

COURAGE

Cultural Opposition: Understanding the Cultural Heritage of Dissent in the Former Socialist Countries

Country Reports



SERBIA BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA MACEDONIA MONTENEGRO KOSOVO

Authors

Milena Dragičević Šešić

Jacqueline Nießer

Regensburg 2018



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 692919.

About the authors

Milena Dragićević Šešić is the Director of the
Institute of Theatre, Film, Radio & Television
and Professor of Cultural Policy and Management
at the University of Arts Belgrade.
msešic@gmail.com

Jacqueline Nießer is a researcher at the
Leibniz Institute for East and Southeast European Studies
in Regensburg.
niesser@ios-regensburg.de

To quote this report:

Milena Dragićević Šešić, Jacqueline Nießer: "Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro, Kosovo", COURAGE Country Reports. Regensburg, November 2018, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.24389/cr-serbiaetal>

Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Contexts	7
2.1 Cultural Opposition under Socialism in Yugoslavia	7
2.2. Concepts and Research on Cultural Opposition under Socialism after Yugoslavia.....	9
2.3 Institutions and Initiatives for the Preservation and Interpretation of the Socialist Past in Serbia	12
3. Bosnia and Herzegovina	17
4. Republic of Macedonia	19
5. Montenegro	22
6. Kosovo	25
7. Analysis of the Collections in the COURAGE Registry	27
7.1. Topics.....	27
7.2. Actors, Users, Networking Capacities	29
8. Conclusions and Best Practice	31
9. Recommendations	32
References.....	35
Other	39
Appendix:	
List of Collections Described.....	40
List of Institutions and Owners.....	41
List of Persons Researched.....	42

1. Introduction

Since 1990, Yugoslavia has broken into the new states of Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Kosovo, and Serbia. The following report focusses on Serbia as the biggest successor state of Yugoslavia with brief references to Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, and Kosovo. Croatia and Slovenia are covered by our partner in the COURAGE project, the Croatian Institute for History, in a separate report.¹

Public discourse on the socialist past is, in all the successor states, dominated by anti-communist and nationalist stances, legitimating the independence and sovereignty of the new post-Yugoslav countries'.² Therefore, generally, when it comes to dealing with the cultural heritage of socialist Yugoslavia, research on the legacy of anti-communist and nationalist activities is politically favoured and funded. The existing research follows basically two opposing perspectives. On the one hand, there are researchers who, despite its censorship and deprivation of (human) rights, see socialist Yugoslavia as a space where "grey zones" were possible, and who emphasize the progressive and developmental features of the socialist period against the limitations of creative expression and liberties. On the other hand, there are those who see nothing but evil in the socialist period. As already mentioned, public discourse favours such anti-communist statements, which through different media, especially TV, reach wide audiences. The exhibition *U ime naroda: Politička represija u Srbiji 1944-1953* [*In the name of the people: political repression in Serbia 1944-1953*], curated by Srđan Cvetković and presented in the Museum of Serbian History, was one of the most visited cultural events in 2014 in Serbia, although it was highly controversial and was met by the protests of different historians.³ These historians criticized how the exhibition equated innocent victims of post-WWII revolutionary revenge with Nazi collaborators who were on trial and even executed.

An ideological and cultural polarisation in Serbian society is omnipresent and severely impacts research on the cultural heritage of Yugoslavia, as well as all sorts of cultural practices like writing and publishing in daily and weekly press and publishing houses, and taking part in debates at different cultural institutions and festivals.⁴ The ideological divide between researchers leads to the same historical events or data being presented in opposite narratives. Rare are platforms that would truly confront those polarisations academically. Accusations are often severe: leftist intellectuals call right-wing ones 'fascists', while right-wing

¹ Mihaljević: "Croatia and Slovenia."

² At the same time those narratives consider liberal capitalism and Western democracy as a norm.

³ See for instance <https://www.slobodnaevropa.org/a/u-ime-naroda-antikomunisticka-podvala-ili-istorijsko-istrazivanje/27161587.html>

⁴ Thus, on one side, there are journals such as *Danas* [Today] and *NIN - Nedeljne informativne novine* [Weekly Informational Newspaper], publishing houses Clio, Arhipelag, XX vek, and Fabrika knjiga [Book Factory]; on the other side one finds *Pečat* [Seal], *Nova srpska politička misao* [New Serbian Political Thought], etc.

intellectuals call left-wing ones 'anti-patriots', 'traitors', or "Soros people"⁵. Right-wing intellectuals, such as Lompar, Đurković, and Avramović support each other by giving positive feedback to each other's texts⁶, while left-wing intellectuals can be very critical of each other.⁷ These fights between leftists could be best understood in the debate between Markovina and Kapović (*Novi plamen*, 2017), although this was mostly linked to the Croatian scene. Most leftists focus their attention on antinationalism and anticlericalism (like Markovina), while those who claim that they are the only "real" leftists (like Kapović) focus on anti-capitalism.⁸

Latinka Perović's book *Dominant and Unwanted Elites (XX-XXI Century)* for instance raised a lot of debate: it was welcomed as a capital contribution to understanding Serbian intellectual life and the political reservations of different regimes toward its most outstanding critical thinkers. At the same time Perović was criticized and addressed as the mother of the 'Other Serbia' that looks at history only through ideological lenses. The 'Other Serbia' has become a term for contemporary counterculture that assembled anti-war, anti-nationalist, and cosmopolitan stances. But Latinka Perović is also criticized from the left, for instance in the works of Mirjana Bogdanović and Zlatko Paković, "for promoting the de-legitimization of a vision of society based on social justice, for propaganda of capitalism". For them Perović's thinking was that "yesterday was for a better tomorrow while today she is for a better yesterday. With those that criticized her work from rightist-nationalistic positions, she shares an anticommunist attitude".⁹

An important forum for intellectual exchange during the 1990s was the Belgrade Circle [*Beogradski krug*]. Many non-conformist intellectuals from the socialist period like film director Lazar Stojanović, sociologist Nebojša Popov, philosopher Dragoljub Mićunović, dramaturge Borka Pavićević and art historian Dunja Blažević, gathered there debating current issues and controversies. One objective of those discussions was to oppose the ongoing devaluation of the 'Brotherhood and Unity' paradigm that was promoted in socialist Yugoslavia, but had become obsolete during the wars. Serbian cultural counterpublics wanted to prove that 'Brotherhood and Unity' was a positive value and that still makes sense, so that

⁵ In the discussion about possible new members of Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences in fall 2018, those accusations are very present from the right wing. Časlav Očić in his writing (*Danas*, daily, September 2018) accuses the leadership of SANU of lobbying for "Soros intellectuals".

⁶ Zoran Avramović states about Milo Lompar's book "Self-defamation": "a book that illuminates the wrong paths taken by Serbian cultural consciousness. The spirit of self-abnegation, the spirit that rejects national cultural identity, is anchored in Yugoslavian identity and Titoist communism. It was the spirit of subordination, not of freedom." Lompar, Milo. *Duh samoporicanja. Prilog kritici srpske kulturne politike*, Novi Sad: Orpheus, 2011. Lompar writes about Avramović: "Avramović deals with very sensitive issues – patriotism and topic of betrayal. Betrayal of those who are transferring all guilt on Serbs".

⁷ Zlatko Paković in his texts and theatre performances would attack prominent intellectuals like Gojko Tešić for his criticism of civil society, and even intellectuals like Filip David, for not being radical enough, although David expressed how uncomfortable he feels in presence of the President of the State (from the right-wing populist party) while receiving the prize for the most read author at the National Library of Belgrade.

⁸ "[...] the issue of nationalism and clericalism could not and will not be solved prior to changes in economic relations. Economic and social relations, inequity, poverty and exploitation, are preconditions for other changes." Kapović, *Novi plamen*, 7.1.2017.

⁹ Bogdanović, *Dissidents*.

cultural activities concerned with re-establishing the broken links referred to it, like for instance during the Flying Classroom Workshop [*Leteća učionica radionica – LUR*], that brought Serbian artists to Mostar and other parts of former Yugoslavia, or Dibidon and Kontradibidon that engaged different artists from underground and alternative scenes in Serbia and Slovenia in 1994, supported by the Open Society Foundation. An important testimony of that counter-cultural continuity of the 1990s against the backdrop of the disintegration of Yugoslavia is the book *Vjetar ide na jug i obrće se na sjever* [The Wind Goes to the South and then Turns Northward] by the women Radmila Lazić, Biljana Jovanović, Rada Iveković, and Maruša Krese, containing their correspondence from the wars.¹⁰ The primary aim of these intellectuals here was to respond and to react to authoritarianism¹¹ and not to re-think their previous period of so-called “petitionism” (usually linked to the 1980s when liberal intellectuals in Belgrade organized numerous petitions advocating for intellectuals such as Dobrica Ćosić, Vojislav Šešelj, and Dragomir Olujić, among others, imprisoned during the Open University affair). The women’s open engagement for peace was seen as a betrayal of the new independent states, like in the case of Croatia, and as betrayal of a state based on ethnic belonging in the case of Serbia. In Croatia and Serbia these women and other female activists were publicly villainized as witches.¹²

For counter-cultural activities new spaces were created like the Centre for Cultural Decontamination [*Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju*] and Rex in Belgrade, but also some public cultural institutions dared to host controversial public debates dealing with the culture of dissent. Lazar Stojanović’s film *Plastic Jesus* was screened in presence of its author. In 2005, he found himself under attack again for his new movies about the war criminal Radovan Karadžić and the Bosnian war. Želimir Žilnik continued to make movies that were anti-establishment especially as they criticised capitalism and the transition period, such as in the film *The Old School of Capitalism* [*Stara škola kapitalizma*] (2009) involving eminent cultural dissidents such as Lazar Stojanović.

Within those circles which followed the socialist self-management pattern around some dissident media (*Republika*, the radio stations B92 and Index, *Borba*, and later *Naša borba*)¹³, cultural counterpublics emerged whose activists also engaged in memorializing dissent. Activists were often also academics, so research on the ‘culture of dissent’ evolved too. This continuity of a ‘culture of dissent’¹⁴ does not follow the polarized pattern of pro- or anti-

¹⁰ Jovanović, *Vjetar ide na jug*.

¹¹ cf. Milan Podunavac, Caesarism and democracy; In: Udovički and Ridgeway. *Burn This House*.

¹² Vesna Kesić, Jelena Lovrić, Slavenka Drakulić-Ilić, Rada Iveković, and Dubravka Ugrešić were villainised as witches in Croatia, while in Serbian activists like Sonja Biserko, Nataša Kandić; Biljana Kovačević Vučo, Borka Pavićević, and Jelena Milić were slandered as “non-governmental witches” (B92, 3. 12. 2002). Contemporary left-wing perspectives on such women-led peace movements completely neglect the class dimension.

¹³ Due to the privatization of media, the only remaining media cooperative, *Republika*, was unable to survive on the market. However, artistic collectives and NGOs within the counter-public sphere have continued the culture of participative governance.

¹⁴ Dragičević Šešić, *Umetnost i kultura otpora*.

communist perspectives, but looks at dissent and freedom in socialism without depreciating the positive contributions of socialist Yugoslavia, like self-management.¹⁵ One paradigmatic example from the cultural sphere is the performance “Everyman Đilas” in the Montenegrin National Theatre in Podgorica. Until recently, both socialist Yugoslavia and Đilas were equally well evaluated among researchers who discussed their importance in the development of Montenegro. But within the discussions raised around the 100-year anniversary (1 December 2018) of the foundation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes), there have been more and more Montenegrin researchers that portray the socialist period as a period of humiliation, in spite of the fact that Montenegro was a Republic. However, it did not have its autonomous church, and the language was Serbo-Croatian, thus, they claim that Montenegrin identity was suppressed.

In brief, although alternative spaces and media for counter-cultural activism and thinking exist, mainstream public debates are limited to the described ideological polarization between pro- and anti-communist stances which impacts research on the cultural heritage of socialist Yugoslavia, in all of its complex modes of representation.

2. Contexts

2.1 Cultural Opposition under Socialism in Yugoslavia

In order to contextualize research on the cultural legacy of socialism in Yugoslavia, it is important to stress that Yugoslavia was a very heterogeneous construct. Tito’s socialism was an experiment that tried to regulate a multi-cultural reality which embraced ambivalences and syncretism. Those multiplicities were also the heritage of a conglomerate of people and a unique geopolitical synthesis that had emerged from the ruins of two multicultural polities, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and the Ottoman Empire. Tito’s experiment was to manage those multiple identities through a state policy based on “Brotherhood and Unity”. Therefore, despite the one-party political system of Yugoslavia’s socialism, culture in socialist Yugoslavia could hardly be subordinated to only one paradigm. Additional heterogeneity was possible as in 1953 the Federal Culture Ministry was abolished and ministries of culture existed only on the level of Yugoslavia’s republics.¹⁶

Therefore, cultural life in socialist Yugoslavia was more pluralistic than the political sphere with its continuous monopoly of the Communist League.¹⁷ The most important reasons for this cultural opening were the Tito-Stalin split in 1948, Yugoslavia’s leading position in the

¹⁵ Jakovljević, *Alienation*.

¹⁶ The only former republic of Yugoslavia that did not have a Ministry of Culture was the Republic of Montenegro. It created a separate ministry only in 1992, in the same moment when Yugoslavia (what was left of it), re-created a federal ministry, which only lasted until 1995.

¹⁷ Due to the federalization of the country, variations of communist rule on different levels were possible, so that the monopoly of the Communist League did not necessarily translate into monolithic practice.

