom*“ generacija, odrasla u dubokom uvjerenju da budućnost može biti samo bolja. Uvijek sam se čudio generaciji mojih djedova i baka čiji je „*weltanschauung*“ nedvojbeno bio da budućnost uvijek može biti gora. Mislio sam da se radi o generacijskom jazu (o tome da je smrt mnogo življa činjenica njihove bliske budućnosti). No, možda se radilo tek o jazu između djece rastućeg i padajućeg  $\beta$ .

Piketty zlatno doba vidi kao singularni i u povijesti kapitalizma neponovljivi fenomen. Radilo se o konvergenciji Europe i Japana prema SAD-u, koja je stopu rasta  $p$  držala visokom, dok je u kombinaciji s visokim porezima i strahom od komunizma stopa kapitalnih prinosa  $k$  i dalje bila niska.

No, u zadnjih 30-tak godina  $k$  je opet veći od  $p$  kao i u cijeloj prethodnoj povijesti.

#### 4. Gdje smo i kamo idemo

Zlatno doba kapitalizma, proizašlo iz  $k > p$  definitivno je iza nas. Nezaustavljivo napuštamo singularno razdoblje eksponencijalnog rasta (inicirano industrijskom i političko-liberalnim revolucijama), rasta koji su u 20. stoljeću uspješno održala dva svjetska rata, konvergencija nejednako razvijenih ekonomija i demografski rast.

Kada i Kina konačno „otkonvergira“ ti će izvanredni uvjeti nestati i kapitalizam će opet zaglibiti u „*la belle époque*“  $p > k$  fazi. Naime, kraj konvergencije znači da će sve razvijene zemlje rasti po stopi tehnološkog napretka, cca 1.5%, dok će kapitalni prinosi i dalje imati svoju stabilnu povijesnu vrijednost od cca 4.5%. Dakle, uz  $p = 1.5\%$  i  $k = 4.5\%$  opet ćemo imati  $p > k$ .

Ova Pikettyjeva verzija ekonomske povijesti odudara od standardne slike industrijske revolucije koja nas definitivno izvlači iz Malthusove zamke (u kojoj demografski rast stalno izjeda ekonomski rast). U toj slici, nakon tisuća godina nikakvog rasta s industrijskom revolucijom počinje eksponencijalni rast kojemu nema kraja.

Zašto mu nema kraja? Zato što ga do sada nismo vidjeli! Baš i nije neko objašnjenje.

Vidjeli smo da Piketty nudi bar neku dodatnu analizu (iako ni ona nije bez zamjerki): omjer  $\beta$  kroz povijest se prilično i znakovito mijenja, no uz sve njegove mijene kapitalni prinos  $k$  iznenađujuće je stabilan i takav će i ostati; to nas vraća u nasljedni kapitalizam i romani Jane Austen mogli bi postati slikom budućnosti, a ne samo prošlosti.

U trenutku u kojem nejednakost opet postaje velikom ekonomskom, političkom i socijalnom temom, Piketty nam nudi njezinu teoriju. Teoriju koja je smješta u međudnose ekonomskog

rasta, različitih prinosa od rada i kapitala, te načina (individualne) distribucije nacionalnog bogatstva.

Osim moguće nedostatnosti samo povijesnih razloga za stabilni  $k$ , prognozirani povrat kapitalizma u „*la belle époque*“ fazu ima još jednu moguću zamjerku (ili bar kvalifikaciju). Današnja nejednakost u SAD na razini je one s kraja 19. i početka 20. stoljeća ali je njezina struktura bar donekle različita. Njen veliki dio čine super *zarade* super menadžera.

Mnogi ekonomisti smatraju da je to rezultat tehnološkog razvoja koji generira „tržišta sa samo jednim pobjednikom“. U takvim tržištima mali broj pojedinaca ubire većinu plodova čak i kada su tek infinitezimalno bolji od svojih (slabije plaćenih) konkurenata.

Piketty (kao i mnogi neekonomisti) ne prihvaća to objašnjenje super plaća malog broja super menadžera, jer je njihov doprinos teoretski gotovo nemoguće monetarno kvantificirati (dapače, Piketty daje uvjerljive argumente da je uspjeh super menadžera prije rezultat sreće nego kvalitete njihovog upravljanja).

Praktički se taj doprinos kvantificira tako da super menadžeri imenuju odbore za kompenzacije, koji određuju njihove naknade. Drugim riječima svoje super plaće, super menadžeri određuju sami. U toj (krajnje netržišnoj) situaciji jedino što ih ograničava su socijalne norme. Erozijski tih normi (koju potiče i pozitivna povratna sprega: što više super menadžera iskače iz norme to je norma manje norma) glavni je uzrok tog novog fenomena.

No, čini mi se da taj novi fenomen zapravo ne iskače iz Pikettyjeve opće slike. Naime, kapitalni prinosi i dalje imaju veliki udjel u generiranju nejednakosti, a i nasljednici današnjih super menadžera (čiji je prihod, prihod od rada) najvjerojatnije će postati rentijeri (čiji će prihod biti prihod od naslijeđenog kapitala).

Već sa sljedećom generacijom (dakle, za dvadesetak godina) SAD bi mogle postati rentijersko društvo s ekstremima koji nisu viđeni ni u „*la belle époque*“. Koju generaciju kasnije mogao bi ih slijediti i ostali razvijeni svijet.

Međutim, to se ne mora nužno dogoditi. Stafilokokna infekcija vjerojatno nas vodi u smrt, *ako nemamo antibiotika*. Opisani ekonomski čimbenici vode nas u nasljedni kapitalizam, *ako nemamo politička rješenja koja to sprečavaju*. Piketty predlaže progresivno oporezivanje **ekstremnih** prihoda i nasljedstava. Ono bi se moralo koordinirano provesti na globalnoj razini kako „porezni rajevi“ ne bi srušili cijelu konstrukciju.

