

Biljana T. Prođović Milojković<sup>1</sup>  
Metropolitan University,  
Faculty of Applied Ecology – Futura  
Belgrade (Serbia)

## CONTENT ANALYSIS: ĐORĐE TASIĆ IN THE PREVIOUS ISSUES OF THE *SOCIOLOŠKI PREGLED* / *SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW*

---

**ABSTRACT:** This year is the 130th birth anniversary of Đorđe Tasić, PhD, Professor of the Faculty of Law in Belgrade. In that context, the author would like to point out the importance of Đorđe Tasić's pioneering contribution to the founding of the Serbian Sociological Society, with a special emphasis on launching and editing the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* in 1938, which is considered the pinnacle of Serbian sociology and, at the same time, the foundation of the successful development of sociology in Serbia after the Second World War.

The paper discusses the ideas of Đorđe Tasić, one of our most famous theorists between the two world wars, published in the mentioned journal. In addition to bibliographic significance, the author will point out general indication, but also the structure of the author's texts by sections and topics. Thus, through the content analysis, the author intends to discover and consolidate the extent to which Tasić's scientific contributions are mentioned in the works of various authors published in the previous issues of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* - in the period from 1938 to 2022.

The precious intellectual trace that Tasić left in our science will serve as a model and signpost for new generations of various scientific profiles, including sociologists, that only with competitiveness and professionalism they can raise the reputation/affirmation of their vocation and profession in society.

**KEYWORDS:** Đorđe Tasić, *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*, sociology, content analysis.

---

<sup>1</sup> biljanaprođovic@gmail.com

## INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION - ĐORĐE TASIĆ'S PERSONALITY THROUGH THE PRISM OF THE CONTENT ANALYSIS

The fact that the content analysis is hardly used in research in our sociology is proved by many authors. The small number of references in the Serbian language about this method, and an even smaller number of research studies are at the same time an indicator and one of the causes of this method being neglected (Stojšin, 2014: 193). There are quite many ambiguities in the way of its application, which is a consequence of the few and already outdated references. The content analysis is usually viewed as an exclusively quantitative method, while almost any discussion is avoided about its qualitative aspect (Stojšin, 2014: 193-194). The development of this method began in the 17th century, in the research into the content of human communication. A more modern form was applied at the beginning of the 20th century in the research into the content of public information media, and it experienced a significant boom in the research into political propaganda during the Second World War, after which its application began in other areas of research: linguistics, history, art, psychology, media research, in the field of sociology, political science, in marketing, as well as in other areas of social communication<sup>2</sup>.

According to Vojin Milić, this method was created “as a result of practical and theoretical needs to obtain more objective and complete data on certain forms of social communication” (Milić, 1996: 571). Its basic characteristic, according to Steve Stemler, is reflected precisely in the fact that it allows us to discover and describe what individual, group, institutional and social communication in general focuses on (Stemler, 2001: 4).

As the quantitative analysis is used much more often than the qualitative one, the very problem of “choosing” one or the other arises for many authors. However, Strauss and Corbin state that the question is not whether to use one or the other procedure, but how to combine them, in order to better explain the phenomenon (Strauss, Corbin, 1998: 28). For this reason, opinions are mostly interwoven throughout the literature stating that there are two types of content analysis, in which they do not deal much with pointing out their advantages and disadvantages in application (Stojšin, 2014: 202). Đuro Šušnjić also supports their combination, in the context when he says that the “content analysis (is) quantitative and qualitative. The former relates to the distribution, and the latter to the content of attitudes” (Šušnjić, 1973: 256). Weber also points to the confirmation of such an opinion when he says that the best studies are those in which both procedures were used (Weber, 1990). Based on existing insights, the authors increasingly opt for a variant of these two types, all for the sake of obtaining as detailed an analysis of the collected material as possible (Stojšin, 2014: 204)<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> For a more detailed analysis of the development and application of this method, see: Manić, 2017; Stojšin, 2013; Milić, 1996.

<sup>3</sup> For more information on this and other methodological analyses, see: Branković, 2009; Kaljević, 1972: 215-229; Stojak, 1990; Bešić, 2019; Branković, 2014: 1-407; Đorić, Popović, 2000.

Qualitative research is becoming more and more important and present in the field of social sciences. The *content analysis* is one of the techniques within qualitative research and a flexible method for analyzing different contents, but it is primarily used for text analysis (Cavanagh, 1997). This procedure allows us to find out in which direction a certain area is going and what the topics that dominate it are. Scientific journals are the first and most important source of information for experts in various scientific disciplines. The *analysis of the content* of social (as well as other) journals is an important step in finding research trends in social areas, therefore also in (in)familiarity with the life and work of certain personalities. The content analysis of the published articles points to growth in the researched scientific discipline and area, and determines the interests and beliefs of scientists, editors, scientific discipline, and perhaps readers and practitioners. Moreover, such analysis enables gaining an insight into neglected areas of research, which has the sole purpose of indirectly warning about the need to increase the scope of research in them, and also a better insight into the most important areas of the social science discipline. Namely, precisely by emphasizing and highlighting authors with a greater number of publications and institutions with which they are connected, a contribution is made to the professional development of the profession itself<sup>4</sup>. That was the guiding theme of the research in the rest of the text.

Đorđe Tasić (1892-1943) was a doctor of legal sciences and professor, theoretician and philosopher of law and sociology. He was born in Vranje on 25 October 1892 to father Rista (municipal clerk) and mother Paraskeva (housewife). He completed elementary school and six grades of secondary school in Vranje, and the seventh and eighth grades in the Third Belgrade Grammar School. After graduation and doctorate at the Faculty of Law in Belgrade, he obtained all other titles at the same university until the outbreak of the war, which found him in the position of the dean of this Faculty. After being arrested and tortured by the occupiers at Sajmište in 1943, Tasić ended his short but very fruitful life with a martyr's death (Vasić, 1999). It is inevitable to point out his great activity, which stems from his trust in man and willingness to make sacrifices of all kinds in order to contribute to the progress of humanity. In this context, he said that "in reality man is in a state of continuous activity, striving for the ideal of moral perfection and truth, since nothing perfect and complete is given, but everything must be won. Life is something given as a gift and a task at the same time" (Lukić, 1959). The whole moral and social attitude of Đorđe Tasić is summed up in these words, because, in the final analysis, according to him, man never exists alone or for himself.

In fact, his working life will be reduced to around twenty years – from 1920, when he received his doctorate, to 1941, when the collapse of the old Yugoslavia occurred

---

<sup>4</sup> Here we point out that just researching the number of visits and downloading articles from a scientific journal represents help to the editors themselves in obtaining important information about the characteristics, strengths and weaknesses of their journals; which, among other things, allows them to improve their daily work and quality, and change the policy of accepting articles for publication. This condition is among the basic ones when it comes to the observed journal.