Non-Aligned Movement from the 1960s, trade and travel with and to the West and a reinforced federalization of the country in the 1970s. The Belgrade historian Radina Vučetić coined the term “Coca-Cola Socialism” to describe Yugoslav popular culture of the 1960s, and the processes of the Americanization and development of consumerism that followed.¹⁸ At the same time the Cold War should not be neglected in analysis of dissidence in Yugoslavia.¹⁹

Another crucial specificity of the Yugoslav system was self-government, which also concerned the cultural sector. The public sphere in Yugoslavia was largely controlled by self-governing forces, which made it possible that dissenting opinions could be publicly presented through artwork, reviews, and books. However, once private initiatives became organised, as happened with the Praxis Group in the late 1960s/early 1970s and with the Open University Movement in the 1980s, the system intervened and prevented further operation.

Cultural production offered alternatives to the political sphere, but the cultural sector can rarely be regarded in clear opposition to Yugoslavia’s politics. Many dissenting voices and expressions were possible within the establishment, or despite it.²⁰ Belgrade had for instance a state-funded avant-garde theatre, Atelje 212 [Atelier 212], whose director, Mira Trailović, never became a member of the communist party. Trailović can be described as an “aesthetical dissident” as she introduced cutting-edge dramaturgy and theatre expression to Yugoslavia’s theatrical realm. Tito promoted a “state-ordered freedom” in culture (A. Vujanović), for which the Belgrade International Theatre Festival (BITEF) also serves as a good example.²¹

Ambivalences were hence the most remarkable feature of Yugoslav cultural policy, for which the story of the writer Danilo Kiš is another example. Kiš won the prestigious NIN award for Yugoslav literature for his novel *Hourglass* [*Peščanik*] in 1972. But literary political circles raised numerous issues around his next book *A Tomb for Boris Davidovich* [*Grobnica za Borisa Davidoviča*] in 1976. Kiš was accused of plagiarism (such accusations were first made in *Oko* magazine, based in Zagreb, and *Književne novine*, based in Belgrade). Kiš responded to the accusations with the book *The Anatomy Lesson* [*Čas anatomije*] in 1978. The key leader of this polemic, Dragan Jeremić, responded with the book *The Narcissus Without a Face* [*Narcis bez lica*] in 1980. During the promotion of Jeremić’s book, 400 people gathered to listen to both authors, as well as to Nikola Milošević (at the time, the most popular dissident, who used public cultural centres for lectures and debates). Milošević defended Kiš while another participant, Zoran Gavrilović, kept a sarcastic distance (“Kiš is not a plagiarist, he is an

¹⁸ Vučetić, *Koka-kola socijalizam*. The book received severe criticism for certain imprecisions and use of American references that neglected Yugoslav contributions and interests in the development of cultural cooperation, for instance for bringing important American exhibitions of abstract art to Belgrade. It was also criticized for not even mentioning the role of Marko Ristić as the head of the Committee for International Cultural Relations (Kršić 2013).

¹⁹ Bogdanović, *Dissidents*.

²⁰ Vučetić, *Monopol na istinu*, 17.

²¹ Vujanović, “Nove pozorišne tendencije,” 377. See also Radulović, Ksenija, *The foundation of Bitef* (1967) and *Cultural Diplomacy of Socialist Yugoslavia*. In, Dragičević Šešić, *Cultural Diplomacy*.

epigone"). The polemic still raises ongoing interest in contemporary literary debate.²² The journalist Dragoljub Golubović also participated in this debate, and accused Kiš of defamation. The accusations were dismissed, but the public attacks continued. Kiš described two types of pressure against "politically suspect persons": a dumbing down by constant repetition of false accusations and moral disqualification of the pressured person. "Those two are typical phenomena of the totalitarian heritage, and the application of this heritage in practice may one day serve a sociological analysis of our literary life."²³ Kiš left Yugoslavia, but nevertheless, his ex-wife Mirjana Miočinović stressed in an interview with COURAGE that he never perceived himself as a dissident, but rather as a non-conformist writer.²⁴

Although the period after Tito's death in the 1980s brought more freedom of expression, a massive yearning for the lost strong leader occurred resulting in a re-emphasis of the personality cult. This "freedom" facilitated also the raise of nationalism, media war, and hatred among Yugoslav nations. Censorship was very rare, but still occurred as was the case with the agency *Novi kolektivizam* [New Collectivism], a part of the collective *Neue Slowenische Kunst* [New Slovenian Art] (1987); the journals *Vidici* [Views](1981) (the case of Glossary of Technology); and the journal *Student* (1984) in Belgrade. The *White book*, compiled by Stipe Šuvar in Zagreb, brought these controversial cases out into the open.²⁵

2.2. Concepts and Research on Cultural Opposition under Socialism after Yugoslavia

Historical research on cultural opposition in former Yugoslavia applies the concepts of censorship (Vučetić), non-conformism (Miller), and 'dissidents' (Cvetković).²⁶ Art historians frame cultural opposition through (neo-)avant-gardes as "excessive, experimental and emancipatory art practices that most frequently developed [...] in the Cold War climate of a high modernism in the political West and the dominating socialist modernism in the political East".²⁷ According to Radina Vučetić, research on avant-garde culture in socialism helps decipher what she refers to as the "deep schizophrenia of Yugoslav society."²⁸

In her landmark book about censorship in Yugoslavia, Vučetić describes censorship as heterogeneous, because within the country, various realms of freedom and of repression existed resulting in manifold formal and informal censorship practices at different places, differing throughout time as well.²⁹

²² For instance Nebojša Vasović, 2014, *Zar opet o Kišu*, Nebojša Vasović, 2005, *Lažni car Šćepan Kiš*, and Politika supplement *Ko se boji Kiša još*, 2014.

²³ Kiš quoted in Miočinović 2004: 82-83.

²⁴ Miočinović Mirjana, interview by Sanja Radović for the COURAGE project, January 14, 2017 and December 26, 2016.

²⁵ Šuvar, *Bela knjiga*.

²⁶ Miller, *The nonconformists*. Cvetković, *Portreti disidenata*.

²⁷ Šuvaković, "Novavangarda i Neoavangarde," 281. See also: Đurić, *Impossible Histories*.

²⁸ Vučetić, "Između avangarde i cenzure," 705.

²⁹ Vučetić, *Monopol na istinu*, 21.

Applying the term 'dissident' when researching socialist Yugoslavia is largely misleading for at least three reasons. First, key intellectuals who called for reforming Yugoslav socialism were of leftist (Đilas) and not civic provenance (Borislav Pekić and the democratic youth in 1950s were marginalized, imprisoned, and without any public voice during this period). The most prominent assembly of such leftist intellectual opposition was the Praxis Group. It gathered Marxist philosophers and sociologists, and from 1964 onwards published the Praxis journal and opened a summer school on the island of Korčula, in which Yugoslav intellectuals and some of the most prominent philosophers from around the world participated. In their work, the Praxis intellectuals critically discussed the policy of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY) and they were therefore labelled "anarcho-leftists" and condemned by the party. After ten years, in 1974, the "Praxis Group" was forced to cease activity.

Second, the strategy of the regime to fight opponents was not completely inhibiting them, but partially embracing or winning them over. Although books and journal issues were forbidden, professors had to change their position or their work place, and although some film directors or authors faced trials, the consequences of opposing Tito's system did basically not threaten life, but predominantly the freedom of expression.³⁰ The ambiguity of Yugoslavia's cultural policy has, one may conclude, produced 'conformist dissidents', if one absolutely wants to apply the concept to this region at all.³¹ Art historian Branislav Dimitrijević warns: "Yugoslav dissidence is a quite intangible phenomenon. Who were dissidents? People that were linked to Communist Party as it was Milovan Đilas. Only in one moment they were excluded [from the party]. But he really was a dissident. There are only few more examples. Most of those that presented themselves as dissidents in reality were part of the system. What we call today dissident culture in reality was official culture. The case of [the painter] Mića Popović proves that - he went with state scholarship to France in 1950 [and depicted Yugoslav society and Tito critically at the end of sixties and in the seventies]. Most of dissident movies were financed and shot in state studios."³²

Third, from the perspective of the new post-Yugoslav countries, clearly those Yugoslav 'dissidents' who embarked on nationalist paths became most prominent later.³³ That is how the term 'dissident' alludes to some kind of betrayal for many people who yearn for the cultural pluralism of Yugoslavia that was overthrown by the nationalist monism of the new states. Nick Milller and Jasna Dragović-Soso have shown how important having a cultural research perspective is to explain such developments. Borislav Mihajlović Mihiz, for instance,

³⁰ However, up to about 400 political prisoners incarcerated at the Goli Otok [*Bare Island*] prison between 1949 and 1956 died due to poor living conditions and exhaustion. <http://www.noviplamen.net/dosije-o-golom-otoku/>

³¹ Interview with Katarina Ristić, Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, Belgrade, 09.05.16 by J. Nießer.

³² <https://www.slobodnaevropa.org/a/intervju-branislav-dimitrijevic/28499038.html>.

³³ Interview with Predrag Marković, Belgrade, 10.05.16 by J. Nießer.

a writer that became famous for his nationalistic ideas (expressing that Serbian people were endangered in socialist Yugoslavia), has been re-evaluated as this type of cultural dissident.

For Miller, Dobrica Ćosić's intellectual and political career for instance illustrates "that nationalism was more than a tool for cynical and needy politicians and less an ancient bequest than an unsurprising response to real conditions in Tito's Yugoslavia. [...] In their very humanism the seeds of failure sprouted, since the Tito regime was unwilling or unable to satisfy this one's desire to develop a new universalist culture, that one's faith in the regime's commitment to social justice."³⁴ Miller hence shies away from reducing the path from non-conformist, dissenting intellectual engagement towards a nationalist stance only to personal choice (or failure), but he puts the intellectual trajectories in the broader social and political context of a disintegrating state. Dragović-Soso also reminds us that the national question was not invented or imagined either by intellectuals or by Milosevic in the 1980s, but that nationalism "is the structural legacy of the region's historical development and the Yugoslav communists' federal division of the country's territory."³⁵

In Serbia, the interest in studying alternative cultural and artistic movements and related censorship began immediately after transition³⁶ when several MA theses were written.³⁷ But the major research started only in the first decade of the twenty-first century, resulting in several books and films.³⁸ The contributions of the historians Dubravka Stojanović and Radina Vučetić to the understanding of the social and cultural history of Serbia within Yugoslavia are ground-breaking.³⁹ In the framework of the promotion of Vučetić's book on censorship, the Clio publishing house together with the curators from the Museum of Yugoslavia, Marija Miletić and Mirjana Slavković, have organized the exhibition *Art in a Bunker* (in the military bunker at Belgrade's fortress Kalemegdan between April and November 2017). Serbian state radio and television broadcasters made a documentary about the censorship phenomena that Vučetić described, thus showing growing interest in the issues of dissidence, censorship, and repression in the Serbian public sphere.

Numerous dissertations have also covered this period, from those defended at history departments and arts schools in Serbia, and at foreign universities.⁴⁰ A few independent

³⁴ Miller, *The nonconformists*, xi.

³⁵ Dragović-Soso, *Saviours of the nation*, 255.

³⁶ Pašić, *Mira Trajlović*; Dragičević Šešić, *Umetnost i alternative*.

³⁷ Bobić, "Cenzura i ideologije"; Prnjat, "Kulturna politika."

³⁸ Film „Zabranjeni bez zabrane“ [Forbidden without Forbidding] 2007, dir. Milan Nikodijević and Dinko Tucaković, „Cenzura“ [Censorship] 2016 dir. Milutin Petrović; Cvetković, Srđan. *Portreti disidenata*, 2007.

³⁹ Stojanović, *Noga u vratima*; Vučetić, *Monopol na istinu*. However, censorship in architecture has not been documented, although since Tito's speech in Split in 1962 for several years, balconies of apartment buildings were "censored", mostly in Belgrade where, at the time, New Belgrade was being constructed. "Censoring balconies" meant that they were deleted although planned, or their size was reduced.

⁴⁰ Milivoj Beslin 2014; Cvetković, *Portreti*; Suša, "Beogradsko pozorište." Greg de Cuir's dissertation about the Black Wave Movement (defended at the Faculty of Drama Arts) was printed by the Serbian film centre in 2011; Spasovska, *The Last Yugoslav Generation*.

authors have conducted thorough research about specific cases of censorship, like in theatres⁴¹, and alternative writing between the fifties and nineties⁴². This documentation was mostly inspired by the wish to preserve the memory of such phenomena happening at the margins of public institutions.

2.3 Institutions and Initiatives for the Preservation and Interpretation of the Socialist Past in Serbia

Only a few public institutions devote their attention to the heritage and legacy of socialist Yugoslavia: first the Museum of Yugoslavia, which has a permanent programme called *Discussions about Yugoslavia* that has already held more than twenty events. However, the Museum of Yugoslavia devotes more attention to the mainstream or dominant features of Yugoslavia such as Tito's diplomacy in the post-colonial world, the non-aligned movement, self-government, development of consumerism (social gatherings with Vespas and the first Yugoslav car, Zastava 750, Fića). More recently they have turned their attention to the history of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1918-1941). Issues of dissidence, and alternative and vanguard movements are treated within more general exhibitions there (i.e., an exhibition of Russian avant-garde art was complemented with exhibits related to the journal *Zenit* that was published in the same period in Yugoslavia).