Koliko je takav plan realan, tj. koje bi ga političke snage prihvatile i provele nije jasno. Ja ih osobno ne vidim nigdje. No, kao što reče Keynes „*nikada ne treba podcijeniti snagu ideja*“. Možda je Pikettyjev „*Kapital u 21. stoljeću*“ baš takva djelatna ideja koja će političke poglede, pa čak i aktivnosti, usmjeriti u novom pravcu.

Ako je suditi po paničnoj reakciji *think-tankova* koji skrbe o boljitku najbogatijih, na dobrom je putu.

## Workflow 2

### Book Review – Thomas Piketty: “Capital in the 21st century”

Source text 2, *Recenzija knjige – Thomas Piketty: Kapital u 21. stoljeću*, is a semi-formal text. Author of the text is Zvonimir Šikić, professor at the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, University of Zagreb. Text is a review of Thomas Piketty’s book “Capital in the 21<sup>st</sup> century” and has many technical terms and expressions pertaining to economic domain. Syntax is relatively simple and there were not too many ambiguous or long sentences. Specific terms that have to be consistently used in the target text posed the main problem.

The first problem that occurred while translating this text was the one with how to translate *na povratnom putu*. The syntagm was metaphorically used in the source text, i.e. its role was to enhance the fact that the USA is the first to abolish its own system. I decided to translate it with a phrase *use the return ticket* because it implies that the USA is going away from where it has been and successfully replaces the original phrase.

There are a few more examples of non-literal translations. The construction *većini američkih građana to je ipak jasno* is a correct Croatian structure and would be formally correct in English language too. However, when translated literally into English it feels artificial and inappropriate. Therefore, I decided to formulate it as *the majority of US citizens know what is going on*.

*Da politika uspješno obavlja ovaj posao vidimo i po tome da je 1979. godine 1% najbogatijih u Americi uprihodilo 17% ukupnih prihoda od kapitala, dok se 2007. godine to popelo na 43%.* is one of the examples where I broke a single unit into two separate parts. Separate constructions *That politics is really successful in maintaining is obvious from the facts.* and *In 1979, 1% of the wealthiest people in USA had earned 17% of total capital income while in 2007 that number*

*grew to 43%*. have a better sentence flow and reader can easily follow percentages without creating a wrong picture.

Technical terms pertaining to economic domain were challenging. When translating *obveznica* I had to decide which one to choose between *obligation*, *bond*, *debenture*, *promissory note* and *note of hand* (Bujas, 2011). After I have consulted Limun.hr, I found that *bond* is a proper term used in economy so that was my decision.

*Porezni raj* was also an instance of economic domain. When translating it, one must be very careful and not mix it with *tax heaven*, but use a specific syntagm *tax haven*.

There were few examples where I decided to intervene in a syntactic structure, i.e. to put source language object as a subject in the target language. *Junacima i junakinjama Jane Austen obrazovanje je tek sredstvo za poboljšanje bračnih perspektiva*. was one of these examples. While here *obrazovanje* stands in a place of a subject and *junacima i junakinjama Jane Austen* in the place of an indirect object, in my translation *Jane Austen's heroes and heroines* has a position of a subject while *education* is put in a place of an object. The final result is *Jane Austen's heroes and heroines used education only as a means of improving their marital prospects*. I found this version simpler and got an impression that, even though *education* is not a subject anymore, it is easier to understand for what purpose and who used *education*. Of course these and similar problems occur simply because Croatian and English are not identical languages. While Croatian has a flexible syntactic order, English prefers fixed word order and the described syntactic changes are inevitable.

Sometimes, in order to achieve full cohesion of the text, I had to shift tenses. *Dvadeseto stoljeće (točnije razdoblje od Prvog svjetskog rata do 80-tih) donosi ogromne promjene* was the original

sentence that perfectly conveyed the message, but seemed odd when literally translated into English language. The sequence of tenses in my translation called for the Past Perfect, i.e. a tense that refers to actions in the past that are completed at or before a given time in the past (Biber, Conrad & Leech, 2002). The translated version is *The 20th century (precisely, period from the First World War to eighties) had brought enormous changes.*

In Croatian, *radilo se* is probably one of the most commonly used phrases. However, English equivalents such as *the point was, this was the case of, the fact of the matter here was* (Bujas, 2011) were not suitable replacements for the phrase in a construction *radilo se o konvergenciji*. Instead of using them, I decided to render the phrase simply as *it was a period of Europe and Japan's convergence*. This option is more neutral and fits better with the rest of the sentence.

Sometimes I decided not to translate word for word, but replace a particular word with a set of words that convey the same meaning as the one in the source text. *Nezaustavljivo napuštamo* is one of these examples. Instead of using *unstoppably* or *uncontainable* (Bujas, 2011) *leaving*, I opted for *nobody could stop us on our way of leaving*.

Source text 2 had a few words “invented” by the review’s author. One of them was the verb *otkonverirati*. Here I had to come up with my own version of that word, bearing in mind that the sense must be kept. Prefix *od-* (here modified into *ot-*) was quite helpful and I followed its meaning to create an equivalent. The explanation of the prefix is: dio složenoga glagola ili riječi glagola. Izriče a.) odvajanje, udaljavanje, odstranjivanje [otići; odbaciti] b.) radnju uzvratanja ili oprečnu glagolu [odazvati; odmoći] c.) izvršenje radnje do kraja ili okončanje stanja [odsvirati; odspavati] (Hrvatski jezični portal). As in the source text that lexeme was used to define the end



of a convergence process (*Kada i Kina konačno „otkonvergira”*), my translation was: *When China finally finishes its convergence.*

There were several ambiguous Croatian sentences that were enormously long and not coherent enough. They are not only translation issues, but pose problems for readers of the original text as well. When I came across such sentences, I broke them into two or even three parts. Long sentences are not typical English sentences, but they should be also avoided in Croatian.