(Lukić, 1959). There was no problem in our social and legal existence that Tasić did not write about. Between the two wars, there was hardly a significant journal or anthology without one of his scientific contributions or studies. He wrote in our language and several world languages. He left behind over six hundred published works, so he was one of the most valuable and prolific writers. He was infinitely devoted to the interests of our people and our science. From 1939 to 1941, Tasić was the editor of the *Archive for Legal and Social Sciences*, the journal in which, his texts will also fill a large number of pages (Simonović, 1999). It should be mentioned that Tasić was a member of the editorial board of our first sociological journal, *Social Life*, whose founder and editor was Mirko M. Kosić (1892-1956) (more in: Vojnović, Bogdanović, 2013: 476)<sup>5</sup>.

He worked in a small environment, but thanks to his talent, versatility, education and incredibly extensive production, he gained lasting fame in our country and reputation in the world. Many have written about him. Among other things, Professor Đorđe Tasić was seen as “a prime mover of sociological thought in our country and a man who wanted and knew how to engage in science without any dogmatism and to bring together for that purpose, without any sectarianism, representatives of different and even opposite philosophical and ideological attitudes” (Bakić, Miljković, Janićijević, 1978: 9). For Radomir Lukić, “Tasić was one of the smartest minds we have had in the field of social sciences and a theorist of a really wide range” (Antonić, 2018). Đorđe Tasić is of monumental importance for the origin and development of Yugoslav sociology in general, considering that he was the founder of the first professional association of sociologists and the publisher of a sociological scientific journal (Dimitrijević, 2000: 259–268), which is still published by the Serbian Sociological Association.

The efforts and preparations for the foundation of *the Sociological Society* during 1920-1921 failed. However, as the then main initiator and motivator in the creation and development of sociology in Serbia, Tasić succeeded in founding the Society for Legal Philosophy and Sociology in 1935, which was renamed into the Society for Sociology and Social Sciences in 1938 (Bakić, Miljković, Janićijević, 1978: 11). In 1938, he immediately initiated the publication of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*, under the influence of Durkheim’s school in particular<sup>6</sup> (Trkulja, 2018: 29). The *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* as the first sociological journal in Serbia, dates back to 1938. Until

---

<sup>5</sup> After six published issues, the journal *Social Life*, which was the first and only sociological journal to fill a noticeable gap in our expert literature at the time and gathered our best and most famous social and cultural workers, was closed (Trkulja, 2013: 47). The intention of Tasić, Kosić and Nikić at the time was to celebrate the founding of the Sociological Society with the release of the first issue of this journal. It was also among the first attempts to establish it, which unfortunately did not succeed (Nikić, 1981: 157).

<sup>6</sup> This was understandable, given that the authors who published articles in the journal had been educated in France and were connected to French science and culture (Trkulja, 2018: 31). Until then, Tasić saw himself primarily as a legal philosopher, and only secondarily as a sociologist. However, his study stay in France and Belgium will be of crucial importance for his strong turn towards sociology (Antonić, 2018: 10).

then, works from sociology had been published in both literary and legal journals, such as: *Annals of Matica srpska*, *Brankovo kolo*, *Serbian Literary Journal*, *Delo*, *Savremenik*, *Archives for Legal and Social Sciences*, *Branič*, *Legal Thought* (Trkulja, 2018: 25)<sup>7</sup>. In that period, Đorđe Tasić, together with Mirko M. Kosić and Mihailo Ilić, with the support of Slobodan Jovanović, Živojin Perić, Toma Živanović and other younger colleagues, paved the way towards the institutionalization of sociology and its disciplines (by founding the first sociological journals, special editions and newspapers in which sociological works and topics were published, from general sociology, sociology of law, sociology of village to political sociology and other sociological disciplines).

In the literature about this first issue of the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*, serious objections can be made, claiming that there is more “enthusiasm and bold effort to meet the new and unknown than competence and professional foundation” (Trkulja, 2018:30). Nevertheless, despite these weaknesses, this very first issue of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* represented “a solid platform for future sociological research and the establishment of sociology as a scientific and university discipline in Serbia” ... the intention of the editors at the time was to ... “open a whole panorama of topics and problems about sociology and its individual disciplines, and that to process those matters gradually, systematically and completely in subsequent, separate issues” (Trkulja, 2018: 31).

The publication of the already prepared second issue of the journal was definitely prevented by new unfavourable circumstances and the entry of the country into the war. The situation after the Second World War, where the authoritarian political system dominated by one party and its rigid ideology was established in the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia (including Serbia), particularly affected sociology (and, within it, sociology of law), which has remained marginalized and underdeveloped to this day. On the other hand, Professor Radomir Lukić, formerly Đorđe Tasić's student, bravely and resolutely persevered on that path: by founding and chairing the *Serbian Sociological Society* (1954-1956), publishing the first sociology textbook (1957), ensuring that sociology was introduced as a compulsory subject (1958); initiating the establishment of the Sociological Institute and the Sociology Group at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Belgrade. In this way, among other things, he contributed to: “(1) liberation from ideological dogmas and rigid canons, (2) opening to the scope of civic sociology, and (3) establishing bridges with our sociological heritage founded by Valtazar Bogišić, Vladimir Karić, Milan Đ. Milićević, Jovan Cvijić, Slobodan Jovanović, Đorđe Tasić, Mirko Kosić, Dragoljub Jovanović, Sreten Vukosavljević and others” (Trkulja, 2018: 35-36).

---

<sup>7</sup> Some of the aforementioned journals had special sections for social sciences, in which sociological topics and the development of sociology as a scientific discipline were monitored and published. In addition, these journals paved the way for new scientific and university disciplines in Serbia, which were in full swing in France, Germany, Great Britain and the USA at that time (Trkulja, 2018: 25).

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The paper used the bibliographic method of content analysis of all issues of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* (here in after: SP) in the period from 1938 to June 2022. All the researched articles and information were taken from the journal's official website<sup>8</sup>. All issues of the journal and the contributions in them were examined *de visu*<sup>9</sup>.

The method used in the work is the content analysis. The work is based on a qualitative-hermeneutic scientific approach; however, scientific content analysis with a share of quantitative analysis prevails. It determined the scope of Đorđe Tasić's representation within the journal itself, while the content analysis identified and described the subject areas in which he is mentioned and recognized within the interpreted texts of the journal. For the unit of analysis, a single text within the issues of the journal was used, and the text was coded according to the set research tasks. At this point, we find it necessary to explain the way of quoting and paraphrasing the used excerpts and parts of the texts found within the researched journal issues that are considered relevant for confirming the conclusions reached during the research process. Since it is a single journal, it is not necessary to state the name of the journal, but when using parts of the text, we will refer to the initials of the journal, the year and number of the journal, and the page number<sup>10</sup>.

According to the used research method [study design], descriptive-analytical design prevails, and in relation to sampling methods, simple random selection. Although there are different ways of analyzing the content, such as content analysis of keywords, abstracts, article titles, in this paper we opted for the content analysis of the full text. The author's secondary goal was to determine the subject areas of the published articles, as well as the dynamics and frequency of mentioning and quoting Đorđe Tasić in the previously published issues of the journal, in the spirit of the observed time. Using the method of the text content analysis for the period of 84 years, a total of 218 issues of the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* were published, in 163 books, of which 117 were single issues, 41 two-issue, 1 three-issue, and 4 four-issue on as many as 32,062 pages. Over 1,630 articles comprehensively published in these issues were included in the analysis. A total of 1,438 articles were written by only one author; 229 articles were written by two or more authors, two articles have up to six authors, while only one article was written by more than six authors. They are categorized into: original, review and expert scientific papers, announcements, reports and reviews, and other contributions.