Academic journals from time to time pay attention to Yugoslav history, and currently Tatomir Toroman, an anthropologist, and Aleksandar Raković, historian, are preparing a thematic issue of the journal *Kultura* [Culture] devoted to the culture of socialism (to be published in January 2019). Another team, consisting of the art historian Branislav Dimitrijević, the anthropologist Ildiko Erdei, and, again, Tatomir Toroman, is preparing a book about Yugoslavia for the Museum of Yugoslavia, and have expressed interest in including topics such as dissidence and cultural policy.

Public institutions prefer to preserve their organizational histories as "stories of triumph", so that censorship cases have not been thoroughly documented in institutions themselves; one may conclude that they tend to erase those traumatic events from their institutional memory.⁴³ Nevertheless, research has started to explore dissident and non-conformist artists that were linked to public institutions such as the playwright Aleksandar Popović⁴⁴, the dramaturge Mira Trailović⁴⁵, the writer Branko Ćopić⁴⁶, the film director Dušan Makavejev⁴⁷, and the painter Miodrag Mića Popović⁴⁸.

⁴¹ Novaković, *Kako je Tito razbijao tikve*.

⁴² Petrović B. 2008 & Peković, *Sudanije Branku Ćopiću*.

⁴³ Dragičević Šešić, "How theaters remember."

⁴⁴ Ljutanović, *Aleksandar Popović*.

⁴⁵ Pašić, *Mira Trailović*; Dragičević Šešić *Umetnost i alternative*.

⁴⁶ Peković, *Sudanije Branku Ćopiću*.

⁴⁷ Dimitrijević, *Slatki film*.

⁴⁸ Živadinović, *Miodrag Mića Popović*.

There were also efforts to document and write about dissident movements that were not directly connected with arts.⁴⁹ In addition to the huge efforts undertaken by Ante Lešaja in Croatia, the work on the Praxis movement has also inspired authors in Serbia.⁵⁰

The Centre for Politics of Emancipation [*Centar za politike emancipacije*] is an NGO that organises a Studies of Socialism programme in order to fight against the erasure of the socialist theoretical perspective from higher education's social sciences and humanities curricula.⁵¹ A few choirs in Belgrade today attempt to preserve the heritage of socialist Yugoslavia through songs (*Naša pjesma*, *Horheškart*⁵²).

The 2018 exhibition "Towards a Concrete Utopia: Architecture in Yugoslavia, 1948–1980" at the MOMA in New York demonstrates foreign interest in official Yugoslav culture. The exhibition also showed the ambiguities of culture in socialist Yugoslavia. Most of the architects that built important projects in Yugoslavia (like Stojan Maksimović, who designed Belgrade's Sava Centre or Bogdan Bogdanović, who designed numerous memorials) cannot simply be considered "state architects". Their work was often questioned in Yugoslavia and usually resulted in emigration or inner emigration. Somehow architecture stayed outside of discussions related to the culture of dissent, and the most important example of architectural dissidence, the *New School of Bogdan Bogdanović*, lasted only a few years (1970-1973), before it was forced to "emigrate" from the Faculty of Architecture to Bogdanović's private house in the village of Mali Popović. The Centre for Cultural Decontamination has been exploring the heritage of the *New School* and why it was rejected by the state, but it seems that there is still much research and better documentation to be done.

When the history of Yugoslav arts is written, there is often a lack of research on independent initiatives in the history of theatre⁵³, publishing and literature⁵⁴, and visual arts.⁵⁵ Thus, it is very important to train artistic collectives and civil society groups to archive their own projects and achievements. It is also crucial that funding is provided for heritage preservation and for research on such initiatives.

The politics of cultural memory has meant that only the works of the public cultural sector is followed and archived, and only of those artists who were officially recognised in their times. The semi-periphery of Europe has had many opportunities to develop innovative and creative

⁴⁹ Also, a few cases had been explored from legal perspective like Todorović and Trkulja, *Zločin nad mišljenjem*. Trkulja, *Slučaj "Crveni kralj."*

⁵⁰ Popov, *Sloboda i nasilje*.; Jakšić 2012; Olujić, Stojaković 2012.

⁵¹ Most of those programmes are supported by the German foundation of the Left party – Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung South East Europe.

⁵² Since 2006 known as "Horkestar" (<http://horkestar.org>)

⁵³ For instance there is no research on the series of theatrical initiatives of Radomir Stević Ras: Ras Endowment in 1956; or of the *Ovako* club for synthesis of arts of 1959 which later became Theatrical Playground, then Theatre of National Drama and, at the end, the Belgrade Summer Festival [*Beogradski letnji festival - BELEF*].

⁵⁴ Like for instance on the Independent Publishing Program of Slobodan Mašić.

⁵⁵ First private galleries in Belgrade: Az, Lada, etc.

projects and campaigns but has never had the capacity to record the memory of them, to organize the transmission to following generations and to make them living archives (used for inspiration but also for research).

In 2016, researchers have launched the transdisciplinary Centre for Yugoslav Studies [*Centar za jugoslovenske studije* - Cejus] at Belgrade's Faculty of Media and Communication.⁵⁶ Cejus aims to "to go beyond the dichotomies in the paradigms that has [sic] marked the discourses on Yugoslavia: the 'totalitarian' and the 'Yugonostalgic' examples. Rather, we would like to illustrate the complexities and ambivalences that characterised Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav societies."⁵⁷ Like Cejus, such research is based on individual's engagement seldomly supported by public institutions. Many researchers therefore cooperate with NGOs such as the Centre for Cultural Decontamination⁵⁸ or the Centre for Public History [*Centar za primenjenu istoriju*]⁵⁹. Public cultural institutions such as the Belgrade Youth Center [*Dom omladine*] or Parobrod, the cultural centre of the Belgrade's old town, host such events.

Another independent initiative to begin Yugoslav studies comes from the art historian Branislav Dimitrijević, who advocates, like *Cejus*, to overcome dominant (revisionist) discourses about the totalitarian character of the Yugoslav socialist system. Dimitrijević collaborates with the Museum of Yugoslavia and other professionals and artists, such as Igor Grubić, who share such views. Regarding the example of socialist monuments which continue to attract global interest, Dimitrijević illustrates how the socialist system in Yugoslavia enabled visual artists to express themselves freely, but he also devotes attention to the work of film artists who were censored (Ž. Pavlović) or forced to leave (Makavejev, Žilnik).⁶⁰

Today there are only a few archives that are digitalised and accessible to wide variety of users. The Institute for Theatre, Film, Radio and Television in cooperation with the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts [*Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti* - SANU] has digitalised the journal *Filmske sveske* that in itself was not seen as dissident but gathered important materials related to film theory and history.⁶¹ The Archive of Alternative Films and Videos of the Student City Cultural Centre [*Dom kulture "Studentski grad"*] holds important films of the Belgrade and Serbian alternative club scene from 1960s including early works of Živojin Pavlović, Dušan Makavejev, and many others.⁶² In September 2018, the Belgrade International Theatre Festival (BITEF) launched a specific website for its digital archive in cooperation with

⁵⁶ <https://www.facebook.com/cejus.jus/>. Before that, there was another initiative named "Yugoslavology, independent research centre for Yugoslav studies" [*Jugoslavologija.eu*] in Belgrade, but it has ceased to exist.

⁵⁷ Petrov, "Introduction: Towards Yugoslav Studies," 2.

⁵⁸ <https://www.czkd.org/>.

⁵⁹ <http://www.cpi.rs/en/>.

⁶⁰ Dimitrijević, *Potrošeni socijalizam*.

⁶¹ <http://filmskesveske.mi.sanu.ac.rs/>.

⁶² http://www.dksg.rs/afc_arhivAlternativnogFilmaIVideoa.php.

Belgrade's University Library.⁶³ These are only few cases of digitization that indicate what more has to be done.

An important prospect for intensifying research on the culture of dissent in Serbia is the COST project CA16213: *New Exploratory Phase in Research on East European Cultures of Dissent*. In 2018, the Institute for Theatre, Film, Radio and Television of the Faculty of Dramatic Arts joined the Institute for Mathematics of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts as representatives of the Serbian research community in this research project on resistance and dissent in former socialist Europe 1945–89.⁶⁴ The consortium began with the premise that the dissident movement constituted “a remarkable chapter of Europe’s recent past, which not only informs in a decisive way the identities of post-socialist societies, but has also reshaped the continent as a whole and still provides an important reference for contemporary social movements worldwide”. The main aim of the COST project is to re-evaluate this legacy through new, reflexive approaches and interpretations. It should be a valuable interface between three communities of practice: researchers and archivists, art and cultural heritage curators and IT experts with humanities and social science expertise.⁶⁵ The project intends to build upon the results of the COURAGE project and of the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) for encoding humanities data in electronic form, the Collaborative Digital Archival Research Infrastructure (CENDARI) for virtual research environment for historians, and Pelagios. Within the COST project the Faculty of Dramatic Arts in Belgrade will realize several sub-projects based on oral history methods as well as on artistic, practice-based research.⁶⁶ The project also aims at breaking the “shameful silence” which occurred around film director Živojin Pavlović following his demotion from professor to the position of coordinator of learning tools at the Faculty of Dramatic Arts.⁶⁷ A special project group, led by art historian Branislav Dimitrijević will create artistic-based research devoted to the curatorial work of Pavlović.

The journal *Hereticus. Časopis za preispitivanje prošlosti* [Hereticus. Journal for Re-examining the Past] is the only journal completely devoted to legal and political issues linked to dissidence, such as the rehabilitation of political prisoners, lustration, restitution of confiscated property etc.⁶⁸ It is published since 2003 by the NGO Center for Advanced Legal Studies [*Centar za unapređivanje pravnih studija*] (est. in 1998). The journal is interdisciplinary, open for authors of different political and theoretical orientation and may offer a forum where different perspectives on the socio-political and cultural changes in Serbia can be evaluated

⁶³ <http://digitalniarhivbitefa.unilib.rs/>.

⁶⁴ The Faculty of Dramatic Arts team consists of Milena Dragičević Šešić, Nina Mihaljinac, Ljiljana Rogac, Ivan Medenica, Ksenija Radulović, Vlatko Ilić, Irena Ristić, and Ana Martinoli.

⁶⁵ There are six working groups: Culture under Surveillance, Culture in the Grey Zone, Alternative Cultures, Cultural Memory of Dissent, Mediating Research through Technology, and Art and Cultural Heritage Curation.

⁶⁶ For instance, on October 8th 2018 in Belgrade's cultural centre, Parobrod, four focus groups collected testimonies directly from the persecuted participants of certain events: 1) repercussions of *Plastic Jesus* affair for students; 2) Student Cultural Centre as a grey zone of negotiation levels of freedom; 3) theatre and censorship, and 4) open university and the persecution of the Group of Six.

⁶⁷ Dragičević Šešić, “How Theaters Remember.” *Etnoantropološki problemi*, 621-640.

⁶⁸ <http://hereticus.org/arhiva-casopisa-hereticus/>.

and assessed. The accent of the last published issue in 2017 was on the authoritarian aspects of the Serbian present. Since then however, no other issue appeared and the future of the journal seems to be unclear.

Another recent development comes from the former editorial staff and journalists of the journal *Student*, who organized three public discussions at Belgrade's Studentski grad [Student City] in spring 2017 to recall the importance the journal once had for youth in Yugoslavia. The most notable and attended discussion was titled *Student Journal in the History of the 1968 World Revolution*, which was held in June 2017. In October 2017, an exhibition of reproductions of *Student* cover pages was organized under the title *Visual Identity and Visual Narration*. The exhibition also displayed cartoons and critical texts created mainly at the end of the 1960s, when *Student* had its highest circulation and greatest influence. There are plans to print a monograph, which would contain the written memories of collaborators and contributors, and if funds allow, the making of a film about the history of the journal. Additionally, in June 2018, at the occasion of the 50th anniversary of 1968 several events were organized, like the gathering *Right to Rebellion, 1968 Here and in the World* [Pravo na pobunu – '68. kod nas i u svetu] at the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts.⁶⁹

To sum up, there is actual public interest in the topic of cultural opposition and the heritage of dissent in Yugoslavia in contemporary Serbia. The organisers of cultural events, research, and discussions are mainly either eyewitnesses of the bygone Yugoslav cultural sphere who are interested in preserving the memory of their activities, or activists from leftist youth movements. Institutional support comes predominantly through personal contacts in public institutions (like the Museum of Yugoslavia, SANU, and the Belgrade Youth Centre) and from NGOs (like the Centre for Public History). However, efforts to preserve and investigate the cultural heritage of dissent in socialist Yugoslavia is not a priority in cultural and educational policies.

⁶⁹ Other discussions were: "What Has Stayed from 1968 / Where Are Those Actors Today" (19 June), "Student in 1968 – 1968 in the Journal *Student*" (20 June), "1968 Resonating in Arts – Film, Literature, Music, Design" (21 June), and "Student Movements in the World" (22 June). <https://www.sanu.ac.rs/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/pravo-na-pobunu-program.pdf>. <https://www.sanu.ac.rs/68-u-studentu/>.

3. Bosnia and Herzegovina⁷⁰

During the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) between 1992 and 1995 about 100,000 people were killed and severe destruction of cultural heritage took place.⁷¹ According to Nedžad Memić, cultural politics in BiH mirror the destruction of the common cultural sphere, because cultural policy lies not in the responsibility of the entire Bosnian state anymore, but is in the hands of the entities and the cantons since the war's end.⁷² There is no Ministry of Culture that covers the entire state of BiH. Instead the Ministry of Civil Affairs deals with culture on a state level sometimes. In the two entities of Bosnia and Herzegovina cultural politics is differently managed: Republika Srpska (literally "Serb Republic") organizes cultural affairs centrally through the Ministry for Education and Culture [*Ministarstvo prosvjete i kulture*]. The Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) which forms the other entity of Bosnia and Herzegovina in contrast regulates cultural policies decentralized within its ten cantons. Its Federal Ministry for Culture and Sport [*Ministarstvo kulture i sporta*] supports activities on a cantonal level, but also has its own activities.⁷³ This set-up indicates that cultural politics in Bosnia and Herzegovina are strongly divided along ethno-political lines.