Finally, sometimes I had to replace the emphasis from “undergoing an action” to actually “doing an action”. Croatian structure *imaju veliki udjel u generiranju* was one of those examples. Instead of translating it as *have some say* or *have hand in* (Bujas, 2011) I opted for a more active structure like *play a great role in generating.*

## Target text 2

### Book Review – Thomas Piketty: “Capital in the 21st century”

**It is not bound to necessarily happen that new generations of wealthy people will be indefinitely increasing their incomes through inherited capital and rent, writes Zvonimir Šikić while commenting the book “Capital in the 21st century”. He holds that this book can start up realization of the idea about progressive taxation of extreme incomes and inheritance on a global level**

Zvonimir Šikić Published 00.30, 20 June 2014

*Author is a professor at the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, University of Zagreb*

#### **1 Inheritable capitalism**

World has made significant progress on its way to plutocracy. French economist T. Piketty in his *magnum opus* “Capital in the 21st century” clearly documents enormous concentration of income and wealth in the hands of a very narrow layer of extremely rich people.

It is not only the case of extremely rich people but more and more of extremely rich inheritors. That brings us back (according to Piketty) to “inheritable capitalism” in which birth is more important than work and talent.

USA was the first to take a new road by introducing tax on income and inheritance (in order not to become “a state of inheritors like Europe”) and is the first to use the return ticket to inheritable capitalism.

Of course, that way back is not possible without a radical change of law, i.e. it is not possible without political support. The USA made headway in ensuring such support: one of the two most important parties (alongside with the significant part of the other) is almost entirely dedicated to protection of rich elite's interests. Although the Republicans are heartily trying to represent themselves in a new light, the majority of US citizens know what is going on (perhaps they do not understand the proportions of that dedication).

G. W. Bush had lowered the taxes on work earnings from 39.6% to 35%, but had much more radically lowered the taxes on capital earnings, from 39.6% to small 15%. Even more radical was the tax cut on the immovable property (were they sheds or castles); tax was simply abolished. The formal plan of the Republican Congress is a complete abolition of taxes on capital incomes. Following that plan, those who live exclusively of inheritance would not pay any taxes.

That politics is really successful in doing that job is obvious from the facts. In 1979, 1% of the wealthiest people in USA had earned 17% of total capital income while in 2007 that number grew to 43%. Why is politics in the USA (and it is followed by the politics in the rest of the developed world) increasingly moving in that direction? Unfortunately the answer is really simple. Great wealth easily entails great political influence and not only through big donations to political parties and their campaigns (although even that is quite important as proved by a tragicomic decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which says that unlimited and secret donations to political parties are inalienable right of the freedom of speech).

Many politicians actually live inside of the completely isolated balloons blown by different think-tanks and influential media financed by a handful of mega donators. Therefore, it is not unusual that in golden isolation of that balloon many of them start to think that what is good for a wealthy

elite is also good for the rest of people (if it is useful for me and my people; if it occurs frequently and persistently, etc.).

Is there any hope for that trend to change, or at least that it does not spread all over the world? Many Americans see that change as anti-American, while more and more Europeans see it as anti-liberal. Only neoliberal socialists (or even worse, communists) can invoke *“a state which would by aggressive taxation of enormous wealth efficiently prevent unfair accumulation of money and creation of a narrow layer of extremely wealth and politically influential people whose main goal is increasing their own power”*.

Some hope lies with the fact that this is not a quote of some left-wing radical, but T. Roosevelt from 1910 when the USA had for the very first time lapsed into inheritable capitalism. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century (thanks to many “Roosevelts”) the USA managed to successfully withstand and show Europe the right way. Presumably, it will have enough strength to do it once again.

Unfortunately, the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on unlimited and secret donations to political parties is not a good sign because it undoubtedly pushes democracy towards plutocracy (however, let’s hope that there are politicians who deem their job as a public one and not only as a private matter).

### **Jane Austen and capitalism**

How does capitalism work? Piketty gives us the following answer: key is the relationship between capital  $C$  and income  $I$ , i.e. ratio  $C/I = \beta$ , wherein any possession that brings refund is considered to be capital (land, houses, machines, cash, bonds, shares, etc.). After he had done historical analyses of French, British and American economy, Piketty came to a conclusion that  $\beta$  was high in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century. Immediately before the First World War,  $\beta$  was 7 in France

and Britain and 5 in USA (6 in South and 3 in North). In the following 50 years  $\beta$  fell under 4, but in the last 30 years it started to grow rapidly, reaching a value from the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The real significance of the growing  $\beta$  becomes obvious when one notes its connection with rates of income growth of capital  $c$  and total income  $i$  (comprised of the rate of work income growth, as well). Namely, it is obvious that the constancy of the ratio  $C/I$  (i.e. constancy of  $\beta$ ) means that  $c=i$ , its fall means that  $c < i$ , its growth that  $c > i$ . Hastened growth of  $\beta$  means not only that  $c > i$ , but also that  $c$  is more and more departing from  $i$ .

(For those who are not afraid of math, here are some simple inferences from these obvious facts: from  $C = \beta I$  follows that  $pC = \beta pI + Ip\beta$  whence (by dividing) follows  $pC/C = pI/I + p\beta/\beta$ . However,  $pC/C = c$  and  $pI/I = i$  what leads to  $c = i + p\beta/\beta$ . Constant  $\beta$  means  $p\beta = 0$ , i.e.  $c = i$ . Growing  $\beta$  means  $p\beta > 0$  which means that  $c > i$  because  $\beta$  is a ratio of positive numbers. Rapidly growing  $\beta$  means growing  $p\beta$  which then suggests that  $c$  is more and more departing from  $i$ .