---

<sup>8</sup> See: <https://www.socioloskipregled.org.rs/>. Last visit: 22 June 2022. The Bibliography of the Sociological Review in the period from 1938 to 2020, published by the Serbian Sociological Association in Belgrade, co-financed by the Ministry of Culture and Information of the Republic of Serbia, served as an aid in the aforementioned analysis (more in : Vukotić, Aranitović, 2021).

<sup>9</sup> Please note that the published contributions are categorized in accordance with the relevant international standards.

<sup>10</sup> Example: SP, I, 1938: 5.



From the set goal of the work, the task that is pursued through the content analysis emerges - a description of the educational and informative role of the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*, based on the reconstruction of valuable content in Đorđe Tasić's messages. In accordance with the goal, the following research tasks were set:

- using the content analysis to determine the appearance and frequency of Đorđe Tasić within the journal;
- through the analysis, to recognize the promoted values within the area in which they were mentioned, and within the content of the journal itself.

The results are presented in the text with the addition of tabular generalization. The following is a presentation of the results of the analysis of the issues published so far.

## PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis shows that the largest number of articles in which Đorđe Tasić is mentioned in the examined and analyzed issues of this journal were published by researchers who are connected to the University of Belgrade, namely from the Faculty of Philosophy (8), Law (7); Geography (1) and Faculty of Teacher Education (1). There is a smaller number of researchers from the University of Novi Sad, namely the Faculty of Philosophy (2) and the Faculty of Law (1), followed by the University of Niš – the Faculty of Economics (1) and the Faculty of Philosophy (1); and from the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Priština with a temporary seat in Kosovska Mitrovica (2) and the University of East Sarajevo - Pale (1). We must also mention a number of researchers from other institutions - the Institute for Social Sciences (5), and one researcher respectively from the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Belgrade, the Faculty of Applied Ecology Futura, the Higher School for Social Workers, the National Library of Serbia, the National Library of Šabac, Grammar School in Obrenovac, including one translator. Profile-wise, among them is one academician, as many as 26 PhDs of different profiles (starting with lawyers, sociologists, psychologists, philosophers, historians, geographers and communication specialists); researchers (5), but also librarians (2) and social workers (2). The percentage of the authors who come from various civil society organizations is of extreme importance, given that it broadens the range of topics and shows the diversity of experiences of the helping professions.

*International cooperation* is a basic condition for reaching a satisfactory number of citations and recognition of the journal. There is quite a large number of foreign authors who have published works in the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* (as many as 164)<sup>11</sup>, which contributed to the insight of our academic community into international sociological currents (Vukotić, Aranitović, 2021: 6). The above figures also clearly indicate the openness

---

<sup>11</sup> Most of the authors are from Croatia, the USA, Slovenia, Russia, Bulgaria, Germany and Great Britain.

of the journal to external contributors. Before the mandatory bilingual form of papers (in Serbian and in English) was introduced in 2018, only about 80 papers were published in English and one in Slovenian, of which about 30 papers were from the special issue dedicated to the 9th Congress of Sociologists. Unfortunately, there are no published articles in the language of the world academic community [English] that quote Đorđe Tasić and, in that context, international cooperation is not satisfactory, so we need to work on it.

Sociological topics predominate in the journal, although those topics and approaches bordering between sociology and philosophy, political economy, law, political science, medicine or natural sciences were not avoided either. This diversity of topics ensured interesting texts and the current character of the treated matters, broad research topics, but also pluralism of theoretical approaches. The importance of sociology and social sciences is the most common field associated with Đorđe Tasić, followed by the topics related to his efforts in *affirming sociology as a teaching and scientific-research discipline, the relationship between sociology and history, and the most cited works*. The following are the texts in which his importance was given in the publication of the first sociological publication - *the Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review, the relationship between sociology and law and the importance of the sociology of village (rural sociology) and the peasantry in Yugoslavia*. The lowest frequency was recorded in *research into the relationship between sociology and philosophy; his personality traits; critical approaches to his creativity and medical sociology*. The basic method used here was the content analysis as one of the bibliometric methods that tried to describe the subject of research both quantitatively and qualitatively. Perhaps the most reliable and realistic picture of the frequency of application of Đorđe Tasić's achievements will be provided by the number of articles published during certain years, as shown in the tables below (see Table 1 and Table 2).

Table 1: Number of articles in the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* (1938–2022)

Year of publication	Number of citations	Percent %
1938	5	7.7
1974	5	7.7
1976	2	3.1
1977	3	4.6
1978	7	10.8
1984	3	4.6
1987	1	1.5
1988	11	16.9
1989	2	3.1
1993	1	1.5
1994	1	1.5
1999	1	1.5
2012	15	23.2
2018	8	12.3
In total	65	100%



Table 2. Total number of articles in the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* (1938–2022) according to thematic areas by chronological periods

Year	Number of contributions	Percent %
1938-1950	5	7.6
1951-1980	17	26.2
1981-1990	17	26.2
1991-2010	3	4.6
2011-2022	23	35.4
In total	65	100%

Looking at the covered period, we notice that the last decade is considered the most fruitful period in the journal's history, and it is related to the frequency of references to comprehensive contributions and creations left behind by Đorđe Tasić. The reasons for this can be found in the fact that the period after 2006 was somewhat more stable in political and economic terms than the one during the 1990s, and after that period the number of researchers increased considerably and was even doubled. Here, we certainly do not take into account the year of the journal's formation (1938), when Tasić himself contributed to its importance with his articles by covering various topics, starting with the relationship between sociology and other social sciences, primarily philosophy; then about sociology textbooks and sociological congresses, to the reviews of published books until that time. In the 1990s, the number of contributions was generally significantly lower, especially from 1989 until 1999. In fact, we see that over the years the name of this great man is mentioned almost only at the time of celebrating the anniversary of the foundation of the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* itself, or in the context of some sociological manifestations.

Through the content analysis in this paper, the categorizations of all most frequently cited topics in the journal were accompanied by a presentation of their share in the total number (see Table 3).

Table 3: Categorization of all contributions published in SP in the period 1938-2022

Type of contribution	Number of units	%
Citations of Tasić's professional articles	20	30.7
Reviews of Tasić's books	5	7.7
About Đorđe Tasić himself	31	47.7
Tasić as the editor of the <i>Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review</i>	5	7.7
Other (lectures, research...)	4	6.2
In total	65	100%

The deeper analysis showed us that the citations of Tasić's professional articles, together with data about himself, represented more than 80% of the total number of contributions in the analyzed period. Namely, in the analyzed period, much less was written about his editorship of the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* and published books. Most of the reviews in the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* were informative, that is, critical and affirmative. Nevertheless, we must conclude that the number of published versions of his books, considering the growing world production, as well as domestic production, is quite unsatisfactory and that numerous important titles for the history of Serbia and Yugoslavia, as well as the development of sociology in general, have gone unrepresented. Of course, the responsibility for such a situation is assumed by the researchers themselves. According to the data, we actually note that the largest number of citations was published in the 2012 special issue of the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*, dedicated to the centennial of sociology in Serbia, which is an understandable confirmation of the observed statistics. Below is the content of the quoted topics.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF ĐORĐE TASIĆ FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCES

Before listing the theorists and their works emphasizing the importance of Đorđe Tasić for the development of sociology and other social sciences, we will mention those contributions that were mostly preoccupied with the personality of Đorđe Tasić.