Cultural institutions that are relevant for the entire country therefore are in a state of neglect. The state does not support them, because doing so would imply acknowledging the existence of a common cultural and historical heritage. Seven such institutions of national significance struggle for survival: the Country Museum [*Zemaljski muzej*], the National and University Library [*Narodna i univerzitetska biblioteka*], the Museum of Literature and Theatre Art [*Muzej književnosti i pozorišne umjetnosti*], the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina [*Historijski muzej BiH*], the Art Gallery of Bosnia and Herzegovina [*Umjetnička galerija BiH*], the National Film Archive [*Kinoteka*], and the Library for the Blind and Visually Impaired [*Biblioteka za slijepa i slabovidna lica*].⁷⁴ The Council of Europe, in 2002, published a report on cultural policies in BiH suggesting that the legal status of these institutions be clarified.⁷⁵

Regarding engagement with the cultural heritage of socialism, the fate of the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina deserves particular attention. The institution was created directly after the end of World War II under the jurisdiction of the National Government of BiH. Originally, it was called the Museum of National Liberation, but then the name changed to Museum of the Revolution in BiH. The names underpinned the promotion of the socialist state's values, which based its narrative on the antifascist struggle, achievements of the Second World War, international solidarity of the working class, and the dogma of Brotherhood and Unity among Yugoslavia's peoples. Along with the breakup of the Socialist

⁷⁰ by Jacqueline Nießer

⁷¹ Tokača, *Bosanska knjiga mrtvih*, 107-108.

⁷² Memić, „Zwischen Politik und Festival,“ 179.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ <http://www.cultureshutdown.net/> Pearce, S.C. und Mujanović, J. (2014), Local Challenges, Global Implications: Bosnia-Herzegovina's Cultural Institutions in Crisis. Washington: Emerging Democracies Institute.

⁷⁵ <http://www.cultureshutdown.net/cultural-policy-in-bosnia-herzegovina-experts-report-council-of-europe/>.

Republic of Yugoslavia and during the siege of Sarajevo, the Museum in 1993 was renamed again. However, its objectives and commitment to collect, study, professionally process and maintain, and promote the cultural and historical heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina remain unchanged.⁷⁶

Like the six previously mentioned cultural institutions relevant to the entire country, the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina has no resolved legal status, and no financing accordingly.⁷⁷ Due to this ongoing crisis (since 1995), the museum's entire collection and building have been at risk, its staff future unknown, and it faces potential permanent closure to the public.

Despite the legal vacuum and lack of regular financing, the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina with its library, archive, photo and art collection, mostly related to the 20th century history (dominated by material related to the Second World War) continues to be used regularly by researchers for academic purposes. The mere existence of the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina can be viewed as an act of cultural resistance to the political deadlock of the country. It survives due to the idealism and engagement of its staff.

The Museum's objectives in the last years have been focused on community engagement and funding projects from external donors. All the activities carried out in the museum are focused on raising awareness of the museum as the property of all people (under the slogan 'This is your museum!') and on promoting the museum as a platform for dialogue and for the exchange of ideas and knowledge.⁷⁸ The cultural campaign *I am the Museum*, received the Europa Nostra prize in 2016. Started by the *Action for Culture* group in 2014, this campaign invited citizens and artists to guard the museum and its collections [*dežura*]. The activists have also organized a series of cultural events to raise awareness about the museum's status quo and about cultural policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina in general. The *Action for Culture* group has raised concerns about "the welfare of the people looking after the artefacts that remained inside the closed museum, which had no heating and unreliable electricity and water sources".⁷⁹ A statement from the group warned: "What we witnessed was a deep humanitarian crisis among workers – no salaries, no health or social insurance and bad working conditions."⁸⁰

⁷⁶ E-Mail exchange with Elma Hasimbegović, director of the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 09.09.2018 with Jacqueline Nießer.

⁷⁷ Only a part of the cost for maintaining the museum is provided by the canton of Sarajevo and the state of BiH. Marzia, *Bosnia*.

⁷⁸ E-mail exchange with Elma Hasimbegović, director of the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 09.09.2018 with Jacqueline Nießer.

⁷⁹ See more in: Methods of Institutional Agency in the Public Sphere: Cultural Policy Challenges and Achievements, in: Tanurovska, *Modelling Public Space(s)*, 55.

⁸⁰ <https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/24092015-the-national-museum-in-sarajevo-has-reopened>.

However, also other public cultural institutions that are not of national significance, but operate on the entity or cantonal level, work on shoestring budgets.⁸¹ Librarians and archivists struggle to preserve their collections under precarious financial conditions. Additionally, the divisions within the cultural sector impede cooperation and prevent a systematic indexing of cultural heritage for all of Bosnia and Hercegovina.⁸² Memić sums up the challenges that the cultural sector in contemporary BiH faces: a lack of resources, ethno-political instrumentalization of culture leading to a non-transparent and politically one-sided distribution of public funds, lack of coordination between cultural agents, and lack of long-term vision and institutional capacity.

Festivals, private engagement of individuals and international funding offer somewhat of a solution from the ongoing state of emergency of Bosnia's cultural sphere. Through festivals that receive public funding, and projects that operate mostly through international funding, cultural work that goes beyond ethno-political divisions in Bosnia and Hercegovina is possible. However, the spaces of freedom created through the "festivalisation" of culture also has its downside, as it camouflages the lack of public vision for the steady development of the cultural sphere and it supports the commercialization of culture.⁸³

Private engagements in collaboration with religious groups are another way to help the preservation of cultural heritage. For example, the Bosniak Institute – Adil Zulfikarpašić Foundation in Sarajevo, a private foundation of the Bosnian émigré Adil Zulfikarpašić, is well equipped to maintain its rich collection of Bosnian cultural heritage artefacts stretching back to the 13th century in its archive and library. It operates thanks to the support of private donations and charitable Islamic endowment known as *waqf*.

Due to the lack of a national cultural policy, the preservation of cultural heritage of socialism in BiH has been largely privatized and localized. One may conclude that culture only survives in Bosnia and Herzegovina when it serves either political or commercial (festivals) purposes.

4. Republic of Macedonia⁸⁴

On September 2011, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Republic of Macedonia's declaration of independence, the Museum for the Macedonian Struggle for Statehood and Independence – Museum of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization and Museum for the Victims of the Communist Regime opened. The museum is part of the government-launched Skopje 2014 project, which plastered the centre of Skopje with neo-neo-classicist buildings, monuments and facades. The thirteenth section of the Museum

⁸¹ The budget for culture in the Republika Srpska amounted 6.7 million euro in 2015, in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina it was 12.2 million euro in 2015. Memić, "Zwischen Politik und Festival," 180.

⁸² Ibid, 195.

⁸³ Ibid, 196–197.

⁸⁴ By Ulf Brunnbauer

contains an exhibition on the victims of communism. This is how the official website describes its content: "Through museum exhibits, the Golgotha is shown which Macedonian citizens had to endure, of their opposition against communist dictatorship, sacrificing their lives for an independent, united and democratic Macedonia."⁸⁵ The exhibition mainly consists of wax figures of opposition figures and communists as well as evocative oil paintings showing the "horrors of communist oppression."⁸⁶

While this exhibition is as histrionic as the whole Skopje 2014 project, it also represents the ambiguous place of the communist period in Macedonian collective memory. Even anti-communist nationalists, who are behind the creation of the museum, can hardly disavow communist rule entirely. After all, it was thanks to the Yugoslav and Macedonian communists, that a modern Macedonian state was established in 1944 as part of the Yugoslav federation, that the Macedonian nation was officially recognized and the language standardized, a national history written, and an autonomous Macedonian Orthodox Church established. Even the scientific and cultural institutions that are officially commissioned to create national Macedonian culture are legacies of communist rule (with some additions after independence).

So, total condemnation of the socialist period would risk throwing the baby (the affirmation of the Macedonian nation) out with the bathwater (communism). Furthermore, the majority of Macedonian society appears to have positive views of the socialist period, many feeling genuine nostalgia for it. The post-communist Social Democratic Union political party, which named several prime ministers after 1990 (and in power again in 2017), has viewed the socialist past positively as well. During periods in power, it did not provide institutional support to public activities to 'come to terms with the communist past'.

These attitudes explain why the study of socialism has not really taken off in Macedonia and why there is not much public debate about the nature of the socialist system. Scholarly interest is limited as well. Since 2000, only 3 out of the more than 310 books of the leading research institute in Macedonia, the Institute for National History in Skopje, have been devoted to the socialist period in Macedonia.⁸⁷ The institute's journal *Glasnik* [Messenger] has also only published a few articles on the socialist period over the last decade – less, for example, than on the ancient and medieval history of Macedonia. The period of communist rule plays only a minor role in the work of most Macedonian historians writing on national history.

The only theme related to communist rule that has attracted more interest is the repression of Macedonian nationalists and their activities in exile. Historian Violeta Achkoska, for example, has published an analysis and the personal documents of repressed Macedonian intellectuals and activists.⁸⁸ The most prominent of them, Metodija Andonov-Čento, president

⁸⁵ Translation from Macedonian by Ulf Brunnbauer. Official website of the museum, <http://mmb.org.mk/index.php/mk/музејска-поставка-mk/вoвeд>.

⁸⁶ For images see the official website, <http://mmb.org.mk/index.php/mk/музејска-поставка-mk/2016-01-28-16-45-14/тринаесетто-одделение>.

⁸⁷ Official website of the institute, <http://www.ini.ukim.mk/index.php?m=7>.

⁸⁸ Violeta, *Demneechki duh*. Violeta, *Represijata i represiranite*.

of the first Macedonian parliament, fell out with the communists in 1946 and was imprisoned. In revisionist accounts after 1990, he became a founding father of independent Macedonia. These people, including writers and intellectuals, were persecuted because they demanded independent statehood and unification with the Bulgarian and Greek parts of Macedonia. The most systematic research efforts into the history of political opposition, in Macedonia and among émigrés, have been those of historian Marjan Ivanovski. He has published, for example, a multi-volume collection of texts by one of the most prominent Macedonian dissidents and exiled opposition activists, Dragan Bogdanovski (1929–98). Bogdanovski managed to leave Yugoslavia after internment in a camp in 1951, but was captured by the Yugoslav secret police in Paris in 1979, and put in jail in Yugoslavia; after his release in 1989 he became one of the founders of the VMRO-DPMNE party.⁸⁹ Sometimes such research is guided by sympathy for the conservative-nationalist VMRO-DPMNE party, which was founded in 1990 and has repeatedly held power since independence.⁹⁰

There is little research on other aspects of opposition against the communist regime. Violeta Achkoska's early studies from the 1990s in which she explored the communist transformation of the countryside and policies towards the Muslim population, both of which provoked resistance, found no follow-up.⁹¹ The electronic catalogue of the Macedonian National Library renders just one hit for the title word "opposition" pertaining to the socialist period. This is also the result of the lack of any government and public interest in the social and cultural history of the socialist period.

Some of the most valuable work on repression comes from the Archive of Macedonia in Skopje and pertains to primary documents. Its multi-volume publication of the *Dark Pages of UDBA* contains many documents on repression that are helpful in reconstructing the strategies of dissent.⁹² The archive also contains relevant personal collections, such as that of the dissident poet and journalist Jovan Koteski (1932-2001).⁹³ It should be noted that generally access to documents in state archives is handled relatively liberally in Macedonia. According to the 1990 Law on Archives and its subsequent amendments, the embargo period is 20 years after the creation of a document.⁹⁴ However, there are important exceptions. Documents that can "violate the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity" of Macedonia, and documents from the spheres of foreign policy, defence, and state security must not be accessed until 75 years after their creation, and for those that "harm national feelings" access is blocked for 100 years.⁹⁵

⁸⁹ Bogdanovski: *Mojata borba*.

⁹⁰ E.g. Todorovski: "Politichkata opozitsija," 43–48.

⁹¹ Violeta, "Emancipacijata na muslimanskata zhena," 17–28.; Ibid.: *Zadolzhitelniot otkup*.

⁹² Petrovski, *Crnite stranici*.

⁹³ See the Wikipedia entry, https://mk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Јован_Котески.

⁹⁴ Apart from the central one in Skopje, there exist regional archives in Bitola, Ohrid, Veles, Kumanovo, Prilep, Shtip, Strumitsa and Tetovo.

⁹⁵ Official website of the archive, <http://www.arhiv.gov.mk>.

Another relevant archival development concerns the question of secret police files. By law, personal files of the former state security became accessible for citizens in 2000.⁹⁶ However, this was not accompanied by any systematic research and documentation effort about the practices of suppression. On the contrary, lustration became a political weapon when the VMRO-DPMNE government established the so-called Commission for Verification of Facts [*Комисијата за верификација на фактите*] in 2008. The constitutional court repealed several provisions of it because they violated human rights and privacy laws. A second lustration law, adopted by parliament in 2012, was opposed by the opposition parties as lustration became a political instrument, not one for establishing historic facts.

Researching the cultural aspects of opposition, thus, could be a good starting point for more nuanced interpretations of the socialist past in Macedonia.