That is the way in which Piketty's model works. Therefore, rapidly growing  $\beta$  actually means that the division of the total income (i.e. the division of GNP) is more and more beneficial for capital. If we take into consideration a fact that capital income is divided among much lesser number of (rich) individuals than the work income, it is obvious that individual division of wealth is going to become even more uneven, i.e. income inequality will grow more.

Piketty also offers historical explanations of the described trends. Growth of the ratio  $\beta$  (capital/income) in the period from the Industrial Revolution to the First World War in France and Britain is a result of high contributions to ongoing accumulated capital which in the political

surroundings favors capitalists more than workers (USA is an exception in that period because their inheritable accumulation is still relatively small as the USA is a “young” country).

In the societies with high  $\beta$ , such as the Victorian-time England and *la belle époque* France, it was more profitable to focus on finding a rich husband or wife, or some other way of inheriting, than to focus on work. The difference between a glittering career based upon learning and working and a comfortable life as a result of a marriage with some rich inheritor is a constant theme of the literary works from that period.

Honore de Balzac and Jane Austen have written unforgettable pages about brutality, comedy and absurdity of that world. (The American economy was running late with their  $\beta$  and, consequently, with adequate literature, but Henry James had it all fully compensated.)

Jane Austen’s heroes and heroines used education only as a means of improving their marital prospects. Work is almost never an option, excluding situations when mere survival has been brought into question. The measure of social status is not a glittering career, but a glittering rent.

I love that literature as I love its unforgettable screen versions, but I have always thought about it as a picture of secondary social happenings. Thanks to Piketty, I can see now how wrong I was.

### **3 Children of growing and falling $\beta$**

In the *la belle époque* period of capitalism (that lasted from the Paris Commune to the First World War) capital owners could expect  $c=5\%$  of refund for their investments with insignificant taxes. Economic growth in that period was barely  $i=1\%$ . That significant difference enabled them to ensure a bigger portion of total wealth by reinvesting only a part of their profit, having alongside a prodigally luxurious lifestyle which actually created a name for the period.

Not even unavoidable and usually counterbalancing death could stop this trend because inheriting was also accompanied with insignificant taxes. Inheritances were 25% of total annual income. No less than 90% of total wealth was inherited while only 10% was saved from newly created income.

The 20<sup>th</sup> century (precisely, period from the First World War to the eighties) had brought enormous changes. We have already seen that the ratio of capital and income  $\beta$  in that period has been rapidly falling in the whole developed world. Piketty explains that with enormous physical capital destruction that happened in both world wars and high taxes on large (most commonly capital) incomes and great inheritances. Of course, everything was done with a goal of supporting enormous war expenses.

After the Second World War that trend went on due to relatively high inflation which favors capital poor debtors (and harms capital rich creditors) and general political atmosphere which is inclined towards workers in the era of constant Soviet danger (surprisingly, Piketty does not mention it). All of these factors have substantially lowered capital accumulation and with that also a portion of capital profit in income, i.e. they lowered  $\beta$ .

That period is known as the golden period of capitalism: *Golden Age*, *les trente glorieuses*, *Wirtschaftswunder*. European economies and Japan had never grown faster in their history and were gaining upon USA with incredible speed. It was a classic, almost school example of convergence. Capital contributions were relatively low, taxes high and the division of wealth shifted from capital to work. The distribution of income was more even-handed.

It was a truly golden period for which my postwar *baby boom* generation grown up in a deep belief that future can only be better. I was always astonished at the generation of my grandfathers

and grandmothers whose *weltanschauung* undoubtedly was that future can always be worse. I thought that this is about a generation gap (that death is a much more relevant fact of their near future). However, it must have been only about the gap between the children of growing and falling  $\beta$ .

Piketty sees the golden period as a singular phenomenon unrepeatable in the history of capitalism. It was a period of Europe and Japan's convergence towards USA which held the rate of  $i$  high, while the rate of capital incomes remained low because of the combination of high taxes and fear of communism.

But in the last thirty-odd years  $c$  is again higher than  $i$  just as it was in the whole history.

#### **4 Where are we and where are we going?**

The golden period of capitalism resulted from  $k > p$  is definitely behind us. Nobody could stop us on our way of leaving a singular period of exponential growth (initiated by Industrial and politically-liberal revolutions), growth that successfully survived in the 20<sup>th</sup> century by the two world wars, a period of unequally developed economy convergences and demographic growth.

When China finally finishes its convergence, those extraordinary conditions will disappear and capitalism will once again end up in *la belle époque*  $p > k$  phase. Namely, the end of convergence means that all the developed countries will grow at the rate of technological advancement, approximately 1.5%, while capital contributions will still have their stable historical worth of approximately 4.5%. Therefore, along with  $i = 1.5\%$  and  $c = 4.5\%$ , we will once again have  $i > c$ .

This Piketty's version of economic history clashes with the standard picture of Industrial Revolution that definitely pulls us out of Malthus's trap (in which demographic growth



constantly devours economic growth). In that picture, after a thousand years of no growth at all, a never-ending exponential growth starts with the Industrial revolution.

Why is there no end? Because we have not seen it so far! Not much of an explanation.

We have seen that Piketty offers at least some additional analysis (although it is not flawless): the ratio  $\beta$  has been significantly and indicatively changing throughout history, but despite all of its changes, capital contribution  $c$  remains stable. That brings us back to inheritable capitalism and paints a picture that Jane Austen's novels might become a representation of future and not only a figment of history.

