# The Dissolution of Yugoslavia and the Emergence of the 'Nationalist' Croatian Democratic Union: A Discourse Analytic Reading

Vlatka Jakir

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Government
University of Essex
May 2016

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**ABSTRACT** . . . . . v

**CHAPTER**

**I. Introduction** . . . . . 1

1.1 Problematization . . . . . 2
1.2 The Contributions and Outline of the Thesis . . . . . 8

**II. The Existing Literature and the Theoretical and Methodological Framework of the Thesis** . . . . . 15

2.1 Introduction . . . . . 15
2.2 Current Approaches to the Emergence of the CDU Party (1989-1990) 16
2.2.1 The break-up of Yugoslavia . . . . . 16
2.2.2 The Croatian democratic transition . . . . . 26
2.2.3 Croatian national identity . . . . . 31
2.2.4 Reflections on the existing approaches . . . . . 40
2.3 The Emergence of the CDU Party in the Context of Yugoslavia's Dissolution: a Discourse Analytic Reading . . . . . 42
2.3.1 Poststructuralist Discourse Theory as a research paradigm 42
2.3.2 Yugoslavian dissolution and the emergence of the CDU party: a discourse analytical reading . . . . . 59

**III. The Frontiers of the Yugoslavian Imaginary: Self-management and Brotherhood and Unity** . . . . . 63

3.1 Introduction . . . . . 63
3.2 The Contours of the Yugoslavian Socio-Political Landscape . . . . 65
3.3 The Differential System Instituted by Self-Management . . . . . 67
3.4 The Differential System Instituted by Brotherhood and Unity . . . 73
3.5 Conclusion . . . . . 78

**IV. The Croatian Spring: Transforming Rules and Crossing Boundaries** . . . . . 80

4.1 Introduction . . . . . 80

4.2 Dislocations and Antagonisms: the Context of the Croatian Spring Movement . . . 83
4.3 Disentangling the Croatian Spring Movement . . . 87
4.3.1 The Declaration: posing the 'national' problem in cultural terms . . . 87
4.3.2 The LCC: contesting rules and politicizing the republican working class identity . . . 88
4.3.3 Matica hrvatska: transgressing boundaries and antagonising national identities . . . 95
4.3.4 The Student movement: linking demands to action and transgressing the boundaries of politics . . . 99
4.4 The Hegemonic Response: Excluding the Movement and Including the Logic . . . 101
4.5 Conclusion . . . 103

**V. Decontesting Yugoslavian Identity: Unity, Hierarchy and Self-Management** . . . 105

5.1 Introduction . . . 105
5.2 The System of Rules of Mutual Constitution of the Identities . . . 107
5.3 The Principles, Values and Goods Constituting Yugoslavian Identity 113
5.4 The Relations of Governance, Rules and Procedures for Practices . 117
5.5 Institutions for Discussion and Alternation of Rules and Relations 120
5.6 Conclusion . . . 126

**VI. Hegemonic Crisis: the 'Floating' of Self-management** . . . 128

6.1 Introduction . . . 128
6.2 Subtracting Tito and Kardelj: 'Rotating' the Hegemonic Centre . . 131
6.3 The Economic Crisis: the Failures of the Emancipatory Project . . 135
6.4 The Crisis of Federalism: Institutional Forms Fail to Decontest and Deliver . . . 144
6.5 The Crisis in the LCY: Disunity and the Inability to Redefine the Order . . . 153
6.6 Conclusion . . . 161

**VII. Hegemonic Crisis: Politicizing National Identities in the Socialist Republic of Serbia and the LCS's Transformist Project** . . . 163

7.1 Introduction . . . 163
7.2 The Constitution of SR Serbia in the Yugoslavian Imaginary . . . 165
7.3 Contending Demands for Constitutional Change in AP Kosovo and the Emergence of the Serbian National Myth . . . 169
7.3.1 Kosovo Albanian protests and regime response . . . 169
7.3.2 Kosovo Serb/Montenegrin protests and regime response . 173
7.3.3 The Serbian intellectuals: the mythical dimension to the Kosovo problem . . . 182

7.4 Slobodan Milošević's Transformist Anti-bureaucratic Revolution and the New Constitutional Concept . . . . . 190
7.4.1 The rise of Slobodan Milošević and the absorption of social demands . . . . . 190
7.4.2 The anti-bureaucratic revolution: deepening the LCS's hegemony and the new constitutional concept . . . . . 193
7.5 Conclusion . . . . . 201

**VIII. The Articulation of Democratic Identities in the Socialist Republic of Croatia** . . . . . 203

8.1 Introduction . . . . . 203
8.2 The Hegemonic Crisis of the LCY and the Introduction of multipartyism in SR Croatia . . . . . 206
8.3 The Myths and Subjectivities Articulated in the Electoral Campaign 210
8.3.1 The Croatian Democratic Union . . . . . 210
8.3.2 The League of Communists of Croatia–The Party of Democratic Changes . . . . . 217
8.3.3 The Serbian Democratic Party . . . . . 222
8.4 Conclusion . . . . . 228

**IX. Conclusion** . . . . . 231

# ABSTRACT

**The Dissolution of Yugoslavia and the Emergence of the 'Nationalist' Croatian Democratic Union: A Discourse Analytic Reading**

The thesis addresses the question of how the essentialist and exclusivist representation of the Croatian nation that underlies the post-socialist democratic order came into being. It does so by examining the emergence of the Croatian Democratic Union's nationalist discourse in the context of Yugoslavia's dissolution, revealing its historical specificity.

The analysis covers the form of social division instituted by the Yugoslavian regime, the politicizations of the Croatian nation during the Croatian Spring movement (1968-1971), the identitary logics that underpinned Yugoslavia's constitutional order, their contestations and the emergence of the League of Communist of Serbia's transformist project in the 1980s, the disarticulation of the form of social division instituted by the Yugoslavian regime, and the contending democratic discourses that emerged in the Socialist Republic Croatia during the first democratic elections (1990).