5. Montenegro⁹⁷

Montenegro became an independent country only in 2006 via referendum. During the socialist period in Yugoslavia, many Montenegrin intellectuals considered Montenegrin culture as part of Serbian culture. This was mirrored in the lack of a Ministry of Culture for Montenegro within Yugoslavia. The Ministry of Culture of Montenegro was created in 1992.⁹⁸ The major contribution for the construction of a new Montenegrin cultural identity has been offered by Montenegrin artists and intellectuals that left Belgrade cultural institutions and academia (Branislav Mićunović, Radmila Vojvodić, Branko Baletić, etc.). By the second part of the 1990s official cultural policies, mostly led by such individuals, started to reflect the needs of the future independent state. New cultural institutions were created in order to promote Montenegrin national identity. The Academy of Fine Arts and the Academy of Music were later joined by the Faculty of Dramatic Arts in Cetinje. The Budva City Theatre and Montenegrin National Theatre with their repertoires for the first time reflected mostly nationally relevant issues and dramaturgy.

In the first part of 1990s, when Serbia and Montenegro stayed together in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, scarce academic and research resources in Montenegro did not deal with issues of cultural opposition under socialism. The new political status at this time divided Montenegrin society, especially researchers. The first group was the one that saw Serbia and Montenegro as one and the same culture (and people). The Montenegrin Academy of Arts and Sciences [*Crnogorska akademija nauka i umjetnosti – CANU*] defended this position. The second group asked for the creation of a completely independent state of Montenegro with a specific Montenegrin cultural identity. The Doclean Academy of Sciences and Arts [*Dukljanska akademija nauka i umjetnosti - DANU*] was created in 1999 to fight against the ‘Serbisation’ that was implemented by the CANU. Several members of the CANU helped to create DANU

⁹⁶ Henri, “Coming to Terms.”

⁹⁷ By Milena Dragičević Šešić.

⁹⁸ [Http://www.mku.gov.me/ministarstvo](http://www.mku.gov.me/ministarstvo).

(e.g. Jevrem Brković, Sreten Asanović, Šerbo Rastoder, Zuvdija Hodžić, and Vojo Stanić), becoming in that moment “dissidents” regarding the official policy whose discourse still underlined the unity of Serbian and Montenegrin culture.

Thus, neither researched or prioritised the question of dissidence except DANU’s efforts to re-evaluate those Montenegrins that were excluded from public life in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia due to their fight for an independent Montenegrin state, like the *Zelenaši [Greens]* movement for confederal state⁹⁹. Therefore, socialist dissidents, most of them Stalinist (from the conflict in 1948), have not been studied or ‘rehabilitated’. The most well-known among them is Radovan Zogović that, together with Đilas, in 1930s participated in the famous conflict of the literary left (then rigidly defending the communist party position). In 1948 Zogović withdrew from political life and stayed on the margins of cultural and social life, always considered a communist dissident as numerous other Montenegrin intellectuals that opted for Soviet policy.

Through different efforts the time came for a re-examination of the key dissident figures of Montenegrin descent through academic and artistic work. Radmila Vojvodić, dean of the Faculty of Dramatic Arts and later rector of Podgorica University wrote and directed the play *Everyman Đilas* (a drama in five scenes). The drama (staged in November 2013) explores the nature and consequences of Milovan Đilas’ works (*Anatomy of a Moral, New Class*) as well as the fall of utopian vision alongside that of the Berlin wall. *Everyman Đilas* rehabilitates Đilas’ thoughts as an invitation to see the morality of contemporary humans in enlarging the spaces of freedom. However, contemporary historians such as Mira Bogdanović are challenging Đilas’s contribution to dissident reflection. Her book titled *The Constant Features of Converts: From Đilas to Đilas* disregards him both as a dissident and as a thinker.¹⁰⁰ Her works are often present in academic discussions but are contested.

In 2015 a new law merged the two academies of arts and sciences under the name of CANU. This coincided with the dominant policy of unification of the society and might bring some new research topics related to minor, alternative opinions from the past and present. As Montenegrin identity was in that moment in the process of intensified formation only since the twenty-first century, numerous contradictions and policy priorities in different areas have become visible. Radmila Vojvodić’s and Janko Ljumović’s research project on Montenegrin culture and identity resulted in the publication of a book, which examines the factors, conditions, and cultural patterns that influenced the creation of Montenegrin identity since the nineteenth century throughout life in different Yugoslavian states, but focuses on the last twenty-five, formative years when most of the features of Montenegrin identity had been

⁹⁹ Only recently has the academic community started to explore from different standpoints the unification of Montenegro within the Yugoslav state (Pavlović 2008) and the national identity of Montenegrin confederalists (Stamatović 2007).

¹⁰⁰ Bogdanović, Dissidents.

canonised. Artists have contributed a lot to outlining new features of a Montenegrin identity through films, music, and text.

The contradictory processes of national separation from Serbian culture were led mostly by national cultural institutions. Conceiving of Montenegrin culture in opposition to, and separated from Serbian culture is a contradictory process because many Montenegrin writers, like Mihajlo Lalić or Matija Bećković, perceive themselves as Montenegrin *within* the corpus of Serbian literature.¹⁰¹

However, when it comes to language, the separation was a political decision. In the book of Vojvodić and Ljumović, the only texts that introduce some dissident works from the previous epoch relate to the Montenegrin language. This is a polemical issue even today among Montenegrins as many Montenegrins claim to speak the Serbian language and make ironic comments on the canonization of a dialect as national language. Another controversial text deals with issues related to Montenegrin multiculturalism and demands of the three major ethnic minorities: Serb, Muslim (Bosniak), and Albanian. Although Montenegrins make up the majority of the population, the memory of Serbian and Yugoslavian repression during the Kingdom of Yugoslavia stirs up their perception of victims because Montenegrins themselves had not achieved their cultural rights for an independent church, language, or culture. The majority and minorities in Montenegro therefore can be portrayed as “captive minds”, or prisoners of history.

The major issue of contemporary dissidence in Montenegro is linked to religion: the question of two orthodox religious communities. The abolishment of Patriarchate in Pec during the Ottoman Empire led to the creation of an autonomous Montenegrin Metropolitanate. The creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in 1918 incorporated the Montenegrin episcopate within Serbian Orthodox Church. Today both churches exist in parallel dividing the population.

All texts in the book by Vojvodić and Ljumović reflect problems that Montenegrin society is facing today while attempting to constitute itself as contemporary multicultural and multi-religious state. Beside discussing the issue of faith, the book deals with the architectural heritage ruined by ‘culturalisation’ and investors’ urbanism, the intangible heritage that is ‘de-ethnicised’ and localised (like Boka Night),¹⁰² and it also presents Montenegrin artists and practices that are accepted and interpreted as common heritage of the Yugoslav space (from

¹⁰¹ In November 2018, the Montenegrin government forbid entrance to four Serbian intellectuals, among whom was the poet Matija Bećković, considered an “enemy of Montenegro”, dangerous for the state’s stability and security. <https://www.blic.rs/vesti/politika/povodom-zabrane-ulaska-u-zemlju-vlada-crne-gore-stitimo-stabilnost-i-bezbednost-od/2vhdzmp>.

¹⁰² Cities in the Bay of Kotor [*Boka Kotorska*] were mostly populated by Croats that today represent less than 1%. Numerous traditional customs are derived from Croatian heritage in the Montenegrin town of Kotor, including Boka Night [*Bokeljska noć*], which is currently celebrated as a city event without reference to the Croatian minority.

film director Veljko Bulajić to Marina Abramović) or those who are rejected as unacceptable due to political incorrectness (Njegoš's epic *The Mountain Wreath*, which celebrates war against the Muslim community).

In brief, for the state of Montenegro, the primary issues in contemporary cultural policy and public discussions are concerning the construction of its identity (language, alphabet, church autonomy, etc.). Thus, the culture of dissent in socialist Yugoslavia seems to be a minor point of reference, and is not seen as an important theme to be studied and discussed.

6. Kosovo¹⁰³

Kosovo declared independence from Serbia in 2008.¹⁰⁴ Dealing with the cultural heritage of former Yugoslavia in Kosovo is confronted with the question about the relationship between Yugoslav and Albanian heritage. More precisely, the cultural heritage of Yugoslavia is overshadowed by the legacy of repressing Albanian cultural identity in Kosovo.¹⁰⁵ Sometimes, Yugoslav heritage is additionally oversimplified as Serbian, with the aim of pointing towards the hegemonic cultural stance of Serbs towards Albanians in socialist Yugoslavia.¹⁰⁶ This constellation strains any mentioning of a Yugoslav heritage in Kosovo. The culture of dissent in Kosovo therefore tackles mainly the struggle for the recognition of Albanian identity.¹⁰⁷

However, there would be space for a more nuanced picture of cultural legacy of socialist Yugoslavia in Kosovo. Kosovo rapidly developed its infrastructure, education, housing, and cultural institutions during socialist Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, this development was based on the severe destruction of cultural heritage. The capital Pristina was modernized by destroying the Ottoman bazaar and large parts of the historic centre, including mosques, Catholic churches, and Ottoman houses. But Kosovo received also massive investments in state institutions like the then newly founded University of Pristina, in new apartments, and an industrial zone on the outskirts of Pristina, which attracted many new inhabitants leading to a rapid growth of population.¹⁰⁸ Also, Albanian-language education and the institutionalization of Albanian culture in Kosovo took place during socialist Yugoslavia: the Academy of Science and Arts for instance was founded in the 1970s and the Institute for Albanology was enlarged.

¹⁰³ By Jacqueline Nießer.

¹⁰⁴ The Republic of Serbia does not recognize Kosovo's independence. More than half of all UN member states have recognized Kosovo.

¹⁰⁵ Keçmezi-Basha, *Të burgosurit politik*.

¹⁰⁶ Limani, "Kosovo u Jugoslaviji," 251–78.

¹⁰⁷ Hetemi, „Student Movements in Kosova (1981).“

¹⁰⁸ Ströhle, *Aus den Ruinen*.

Currently Pristina displays a variety of concrete socialist blocs, modernist buildings, and socialist monuments that silently bear witness to Yugoslav ideology. Therefore, in everyday life, socialist concrete architecture is an omnipresent reminder of Yugoslavia in Kosovo. Despite a still-explosive sensitivity when mentioning Yugoslavia, research on the architectural heritage of socialist Yugoslavia in Kosovo may be a starting point for addressing the Yugoslav cultural legacies in Kosovo from a less nationalistic perspective, holds art historian Vesa Sahatçiu: “It’s clear these monuments, even today, are not Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, Montenegrin, Macedonian nor Albanian. For evidence, one need only to notice that they are neglected by their host countries and left to crumble in all the regions of the former Yugoslavia. We are all ambivalent, if not outright antagonistic, toward these monuments. Resurgent nationalist sentiments leave no room for monuments with no national identity. [...] They could, however, be viewed, at least from the perspective of art history, as testimonies to Kosovar modernism.”¹⁰⁹

The preservation of modernist architecture in Kosovo has just recently raised public attention. The plans to build a concert hall in the centre of Pristina follow the paradigm of “destroying the old to build the new” applied by the Yugoslav authorities to modernize Kosovo. This would include destroying the former Gërmia shopping centre, a modernist building inaugurated in 1972 in the heart of Pristina. After DoCuMoMo, an international committee for the Documentation and Conservation of the Modern Movement launched an online petition to protect the Gërmia building, the Kosovo Architecture Foundation and other important organizations active in protecting cultural heritage like the NGO EC Ma Ndryshe requested that the former shopping centre be included on the Cultural Heritage List Under Temporary State Protection of the Ministry of Youth and Culture.¹¹⁰ This list was launched in 2017 by Kosovo’s Ministry of Youth and Culture with 1567 assets, among which one finds ‘Yugoslav’ buildings.¹¹¹ The activists succeeded in including Gërmia in the list on 10 October 2018. However, although temporarily protected assets are under the same protection (for one year) as those under permanent protection, the restoration and conservation can only develop once the assets move from the temporary to the permanent protection list.¹¹² Whether this will happen, remains unclear, but the activism and public debate around the preservation of modernist architecture of socialist Yugoslavia in Kosovo opens a window towards ways of assessing Yugoslav cultural heritage constructively.

¹⁰⁹ Vesa Sahatçiu (2014), Monuments Without a Home, <http://kosovotwopointzero.com/>

¹¹⁰ Cristina Mari. Gërmia Controversy Signals Division on How to Grow Prishtina. 24.10.2018. <https://kosovotwopointzero.com/en/germia-controversy-signals-divisions-on-how-to-grow-prishtina>.

¹¹¹ Cultural Heritage List for Temporary Protection: <https://www.mkrs-ks.org/?page=2,153>.

¹¹² National Strategy for Cultural Heritage 2017-2027 in Kosovo. <https://www.mkrs-ks.org/?page=2,162>.

7. Analysis of the collections in the COURAGE Registry

7.1. Topics

The collections in the registry from Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia and Montenegro do not cover all collections of potential relevance and they are a selection of material pertaining to cultural opposition in socialist Yugoslavia. The selection followed criteria of feasibility, availability, and accessibility of collections and their owners within the research period of about two years (mid-2016 to mid-2018) undertaken by the Institute for East and Southeast European Studies in Bavaria, Germany.

Most of the collections of those five post-Yugoslav countries described in the registry are located in Serbia. Additionally, most of the described collections in all the countries are held in public institutions in the capital cities. The collections cover the topics of censorship, avant-gardes in the fine arts and theatre, cultural dissidents in film, non-conformist writing, intellectual dissent, youth subcultures, post-modernist music, feminism, democratic opposition, national movements, and exile.