Thus, Tasić is mentioned by *Dragoslav Janković* as someone who, together with Slobodan Jovanović and Mihailo Ilić, supported Professor Jovan Đorđević (in the appointment for Assistant Professor) despite the difficulties he found himself in (SP, III, 1978: 14). According to Janković, it was Tasić himself who gave him the articles that he published at the time - in fact, it was a review of several current books. This is what Janković says: "Late Đorđe Tasić was an extraordinary, wonderful man. I went to his house several times during the occupation, usually in the evening, before curfew, to take him out for a walk in the fresh air... Đorđe Tasić was extremely honest in political matters, as in everything else, but I would say, in a certain sense, also - naive. Perhaps it was his naivete that cost him life. He trusted everyone, because he himself was open. He believed that a man should only be honest and then no one would want anything from him. He was such a man. Really wonderful. After the war he would certainly be with us - the communists. I am firmly convinced of that" (SP, III, 1978: 16). *Božidar S. Marković* also wrote about Tasić as someone who had a broad and lively interest in everything new, and turning more and more to sociology itself (SP, III, 1978: 16). In some later years, he wrote about Tasić's tragic fate (alongside Mihailo Ilić) (SP, III-IV, 1984: 292-293).

*Aleksandar Miljković* especially speaks about Tasić's personality and ability to gather young people who would continue his work. According to him, during the 1930s, this personality was not only the pivot around which young forces gathered, but he also organized work on sociology in the broadest and noblest sense (SP, III, 1988: 194). He

is "... without a doubt a special chapter in the history of our sociology. In general, he was an exceptional phenomenon in our science and culture. Not everything that should and could be said about him has been said about him... Thanks to his works, he was in the spotlight of modern times - which was not the case with many of his colleagues from law faculties. This brought him a great reputation among younger scientists and public workers, but also challenges. Regardless of everything, Đ. Tasić will remain recorded as one of the greatest names of our sociology between the two world wars" (SP, III, 1988: 196).

This approach is followed by those who attributed importance to this great thinker in terms of the development of sociology and other social sciences. *Aleksandar Miljković* writes about Tasić's importance at the very beginning of his work "Božidar Knežević from the perspective of sociology". He recalls the article by Đorđe Tasić "General overview of our sociology and our social sciences", published in the pre-war *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* (1938), in which he presented the understandings and the ideas of some of our most outstanding minds he considered valuable for our sociology and our social sciences (SP, II-III, 1977: 165). Miljković says that he does not blame Tasić for failing to systematically cover and fully exhaust the subject he had undertaken to process. According to him, Tasić himself was aware of this when he hinted that "in the following volumes, he will continue his presentations in this sense and speak about the work of our other scientists as well". Unfortunately, Tasić never continued his work. Nevertheless, according to Miljković, this work by Tasić deserves attention as a valuable contribution; considering that it represents the first attempt to give a more systematic overview of the historical development of our sociology and social sciences in our country and, as such, it remains the only work of its kind in our sociological literature (SP, II-III, 1977: 166). That Tasić does not give an overview, but rather an essay about the forerunners of our sociology is indicated by the fact that in the same contribution he does not refer to any of our older writers as sociologist "because they really were not" sociologists. So, for example, he refers to Tihomir Đorđević, whose science he calls "ethnology", as an "ethnologist"; while saying that Božidar Knežević is not a sociologist, but a philosopher" (SP, II-III, 1977: 166). In his own words, Tasić objects to Knežević because "from the point of view of sociology..., he did not build his philosophy on sufficient empirical foundations". With this, Miljković concludes that Đorđe Tasić no longer finds anything that brings Božidar Knežević's philosophy closer to sociology (SP, II-III, 1977: 166-167).

*Mihailo Konstantinović* compares Tasić to a guiding presenter – that is, a scientist and writer who was not committed only to one narrow field, but had broad interests. In this way, Konstantinović reminded of Tasić's importance in the review of the history of Serbian sociology (SP, III, 1978: 9). The importance of Đorđe Tasić for the development of sociology itself and its research is confirmed by *Nikola Vučo* in his recollection of Tasić's invitation to join the Society as a young researcher and lover of sociology and field research (SP, III, 1978: 12). In his text *Publishing Cooperative "Politika i društvo"*, *Božidar Marković* speaks about the eponymous edition initiated in Belgrade in January 1937 with the aim of publishing small and inexpensive monthly volumes with short discussions from the political, social, economic and cultural fields. This Publishing

Cooperative with its members constituted the elite of pre-war Belgrade intellectuals, including Đorđe Tasić, and played a significant role with their journalistic and socio-political activity, if not in the events themselves, but certainly by contributing to the creation of a democratic socio-political awareness of our environment at that time (SP, III-IV, 1984: 286). The extent to which Tasić himself emphasized the importance of sociological research is indicated in his contribution “*Cvijić’s socio-geographic study of towns*” and **Sreten Vujović**, who in a footnote recommends the work entitled “*Jovan Cvijić from the point of view of sociology*” (SP, 1938: 255-261) by Đ. Tasić as someone who interpreted Cvijić’s theoretical views, as well as his autobiographical accounts (SP, I-II, 1988: 100).

At the jubilee meeting of sociologists celebrating the 50th anniversary of the *Serbian Sociological Society* and the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* (held in Belgrade on 11-12 November 1988), in his presentation “*Social conditions of the origin and development of Yugoslav sociology in the pre-war period*” **Milovan Mitrović**, remembers those who affirmed sociology with their efforts, including Đorđe Tasić, the jurist (SP, III, 1988: 167). He sees him as one of the most deserving intellectuals for the affirmation of sociology between the two world wars in Yugoslavia, especially at the University of Belgrade and the Faculty of Law. He especially points to his work *General review of our sociology and our social sciences* (SP, 1938: 240-241) and speaks about “theoretical activity around significant “ideological and practical movements”, which was helped by... the creation of scientific sociological literature” (SP, III, 1988: 170).

Of particular interest for our sociology are Tasić’s reflections on Tihomir Đorđević and his study of our people’s customs “from the point of view of sociology” (SP, III, 1988: 188). During 1920-1921. In the journal *Social Life*, Đorđe Tasić publishes articles that may not be entirely sociological, but they discuss social issues, such as the contribution “On trade unionism and the clerks’ strike”, as well as his critical account of Lenin’s State and revolutions translated by Filip Filipović (SP, III, 1988: 193-194).

**Radomir Lukić** is right to believe that Tasić is “above all, a pioneer in our sociology”. Moreover, he considers him “the founder of a sociological school”, “which, unfortunately, could not develop further from the very beginning” (SP, III, 1988: 196). According to him, Tasić wrote many works, around 200 (in addition to several books), including a large number of sociological ones, “many of which are actually small monographs”. That is why, according to him, Tasić belongs to those spirits for whom broad tolerance is the most important characteristic. “If someone should be said to have been a pluralist in science, it was Đorđe Tasić” (SP, III, 1988: 197).