Drawing on a combination of Poststructuralist Discourse Theory and James Tully's work on constitutional development, the analysis develops a critical account of the 'nationalist' CDU's emergence without reproducing the party's own representations of its origins, social unity, division and Croatian nationhood. Central to this analysis is the broader movement from the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon to the 'new' myths that emerged in the process of its dissolution and the discursive constructions of the nation in this process. The thesis seeks to expose the limitations of CDU's nationalist discourse and the complex process of political identity formation and dissolution that made the party's emergence possible and that continues to shape Croatian politics today.

**Keywords:** political practices of nationhood, self-management, the break-up of Yugoslavia, the Croatian Democratic Union, nationalism, myth, imaginary, Croatian national identity

# CHAPTER I

# Introduction

The first democratic elections in Croatia, held between April and May 1990, brought the 'nationalist' Croatian Democratic Union (CDU) to power in the Socialist Republic of Croatia. The party won the elections on a nationalist platform, one permeated with the language of national self-determination and historical determinism. It claimed to express the centuries old desire of the Croatian people to constitute themselves as an independent nation within its own presumed historical borders. In the context of the emergence of nationalist politics on the eve of the Yugoslavian dissolution, the party also declared that it would protect the Croatian nation and its state from 'great-Serbian expansionism' and that it would defend the nation's 'historical-geopolitical interests'. Although the party received only 41,9% of the overall vote, due to the absolute majority electoral system, it claimed 205 out of 356 seats in the Constitutive Assembly and it thus shaped the terms under which the new democratic order was constituted.[1] The party has governed uninterrupted between 1990 and 2000 while its leader Franjo Tuđman became Croatia's first democratically elected president and remained in that position until his death in 1999. Under CDU's rule Croatia ceased to be socialist, it seceded from Yugoslavia and it fought the so-called 'Homeland War' (1991-1995) that broke out as part and parcel of the secession process. The specific historical conjecture that was characterised by the collapse of communism across Eastern Europe and the electoral victory, placed the party in the position of shaping the trajectory of Croatia's transition from a socialist republic in a

[1] For details about the electoral outcome see: Mirjana Kasapović. "Electoral Politics in Croatia 1990-2000". In: *Politička misao* 37.5 (2000).

federal state to an independent market-oriented, multi-party democracy. The CDU has remained one of the central players in Croatian politics until the present day, a position it shares with the successor of the League of Communists of Croatia, the Social Democratic Party of Croatia.

The present study seeks to investigate the emergence of the CDU as well as the broad reception of its nationalist program, in the context of Yugoslavia's dissolution and the pluralization of politics in the Socialist Republic of Croatia. It does so by examining the discursive constructions of the nation in Yugoslavia (1958-1990), accounting for the CDU's emergence from within this particular historical context and by drawing out the limitations of its nationalist programme. I believe that this examination is important because the party shaped the first democratic constitution of the Republic of Croatia promulgated in 1990, whose (historical) foundations have remained unchanged until the present day, and because the violent events of Yugoslavia's dissolution normalized its nationalist perspective to such an extent that it is very difficult to criticize its positions in a systematic manner. In fact, as I shall argue in this introduction, it is very difficult to separate the party's own nationalist programme from the overall trajectory of Croatia's transition to democracy.

By way of introduction, I problematize the assumptions that are embedded in the present Croatian constitutional order and relate them to the CDU's interpretation of the Croatian nation, state and history to explain why I believe that the examination of the party's emergence is important. Thereafter, I summarize the contributions made by the thesis, provide its outline and indicate the lines of argument that I will pursue.

## 1.1 Problematization

According to Croatia's present constitution, the historical foundations of which were laid down by the 'nationalist' CDU party after it came to power in May 1990, the Croatian nation is a clearly delineated political subject whose development has determined the trajectory of history. The existing democratic order is portrayed as the materialization of a millennia old Croatian national identity, and as the expression of the historical continuity

of its statehood. The historical foundations of the republic's constitutional order read like a chronology of instances where the nation's essence was manifested in the expression of 'its' desire to possess a state. These moments include various crypto-state formations, ranging from the Croatian principalities of the 7$^{th}$ century to the Socialist Republic of Croatia (1963-1990). They also include a series of political decisions, ranging from the decision of the Croatian Parliament to elect a king from the Habsburg dynasty (1527) to the decisions of the Anti-fascist Council of National Liberation of Croatia (1943). The first democratic elections (1990) form part and parcel of this national state-forming chronology. They are portrayed as the reaffirmation of the millennial old statehood of the Croatian nation that already existed in incipient form since the 7$^{th}$ century and the free expression of its democratic will.[2] The portrayal of history and politics as revolving exclusively around the Croatian nation and its state is identical to CDU's nationalist representations of these phenomena in its 1990 electoral programme in the run up to the first democratic elections.[3]

Furthermore, although the historical foundations of the democratic order portray its history as a logical and gradual evolution of the Croatian nation towards its state, in 1990, when they were laid down, dramatic changes were introduced to the Croatian political landscape. After 55 years Croatia ceased to be a socialist republic and the state ceased to be understood as shared between the Croatian nation and the Serbian nation in Croatia. The historical narrative embedded in the constitutional order normalized the formal transformation of the Serbian nation in Croatia into a national minority living in a republic that belonged to a Croatian national majority. This is precisely how the CDU understood the relationship between the nation it claimed to embody in the first democratic elections and the state.[4]

The first democratic constitution drawn up by a CDU dominated Constitutional Assembly also laid the legal grounds for Croatia's secession from the Yugoslavian federa-

[2] *The Constitution of the Republic of Croatia*. Zagreb: Novi informator, 2010, Historical Foundations.

[3] Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica. "Programske zasade i ciljevi [The Program's Foundations and Objectives]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990.