The topic of censorship is well covered by collections in Croatia (see separate Country Report on Croatia and Slovenia). Informal and self-censorship are also worth mentioning, although these are more difficult to track historically. Such forms of limiting free expression occurred through telephone calls, informal talks, professional “advice” by theatre and film committees and editorial boards, and through media campaigns.¹¹³ In the COURAGE registry, incidents of informal and self-censorship are told in oral history interviews and in debates in the collections of literary and cultural journals, like *Književne novine* [Literary News], *Vidici* [Views], *Polja* [Fields], *Új Symposion* [New Symposium] and ARS.

In Serbia, we covered several ad-hoc collections at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade (Mića Popović, Goranka Matić, Tomislav Peternek, and The Group of Six). At the Museum of Contemporary Art Vojvodina, we described the ‘The Continuous Art Class, The Novi Sad Neo-Avantgarde of the 1960s and 1970s’, a project that referred to the ‘Public Art Class’, a campaign realized by the leaders of the Novi Sad conceptual art scene on the Danube Quay in Novi Sad in 1970. A still-existing commune in the countryside of Vojvodina is described as another continuing niche of freedom in the collection of the ‘Family of the Clear Streams’ of Božidar Mandić.

(Neo-)avantgarde in theatre is relevant, as this part of Yugoslav culture seemed particularly free, with Samuel Beckett’s *Waiting for Godot* being staged in Yugoslavia as early as 1956, for instance. As the collection of the Belgrade International Theatre Festival (BITEF) at the Historical Archives of Belgrade shows, however, such festival culture served to maintain a certain liberal image relevant for Yugoslavia’s position as a non-aligned country.

¹¹³ Vučetić, *Monopol na istinu*, 48–49.

Cultural opposition in film must be linked to the Black Wave movies – a movement that tackled the darker sides of socialist realities in Yugoslavia. Among many important filmmakers, Lazar Stojanović stands out from the second generation of the Black Wave, not for his artistic oeuvre, but for his destiny as cultural dissident. His film *Plastic Jesus* (1971) was declared anti-communist propaganda and led to Stojanović's imprisonment for three years. COURAGE managed to interview Lazar Stojanović before he died in March 2017 and described his private collection which he assembled over the course of the previous decades consisting of books, newspapers, posters, catalogues and video materials/films, including *Plastic Jesus*, which became one of the most famous acts of cultural dissidence in socialist Yugoslavia. In order to cover the prolific work of the most important Black Wave film directors like Želimir Žilnik, Dušan Makavejev or Živojin Pavlović, the Archive of Alternative Films and Videos of the Student City Cultural Centre [*Dom kulture "Studentski grad"*] should be described by future projects.¹¹⁴

Of the works which were censored in Yugoslavia, most were books.¹¹⁵ However, as mentioned above, censorship rarely occurred in a direct way, as the Danilo Kiš collection at the Archives of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SANU) exemplifies.

Intellectual dissent in Yugoslavia was palpable for instance regarding the phenomenon of the neo-Marxist philosophy and sociology, of which there is significant heritage in Yugoslavia. In Serbia, the Ljubomir Tadić Collection at SANU and the Nebojša Popov Collection at the Historical Archives of Belgrade represent the Belgrade circle of the Praxis orientation in the COURAGE registry.

Youth subculture and music are illustrated by the Zenit Đozić Collection on New Primitivism [*Novi primitivizam*] in Bosnia and Herzegovina, containing material on a subcultural movement established in Sarajevo which found expression in music and comedy on radio and television in the 1980s. Post-modernism in music is described in the COURAGE registry through the private collection of Srđan Hofman, the most influential composer of electro-acoustic music in Yugoslavia.¹¹⁶

The feminist movement is represented in the Žarana Papić Collection at the centre for Woman Studies in Belgrade, and the Women's Activism Collection of the Kosovo Oral History Initiative.

The national movement of Albanians in Kosovo is covered through ad-hoc collections at the Archives of Kosovo about the demonstrations of 1968 and 1981. There is also a private collection on the Albanian underground groups, Illegalia. A collection on the notorious labour

¹¹⁴ http://www.dksg.rs/afc_arhivAlternativnogFilmaIVidea.php.

¹¹⁵ Nikolić, *Bela knjiga-1984*, 20.

¹¹⁶ The highly important composer and multimedia artist Vladan Radovanović also needs to be mentioned here, whose voco-visual works are in a private collection.

camp for political prisoners on the island of Goli Otok [literally: Bare Island] in the Adriatic documents the repressive character of the system, particularly in its first decade. The collection is held at the Serbian Academy of Sciences (SANU). Tackling Goli Otok in the arts and in literature in particular was “one of the biggest taboos of the Yugoslav public sphere” during Tito’s reign, as exemplified by the 1969 ban on the play *When the pumpkins blossomed*, based on the novel by Dragoslav Mihajlović, who created the Goli Otok collection at SANU.¹¹⁷ Another national movement described in the registry can be found in the Bosanski Pogledi [Bosnian Views] collection at the Bosniak Institute – Adil Zulfikarpašić Foundation in Sarajevo. Bosnian Views was intended for Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslim emigrants, and it strove to keep its readership informed of political and social events.

From Yugoslav exile collections, we described the private collection on Yugoslav Cominformist émigrés in Prague during the period 1971–76, owned by the historian Ondřej Vojtěchovský. The significance of this collection lies in its analysis and criticism of the Yugoslav socialist regime from the radical leftist point of view by emigrants in an Eastern bloc country.

Descriptions of much more existing material, particularly in private hands, should be ensured by future projects led by institutions throughout former Yugoslavia.¹¹⁸

7.2. Actors, Users, Networking Capacities

Most of the collections are kept in public institutions, usually owned by the state. Most are found in public archives. These collections are usually archival funds of the state institutions and associations and personal funds of individuals whose heirs donated their collections to the archives. Libraries and museums also hold many of the collections in the Yugoslav successor states. Questions by COURAGE to those institutions on the institutional set-up, finances, management issues, and networking strategies were mostly unwelcome, although one would understand transparency to be part of a public institution’s function. Mistrust towards a project funded by the European Union (‘who wants to teach us what is right or wrong without understanding the specificities of Yugoslavia’) and the lack of personal resources have led to low amount of data on those items examined in COURAGE’s research in Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Kosovo.

In collections that were created through the work of institutions and organizations, the history of collecting and preserving generally has not significantly involved stories of opposition. In most of the cases, laws mandated the acquisition of these collections by the state archives, and it was thusly applied. However, when the historian Branka Prpa became director of the Historical Archives of Belgrade under Zoran Đinđić, it was her personal initiative to collect the

¹¹⁷ Münnich, “Jugoslawische, literarische Geschichtskonzeption,” 207.

¹¹⁸ Highly important but missing are for instance the Archive of Alternative Films and Videos of the Student City Cultural Centre [*Dom kulture “Studentski grad”*]. See also the Goran Đorđević Kunsthistorisches Mausoleum private collection, Belgrade and Igor Grubić – *Anđeli garavih lica*.

bequests of intellectuals and personalities in the cultural sphere of Belgrade to preserve their legacy for future generations in the Historical Archives of Belgrade.¹¹⁹ The already mentioned Nebojša Popov fond, the bequest of the theatre director Jovan Ćirilov, and the materials of the ballet dancer and peace activist Jelena Šantić, are now available, amongst others, for research in the archives.¹²⁰

Regarding private collections, the situation is different and usually far more interesting. Perhaps one of the best examples is the story of the Lazar Stojanović Collection. Some parts of his collection, especially the most politically sensitive items, were confiscated during several police investigations of Stojanović in the 1970s and 1980s, and they have not been recovered. Other parts have been lost due to his changing residences. The story of Stojanović also illustrates how cultural opposition can become a lifetime activity despite changing political systems. After Yugoslavia, the author and film director returned to Serbia from abroad to engage in the anti-war movement and participate in the activities of human rights groups.

The size of the collections varies from only several items to collections of more than 100 archival boxes of documents. The COURAGE registry also contains several ad-hoc collections. These collections do not exist as independent units but are often part of more extensive collections containing various materials. This is the case with the four collections at Belgrade's Museum for Contemporary Art, which contain works criticizing and depicting the social, political, and aesthetic conditions in Yugoslavia (Mića Popović, The Group of Six Artists, Goranka Matić, Tomislav Peternek). Also, the collections of the magazines *Vidici* and *Student*, and *Književne novine* do not represent a separate library unit, but are kept as part of the periodicals collection in two institutions, the National Library of Serbia and the University Library of Belgrade. Literary and cultural magazines from Yugoslavia are relatively well represented in the registry, not only because they are well preserved (excepting 'forbidden', still unavailable issues), but also because they illustrate the wealth of intellectual activities unfolding within and despite a restrictive system.¹²¹

Some of the essential collections are in private hands and are now unavailable to the public. Suzana Jovanović, the widow of Lazar Stojanović, is the owner of his collection, with no financial support from any additional source. Zenit Đozić has plans to establish a cultural centre to commemorate the phenomenon of New Primitivism, but the financing is still uncertain. Anti-authoritarian activists, like Borka Pavićević and Dragomir Olujić (Open University collection), have valuable materials but no institutional capacity to archive and store them, which are held in their private flats or houses. Other collections are in the private hands of researchers (CADDY bulletin collection, Mysticism in Macedonia, Srđan Hofman

¹¹⁹ Prpa Branka, interview by Jacqueline Nießer for COURAGE-project, June 24, 2017.

¹²⁰ <https://www.arhiv-beograda.org/en/legacy-of-jelena-santic>.

¹²¹ Other important journals that could not be covered within the COURAGE project period, but deserve attention are *Književna reč* [Literary Word] and *Delo* [Piece], and youth publications such as *Mladina* [Youth], *Polet* [Enthusiasm], and *NON*.

electronic music collection). These collections are significant in the history of cultural opposition, but their fate is uncertain because they are funded mostly by the owners themselves, who may have limited means.

Most public collections are rarely funded with direct or special funding. In this sense, the Zoran Đinđić Library, which was financed by the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Belgrade, is more of an exception than a rule. Collections that are held in public institutions (archives, museums, libraries) are normally financed through state institutions (Ministry of Culture). Direct funding occurs for special events, such as publications or exhibitions on anniversaries, as happened for the 40th anniversary of the Belgrade International Theatre Festival (BITEF collection) at the Historical Archives of Belgrade.

Most of the collections described in the registry, however, are rarely used. For instance, COURAGE researcher Sanja Radović was the first person to access the Zoran Đinđić collection at the Archives of Serbia.¹²² The potential of these collections is not sufficiently exploited academically, and even less so socially. Most of those who have used the collections are researchers, primarily historians. Although most collections are fully or partially available for research, only a few are available online. This is the case with the Zoran Đinđić Virtual Museum, which is partially digitized. The entire *Polja* – Magazine for Culture and Art collection is digitalized and the BITEF poster collection now is online available, too. The most original elements of the COURAGE research project however may be found in the oral history interviews.

8. Conclusions and Best Practice

The ideological polarization of the Serbian public sphere can be seen as a main obstacle for mapping, preserving, interpreting, and making accessible the cultural heritage of the socialist period, in all of its complex modes of representation. This is how censorship, dissent, and non-conformism in Yugoslavia is often interpreted through a very narrow lens, reducing ambivalences, interdependences, and discontinuities to simple explanations of pro- or anti-communist stances.

Although all five countries experience cultural struggles to consolidate their identities after the dissolution of Yugoslavia, public funds for culture and education in general are relatively low. Within this already underfinanced cultural public sector, the topic of the cultural heritage of socialist Yugoslavia is very marginally treated.

Another problem is that research institutions on the one hand and cultural institutions on the other hand are functioning within their own worlds, separated from each other, as in these countries, museums and archives are not seen as research institutions, but as 'belonging to'

¹²² Kostić, "Đinđićeva zaostavština."

(being under supervision of) the respective Ministry of Culture. Also, the division between research and primary and secondary education should be overcome – the results of research should be introduced into the curricula of primary and secondary schools as soon as possible.

Major challenges are related to the necessity of transdisciplinary approaches for researching cultural opposition. There is a lot of lip service paid to collaboration in multidisciplinary teams, but in reality, transdisciplinary research is not really supported in the academic world. The university system of career development mostly favors disciplinary research and publishing; cooperation happens mostly among the same ‘kind’ of researchers, while transdisciplinarity is seen as a threat, or ‘escape path’ for ‘bad academics’.

Best practice

The preservation of the BITEF collection at the Historical Archives of Belgrade, its outreach events in form of several exhibitions and a major publication, as well as the recent digitalization of some of its material with the support of the University Library Belgrade form an excellent example of how public institutions should engage with the past and make it accessible to wider audiences.

9. Recommendations

A – Recommendations for Developing a Transnational Perspective on the Cultural Heritage of Dissent

1. BUILD UPON existing research on the culture of dissent and of the socialist period through EU research projects (Horizon 2020, COST, etc.) (after evaluating challenges and achievements) as well as the Creative Europe programme to support projects that bring these missing perspectives to light (memory documentation, new interpretations, digitalization, etc.) in a transdisciplinary approach, that connects historians, anthropologists, sociologists, political scientists, and researchers of culture and media;
2. SUPPORT the preservation of collections from public television broadcasters, “film journal” organisations [*Filmske novosti*], film archives and cinematheques, archives of film schools, etc., helping to digitalise and make accessible materials for researchers and the wider public;
3. DEVELOP a network: The Museum of Yugoslavia in Belgrade, as the strongest institution of this kind, should be consulted and supported to initiate and lead a network linking relevant institutions in the region that preserve the heritage of Yugoslavia, such as Kadinjača (Užice) Memorial Museum; Tjentište (Foča) Memorial

Complex; Tito's Museum in Drvar, AVNOJ Museum Jajce, AVNOJ Museum Bihać, Franja Partisan Hospital, Slovenia (recognized as an EU heritage label), Kumrovec, Tito's yacht *Galeb* situated in the port of Rijeka (owned by the city), among many others.