In terms of the importance of the development of sociological science itself, in his contribution written in memory of Branislav M. Nedeljković (the youngest of all the below-listed), **Aleksandar Miljković** also remembers Đorđe Tasić and his associates Slobodan Jovanović, Dušan and Slobodan Popović, Slobodan Drašković, Božidar S. Marković, Jovan Đorđević, Mihailo Konstantinović, Nikola Vučo and Dragoslav B. Todorović (SP, III-IV, 1989: 114). We see the confirmation in **Toma Milenković’s** work *On the Society for Social Education*, which, in addition to Mihailo Avramović, Živko Jovanović and Mirko Kosić,

also mentions Tasić as someone who, along with other intellectuals, attended and spoke at the meetings of the *Society for Social Education*. His lectures are also mentioned: *Theory and practice, Democracy in morality; Social idealism, nationalism and internationalism, social necessity and creative activity of man* (SP, III-IV, 1989: 123-129).

About twenty years later, Đorđe Tasić is mentioned by *Milojica Šutović* in his contribution “*Radical Sociology*” and “*Sociological Imagination*” by *Svetozar Marković*, when speaking about Tasić’s observation in the *General Review of Our Sociology and Our Social Sciences*, which in the very first sentence indicates that “sociology in our country was barely existent and it is currently being created”. Šutović finds Tasić’s historical review of Serbian sociology (SP, PB-1, 2012: 113-114) particularly outstanding. In the same period, *Ivan Jovanović* wrote *Slobodan Jovanović as a sociologist*, in which he recalled the personality of Đorđe Tasić and his importance in the development of the sociological discipline in us, introducing us once again to Tasić’s famous sentence quoted above (SP, PB-1, 2012: 217). This is also done by *Slavoljub Mišić* in his work *The foundation of historical sociology in the works of Slobodan Jovanović* when he, together with Mirko Kosić, Dušan Popović, Kosta Stojanović, Sreten Vukosavljević, Slobodan Jovanović, Jovan Đorđević and Radomir Lukić, also mentions Đorđe Tasić as one of the pioneers of Serbian sociology (SP, PB-1, 2012: 269).

In *Mirko Kosić - a forgotten sociology* by *Dejan Petrović* and *Milena Stanojević* (SP, PB-1, 2012: 341) and *Genesis of sociological periodicals in Serbia* by *Jovica Trkulja* (SP, I, 2018: 26-32), Tasić is mentioned as someone who, together with Fedor Nikić, founded the journal *Social Life* within broader efforts aimed at founding the *Sociological Society*.

In his paper “*On the need to re-examine our sociological heritage*”, *Milovan Mitrović* says that Tasić spoke about theoretical activity around significant “ideological and practical movements”: “Whoever wants to paralyze certain unwanted effects of this kind of literature can do it best by creating scientific sociological literature” (SP, II-III, 1974: 355). He continues by saying that “abstract formalism retained the mask of strict science, but it played very well the role of paralyzing unwanted effects of the so-called “non-scientific literature” of progressive movements” (SP, II-III, 1974: 356). In this context, when speaking about sociological heritage, Mitrović singles out Đorđe Tasić, the liberal who differs from conservative Slobodan Jovanović (with the thesis on the “rule of law” as an apology for the government) (SP, II-III, 1974: 356).

In the context of the relationship between philosophy and sociology, Đorđe Tasić is mentioned by *Milovan Mitrović* who emphasizes his importance for the establishment of the *Society for Legal Philosophy and Sociology* in our country in May 1935 and was its first and only president until the war (SP, II-III, 1974: 358).

In his attempt to describe the relationship between sociology and history, *Milislav Janićijević* mentions Tasić in his paper “*Old and new prejudices about the relationship between sociology and history*”: “Almost four decades ago, one could read that one of the peculiarities of our national historiography consists in the fact that preoccupied with

personalities and individual events, and almost completely neglects the examination of social moments of real socio-historical events” (SP, I-III, 1976: 71). The importance of this area is also indicated in *Aleksandar Miljković's* paper “*Dušan J. Popović Study of Aromanians*”, when he singles out Đorđe Tasić as one of the first to stress the importance of Popović's study of Aromanians for our sociology. In his contribution to the first book of the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* collection (1938) entitled “*General overview of our sociology and our social sciences*”, Tasić wrote that “the works of Dušan Popović on Aromanians and outlaws belong to cultural history, but they contain many moments of a social nature and will be very useful to sociologists”. In that context, his debates to a certain extent belong more to the field, if not of sociology, certainly of social and cultural anthropology, in addition to the fact that they “contain many moments of a social nature” (SP, I, 1977: 118). The same paper applies a critical approach – when, in the case of Aromanians, the anthropological approach to the study of a certain population is mentioned, of which neither Dušan Popović nor Đorđe Tasić was aware (SP, I, 1977: 119).

In order to present the historical development of Serbian sociology, it is necessary, first of all, to determine which writers and which papers will be considered as marking the beginning of our sociology or, at least, significant for the sociological study of Serbian society. In his paper “*Pluralism in Serbian Sociology until 1941*”, *Aleksandar Miljković* mentions Đorđe Tasić in the context of the importance of Vuk Karadžić, alongside Cvetko Kostić and Radomir Lukić (SP, III, 1988: 173). At this point, he does not forget to recall Tasić's contribution “*General review of our sociology and our social sciences*” (SP, III, 1988: 180).

One must certainly mention the importance of Đorđe Tasić for the development of sociology of village (rural sociology) and the peasantry in Yugoslavia. In the interview on the occasion of the 40th anniversary, *Jovan Đorđević* mentions Tasić when speaking about the first serious research works in the field of sociology, which primarily related to rural sociology, that is, to the examination of the sociology of villages and peasantry in Yugoslavia. The initiator of this research was Professor Tasić in cooperation with Sreten Vukosavljević (SP, III, 1978: 8). Some 30 years later, *Aleksandar Gordić* mentions Đorđe Tasić in his contribution “*Metaphysics of rural life in the work of Sreten Vukosavljević*” and his lectures (by invitation) on rural sociology at the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Law in Belgrade (1938-1941), the first in this part of Europe (SP, PB-1, 2012: 315). In addition, Slobodan Antonić, in his article *Foundation of the Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review in 1938*, recalls Đorđe Tasić as the initiator of experiential sociological research in rural Serbia with the aid of a “general questionnaire”, following the example of Cvijić (SP, I, 2018: 11).

Tasić is mentioned in terms of the relationship between sociology and law when his work *Introduction to Legal Sciences* (1933) is cited. It is emphasized that he is a professional in whom a historian, psychologist, lawyer, ethnologist and, above all, a sociologist and a philosopher are combined. In that manner he unites all sciences and all methods (SP, 1938: 374-375). This theme is continued in Tasić's review and critique an important paper by Gurvitch (*L'idée du droit social. A propos de l'oeuvre de Georges*



*Gurvitch: L'idée du droit social*, 1932), in which Tasić cites *social law* evidently forgotten by Gurvitch (SP, 1938: 356). Another book by Tasić is mentioned (*Contemporary systems and understandings of the state*, 1936), in which he, with explicit explanations, reviews the concepts of social democracy and their criticisms, calling for social rights, all this on the basis of historical-sociological knowledge and philosophy (SP, 1938: 379). Citations on this topic continue in Tasić's book (*L'Histoire constitutionnelle de la Serbie - Revue de l'histoire politique et constitutionnelle*, 1938) in which he discusses the legality of Serbian constitutions and their binding force, the democratization of Serbia, the principle of national sovereignty, radical movement; and all this again with the help of sociology, ethics and comparative law (SP, 1938: 388-389).