[4] Ibid., p. 76.

tion.[5] This 'novelty' was normalized in and through the historical foundations of the new democratic order. Between 1945 and 1990 secession was deemed anti-constitutional, but the historical foundations of the new democratic order rendered the secession a logical outcome of the Croatian state-forming trajectory. In June 1991, after the Croatian independence referendum made visible that more than 90% of those that did vote favoured secession from Yugoslavia, the Republic seceded and became an independent state. The 'nationalist' Serbian Democratic Party (SDP), which participated in the first democratic elections in Croatia too, called upon Serbian nationals in Croatia to boycott the independence referendum. Under the SDP's leadership a segment of the Serbian population in Croatia declared first their autonomy within the borders of newly independent Croatian Republic and, after holding their own secession referendum, the secession of 'their own' Serbian-majority municipalities from Croatia with the aspiration to eventually join the Republic Serbia. The clash between these antagonistic secessions gave rise to a war officially called 'the Homeland War' (1991-1995) in Croatia. It resulted in the victory of the Croatian Army and the consolidation of Croatian national sovereignty within borders identical to those of the Socialist Republic of Croatia. The war however expanded to engulf Bosnia and Herzegovina and became just one episode of the wars of Yugoslavia's dissolution.[6]

All of these dramatic developments took place under the rule of the CDU and the presidency of its leader, Franjo Tuđman. However, I argue that the nationalist CDU did not just govern in this turbulent period but that its position as a central player in Croatian politics was entrenched in and through these developments because they seemed to be unfolding, in and of themselves, precisely in accordance with its 'nationalist' agenda. For instance, CDU's claim that it would defend the geopolitical interests of the Croatian nation against great-Serbian expansionism that was constitutive of its electoral programme in 1990, became 'reality' during the 'Homeland War'. The great majority of Serbian

[5] *Ustav Republike Hrvatske [The Constitution of the Republic of Croatia].* Narodne Novine, 56/1990. [Electronic record]. URL: `http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/1990_12_56_1092.html` (visited on 05/12/2016), Članak 140.

[6] For a chronology of events see: Sabrina P. Ramet and Davorka Matić, eds. *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media.* College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007, pp. xvi-xvii.

nationals in Croatia had 'in fact' expressed their desire to expand Serbia by seceding from Croatia and joining Serbia, while the governing CDU and the president Franjo Tuđman were 'in fact' preventing the Serbian expansion and defending the nation's borders. Similarly, the war that broke out in the process of Croatia's secession from Yugoslavia was rendered intelligible as the struggle of the Croatian nation for independence and sovereignty.

This perspective is embedded in the present constitution because its historical foundations include 'the Homeland War' as the very last instance when the Croatian nation expressed its 'legitimate' and 'justified' desire to establish and preserve its very own state.[7] Yet, similar themes informed the CDU's electoral programme already in 1990 prior to Croatia's secession from Yugoslavia and the outbreak of armed conflict.[8] Even the term 'Homeland War' as a representation of the Croatian episode of the War(s) of Yugoslavian dissolution, reads like a logical extension of the CDU's 1990 electoral programme. Likewise, Croatia's secession from Yugoslavia and its victory in the 'Homeland War' under the party's rule made it possible to insert its leader and the first Croatian president, Franjo Tuđman, into a sequence of figures from Croatia's past that had presumably worked towards realising the same state- forming idea. Again, the practical and theoretical work of these historical figures formed the self-declared foundations of the CDU's electoral program already in 1990.[9]

Overall, the CDU's unbroken reign during the 1990s had a profound effect on the manner in which the socialist past came to be officially represented in the new democratic context. The transition from socialism to democracy was much more than the introduction of a set of new economic and political rules. It involved the transformation of the society at the fundamental level and called for the re-evaluation of who 'we are' and how this 'we' is to be expressed in the and through a new democratic constitutional

[7] *The Constitution of the Republic of Croatia*, Historical Foundations.

[8] Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Programske zasade i ciljevi [The Program's Foundations and Objectives]".

[9] Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica. "Prednacrt programske osnove [A Preliminary Draft of the Party Program]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, p. 60.

order.[10] The first democratic elections held in 1990 centred precisely on issues such as who constituted the 'we', how similarities and differences were to be understood, how this new democratic community would relate to the socialist past, and where it sought to go in future. The victory of the 'nationalist' CDU in the elections for Croatia's Constitutive Assembly (1990) and the central role it has played in shaping the foundations of Croatia's democratic order have made it extremely difficult to disentangle its nationalist programme from the trajectory of Croatia's democratic transition. Much like the League of Communist of Yugoslavia that dissolved in January 1990, the CDU institutionalized into a regime after May 1990 and grafted its own answers to these questions on to the fabric of the democratic order.[11]

Central to the CDU's understanding of Croatian nationhood has been the difference between its Yugoslavian socialist variant and its post-Yugoslavian variant. The difference is not understood as a matter of form/guise but as an essential difference in the political import of national identity. The 'new' post-socialist Croatian nation is assumed to capture the 'objective' political state of being a nation, of Croatian nationhood in its very essential form. In contrast, the 'old' socialist Croatian nation, that was constitutive of Yugoslavian federalism, is treated as having been incomplete and, thus, empty of political import. As a result, the 'old' Croatian socialist nation is retroactively measured against the 'objectivity' of the post-socialist variant and 'true' Croatian nationhood assumed to be essentially incompatible with Yugoslavism. In other words, the CDU party and Croatian nationalists more generally, assume that the 'objective' Croatian nation was always already present in Yugoslavia but that it could not express itself in that particular context. This difference between the Croatian socialist identity and the democratic identity it claimed to embody formed the very grounds of the CDU's electoral programme in 1990. In and through this difference the CDU represented its own political programme as the political embodiment of the 'objective' Croatian nation that was distorted by the ideology

[10]Claus Offe and Pierre Adler. "Capitalism by Democratic Design? Democratic Theory Facing the Triple Transition in East Central Europe". In: *Social Research* 58.4 (1991), pp. 869-870.