At the moment when inequality once again starts to be a great economic, political and social topic, Piketty offers Austen's theory. A theory that places her in interrelationships of economic growth, different work and capital contributions and ways of (individual) distribution of national wealth.

Besides possible insufficiency of only historical reasons for stable  $c$ , the foreseen return of capitalism in *la belle époque* phase has another potential flaw (or at least qualification). Today's inequality in the USA levels that from the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but its structure is somewhat different. Enormous *earnings* of super managers make its large part.

Many economists believe that this is the result of technological development which generates "markets with only one winner". On that markets only a minority of individuals collect a majority of fruits, even when they are only infinitesimally better than their (less paid) competitors.

Piketty (like many other non-economists) does not accept that explanation of great pays for the minority of super managers because it is almost impossible to monetarily quantify their contribution (quite the contrary, Piketty gives convincing arguments to prove that successes of super managers are more results of luck than their quality managerial).

Basically, that contribution is quantified in a way that super managers appoint a compensation committee which then determines their compensations. In other words, super managers determine their own great pays. In that (ultimately non-market) situation the only things that limit them are social norms. Erosion of these norms (also stimulated by a positive feedback alliance: the more great managers stand out of the norm, the less is norm a norm) is the main cause of this new phenomenon.

However, I got an impression that this new phenomenon does not stand out of Piketty's general picture. Namely, capital contributions still play a great role in generating inequality and even the inheritors of today's super managers (whose income ensues from work) will most probably become rentiers (whose income will be income from the inherited capital).

With the next generation (in twenty-odd years) the USA may become a rentier society with extremes not seen in *la belle époque*. Some generation later, the rest of the developed world could also suit.

However, that is not bound to happen. Staphylococcus infection probably leads us to death, *if we do not have antibiotics*. The economic factors described lead us to inheritable capitalism, *if we do not have a political solution*. Piketty suggests progressive taxation of **extreme** incomes and inheritances. It should be coordinately carried out on a global level so that "tax havens" do not tear apart whole construction.

It is not clear which political forces would accept and realize that plan. Personally, I do not see them. But as Kenyes said: “*never underestimate the power of ideas*”. Piketty’s “*Capital in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*” may be exactly the active idea that will direct political perspectives and activities direct to a new path.

If it is to judge by the panic reaction of think-tanks which look after prosperity of the wealthiest, Piketty is on the right track.

## Source text 3

### Mladi i socijalna pravda

Damir Ljubotina

Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu

### Završna rasprava

Ukoliko rezimiramo prikazane rezultate, možemo uočiti tendenciju da sve tri dobne skupine mladih neke aspekte društva u kojem žive opažaju nepravednim i to u relativno visokom stupnju. U kojoj mjeri je ta percepcija odraz stvarne ili doživljene nepravde u društvenim odnosima, a u kojoj mjeri je uzrokovana drugim faktorima izvan je predmeta ovog istraživanja. Latentna struktura korištenog upitnika percepcije socijalne nepravde ukazuje na tri neovisne dimenzije procjene: «opća neravnopravnost članova društva» koju najbolje opisuju tvrdnje «općenito naše je društvo nepravedno» i «u Hrvatskoj svi ljudi nemaju jednake šanse da ostvare svoje želje i ciljeve». To znači da mladi ne doživljavaju naše društvo društvom jednakih šansi.

Drugu dimenziju nazvali smo «nejednakost članova pred zakonom», a najviše je saturirana tvrdnjama «mnogi kriminalci su i dalje na slobodi», «mnogi su se na nepošten način obogatili tijekom rata», te «država ne kažnjava dovoljno one koji su je opljačkali». Ovo je dimenzija koja ukazuje na loše funkcioniranje pravne države i izostanak formalnih sankcija prema onima koji su prekršili zakon. Rezultati pokazuju da su na toj dimenziji ispitanici postigli najviše rezultate, odnosno iskazali najveći stupanj percipirane nepravde. Prema ranije izloženim teorijama proceduralne pravde posljedice nejednakog tretmana od strane autoriteta ili referentne grupe (u ovom slučaju društva) mogu biti različite: od gubitka samopoštovanja, nepridržavanja postojećih normi i pravila, gubitka interesa za sudjelovanje u društvenom životu, pa sve do napuštanja takve

socijalne zajednice. To potvrđuju neke ranije analize prema kojima je veća percepcija društvene nepravde povezana s namjerom napuštanja Hrvatske zbog posla ili studija (Lugomer Armano, Kamenov, Ljubotina, 2003.).

Treća dimenzija proizašla iz analize latentne strukture odgovora ispitanika odnosi se na «toleriranje devijantnih ponašanja», koje opisuju tvrdnje «ne isplati se biti pošten da bi uspio u životu» i «znanje i sposobnosti kod nas nitko ne cijeni». I ovdje se radi o kršenju proceduralnih načela, jer se pri ostvarenju životnih ciljeva ne vrednuju istinske vrijednosti, već uspjeh ovisi o korištenju različitih polulegalnih i socijalno neprihvatljivih strategija. Dva glavna motivacijska mehanizma - potkrjepljenje pozitivnog ponašanja, te sankcioniranje negativnog, kojim zajednica regulira ponašanje - u ovom slučaju izostaju ili ih barem mladi ne uočavaju. Prema Lernerovoj teoriji motiva pravednosti osnovni način očuvanja vjerovanja u pravedan svijet je uspostavljanje pravde intervencijom u samu situaciju tako da se nepravda i njezine posljedice uklone ili barem reduciraju, što u ovom slučaju, barem kratkoročno, za mlade članove društva nije moguće. Osjećaj pojedinca da ne može utjecati na društvene procese vodi ka pasivnosti i marginalizaciji, što je kod mladih posebna opasnost. Druga mogućnost prema Lerneru je kognitivno restrukturiranje situacije tako da se reducira ili čak ukloni opaženi element nepravde (npr. okrivljavanjem žrtve ili nalaženjem nekog «višeg» cilja ili svrhe koji će nepravdi dati neki smisao). Kognitivno restrukturiranje bit će vjerojatnije u situacijama u kojima više nikakva intervencija nije moguća ili kad bi cijena intervencije bila previsoka. Prema Adamsovoj teoriji pravednosti moguć je izostanak reakcije na opaženu nepravdu budući da pojedinci percipiraju da su i ostali njima slični pojedinci u jednakoj situaciji. Ta «adaptacija na nepravdu» može poslužiti pri objašnjenju relativne pasivnosti mladih (osobito studenata) u političkom životu, što je u