In his introductory presentation, when writing about Slobodan Bakić, a sociologist and colleague, *Trivo Indić* mentions Đorđe Tasić as someone who, among others, gave a significant foothold to legal science at that time. Thus, sociology itself was largely constituted by jurists in the period between the two world wars (SP, IV, 1987: 274). *Miloš Marjanović*, in the text *Bogišić's contribution to the constitution of the empirical sociology of law*, explains that in his analysis he mainly relied on the article by Đorđe Tasić - *How Valtazar Bogišić understood customary law*, published in Belgrade's newspaper *Pravda (Justice)*, on the occasion of Bogišić's 100<sup>th</sup> birth anniversary, on 29 December 1934 (SP, PB-1, 2012: 74-75). In his text *Sociological theory of law by Živan Spasojević*, *Saša Bovan* compared the quantity of Spasojević's texts with the works of his contemporaries who were his friends and also shared their views on sociological theory of law (such as Ž. Perić and Đ. Tasić) (SP, PB- 1, 2012: 282). In addition, Saša Bovan mentions Tasić, as one of the founders of our sociology of law, when he tries to define the science of law –where in his attempt to define this science he fails to establish it paradigmatically, but only phenomenologically and relationally, when he says that “the sociology of law has as its subject the examination of law according to its origin and functioning, observing it in its relations with other social factors” (SP, PB-1, 2012: 284).

At this point, we will very briefly point out the importance of Đorđe Tasić in the development of medical sociology. Namely, in his article *Topics from Medical Sociology on the pages of the Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* *Uroš Šuvaković* indicates that one of the first texts in which the subject of medical sociology is treated was actually published in the very first issue of the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*. He emphasizes that it was Professor Đorđe Tasić who published a short review, more like a note, about several studies by Slobodan Vidaković, including the one entitled “Tuberculosis and Syphilis”. It was the first text that, albeit in a very short, informative way, connected this special branch of sociology and the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* (SP, I, 2018: 304-305).



## AFFIRMATION OF SOCIOLOGY AS A TEACHING AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH DISCIPLINE

In addition to Mirko Kosić, *Aleksandar Miljković* also singles out Đorđe Tasić as someone who “consciously established continuity between the pre-sociological tradition in the social and historical sciences in our country from the time before 1914 and the sociological directions and tendencies between the two world wars”. According to him, both Kosić and Tasić confirmed with their articles, although it was not their intention, “theoretical and research pluralism in our sociology and our social sciences” (SP, III, 1988: 186). In the field of this task, Tasić is also mentioned regarding the fact that some teachers from Serbia taught at other university centres as well. Thus, according to Miljković’s sources, Tasić was a professor at the Faculty of Law in Ljubljana from 1923 until 1930, when he started working at the University of Belgrade (SP, III, 1988: 187). Tasić’s various collegiate activities are mentioned in the affirmation of sociology as a teaching discipline. In *Aleksandar Miljković’s* paper *Reflections on “Letters from the Village” by Sreten Vukosavljević*, Đorđe Tasić is mentioned as someone who, together with Slobodan Jovanović and Mihailo Konstantinović, was responsible for Vukosavljević’s appointment at the session of the Council of the Faculty of Law in Belgrade on 22 April 1939 (SP, I-IV, 1993: 271).

The significance of the affirmation of the scientific discipline is also indicated by *Milovan Mitrović* in the paper *Radomir D. Lukić – continuation of the old and founder of the new Serbian sociology* (1914-1999), where Đorđe Tasić is mentioned as the founder of the first department of sociology (SP, III-IV, 1999: 339). About ten years later, in his article *A Century of Serbian Sociology* the same author recalls Tasić again as one of the founders of Serbian academic sociology, with an illustration of his photograph. On one of the following pages, Mitrović speaks in further detail about his role in establishing sociology as a separate science in our academic environment, the already mentioned Society for Legal Philosophy and Sociology, later renamed into the Society for Sociology and Social Sciences; as well as in editing the first Serbian sociological collection of papers (SP, PB-1, 2012: 10-12). In the same year, *Srdan Šljukić*, in the contribution *Slobodan Jovanović and the Serbian peasantry*, indicates that, in addition to the fact that in his works on Serbian history of the 19th century Jovanović fostered, among others, a sociological approach, he, together with Đorđe Tasić, influenced sociology to become part of the curriculum of the Faculty of Law in Belgrade (SP, PB-1, 2012: 239). *Slobodan Antonić* states the same recognition in his contribution to the *Foundation of the Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review in 1938* by mentioning Tasić as the one who initiated lectures in sociology for doctoral studies at the Faculty of Law for years in the subjects of Sociology and Philosophy of Law (SP, I, 2018: 7 -8). In a similar context, in the text *Teaching-scientific and public activity of Miroslav Pečujlić*, when the biographical data of this great man are discussed, it is mentioned that Pečujlić began his studies at the Faculty of Law of the University of Belgrade in 1952. The author of the thesis, *Jovica Trkulja*, says that at that time the lecturers were professors who were formed during the golden age of the Faculty between the

two world wars, under the influence of the luminaries of Serbian legal thought – Slobodan Jovanović, Živojin Perić, Toma Živanović, Đorđe Tasić and others (SP, PB-2, 2012: 446).

That Đorđe Tasić also ascribed importance to scientific and research activity is stated by the authors of the contribution *Sociology and geography in the works of Jovan Cvijić, Ljubica Rajković and Vesna Miletić-Stepanović*, who mention Tasić in connection with Cvijić's research of common social conditions, relations, common social atmosphere, encounters, interrelations, marriage relationships, economic and political conditions exactly as it should be done by sociology. According to Tasić, such "... questions are very subtle and very uncertain. He discusses them with extraordinary talent". That is why he "gave many important things to sociology" (SP, PB-1, 2012: 160).

In *Sociological section on Mihailo Đurić's path of thought*, **Danilo Basta** speaks about the Faculty of Law in Belgrade as a true nursery of sociology in our academic environment, where he mentions, among others, the personality of Đorđe Tasić. He says that attention must be paid to his organizational activism, participation in the creation of suitable institutional forms for serious scientific research work in sociology, and in encouraging younger forces to devote themselves to such work (SP, PB-2, 2012: 417-418). **Jovica Trkulja** builds on this in his work *The emergence of sociological periodicals in Serbia* when he says that in a concrete-historical and ideological-theoretical context, a group of teachers from the Faculty of Law in Belgrade and the Faculty of Law in Subotica paved the way for the institutionalization of sociology and its disciplines. According to him, Tasić ranks first among them (SP, I, 2018: 25)<sup>12</sup>.