[11]Goran Čular. "Political Development in Croatia 1990-2000: Fast Transition-Postponed Consolidation". In: *Politička misao* 37.5 (2001), pp. 36-37.

of Yugoslavism.[12] In this sense, the CDU produced the Croatian nation whose interests it claimed to embody in 1990 by contrasting it to the 'old' Croatian socialist nation.

This perspective on the relationship between the Croatian nation and Yugoslavia is also embedded in the Croatian constitutional order. Yugoslavia is portrayed exclusively as a particular legal framework laid down in the 1943-1990 period that created the formal conditions of possibility for subsequently establishing the Croatian Republic as the Croatian national state. The decisions of the Antifascist Council of the National Liberation of Croatia (1943), the Constitution of the Peoples Republic of Croatia (1947) and the two Constitutions of the Socialist Republic of Croatia (1963 and 1974) are argued to carry traces of the very state-forming idea that materialized in the 1990s.[13] Furthermore, the nation is constituted as having become a full political agent in 1990 when it expressed its will by drawing on that legal framework and realising its 'true' nationhood. Likewise, although the Croatian nation is said to be millennia old, it is portrayed to be present in an incipient form since the 7$^{th}$ century, erupting occasionally onto the political terrain to transform it to its 'full' image after the collapse of communism.[14]

In this long state-forming trajectory that spans from the 7$^{th}$ century until the collapse of communism, there is no trace of the agency of the Croatian socialist nation. The 'nationalist' perspective embedded in the constitution omits the fact that this very nation was already a political force during socialist Yugoslavia and that Croatian nationhood existed as a particularity in the federation. Its political nature was understood to be expressed in and through the Croatian branch of the federal League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY), and in and through the Socialist Republic of Croatia. It also excludes the fact that the Croatian socialist nation based the political order of the Socialist Republic of Croatia for 55 years and that this identity was assumed to be a political force in and of itself. The legal-constitutional rules that are retroactively understood to be expressions of the 'true' post-socialist Croatian nation came into being precisely because the 'old'

[12]Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Prednacrt programske osnove [A Preliminary Draft of the Party Program]"; Vladimir Šeks. "Ciklus tribina: Izbori u Hrvatskoj-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990 [The Cycle of Discussions: Elections in Croatia-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj [Parties in Croatia]*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990.

[13]*The Constitution of the Republic of Croatia*, Historical Foundations.

[14]Ibid., Historical Foundations.

Croatian socialist identity had a political import; individuals identified with it, shaped their practices in accordance with it, argued what it meant, how it could be expressed in institutional forms, and how its institutional blueprints could be transformed, and/or improved. However, the 'new' Croatian national identity has managed to dominate the past to such an extent that it now seems 'older' than its Croatian-Yugoslavian predecessor.

Explaining how this state of affairs came into being, I believe, necessitates accounting for the emergence of the 'nationalist' CDU within the context of Yugoslavia's dissolution and doing so in a systematic and critical manner. By critical, I mean without reproducing the party's own representations of its origins and the reasons behind its emergence. I shall argue that the limits of the nationalist perspective on Croatian nationhood can be exposed when related to the historical context of its emergence, before its actual sedimentation in and through institutional forms. This is particularly important given the CDU's eerie ability to accommodate the dramatic events of the 1990s and the degree to which it's understanding of 'objective' Croatian nationhood is embedded in the constitutional fabric of the present democratic order.

## 1.2 The Contributions and Outline of the Thesis

Different bodies of literature, ranging from the literature on Yugoslavia's dissolution, Croatian democratic transition and Croatian national identity, have addressed the party's emergence in their own ways. In the literature on Yugoslavian dissolution there is a general consensus that nationalism(s) destroyed Yugoslavia, indirectly or directly, and that Croatian nationalism formed part and parcel of this disintegrative process. The literature assumes Yugoslavia was defective (be it economically, constitutionally, culturally, ideologically) and that nationalisms emerged in response these defects. Within the logic of Yugoslavia's dissolution, Croatian nationalism tends to be treated as a 'natural' response to Serbian nationalism and, since the 'nationalist' CDU party expressed it politically, its very emergence is understood as a reaction to the politics of Slobodan Milošević. Similarly, the party's emergence is often represented as in continuity with the Croatian Spring

(1968-1971), a cultural-political movement that emerged within the ranks of the League of Communists of Croatia and expanded to include social groupings external to the party in the period.

In the literature on Croatia's democratic transition there is a general consensus that nationalism became the dominant political ideology in post-socialist Croatia precisely because the 'nationalist' CDU played a central role in shaping the democratic order. In general, this body of literature focuses on the negative effects that the party's unbroken rule has had on democratic consolidation and it is not interested in examining its emergence within the context of dissolving Yugoslavia. From this perspective, the emergence of the CDU forms part and parcel of the 'inevitable' first phase of transition when communism collapsed and democratic rules were put in place to structure decision-making processes. The CDU party becomes an object of analysis only after it became visible that its understanding of politics and society was an obstacle for democratic consolidation, and some authors even see in the party's programme a reflection of pre-existing social divisions in SR Croatia.

Yet, both bodies of literature fail to examine the specificities of CDU's nationalist programme, fail to problematize its particular essentialist understanding of the nation and fail to specify the relationship between it's own political project and the dissolving Yugoslavian order. Furthermore, they tend to adopt aspects of the party's own representation of its origins, the nature of the Croatian democratic identity, and the relationship between the state and the nation. These include the assumption that CDU's programme bears, in one way or another, a continuity with the Croatian Spring movement, and/or that it is a 'normal' Croatian response to Serbian nationalism, and/or that the party realised an incomplete state-forming process. Within the context of the democratic elections (1989-1990), these assumptions include the idea that the 'nationalist' CDU expressed the Croatian national interest more accurately than its biggest competitor in the elections, the League of Communists of Croatia-Party of Democratic Change (LCC-PDC).