suprotnosti s dobivenim rezultatima prema kojima mladi u visokom stupnju uočavaju socijalnu nepravdu.

Naši rezultati slažu se rezultatima Flanagan i Tuckera (1999.), prema kojima mladi u funkciji dobi postaju svjesniji različitih oblika društvenih utjecaja. To je uvjetovano većim osobnim iskustvom, tj. većim brojem socijalnih interakcija, odnosno društvene inicijacije koje mladi osobno prolaze (iskustvo s školskim ocjenjivanjem, upisi u srednju školu ili fakultet, sudjelovanje na različitim natjecanjima, prve romantične veze i sl.), pri čemu uočavaju da na rezultat ne utječu samo vlastite sposobnosti i uloženi trud već i neki vanjski uvjeti. Osim toga tijekom školovanja mladi usvajaju sve više informacija o funkcioniranju društva, te internaliziraju neke društveno proklamirane vrijednosti, ali kroz medije, te učeći od dostupnih modela usvajaju i neke nepoželjne vrijednosti. Obitelj, obrazovne institucije, kao i mediji trebali bi u procesu socijalizacije kod mladih razvijati osjećaj za socijalnu pravdu i altruistične oblike ponašanja. S druge strane, dobiveni rezultati pokazuju da društvo mora učiniti značajne napore i promjene kako bi ga mladi, pa i svi ostali počeli doživljavati pravednijim. Naime, mladi se prema percepciji društvene nepravde ne razlikuju bitno od rezultata koje postižu odrasli. Prema rezultatima koje navode Črpić i Rimac (2000.) u Hrvatskoj čak polovina ispitanika tolerira kršenje normi poput primanja mita, porezne evazije i sličnog. Veliko ili vrlo veliko povjerenje u pravni sustav u Hrvatskoj ima 30,5% ispitanih, u Sloveniji 34,4%, dok je u Nizozemskoj taj postotak 63,7%.

Podaci Šakića (1999.), proizašli iz empirijskog istraživanja, ukazuju na to da je primijenjeno načelo raspodjele tijekom privatizacije u gotovo potpunoj suprotnosti s očekivanjima i željama većine hrvatskih građana.

Štulhofer (1998.; 2003.) rezimira neke od ciljanih društvenih mjera koje mogu imati učinak na razvoj povjerenja u društvo općenito: a) povećanje djelotvornosti sudstva, što naglašava i Putnam (2000.), b) borba protiv oportunističkog ponašanja, c) intenzivniji razvoj civilnog društva, d) promicanje profesionalizma, e) transparentnost političkih odluka, f) obrazovanje i g) otvorenost i uključivanje u međunarodne integracije. Globalizacija i procesi integracija postavljaju pred brojne zemlje visoke zahtjeve u pogledu načina reguliranja socijalnih odnosa i sustav nadgledanja provođenja postavljenih normi, te poštivanje socijalne pravde postaje preduvjet za ulazak u različite oblike integracija.

Lund (2003.) naglašava važnost obrazovnog sustava kao jednog od najvažnijih činitelja u promociji društvene pravde. U kontekstu američkog društva autor predlaže razvijanje multikulturalne i antirasističke edukacije.

Lind, Kanfer i Earley (1990.) navode značaj mogućnosti sudjelovanja u procesu donošenja odluke. Kad su sudionici u socijalnim eksperimentima imali mogućnost iznošenja vlastitih argumenata (čak i kad time nisu utjecali na konačni ishod), cjelokupnu su interakciju procjenjivali pravednijom i korektnijom nego kad nisu imali tu mogućnost. Mogućnost aktivnog sudjelovanja učenika i studenata u odlukama koje su za njih relevantne u psihološkom smislu je važna za osjećaj pravednosti, te razvoj samopoštovanja. Ono što u ovom slučaju zabrinjava su rezultati empirijskih istraživanja koja pokazuju da jednom izgubljeno povjerenje u proceduru nije lako vratiti (Van den Boss, Vermunt, Wilke, 1997.).

## Workflow 3

### Youth and Social Justice

Source text 3, *Mladi i socijalna nepravda*, is a scientific text written with a high level of formality. It is entirely an objective text, without any subjective evaluations. The author of the text is Damir Ljubotina, professor at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. Text's topic pertains to the sociology domain which led to using several specific sociology terms and their elaboration. Text is in concord with the rules of scientific discourse: syntax is simple, there are no many adjectives, not many metaphoric expressions and not a single rhetorical question. However, there were a few elements that appeared as problems while translating the text into English language.

The very first sentence of the discussion is partly ambiguous: *možemo uočiti tendenciju da sve tri dobne skupine mladih neke aspekte društva u kojem žive opažaju nepravednim*. Object (*neke aspekte društva*) is here placed before the verb (*opažaju*) which is followed by object complement (*nepravednim*). Such structures are not neutral, but rather poetic and therefore not appropriate for scientific texts. Because of these reasons, I decided to translate that part of the sentence as *we can notice a tendency that all three age groups of youth perceive some aspects of the society they live in as unfair*.