4. PROMOTE: Utilize existing festivals in the region to stimulate public discussion about the topic of cultural opposition under socialism (for instance at the festivals of Na pola puta [Halfway] and Bez prevoda [No Translation] in Užice, Krokodil [Crocodile] in Belgrade, the Motovun Film Festival, Sarajevo Film Festival, etc.).

B – Recommendations for Governments and Public Institutions

<i>Challenge</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
1. Lack of institutions in charge of documenting and researching dissident movements.	1. Create a public centre for research and documentation of the culture of dissident under socialism covering agents, practices, movements, temporalities, and instruments of repression.
2.1. Lack of institutional memory practices . Culture of memory linked to celebrations and 'glorious' moments of institutional past. 2.2. Cultural management is unaware that institutional memory is crucial part of organisational culture and that it is its duty to enable intergenerational transmission.	2.1. Support research including individual memories (oral history) , collective memories (jokes, anecdotes, and storytelling) enabling transfer toward cultural memory. 2.2. Raise public institutional capacity to archive, interpret, and digitalise. 2.3. Incorporate training into organisational culture development within management.
3.1. Lack of systemic archiving of independent initiatives . 3.2. Lack of accessibility even for those that are kept in private or organizational archives. 3.3. Low level of awareness of the utility of archiving and preserve memories for maintaining organisational identity and values.	3.1. Map existing resources; supporting its digitalisation and accessibility. 3.2. Capacity building of civil society organisations to archive, interpret, and digitalise. 3.3. Raising level of endorsing organisational cultures within civil society and private organisations.
4. Lack of transdisciplinary approaches to research cultural phenomena such as the culture of dissent, non-conformism, avant-gardes, etc.	4. Stimulate creation of transdisciplinary teams to address those issues. In addition to historians and art historians, research groups should include cultural policy

	experts, experts in political science, anthropologists, sociologists, etc.
5. Cultural policy and cultural management research does not take in account importance of bottom-up cultural policies (contributions of individuals and independent initiatives).	5. Exploring phenomena of “temporary and permanent working communities of artists” that marked the 1970s and 1980s in Yugoslavia ¹²³
6. 1. Audio-visual sources: Public television and radio have huge archives that are only sporadically available.	6.1. Within public radio and television archive, systematically explore and map all materials related to dissident movements. 6.2. Specific emphasis should be placed on their own programmes that were informally censored
7. The mobility of dissident artists and intellectuals and their mutual solidarity and empathy is not followed up by research. The Yugoslav dimension of many of those trajectories is neglected by present interpretations.	7.1. Collaborative international research teams should be engaged to assess and evaluate different phenomena of social practices, institutional responses, and individual gestures of solidarity. 7.2. Networks of student cultural centres, of film clubs, theatre organisations, etc., should be explored as organisations of Yugoslave relevance, not appropriated by one of the former Yugoslav republic due to their location ¹²⁴ .

¹²³ From theatres such as *Pod razno* [Diverse Issues] in 1974 to *Nova osećajnost* [New Sensibility] in 1981 or PPP in 1989, or film companies such as Art Film, cultural animation collectives *Znaci kulture* [Signs of Culture], etc.

¹²⁴ MAFAP - *Međuklupski i autorski festival amaterskog filma* [Inter-Club and Authors' Festival of Amateur Film] - was part of common Yugoslav history and thus important as much for Serbian as for Croatian film history for instance.

References

- Achoska, Violeta. *Demneechki duh. Tajnoto politisko dosie na politichkiot zatvorenik suden za Makedonija Gjorgji Dotsev Ordev* [A Vigilant Mind. The Secret Police File of a Political Prisoner Sentenced for Macedonia – Gjorgji Dotsev Ordev]. Skopje, 2012.
- Achoska, Violeta; Zhezhov, Nikola. *Represijata i represiranite vo najnova makedonska istorija* [Repressions and the Repressed in Recent Macedonian History]. Skopje, 2005.
- Achkoska, Violeta. "Emancipacijata na muslimanskata žena" [The Emancipation of the Muslim Woman]. *Glasnik* 36, no 1-2 (1992): 17–28. *ibid.*: Zadolzhitelniot otkup vo Makedonija 1945–1953 godina. [Obligatory Sales in Macedonia 1945–1953]. Skopje: INI, 1995.
- Bobić, Zorica. "Cenzura i ideologija." In: *Polja: časopis za kulturu, umetnost i društvena pitanja*. ["Censorship and Ideology." In: *Fields: Journal of Culture, Arts and Social Issues*] Vol. 36, no. 373 (March 1990): 65-67.
- Bogdanović, Mira. „Dissidents of the second Yugoslavia.“ In: *Status*, no. 14 (2010): 296-314.
- Bogdanovski, Dragan: *Mojata borba za Makedonija* [My Struggle for Macedonia]. Edited by Ivanovski Marjan and Zoran Todorovski. Skopje: Makedonika, 2014–2015.
- Bohnet, Henri; Bojadzhieva, Daniela. "Coming to Terms with the Past in the Balkans. The Lustration Process in Macedonia." KAS International Reports 1, 2001.
- Buden, Buden & Želimir Žilnik. *Uvod u prošlost* [An Introduction to the Past], Novi Sad: Centar za nove medije kuda.org.
- Cvetković, Srđan. *Portreti disidenata* [Portraits of Dissidents]. Belgrade: Institut za savremenu istoriju. Centar za unapređivanje pravnih studija: Istraživačko-izdavački centar Demokratske stranke, 2007.
- Cvetković, Srđan. *Politička represija u Srbiji 1953-1985* [Political Repression in Serbia 1953-1985], PhD diss., Filozofski fakultet Beograd, 2010.
- Cvetković, Srđan & Kosta Nikolić & Đoko Tripković, Bela knjiga-1984 [White Book - 1984]. Službeni glasnik, 2010.
- De Cuir, Greg. *Yugoslav Black Wave: polemical cinema from 1963-72 in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*. Beograd: Filmski centar Srbije, 2011.
- Dimitrijević, Branislav. *Slatki film Dušana Makavejeva* [Sweet Movie by Dušan Makavejev]. Belgrade: Muzej savremene umetnosti, 2017.
- Dimitrijević, Branislav. *Potrošeni socijalizam. Kultura, konzumerizam i društvena imaginacija u Jugoslaviji (1950-1974)* [Used Socialism: Culture, Consumerism and Social Imagination in Yugoslavia]. Belgrade: Fabrika knjiga, 2016.
- Djurić, Dubravka & Miško Šuvaković. *Impossible Histories. Historical Avant-Gardes, Neo-Avant Gardes, and Post-Avant-Gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918 - 1991*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006.
- Dragičević Šešić, Milena. *Umetnost i kultura otpora* [Art and Culture of Resistance]. Belgrade: Institut za pozorište, film, radio i televiziju FDU & Clio, 2018.

- Dragičević Šešić, Milena. *Umetnost i alternative* [Art and Alternatives]. Belgrade: Institut za pozorište, film, radio i televiziju FDU & Clio, 1992/2012.
- Dragičević Šešić, Milena. & Milena Stefanović. "How Theaters Remember: Cultures of Memory in Institutionalized Systems." In: *Культура/Culture* (Skoplje), no. 4 (2013): 11-29.
- Dragičević Šešić, Milena. "The leadership style of Mira Trailović: An entrepreneurial spirit in a bureaucratic world." In: *Arts Leadership, International Case Studies*, edited by Jo Caust. Melbourne: Tilde Publishing and Distribution, 2012.
- Dragičević Šešić, Milena. & M. Stefanović. "Organizational trauma – types of organizational forgetting in the case of Belgrade theatres." In: *Etnoantropološki problemi*, no. 2 (2017): 621-640.
- Dragičević Šešić, Milena et.al., *Cultural Diplomacy. Arts, Festivals and Geopolitics*, Belgrade 2017,
- Dragović-Soso, Jasna. *Saviours of the nation?: Serbia's intellectual opposition and the revival of nationalism*. London, 2002.
- Gađanski et al. *Knjige iz zatvorenog fonda* [Books from a Closed Fund], katalog izložbe [exhibition catalogue], Beograd: Univerzitetska biblioteka, 1991.
- Hetemi, Atdhe. "Student movements in Kosova (1981): academic or nationalist?." *Nationalities Papers* 46:4 (2018): 685-703. Routledge.
- Jakovljević, Branislav. *Alienation Effects, Performance and Self-Management in Yugoslavia, 1945-91*. University of Michigan Press, 2016.
- Jovanović, Biljana, et al. *Vjetar ide na jug i obrće se na sjever* [The Wind Goes to the South and then Turns Northward]. Radio B92, 1994.
- Keçmezi-Basha, Sabile. *Të burgosurit politik shqiptarë në Kosovë 1945-1990* [Albanian Political Prisoners in Kosovo 1945-1990]. Shkup-Prishtinë-Tiranë, 2010.
- Kešetović, Želimir. *Cenzura u Srbiji. Cenzura u izdavačkoj delatnosti u Republici Srbiji posle Drugog svetskog rata* [Censorship in Serbia. Censorship in Publishing in the Republic of Serbia after the Second World War]. Belgrade: Zadužbina Andrejević, 1998.
- Kršić, Dejan. „Velika očekivanja“ [\"Great Expectations\"], Pešćanik, 4.9.2013.
- Kostić, Branka and Mihajlović, Dragan. "Đinđićeva zaostavština" [Djindjić's legacy]. Radio slobodna Evropa, March 3, 2018.
- Lešaja, Ante. *Praksis orijentacija, časopis Praxis i Korčulanska ljetna škola* [Praxis Orientation, the Praxis Journal and Korčula Summer School] [građa]. Beograd: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung, 2014.
- Limani, Mrika. *Kosovo u Jugoslaviji: Protiv kolonijalnog statusa* [Kosovo in Yugoslavia: Against a colonial status]. In *Jugoslavija u istorijskoj perspektivi* [Yugoslavia from a historical perspective], edited by Sonja Biserko, 251–78. Belgrade: Helsinški odbor za ljudska prava u Srbiji, 2017.
- Lopušina, Marko. *Crna knjiga: cenzura u Srbiji 1945-2015* [Black Book: Censorship in Serbia 1945-2015], Novi Sad: Prometej.
- Ljuštanović, Jovan (ed). *Aleksandar Popović*. Novi Sad: Izdavački centar Matice Srpske, 2015.

- Marzia, Bona. *Bosnia: Rampant Festivals and Bankrupt Museums*. Osservatorio Balcani e Caucaso (OBC), 2012.
- Memić, Nedžad. „Zwischen Politik und Festival: Kultur in Bosnien-Herzegowina.“ In: *Das politische System Bosnien und Herzegowinas. Herausforderungen zwischen Dayton-Friedensabkommen und EU-Annäherung* [“Between Politics and Festival: Culture in Bosnia-Herzegovina.” In: *The Political System of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Challenges between Dayton Peace Agreement and EU Approach*], edited by Flessenkemper Tobias & Nicolas Moll, 177–198. Wiesbaden: 2018.
- Miočinović, Mirjana. „Uvodna napomena za "Nacrt odbrane"" [“Introductory Remark for ‘Defense Draft’”]. In: *Hereticus* II: 1 (2004) 83-86. Detalj rukopisa "Nacrt odbrane" [Manuscript Detail from ‘Defense Draft’], 2004.
- Miller, Nick. *The nonconformists: Culture, politics, and nationalism in a Serbian intellectual circle, 1944–1991*. Budapest–New York: CEU Press, 2007.
- Münnich, Nicole. „Jugoslawische, literarische Geschichtskonzeption als Katalysator im gesellschaftlichen Umbruchprozess: Die Goli Otok Literatur nach dem Tode Titos.“ [Yugoslav, literary conceptions of history as catalyst during social transformation]. In *Geschichte (ge-)brauchen. Literatur und Geschichtskultur im Staatssozialismus: Jugoslawien und Bulgarien* [Applying history, Literature and historical culture in state socialism: Yugoslavia and Bulgaria], edited by Angela Richter and Barbara Beyer, 205–20. Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2006.
- Novaković, Aleksandar. *Kako je Tito razbijao „tikve“: istorija zabrane pozorišne predstave „Kad su cvetale tikve“ Dragoslava Mihailovića* [How Tito Broke the 'Pumpkins': the History of the Ban of the Theater Play “When the pumpkins blossomed” by Dragoslav Mihailović] (JDP, 25. X 1969). Belgrade: Narodna knjiga, 2005.
- Olujić, Dragomir; Stojaković, Krunoslav (eds). *Praxis: društvena kritika i humanistički socijalizam* [Praxis: Social Criticism and Humanistic Socialism]. Beograd: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung: 2012.
- Pašić, Feliks. *Mira Trailović, gospođa iz velikog sveta* [Mira Trailović, a Lady from the Big World]. Belgrade: Muzej pozorisne umetnosti, 2005.
- Pavlović, Srdja. *Balkan Anschluss: the Anexation of Montenegro and the Creation of the Common South Slavic State*. Purdue University Press, 2008.
- Petrov, Ana, and Andrija Filipović. "Introduction: Towards Yugoslav Studies." *AM Journal of Art and Media Studies* 13 (2017): 2.
- Petrovski, Filip et al, (eds). *Crnite stranici na UDBA* [Black Pages of UDBA]. 16 vols. Skopje: DARM, 2016–2017.
- Pearce, S.C.; Mujanović, Jasmin. *Local challenges, global implications: Bosnia-Herzegovina's cultural institutions in crisis*. Washington: Emerging Democracies Institute, 2014.
- Peković, Ratko. *Sudanije Branku Ćopiću (1950-1960)* [The Trial of Branko Ćopić (1950-1960)]. Belgrade: Književni atelje BMP. 2000.
- Peković, Ratko. *Ni rat ni mir, panorama književnih polemika 1945-1965* [Neither War nor Peace, Prospect of Literary Polemics (1945-1965)], Belgrade: Filip Višnjić, 1986.