That Đorđe Tasić's name is inextricably connected with the foundation of the first sociological publication (*Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*) is also shown by the following data. Namely, **Milovan Mitrović** cites the importance of Tasić's founding of the *Society for Sociology and Social Sciences*, within which the publishing of the first sociological publication in our country began (SP, II-III, 1974: 358). A few years later, in the introductory text "*Memories of the first contributors to the Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*", the Editorial Board recalled Đorđe Tasić as the initiator of the launch of this journal (SP, III, 1978: 7). Again, **Milosav Janičijević** in his short presentation "*Đorđe Tasić, the first editor of the 'Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review'*" gave Tasić's short biography with an emphasis on everything that was undertaken in Serbia from 1935 to 1941 with the aim of affirming sociology as a teaching and scientific-research discipline, as something which is mostly associated with Tasić's name. It should also be mentioned that a photo of Tasić (1892-1943) accompanied the text written in his memory (SP, III, 1978: 19-20). He is also mentioned as the first editor-in-chief by **Dobrilo Aranitović** in his short "*Bibliography of the Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review 1938-1987*" (SP, IV, 1988: 100). **Bojan Vukotić** also gives Tasić recognition for his editorship in the work *Bibliography of Yugoslav serial publications in the field of sociology (1920-1994)* (SP, III,

---

<sup>12</sup> As an example of someone who, through his work, continued to affirm sociology as a teaching and scientific-research discipline, we will mention Ljubiša Mitrović (for more about his work. see: Prodović, Milojković, 2015: 455-468).

1994: 419); almost 25 years later, *Slobodan Antonić* mentions Tasić's editorship in the contribution *The foundation of the Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review in 1938* (SP, I, 2018: 7-8).

## THE MOST QUOTED WORKS OF ĐORĐE TASIĆ

There must be a chapter that takes into account the most cited works left by Tasić. In the observed period, among Tasić's cited books, the following stand out: a) *The Problem of State Justification* (1920); b) *Rights and duties of a citizen* (1925); c) *Contemporary political systems and understanding of the state*, (1936) and d) *Social ideology and nationalism of Antun Radić* (1939) (SP, II-III, 1974: 360-361).

Among the cited articles, the most frequently mentioned is "A general review of our sociology and our social sciences", published in SP in 1938 (SP, I-III, 1976: 77). This work is cited by *Milovan Mitrović* (SP, PB-1, 2012: 28) and *Milojica Štović* (SP, PB-1, 2012: 136) in the list of references. A few years later, *Zoran Jevtović* and *Tatjana Vulić* quote him in *Public Opinion and the Features of Media Discourse in the Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*, which states the understanding of the importance of public opinion<sup>13</sup>. In it, describing the state of this science, Đorđe Tasić highlights the work of Slobodan Jovanović and his interpretation of "the state as a neutral institution and representative of the general interest". Tasić especially points to the understanding that in a modern state one cannot rule by physical force (SP, I, 2018: 102). This most cited work by Tasić is also of interest to *Biserka Košarac* and *Bojan Ćorluka*, who in their co-authored paper *Representation of topics from the sociology of the family in the Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review (1938–2017)* introduce us to the research of family cooperative, kinship and way of life in the works of Vuk Karadžić and Jovan Cvijić, with Tihomir Đorđević's outstanding research on marriage, kinship, the problem of the position of women and the method of his research seen from Đorđe Tasić's point of view (SP, I, 2018: 253). From a slightly different perspective, this particular paper by Tasić is again taken into consideration by *Petar Anđelković* in his contribution *The Religious Phenomenon in the Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*. Anđelković says that in the first issue, book 1, there are no texts on religion, i.e., there is no work on the relationship between sociology and the sociology of religion. It is only in this work that Tasić speaks about the development of sociological thought in our country, mentioning the importance of Veselin Čajkanović and his contribution to the explanation of religious customs of Serbian folk religion and mythology. Tasić also speaks about Tihomir Đorđević as an ethnologist who studied the customs of our people (SP, I, 2018: 275).

In addition to this legacy, Tasić is also cited for other works. For example, *Božidar Marković* mentions Tasić's *Social Ideology and Nationalism of Antun Radić (1939)* (SP,

---

<sup>13</sup> For more information on the influence of the media and public opinion on human attitudes and behavior, see: Prođović, 2012: 380-390; Prođović Milojković, Miladinović, 2015: 213-227.

III-IV, 1984: 288) when he lists the brochures published by the “Politics and Society” edition. *Bojana Vukotić’s* and *Dobrilo Aranitović’s* monograph *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review 1938–2020: Bibliography 1938–2020* (2021) certainly deserves attention because the opus of Đorđe Tasić is cited in it. In the list of used references, Đorđe Tasić is also mentioned by *Miloš Marjanović* in “How Valtazar Bogišić understood customary law” (SP, PB-1, 2012: 89) and by *Saša Bovan* in *Introduction to legal sciences* from 1933 and *Discourses from philosophy and theories of law* from 1992 (SP, PB-1, 2012: 296).

It is interesting to note that Đ. Tasić is mentioned in terms of criticism as well. Namely, the celebration of the centennial of sociological science in Serbia is a good occasion to save Ž. Spasojević’s academic opus from oblivion. Although his doctoral dissertation was published in Serbian (1996), and his theoretical attitudes even before that (1989), this author is still unknown to our professional public. So, for example, in a preface to a book by Đ. Tasić published in 1992 (Đ. Tasić, *Discourses from the philosophy and theory of law*), R. Lukić, a contemporary of Ž. Spasojević, in his review of our pre-war sociology of law, does not mention this author at all (SP, PB-1, 2012: 282).

## FINAL POINTS

We have already seen that scientific journals are the first and most important source of information for experts in various scientific disciplines. In addition to their usefulness to readers, scientific papers in local journals also promote their authors, placing them on the map of experts in a certain discipline. In this way, the journal itself gathers collaborators not only from the domestic scientific community, but also scientists from the region and the world. Great significance of most journals today, including the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*, is reflected in the fact that all analyzed articles in the journal are simultaneously published in printed and electronic editions - which allows it to be used equally by those who find it easier to use a printed book, as well as by the children of the digital age with the future ahead of them. This enables a far greater reception of the journal in the future because, just by looking at the articles, both of the above group will easily become familiar with the work and creativity, not only of Đorđe Tasić, but also of all other notable personalities, in our as well as in the broader scientific discipline. In this manner, great names will be prevented from falling into oblivion.

In the context of our research subject, we must not forget but keep in mind the size of the “legacy left us by Kosić, Tasić, Ilić and their collaborators (such as: two expertly profiled sociological journals, two reputable editions of papers and one progressive newspaper) in the 1960s. This is precisely what served their successors at the University of Belgrade as a solid foundation for the constitution of sociology as a scientific and university discipline in Serbia” (Trkulja, 2018: 24). That Đorđe Tasić, Professor of Legal Theory, played a decisive role in the foundation of the Sociological Society and the journal is also proved by the fact that “everything that was undertaken in Serbia from 1935 to 1941 with the aim of affirming sociology as a teaching and scientific research

discipline is mostly linked to his name. As his close collaborators point out [...], Đorđe Tasić showed a versatile interest in all issues of the further development of sociology in our community” (Janićijević, 1978: 20). Radomir Lukić, Aleksandar Miljković, Milovan Mitrović and Slobodan Antonić also agree with this. Tasić’s main contributions to our science are reflected in the fact that he managed to raise our philosophy, sociology and the theory of the state and law to a modern European level, the results of which are also noticeable in Europe. He also managed to finally introduce the sociological method in our legal science in general. With his selfless aspirations in the field of legal interpretation, Tasić is one of the most prominent representatives of the view that a jurist is not an expert in narrow terms, but, above all, a social worker. He is the founder of our modern sociological school and the initiator of concrete empirical sociological research, in addition to his great merit as a publicist and public and social worker, of which we have been assured from the content analysis of all the articles.