*Drugu dimenziju nazvali smo* is a correct active structure that I decided to transform into passive structure in my translation. The main reason was the fact that English scientific discourse prefers passive structures and that passive voice is one of the scientific text characteristics in general. My translation was *The second dimension was called*.



Similar to the previously mentioned structure was the following one: *Rezultati pokazuju da su na toj dimenziji ispitanici postigli najviše rezultate*. For the same reasons that made me change the previously explained sentence, I have changed this one, too. Rendered as *Results show that this was the dimension on which the participants achieved the highest results*, the whole structure is more formal, precise and ordered as should be in scientific discourse.

Changing word order is not something unusual in a process of translation. While translating this text, I had to change it several times. One of the examples is the following inversion: *znanje i sposobnosti kod nas nitko ne cijeni*. While Croatian has a relatively free word order, English is more fixed and prefers S-V-O structures. Because of that I opted for *nobody here appreciates knowledge and abilities*.

Probably the most problematic sentence in this text was *Prema Lernerovoj teoriji motiva pravednosti osnovni način očuvanja vjerovanja u pravedan svijet je uspostavljanje pravde intervencijom u samu situaciju tako da se nepravda i njezine posljedice uklone ili barem reduciraju, što u ovom slučaju, barem kratkoročno, za mlade članove društva nije moguće*. First of all, this sentence is too long and its message could not be easily deciphered. Sentences like this one should be generally avoided in all kinds of texts. I decided to break the massive chain into three separate units that are in a cause-effect relationship: *According to Lerner's The Justice's Motive theory, fundamental way for preserving belief in a righteous world would be establishing justice by intervening into the situation itself. Once done that, injustice and its consequences shall be removed or at least diminished. However, in this case and at least for a short period of time, that is not possible for the young members of the society.*

Although metaphoric expressions are not welcome in a scientific text, they often find their place in it. This text was not an exception regarding them. *Kad bi cijena intervencije bila previsoka* was not used to literally describe the price of intervention, but to highlight potential risk that could happen if the intervention takes place. My decision was not to use an English metaphoric expression, but to use the explanation of the metaphor as a target language equivalent. English version is now *when there are too many consequences that an intervention could cause*.

*Podaci Šakića (1999.), proizašli iz empirijskog istraživanja, ukazuju na to da je primijenjeno načelo raspodjele tijekom privatizacije u gotovo potpunoj suprotnosti s očekivanjima i željama većine hrvatskih građana.* is a syntactically correct sentence. My decision was to step away from the verbless phrase *u gotovo potpunoj suprotnosti* and translate it as *point to a clash*. By avoiding an adverb (*gotovo*) and an adjective (*potpunoj*) the phrase message is clearer and deprived of subjective elements. The whole sentence is now: *Šakić's data (1999), collected through an empirical research, point to a clash between division principle used during privatization and expectations and wishes of the majority of Croatian citizens.*

When translating *visoki zahtjevi* I considered two options. Bujas (2011) translated the phrase as *exacting demands* and *high standards* and I decided to go for the first option, *exacting demands*. My decision was based on the fact that *demands* are necessarily expected to be fulfilled, while *standards* may simply imply a certain level of quality or attainment (Oxford Dictionaries).

## **Target text 3**

### **Youth and Social Justice**

Damir Ljubotina

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb

#### **Final Discussion**

If we recapitulate presented results, we can notice a tendency that all three age groups of youth perceive some aspects of the society they live in as unfair in a relatively high degree. To what extent is that perception a reflection of real or experienced injustice in social relationships and to what extent it is caused by other factors is not relevant for this research. Latent structure of the used questionnaire points to three independent dimensions of evaluation: “general inequality of society members” that is best described with claims “in general, our society is inequitable” and “people in Croatia do not have equal chances to realize their wishes and goals”. This means that youth do not perceive our society as a society of equal chances.

The second dimension was called “members inequality in front of the law” and was most saturated with claims “many criminals are still on the loose”, “many people became rich in a dishonest way during the war” and “state is not punishing enough those who plundered it”. This is a dimension which points to malfunctioning of the rule of law and instance of absence of formal sanctions for those who broke the law. Results show that this was the dimension on which the participants achieved the highest results, i.e. showed the highest degree of perceived injustice. According to previously displayed theories of procedural justice, the consequences of an unequal treatment by an authority or a referent group (in this case society) can be various: from losing self-respect, not complying with the existing norms and rules, losing interest for taking part in

social life, up to leaving that social community. This is confirmed by some previously done analyses which proved that a higher perception of social injustice is in a correlation with the intention to leave Croatia because of work or education (Lugomer Armano, Kamenov, Ljubotina, 2003).

The third dimension that resulted from latent structure of participants' responses refers to "tolerating deviant behaviors" described by claims "it is not worth the trouble to be fair to succeed in life" and "nobody here appreciates knowledge and abilities". The issue here is again violation of procedural principles because no real values are evaluated to realize life goals, but success depends upon using different semi-legal and socially unacceptable strategies. Two main motivational mechanisms – corroboration of positive behavior and ratification of negative behavior through which the community regulates behavior – are left out in this case or, at least, young people do not see them. According to Lerner's The Justice's Motive theory, the fundamental way for preserving belief in a righteous world would be establishing justice by intervening into the situation itself. Once done that, injustice and its consequences shall be removed or at least diminished. However, in this case and at least for a short period of time that is not possible for young members of the society. Feeling that one cannot influence on social processes lead them to being passive and marginalized, which is exceedingly dangerous when it happens to young people. According to Lerner, the second option is cognitive restructuring of the situation by reducing or even removing the noticed elements of injustice (like blaming a victim or finding some "higher" goal or purpose that gives some sense to injustice). Cognitive restructuring will probably occur in situations in which no intervention is possible, or when there are too many consequences that an intervention could cause. Adams' Theory of Justice posits that the lack of reaction to the noticed injustice is possible because individuals perceive that other individuals

resembling them are in the same situation. This “adaptation to injustice” can serve in explaining relative passiveness of young people (especially students) in political life. That clashes with the gained results according to which the youth notice social injustice in a high degree.