The poststructuralist strand within the literature on Croatian national identification/nationalism has examined the relationship(s) between nationalism, Yugoslavian so-

cialism, and democratic transition in a more critical manner. This strand has criticized the ontological presuppositions of primordial and modernist accounts of Croatian identity and showed that the movement from Yugoslavian socialism to multi-party democracy was both driven by and reflected in the transformation of collective political identities. The transformations were shaped by Yugoslavian structures and by the context of political struggles that related to those struggles, all of which preceded the formal introduction of political pluralism. In this sense, this perspective unlocks the possibility of relating the so-called millennia old Croatian national identitity(s) to the Yugoslavian-socialist context and examining this relationship in a critical manner. The emergence of the 'nationalist' CDU in particular has not yet been systematically explored from this perspective.

By drawing on Poststructuralist Discourse Theory the present analysis engages with the emergence of the CDU, in particular, within its broader historical context and its immediate electoral context. It does so in a critical manner, by problematizing the party's own representations and drawing out their historical limitations. Furthermore, it avoids subsuming the party's emergence to another process such as the logic of Yugoslavia's break-up, the logic of democratic transition, and/or the logic of nation-state formation. The analysis shows the party's emergence formed part and parcel of contingent processes of collective identity formation, sedimentation, transformation, and dissolution. It also shows that it was not merely responding to events but actively involved in interpreting them and carving out a specific notion of a specific nation out of its interpretation.[15]

The analytic focus of the thesis is placed on the movement from the universal Yugoslavian political imaginary to the particular myths that emerged as it was gradually weakening in the 1980s.[16] I examine the role that political frontier formation, sedimentation and dissolution played in the move from the universal to the particular as well as the different modalities of political subjectivity that formed part and parcel of this process. I substantiate the conditions under which different modalities of political subjectivity appeared, specify what they included and excluded, how they were expressed in the rules

[15]Alan Finlayson. "Ideology, Discourse and Nationalism". In: *Journal of Political Ideologies* 3.1 (1998), p. 105.

[16]Ernesto Laclau. *Emancipations(s)*. London: Verso, 1996, p. 20.

that constituted the Yugoslavian imaginary, and how they were eventually subverted.[17] Central to my analysis are the various ways in which nations were represented within the Yugoslavian imaginary and the transformations these representations underwent in the 1958-1990 period.

The assumption that informs my analysis is that nations acquire meaning only in and through political practices that are embedded in particular historical contexts. Or to put it differently, I do not understand nations to be grounded in a set of positive attributes and/or state-forming processes, against which their 'reality' can be measured. They can gain a seeming objectivity but this is understood to be the product of power rather than the expression of an objective nation that pre-exists political practices. In this sense, the present analysis touches upon the debates about Yugoslavia's constitution/dissolution, Croatian democratic transition, and Croatian nationalism, but addresses these issues from the perspective of political identity formation. It understands political identity formation as a process of instituting and contesting particular forms of social division driven by struggles for hegemony.

The present analysis contributes to our understanding of how the essentialist representation of the Croatian nation that underlies the present democratic order actually came into being, and allows us to analyse its constitutive limitations. It also sheds light on how the sedimentation of that particular representation impacted the trajectory of Yugoslavia's dissolution. Furthermore, it contributes to our understanding of the position that national subjectivities occupied within the Yugoslavian order and the conditions under which these positions were contested and transformed. It does not dismiss socialist-national identities as a priori failed because of the developments in the 1990s, but examines in great detail what they included and excluded and how they operated. Within this context, it also contributes to our understanding of the Croatian Spring (1968-1971) and the emergence of Slobodan Milošević (1987), because it draws out their relation to and impact on the Yugoslavian order while simultaneously criticising the position that the CDU party was

[17] Aletta J. Norval. "Trajectories of Future Research in Discurse Theory". In: *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: Identities, Hegemonies and Social Change*. Ed. by David Howarth, Aletta J. Norval, and Yannis Stavrakakis. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000, p. 231.

a natural continuation/reaction to these developments.

In a broader sense, the analysis presented here shows that engaging with a particular nationalist project in a systematic and critical manner necessitates examining its representation of the nation, substantiating the historical context that has shaped it, and drawing out its limitations and inconsistencies. In other words, it requires taking particular nationalist projects seriously without dismissing them as 'irrational' or understanding them to be a 'normal' reaction to the historical conditions they operate in. In a similar way, the analysis shows nations are produced through a variety of different systems of meaning and are thus not exclusive to 'nationalist' projects that place the nation at its very centre. Given this, the thesis also makes a contribution to the development of theoretical tools available to analyse phenomena such as the one under discussion.

In this thesis I first provide a critical overview of the literature relevant to the key research themes and, drawing on their contributions and limitations, develop a post-structuralist framework of analysis that suits the problem addressed.

Second, I examine the antagonistic frontiers that shaped the Yugoslavian imaginary and based the hegemony of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, and I draw out how national identities were represented within that particular political horizon. I show that two strands of discourse made the transition from the particular to the universal possible, namely the brotherhood and unity discourse and the self-management discourse. I also show that the articulation of the us/them divide on a terrain structured by these discourses had the effect of splitting national identities between the positive inside and the negative outside, instituting a system of social division whereby nations were both different from each other and united in an antagonism towards a set of others.

Third, since the existing literature often treats the emergence of Croatian nationalism in 1990 as in continuity with the Croatian Spring (1968-1971) and the CDU party represented its 1990 program as its continuation, I examine the relationship between the politization(s) of the Croatian national identity during the Spring and the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon. I draw out the ways in which different actors related to the political horizon and show that its central protagonists in the League of Communists of Croatia

(LCC) demanded a transformation of the rules of the Yugoslavian imaginary remaining within its boundaries, while others transgressed its boundaries in different ways. I show the LCY 'produced' the idea that there was a coherent movement and that this movement articulated a coherent counter-revolutionary project.