What we can finally point out in our analysis, in line with the postulates of other authors, is that in the future we need more works in which priority will be given to the importance and creativity of Đorđe Tasić. One of the ways in which the editors of the journal can call for works on the mentioned topic is through special/thematic issues of the journal with Đorđe Tasić’s personality and work as the main topic. It is necessary to announce and organize more international scientific gatherings and round tables that would give priority to everything that Đorđe Tasić was and still represents. That is why the initiative of the Serbian Sociological Association (Belgrade), the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Priština with a temporary seat in Kosovska Mitrovica and the Faculty of Pedagogy in Vranje, the University of Niš, regarding the organization of an international scientific conference about Đorđe Tasić’s legacy is especially praised here. We can and must expect such a trend in the upcoming years, so that younger generations can increasingly turn to Đorđe Tasić’s era.

#### REFERENCES:

- Antonić, S. Č. (2018). The foundation of Sociološki pregled/ Sociological Review in 1938. *Sociološki pregled*, 52 (1), 7-23. DOI: 10.5937/socpreg52-17319
- Bakić, S., Miljković, A., Janićijević, M. (1978). Memories of the First Collaborators of the *Sociological Review*. *Sociološki pregled* XII (3), 7-18. Available at: <http://www.socioloskipregled.org.rs/2017/08/20/socioloski-pregled-1978/>. [In Serbian]
- Bešić, M. (2019). *Methodology of Social Sciences*. Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga [In Serbian]
- Branković, S. (2009): *Methods of Experiential Research of Social Phenomena*. Beograd: Megatrend univerzitet. [In Serbian]
- Branković, S. (2014). *Methodology of Social Research*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike, 1-407. [In Serbian]

- Cavanagh, S. (1997). Content analysis: concepts, methods and applications. *Nurse Researcher*, 4(3), 5–16. [In Serbian]
- Dimitrijević, S. (2000). Đorđe Tasić's sociological understanding of the creation of law. In: S. Taboroši (ed.), *Creation of Law (259–268)*. Beograd: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu [In Serbian]
- Đorić, G., Popović, N. (2000). *Introduction to Data Analysis in the Context of Sociological Theory*. Niš: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu [In Serbian]
- Janičijević, M. (1978). "Đorđe Tasić – the first editor of the *Sociological Review*". *Sociološki pregled*, XII (3), 19–20. Available at: <http://www.socioloskipregled.org.rs/2017/08/20/socioloski-pregled-1978/>. [In Serbian]
- Kaljević, M. (1972). Some possibilities of the application of the content analysis. *Sociologija*, XIV, no. 2, 215–229. [In Serbian]
- Lukić, D. R. (1959). Đorđe Tasić's Scientific Work. *Anali Pravnog fakulteta u Beogradu*, Beograd, year VII, January-March, no. 1. [In Serbian]
- Manić, Ž. (2017). *Content Analysis in Sociology*. Beograd: Čigoja štampa, Institut za sociološka istraživanja, Filozofski fakultet. [In Serbian]
- Milić, V. (1996). *Sociological Method*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva. [In Serbian]
- Nikić, F. (1981). *Works*, vol. I. Beograd. [In Serbian]
- Prodović, B. (2012). Influence of the media on the attitudes and behaviour of man – media and moral panic. In: *Crisis and perspective of knowledge and science, Science and the modern university* no. 1, vol. 2 (380–390). Niš: Filozofski fakultet u Nišu [In Serbian]
- Prodović Milojković, B., Miladinović, S. (2015). Influence of mass media on the value orientation of young people in the Balkans. In *Statehood, democratization and culture of peace* (213–227). Niš: Filozofski fakultet [In Serbian]
- Prodović Milojković, B. (2015). Over the bibliography of Ljubiša Mitrović's works. In: *Promethean sociology in the work of Ljubiša Mitrović* (455–468). Niš: Filozofski fakultet [In Serbian]
- Stemler, S. (2001). An overview of content analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(17), November.
- Simonović, R. (1999). Đorđe Tasić's Life and Scientific Work. *In memory of Đorđe Tasić*. Beograd: Biblioteka "Tragovi" [In Serbian]
- Strauss, A., Corbin, J. (1998). The Interplay between Qualitative and Quantitative in Theorizing, *Techniques of Qualitative Research*, SAGE Publications, 27–34.
- Stojak, R. (1990). Content Analysis Method. In: B. Pejčić (ed.), *Methodology of Empirical Scientific Research*. Beograd: Defektološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu. [In Serbian]



Stojšin, S. (2013). *Application of the Content Analysis in the Research of Political Propaganda*, doctoral dissertation. Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Novom Sadu. [In Serbian]

Stojšin, S. (2014). Qualitative and/or quantitative content analysis – specific characteristics of its application, *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu*, book XXXIX-1, 193-210. [In Serbian]

Šušnjić, Đ. (1973). *Critique of the Sociological Method*. Niš: Gradina. [In Serbian]

Tasić, Đ. (ed., 1938). *Sociološki pregled*, vol I. Beograd: Društvo za sociologiju i društvene nauke. Available at: <http://www.socioloskipregled.org.rs/2017/08/15/socioloski-pregled-vol-i-1938/>. [In Serbian]

Trkulja, J. (2013). Controversy around Mirko M. Kosić. In: J. Trkulja (ed) *Mirko M. Kosić: Personality and work (17–92)*. Kikinda: Narodna biblioteka “Jovan Popović”; Beograd: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, Srpsko sociološko društvo [In Serbian]

Trkulja, J. (2018). Genesis of sociological periodicals in Serbia: Faculties of law in Belgrade and Subotica professors' contribution to the establishment of sociological periodicals between the two World Wars, *Sociološki pregled* 52 (1), 24-52. DOI: 10.5937/socpreg52-16958

Vasić, R. (1999). Liberal miniatures in Đorđe Tasić's social theory, *In memory of Đorđe Tasić*. Beograd: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu; Vranje: Skupština opštine [In Serbian]

Vojnović, Ž, Bogdanović, M. (2013). Bibliography of publications by Mirko M. Kosić, In: J. Trkulja (ed.) *Mirko M. Kosić: Personality and Work (470-504)*. Kikinda: Narodna biblioteka “Jovan Popović”; Beograd: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, Srpsko sociološko društvo [In Serbian]

Vukotić, B., Aranitović, D. (2021). *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review 1938–2020: Bibliography*. Beograd: Srpsko sociološko društvo, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5652094> [In Serbian]

Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic Content Analysis, Second Edition*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.