Our results match with those of Flanagan and Tucker (1999) according to which young people start to become aware of different types of social influences with age. That is conditioned by greater personal experience, i.e. larger number of social interactions or social initiations that young people experience personally (experience with school grading, admission to high school or college, participation in various competitions, first romantic relationships and similar) while noticing that result is not only influenced by their personal abilities and invested effort, but also some external conditions. Besides that, while growing up young people acquire more and more information about how society works and start to internalize some socially proclaimed values through the media. While learning from available models, they learn some undesirable values as well. During the process of socialization family, educational institutions and media should develop a sense of justice and altruistic models of behavior among young people. On the other hand, results show that society has to invest great effort and make significant changes so that the youth, but also all other people, could start to perceive it as more righteous. Namely, young people’s perception of social injustice does not differ from those of the adults. According to the results cited by Črpić and Rimac (2000) half of the respondents tolerate norm breaking such as taking bribe, tax evasion and the like. 30.5% of respondents in Croatia, 34.4% in Slovenia have great or absolute confidence in judicial system, while in Netherlands that percentage is 63.7%.

Šakić’s data (1999), collected through an empirical research, points to a clash between division principle used during privatization and expectations and wishes of the majority of Croatian citizens.

Štulhofer (1998; 2003) recapitulates some of the targeted social measures that can have an impact on establishing trust in the society in general: a) enhancement of judiciary's effectiveness, also highlighted by Putnam (2000), b) fight against opportunistic behavior, c) more intensive development of the civic society, d) promotion of professionalism, e) transparency of political decisions, f) education and g) openness and involving in international integrations. Globalization and integration processes set exacting demands to many countries when it comes to regulating social relationships and establishing a system for monitoring the implementation of set norms. Respecting social justice becomes a prerequisite for entrance into different integration models.

Lund (2003) highlights importance of the educational system as one of the key factors of social justice promotion. Speaking of American society, author suggests a development of multicultural and antiracist education.

Lind, Kanfer and Earley (1990) mention the importance of a possibility to take part in the process of decision-making. When the participants of social experiments had a possibility to introduce their own arguments (even when they made no influence on the final result) they evaluated the whole interaction as more righteous and more concrete than when they did not have that possibility. The possibility to actively take part in the decisions that are psychologically relevant for them is very important for pupils' and students' sense of justice and the development of self-respect.

What worries in this case are the results of the empirical research which show that once lost trust in the procedure, cannot be easily returned (Van den Boss, Vermunt, Wilke, 1997).

## **Conclusion**

Although translation may seem really easy, translator's job includes a lot more than simple rendering a text from a source language into a target language. Culture, customs, slang, history and political circumstances that accompany a certain language are almost equally important for a translator as the language itself. Besides that, translator must be willing to broaden the horizons and learn the key terms of a whole range of fields of study (economy, psychology, sociology, etc.).

Issues are something that cannot be avoided. Sometimes the problem lies within the target text and translators should do the job that is not primarily theirs (correct the mistakes before they could even start to translate the text). It is possible that collocations or lexemes of a source language do not even exist in a target language, but a translator must produce them and fit them into the rest of the text in order to achieve as cohesive translation as is the source text.

## Bibliography

- Bendow, I. (2006). Englesko-hrvatski frazeološki rječnik. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Leech, G. N. (2002). Longman student grammar of spoken and written English. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Bujas, Ž. (2011). Croatian-English Dictionary. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.
- Dictionary, Encyclopedia and Thesaurus (The Free Dictionary)  
<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/>
- Englesko hrvatski i hrvatsko engleski rječnik (Englesko hrvatski rječnik i hrvatsko engleski online rječnik)  
<http://www.englesko.hrvatski-rjecnik.com/>
- Hornby, A. S., Ashby, M., McIntosh, c., Turnbull, J., Wehmeier, S. (2005). Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hrvatski jezični portal (Hrvatski jezični portal)  
<http://hjp.novi-liber.hr/>
- Jergović, M. (2015). 'Ti mene nosiš' film je bez usporedbe u suvremenoj hrvatskoj kinematografiji. Retrieved from: Jutarnji.hr  
<http://www.jutarnji.hr/-ti-mene-nosis--film-je-bez-usporedbe-u-suvremenoj-hrvatskoj-kinematografiji/1357844/>
- Limun.hr - Leksikon (Limun.hr - Leksikon)  
<http://limun.hr/main.aspx?id=9312>
- Ljubotina, D. (2003). Mladi i socijalna pravda. Retrieved from: Hrcak.srce.hr  
[http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id\\_clanak\\_jezik=47662](http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=47662)



- McIntosh, C., Francis, B., & Poole, R. (2009). Oxford Collocations Dictionary for the Students of English. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford Dictionaries - Dictionary, Thesaurus, & Grammar (Oxford Dictionaries - Dictionary, Thesaurus, & Grammar)  
<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/>
- Šikić, Z. (2014). Recenzija knjige - Thomas Piketty: Kapital u 21. stoljeću. Retrieved from: Banka.hr  
<http://www.banka.hr/komentari-i-analize/recenzija-knjige-thomas-piketty-kapital-u-21-stoljecu>