Fourth, I examine the decontestation of the Yugoslavian identity in and through the country's last (1974) Constitution, and flesh out the identitary logic through which a unified representation of the Yugoslavian society was sediment in institutional forms. I show that the logic operated in a hierarchical way; an overarching working class subject position was designated as the primary site of legitimate politics and that it contained, limited and structured national subject positions. This logic was systematically informed the design of the institutional order. I also show that the element self-management operated as an empty signifier because it made the hierarchical articulation between the working class identity and different national identities, possible.

Fifth, the thesis examines the 1980-1986 period as one characterised by a deepening crisis of the LCY's hegemony. I show that the period was marked by the gradual floating of the signifier 'self-management' which embodied the fullness of Yugoslavian society, linked different national identities into a unified social body and secured the LCY's hegemony. I also show that the process of floating came about in and through the regime's inability to articulate a coherent self-managing response to the dislocatory effects of the debt crisis, a failure that resulted in the weakening of the dominant imaginary.

Sixth, since the existing literature often treats the emergence of Croatian nationalism in 1990 as a natural response to the emergence of Serbian nationalism and the CDU represented its 1990 program as a 'defence' against great-Serbian expansionism, I examine the politicization of the Serbian national identity within the context of the weakening imaginary and the gradual dislocation of the hegemonic representation of national identities. I show that Slobodan Milošević's political project was transformist in that it operated by both absorbing nation-centred demands produced by active social elements in the Socialist Republic Serbia and deepening the hegemony of the League of Communists of Serbia. Furthermore, I show that this strategy brought about the deepening of divisions between

republican communist parties and the disarticulation of the system of social divisions that based the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon.

Seventh, I re-activate the creative moment of constituting a new democratic order out of the dying Yugoslavian imaginary in SR Croatia. I examine the articulation of new political myths in the party programs of the Croatian Democratic Union, the League of Communists of Croatia-Party of Democratic Change, and the Serbian Democratic Party. I flesh out the manner in which each party situated its project within the context of the dying imaginary, the particular demands that constituted these projects, how they inscribed the past into the 1989-1990 context, and how they represented the nature of social unity, division and political subjectivity. I show that CDU's articulation of national subjectivity was contingent upon the broader and immediate context and that its identitary logic resembled that of the Serbian Democratic Party; both parties subverted the terms of social division that based the Yugoslavian imaginary and made the signifier 'Yugoslavia' contingent upon the signifier 'nation'. To do so, both included previously excluded elements back into the signifier 'nation' and represented national difference as national and thus 'by nature' political division. In doing so, they drew a new frontier constituted by the logic the political and the national are essentially identical terms. I also show the LCC PDC reiterated the identitary logic of the dying imaginary and decontested national identities through a common social-democratic project, providing thereby an alternative to CDU and the SDP's representation. This representation was excluded once CDU's project expanded into an imaginary through the promulgation of the 1990 Constitution.

The thesis concludes with a summary of the main arguments, their broader implications, and suggestions for further research.

# CHAPTER II

# The Existing Literature and the Theoretical and Methodological Framework of the Thesis

## 2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a critical overview of the literature relevant to the topic of this thesis, namely the emergence of the 'nationalist' Croatian Democratic Union in the context of the dissolution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and, in the light of its contributions and limitations, map out an alternative theoretical approach to the topic. For these purposes, this chapter is divided into two sections. The first section contains a critical overview of three bodies of literature in relation to their (tacit or explicit) treatment of the CDU phenomenon. These literatures cover Yugoslavia's break-up, the Croatian democratic transition, and Croatian identity and nationalism. In this section I argue that, despite their contribution to understanding various aspects of the party's political practices and the socio-political implications of these practices, these approaches either take the party's emergence for granted or reduce it to other processes, and thus fail to account for it in a systematic and critical manner. In the second section, I articulate a specific theoretical approach that can critically address the problem of the party's emergence and map out the research design that forms the backbone of my thesis. My approach draws on the ontological presuppositions and conceptual tools of Poststructuralist Discourse Theory, combined with James Tully's work on constitutional development. After mapping out the main theoretical devices that inform my approach

— 'politics', 'articulation', 'discourse', 'myth', 'imaginary', 'identity', 'subjectivity', 'antagonism', 'hegemony' and 'transformism'— I explain how, by drawing out the historical context conditioning it as well as the limits of its political representations, this particular approach can be critically deployed to account for the CDU's emergence. The chapter closes with an explanation of the chapter breakdown of the thesis, and methodological remarks.

## 2.2 Current Approaches to the Emergence of the CDU Party (1989-1990)

### 2.2.1 The break-up of Yugoslavia

The body of literature focusing on the break-up of Yugoslavia deals, albeit tacitly, with the emergence of the 'nationalist' CDU party. In what follows I provide an overview of the main arguments regarding the causes of Yugoslavia's break-up, based on this large body of work.[1] Since this process of dissolution was inextricably bound up with the emergence of the 'nationalist' CDU, after summarizing these arguments I draw out their implications for understanding the mechanisms behind the party's emergence. Thereafter, by looking at the underlying assumptions of each approach regarding the nature of politics, I flesh out the strengths and limitations of each in accounting for the dissolution and the emergence of the party.

[1]Its scope has given rise to edited volumes summarizing and systematizing the main arguments for the purpose of tracking the state of the debate. See for instance: Jasna Dragović-Soso. "Why did Yugoslavia Disintegrate? An Overview of Contending Explanations". In: *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia's disintegration.* Ed. by Leonard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragović-Soso. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2008; Charles W. Ingrao and Thomas A. Emmert, eds. *Confronting the Yugoslav Controversies: A Scholars' Initiative.* West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2012; Florian Bieber, Armina Galijaš, and Rory Archer, eds. *Debating the End of Yugoslavia.* Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2014; Sabrina P. Ramet. *Thinking about Yugoslavia: Scholarly Debates about the Yugoslav Breakup and the Wars in Bosnia and Kosovo.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005; and Dejan Djokić and James Ker-Lindsay, eds. *New Perspectives on Yugoslavia: Key Issues and Controversies.* London: Routledge, 2010.