- Perović, Latinka. *Dominant and unwanted elites (XX-XXI century)*. Belgrade: Dan graf; Novi Sad: Radio-televizija Vojvodine, 2016.
- Popov, Nebojša, edit. *Sloboda i nasilje. Razgovor o časopisu Praxis i Korčulanskoj letnjoj školi* [Freedom and Violence. Discussion about the Praxis Journal and the Korčula Summer School]. Belgrade: Res publica, 2003.
- Popov, Nebojša. *Contra Fatum. Slučaj profesora Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu 1968-1988* [Contra Fatum. Case of Professor of the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade 1968-1988]. Belgrade: Mladost, 1989.
- Popov, Nebojša, *Sukobi. Društveni sukobi - izazov sociologiji* [Conflicts. Social Conflicts – Challenge to Sociology]. Belgrade: Centar za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju, 1990.
- Prnjat, Dejana, "Kulturna politika i pozorišna cenzura u Beogradu (1945-1980)." ["Cultural Politics and Theater Censorship in Belgrade"] MA thesis, Belgrade: Faculty of Political Sciences, 1993.
- Spasovska, Ljubica. *The Last Yugoslav Generation: the Rethinking of Youth Politics and Cultures in Late Socialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017.
- Stamatović, Aleksandar. "Nacionalni identitet zelenaša i crnogorskih federalista 1918-1941." [National Identity of Greens and Montenegrin Federalists 1918-1941] In: *Politička revija*, no 6 (2007): 119-139.
- Stojanović, Dubravka. *Noga u vratima, prilozi za političku biografiju Biblioteke XX vek* [Leg in the Door, Contributions to the Political Biography of the Library XX Century]. Belgrade: Biblioteka XX vek, 2011.
- Ströhle, Isabel. *Aus den Ruinen der alten erschaffen wir die neue Welt. Herrschaftspraxis und Loyalitäten in Kosovo (1944-1974)* [From the Ruins of the Old We Create the New World. Rule Practice and Loyalties in Kosovo]. Oldenbourg: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2016.
- Sudar, Vlastimir. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Political Dissident, The Life and Work of Aleksandar Petrović*. Intellect books, 2013.
- Suša, Ana. "Beogradsko pozorište i studentske demonstracije '68." [Belgrade Theater and Student Demonstrations '68] MA thesis, Philosophy Faculty, Belgrade, 2002.
- Šuvaković, Misko. „Novavangarda i Neoavangarde.“ In: *Istorija umetnosti u Srbiji XX vek. Radikalne umetničke prakse* [New Avant-garde and Neo-Avant-gardes. In: Art History in Serbia XX Century. Radical Art Practices], edited by Šuvaković, Miško, 281-204. Beograd, 2010.
- Tanurovska, Kjulavkovski et al. (eds). *Modelling Public Space(s) in Culture*. Skopje: Lokomotiva, 2018.
- Todorović, D.; Trkulja, Jovica (eds). *Slučaj "Crveni kralj": osuda i izgon Ivana Ivanovića* [Case "Red King": Condemnation and Expulsion of Ivan Ivanović]. Belgrade: Centar za unapredjivanje pravnih studija, 2005.
- Todorovski, Zoran: "Politichkata opozitsija vo Makedonija po Vtorata svetska vojna" [Political Opposition in Macedonia after the Second World War], *Istorija* 36, no 1-2. (2000): 43–48.

- Tokača, Mirsad. *Bosanska knjiga mrtvih. Ljudski gubici u Bosni i Hercegovini 1991-1995*. [Bosnian Book of the Dead. Human Losses in Bosnia and Herzegovina 1991-1995] vol 1. Sarajevo, 2012.
- Trkulja, Jovica. *Zločin nad mišljenjem – osuda i izgon Mihaila Đurića* [The Crime against Thinking - Condemnation and Expulsion of Mihailo Đurić]. Belgrade: Centar za unapredjivanje pravnih studija, 2013.
- Војводић, Радмила и Јанко Љумовић, (eds). *Црногорске студије културе и идентитета* [Montenegrin Studies of Culture and Identity]. Цетиње: Факултет драмских умјетности, 2016.
- Udovički, Jasminka & James Ridgeway (eds). *Burn This House: The Making and Unmaking of Yugoslavia*, Duke University Press, 2000.
- Vučetić, Radina. *Koka-kola socijalizam* [Coca-Cola Socialism]. Službeni glasnik, 2012.
- Vučetić, Radina. *Monopol na istinu* [The Monopoly on Truth], Belgrade: Clio, 2016.
- Živadinović, Milica. *Miodrag Mića Popović (1923-1996)*. Belgrade: Orion art, 2014.

Other

Interviews

- Hasimbegović, Elma, Director of the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina, E-Mail exchange with with Jacqueline Nießer, September 9, 2018.
- Marković, Predrag, Belgrade, interviewed by Jacqueline Nießer, May 5, 2016.
- Miočinović Mirjana, interviewed by Sanja Radović, December 26, 2016 and January 14, 2017.
- Prpa Branka, interviewed by Jacqueline Nießer, June 24, 2017.
- Ristić, Katarina, Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, Belgrade, interviewed by Jacqueline Nießer, May 10, 2016.

Films

- „Zabranjeni bez zabrane“ [Forbidden without Forbidding] 2007, dir. Milan Nikodijević and Dinko Tucaković,
- „Cenzura“ [Censorship] 2016, dir. Milutin Petrović

Internet

- <https://www.arhiv-beograda.org/en/legacy-of-jelena-santic>.
- <http://www.arhiv.gov.mk>.
- <https://www.blic.rs/vesti/politika/povodom-zabrane-ulaska-u-zemlju-vlada-crne-gore-stitimo-stabilnost-i-bezbednost-od/2vhdzmp>.
- <http://www.cpi.rs/en/>.
- <http://www.cultureshutdown.net/cultural-policy-in-bosnia-herzegovina-experts-report-council-of-europe/>.
- <https://www.czkd.org/>.

[Http://www.dksg.rs/afc_arhivAlternativnogFilmaIVideo.php](http://www.dksg.rs/afc_arhivAlternativnogFilmaIVideo.php).

[Http://digitalniarhivbitefa.unilib.rs/](http://digitalniarhivbitefa.unilib.rs/).

[Http://www.dksg.rs/afc_arhivAlternativnogFilmaIVideo.php](http://www.dksg.rs/afc_arhivAlternativnogFilmaIVideo.php).

[Https://www.facebook.com/cejus.jus/](https://www.facebook.com/cejus.jus/).

[Http://filmskesveske.mi.sanu.ac.rs/](http://filmskesveske.mi.sanu.ac.rs/).

[Http://hereticus.org/arhiva-casopisa-hereticus/](http://hereticus.org/arhiva-casopisa-hereticus/).

Mari, Cristina. Gërmia Controversy signals division on how to grow Prishtina. 24.10.2018.
<https://kosovotwopointzero.com/en/germia-controversy-signals-divisions-on-how-to-grow-prishtina>

[Http://www.mku.gov.me/ministarstvo](http://www.mku.gov.me/ministarstvo).

[Https://mk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Јован_Котески](https://mk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Јован_Котески).

[Http://mmb.org.mk/index.php/mk/музејска-поставка-mk/вовед](http://mmb.org.mk/index.php/mk/музејска-поставка-mk/вовед).

[Http://mmb.org.mk/index.php/mk/музејска-поставка-mk/2016-01-28-16-45-14/тринаесетто-одделение](http://mmb.org.mk/index.php/mk/музејска-поставка-mk/2016-01-28-16-45-14/тринаесетто-одделение)

[Https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/24092015-the-national-museum-in-sarajevo-has-reopened](https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/24092015-the-national-museum-in-sarajevo-has-reopened).

Sahatciu, Vesa (2014), Monuments without a home, <http://kosovotwopointzero.com/>

[Https://www.sanu.ac.rs/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/pravo-na-pobunu-program.pdf](https://www.sanu.ac.rs/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/pravo-na-pobunu-program.pdf).

[Https://www.sanu.ac.rs/68-u-studentu/](https://www.sanu.ac.rs/68-u-studentu/).

<https://www.slobodnaevropa.org/a/u-ime-naroda-antikomunisticka-podvala-ili-istorijsko-istrzivanje/27161587.html>

List of Collections Described¹²⁵

1. Archive of Student Cultural Center (SKC) (Serbia)
2. ARS - First Series Collection (Montenegro)
3. BITEF (Belgrade International Theatre Festival) collection (Serbia)
4. Bosanski pogledi (Bosnian Views Journal Collection) (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
5. CADDY (Committee to Aid Democratic Dissidents in Yugoslavia) Bulletin Collection (Serbia)
6. Danilo Kiš Collection (Serbia)
7. Days of Pain and Pride, Goranka Matić Collection (Serbia)
8. Family of Clear Streams - Art Commune (Božidar Mandić i Porodica bistrih potoka) (Serbia)
9. Former Tito Archive (Serbia)
10. Goli Otok Collection (Serbia)

¹²⁵ As of February 2019. This also concerns the List of Institutions and Owners, and People Researched.

11. Group of Six Artists (Serbia)
12. Illegal Groups in Kosovo (1945 - 1990) collection (Kosovo)
13. Književne novine (Literary News) (Serbia)
14. Kosovo 1968 Demonstrations (Kosovo)
15. Kosovo 1981 Demonstrations (Kosovo)
16. Lazar Stojanović Collection (Serbia)
17. Ljubomir Tadić Collection (Serbia)
18. Museum Macura (Serbia)
19. Mića Popović - The Scenes Painting (Serbia)
20. Mysticism – Bektashi Collection (Republic of Macedonia)
21. Nebojša Popov Collection (Serbia)
22. Novi Sad Neo-Avant-garde Collection (Serbia)
23. Polja (Fields), magazine for culture and art collection (Serbia)
24. Srđan Hofman's Music Collection (Serbia)
25. Student – Journal (Serbia)
26. Tomislav Peternek Collection (Serbia)
27. Új Symposion Journal Collection (Serbia)
28. Vidici (Views) – Journal (Serbia)
29. Women's Activism in Kosovo (Kosovo)
30. Yugoslav Cominformists in Prague (Czech Republic)
31. Žarana Papić Collection (Serbia)
32. Zoran Đinđić Library at the Zoran Đinđić Foundation (Serbia)
33. Zoran Đinđić Personal Collection at the Archives of Serbia (Serbia)

List of Operating Institutions and Owners

Archives of Kosovo
 Archive of Student Cultural Center Belgrade
 Archives of Serbia
 atelje 212
 Belgrade University Library
 Bosniak Institute – Adil Zulfikarpašić Foundation
 Center for Women's Studies Belgrade
 Cultural Center Novi Sad
 Historical Archives of Belgrade
 Kosovo Oral History Initiative
 Literary Municipality of Cetinje
 Matica Srpska Library Novi Sad
 Museum of Contemporary Art Belgrade
 Museum of Contemporary Art Vojvodina
 National Library of Montenegro
 National Library of Serbia
 new media center_kuda.org
 Newspaper Rilindja
 Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SANU)

Student Cultural Center Belgrade
Tribina mladih (Youth Tribune) Novi Sad
Zoran Đinđić Foundation

List of People Researched

Abramović, Marina
Albahari, David
Balić, Smail
Bogdanović, Slavko
Ćirilov, Jovan
Ćopić, Branko
Ćosić, Dobrica
Debeljak, Aleš
Dobruna, Vjosa
Draganović, Krunoslav
Dragila, Dušanka
Dragila, Petar
Drča, Čedomir
Đuzel, Bogomil
Fenyvesi, Ottó
Gashi, Shukrije
Hodžić, Alija
Hofman, Srđan
Jovanović, Suzana
Kiš, Danilo
Lompar, Mladen
Makavejev, Dušan
Mandić, Božidar
Marković, Mihailo,
Mašić, Slobodan
Matić, Goranka
Mihailović, Dragoslav
Milivojević, Era
Miočinović, Mirjana
Mladenović, Tanasije
Papić, Žarana
Paripović, Neša
Pavićević, Borka
Pekić, Borislav
Perović, Slavko
Pilav, Muhamed
Popov, Nebojša
Popović, Mića
Popović, Milorad
Popović, Zoran
Poznanović, Bogdanka
Prpa, Branka

Ristić, Ljubiša
Šalamun, Tamaž
Sinanović, Ivan
Stojanović, Lazar
Sulejmani, Arben
Tirnanić, Bogdan
Tišma, Slobodan
Todosijević, Raša
Tolnai, Ottó
Tomislav Peternek
Trailović, Mira
Urkom, Gergelj
Vagapova, Natalija Mihajlovna
Várady, Tibor
Veselinović Hofman, Mirjana
Vukshinaj, Drita
Žilnik, Želimir
Zulfikarpašić, Adil