#### 2.2.1.1 Arguments and implications

The literature specifies a number of distinct factors that account for the break-up of Yugoslavia, and for the subsequent emergence of the CDU. The inability of the Yugoslavian state to generate wealth and equalize development across the federation is one such key factor identified as a systemic weakness that resulted in the country's disintegration.[2] The argument is that antagonistic economic interests crystallized between the developed north and the underdeveloped south,[3] stemming from different objective economic realities, and giving rise to constant criticisms of the state's economic policy and developmental strategy. These (economic) differences translated into different positions within Yugoslavia's communist elite regarding Yugoslavia's form, thus triggering constitutional debates. The economic restructuring policies introduced under IMF pressure in the 1980s widened the gap in these positions as they had different effects in different territorial units due to already existing inequalities. In this sense, it is argued, the crisis in the 1980s was caused by the economy and driven by the positions of political actors determined by the economic interests of their respective territorial units. Furthermore, these elite positions were adopted by the Yugoslavian working class, because of unemployment, unmanageable inflation and a dramatic drop in living standards.[4] Following the economic logic of the country's dissolution, the pro-independence program of the CDU party reflected the economic interests of the developed SR Croatia, whose development was impeded by its membership in the crisis-ridden federation. The party's project is thus seen as the final

[2]For example: John B Allcock. *Explaining Yugoslavia.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2000, p. 90; Susan L Woodward. *Socialist Unemployment: the Political Economy of Yugoslavia, 1945-1990.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995; Dijana Pleština. *Regional Development in Communist Yugoslavia: Success, Failure, and Consequences.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1992; and Michael Palairet. "The Inter-Regional Struggle for Resources and the Fall of Yugoslavia". In: *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia's Disintegration.* Ed. by Leonard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragović-Soso. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2008.

[3]The interest of the developed north (Croatia and Slovenia) lay in widening the scope of the and retaining the income earned in the republics without central (federal) redistribution. The interest of the underdeveloped south (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro, Kosovo and Belgrade as the center of the federation) lay in centralizing economic resources and redistributing them from developed to underdeveloped regions.

[4]For summaries of the argument see: Ramet, *Thinking about Yugoslavia: Scholarly Debates about the Yugoslav Breakup and the Wars in Bosnia and Kosovo*, pp. 55-57; Dejan Jović. *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away.* West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2009, pp. 15-16 and Andrew Wachtel and Christopher Bennett. "The Dissolution of Yugoslavia". In: *Confronting the Yugoslav Controversies: A Scholars' Initiative.* Ed. by Charles W. Ingrao and Thomas A. Emmert. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2012, p. 16.

(developed) Croatian response to the inability of the Yugoslavian regime to manage the economy adequately and fairly. In this sense, the party's program resembles the Croatian Spring movement (1971), which also stemmed from the objective economic interests of SR Croatia as a developed Yugoslavian republic.

Yugoslavia's constitution has also been identified as a weakness that brought about its dissolution.[5] Its decentralized intra-republican bargaining system has been blamed for failing to ground strong federal institutions that could effectively deal with internal political divisions and thus deliver order. Equally so, its articles on 'self-determination' and 'sovereignty' were said to be ambiguous to such an extent that, during debates regarding reform, both 'separatist' and 'centralist' forces legitimized their positions in reference to the existing constitution. According to this perspective, the weak and decentralized constitutional order gave rise to competing centers of power at lower territorial levels and made the democratization process in the second half of the 1980s a republican-centered and not an all-Yugoslavian process.[6] Following this logic, the emergence of the CDU as an actor in the dissolution was preconditioned by the institutional disarray at the center. Furthermore, its programme was a 'natural' product of the republican-centred democratization which brought about the emergence of parties that appealed to 'national', and not 'Yugoslavian', interests.

Further analysis focuses on the regime's (mis)management of Yugoslavia's internal national and religious diversity as one of the causes of the country's dissolution.[7] In-

[5]For example: Branka Magaš. *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92].* London: Verso, 1993, p. 82; Audrey Helfant Budding. "Nation/People/Republic: Self-Determination in Socialist Yugoslavia". In: *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia's Disintegration.* Ed. by Leonard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragović-Soso. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2008; Vojin Dimitrijević. "Sukobi oko ustava 1974 [The Conflicts arround the 1974 Constitution]". In: *Srpska strana rata: trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju [The Serb Side of the War: Trauma and Catharsis in Historical Memory].* Ed. by Nebojša Popov. Beograd: Republika, 1996; Robert M. Hayden. *Blueprints for a House Divided: the Constitutional Logic of the Yugoslav Conflicts.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999; and Valerie Bunce. *Subversive Institutions: the Design and the Destruction of Socialism and the State.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

[6]For summaries of the argument see: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 32-33; and Dragović-Soso, "Why did Yugoslavia Disintegrate? An Overview of Contending Explanations", pp. 10-13.

[7]For example: Andrew Wachtel. *Making a Nation, Breaking a Nation: Literature and Cultural Politics in Yugoslavia.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998; Aleksandar Pavković. *The Fragmentation of Yugoslavia: Nationalism in a Multinational State.* London: Macmillan, 1997; Paul Lendvai. "Yugoslavia without Yugoslavs: The Roots of the Crisis". In: *International Affairs* 67.2 (1991); and Gale Stokes. *Three Eras of Political Change in Eastern Europe.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

stead of diminishing internal differences and forging a common Yugoslavian culture, the Yugoslavian regime promoted and deepened national-cultural differences through (different) republican education systems, media, cultural institutions and policies. According to this perspective, national narratives 'overwhelmed' the Yugoslavian narrative because the latter was unsubstantiated. The overwhelming of what was shared in Yugoslavia by the 'particularities' of cultural and religious institutions led to the strengthening of national political movements.[8] Cultural nationalism(s) took on more pronounced political forms in moments such as the Croatian Spring (1968-1971), the Kosovo protests (80s) and the Serbian national movement (80s).[9] Following this logic, the emergence of the CDU party can be understood as the political expression of an existing Croatian cultural identity that was 'fuller' than the Yugoslavian identity. Furthermore, the identity expressed by the party was 'fermenting' culturally in the socialist period and occasionally taking on a more pronounced political form.

The dissolution of Yugoslavia has also been explained through the prism of individual acts with the aim of assessing the moral responsibility of the actors involved in the country's demise.[10] According to this perspective, Tito was the only real decision maker in Yugoslavia and a sovereign above the law. He is blamed for having designed a dysfunctional constitutional order which could not have survived his death. After his death, a power vacuum came into being and Milošević tried to fill this by instrumentalizing the Serbian national cause and mobilizing the masses. Since he introduced the language of nationalism into politics, he is the primary culprit for the country's dissolution. Franjo Tuđman, the leader of the CDU and the first Croatian president, is seen as a (Croatian) response to Milošević's instrumental nationalism, primary responsible for reinforcing

[8]On the role of religious and cultural institutions in the conflict see: Vjekoslav Perica. *Balkan Idols: Religion and Nationalism in Yugoslav States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

[9]For various national movements in Yugoslavia see: Nick Miller. "Return Engagement: Intellectuals and Nationalism in Tito's Yugoslavia". In: *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia's disintegration*. Ed. by Leonard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragović-Soso. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2008 For summaries of the argument see: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 19-25; Dragović-Soso, "Why did Yugoslavia Disintegrate? An Overview of Contending Explanations", pp. 5-10; Ramet, *Thinking about Yugoslavia: Scholarly Debates about the Yugoslav Breakup and the Wars in Bosnia and Kosovo*, p. 63; and Wachtel and Bennett, "The Dissolution of Yugoslavia", pp. 17-18.

[10]For example: Christopher Bennett. *Yugoslavia's Bloody Collapse: Causes, Course and Consequences*. Washington Square: New York University Press, 1995; and Louis Sell. *Slobodan Milošević and the Destruction of Yugoslavia*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

enmities instead of mitigating them.[11] Following this logic, the CDU political program is identified with its leader Franjo Tuđman and understood as the product of his will to power. It is a 'natural' response to the Serbian nationalism instrumentalized by Milošević.

The self-managing ideology – a set of ideas and beliefs about the nature of the state driving the actions of Yugoslavia's ruling elite – is also identified as a key reason for Yugoslavia's disintegration.[12] According to this perspective, the dissolution of the country was an unintended consequence of the institutionalization of an ideological tenet regarding the withering away of the state. This ideological tenet also accounted for the choices made by the ruling elite regarding the structure of the economy, the nature of Yugoslavian identity, and the constitutional form of the state. The institutionalization of self-management brought about decentralization and fragmentation, the state withered away into disorder and anarchy. This state of affairs created the grounds for the emergence of state-forming doctrines in Yugoslavia's constitutive units.[13] Following this logic, the CDU party emerged out of the disorderly realities generated by the anti-statist self-managing ideology; its state-forming project was an attempt to institute order in the context of SR Croatia.

Lastly, the dissolution of Yugoslavia has also been explained through the transformation of the bipolar international order in which it enjoyed a strategically important intermediary position between the East and the West.[14] This position was rewarded economically from both sides of the Iron Curtain, and the country's internal stability, cohesion and economic success depended on this particular articulation of global forces. According to this perspective, the position Yugoslavia occupied ceased to exist with the

[11]For summaries of the argument see: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 18-29; Dragović-Soso, "Why did Yugoslavia Disintegrate? An Overview of Contending Explanations", pp. 13-15; and Ramet, *Thinking about Yugoslavia: Scholarly Debates about the Yugoslav Breakup and the Wars in Bosnia and Kosovo*, pp. 66-67.

[12]For this account see: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away.*

[13]For summaries of the argument see: Dragović-Soso, "Why did Yugoslavia Disintegrate? An Overview of Contending Explanations", p. 11; Wachtel and Bennett, "The Dissolution of Yugoslavia", pp. 19-20; and Ramet, *Thinking about Yugoslavia: Scholarly Debates about the Yugoslav Breakup and the Wars in Bosnia and Kosovo*, p. 70.

[14]For example: Kate Hudson. *Breaking the South Slav Dream: The Rise and Fall of Yugoslavia.* London: Pluto Press, 2003; Susan L Woodward. *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution After the Cold War.* Washington: Brookings, 1995; and James Gow. *Triumph of the Lack of Will: International Diplomacy and the Yugoslav War.* London: Hurst, 1997.

rearticulation of global forces after the collapse of Eastern European communism, giving rise to both a crisis of its economy and of its purpose. Since the Yugoslavian communist party came to power through (domestic) political struggles and not (foreign) Soviet intervention, the transition from 'socialism' to 'democracy' was understood as a process of liberation from a 'domestic' communist regime centered in Belgrade.[15] Following this logic, the CDU emerged on the waves of a democratization whose form was determined by the particular position Yugoslavia enjoyed in the bipolar world order. The party's antagonistic stance towards Belgrade and its demands for Croatian independence were formed by the manner in which the LCY came to power in 1945.

#### 2.2.1.2 Strengths and limitations

Despite focusing on the process of Yugoslavia's disintegration, each perspective discussed carries implications for understanding the emergence of the CDU party in SR Croatia. The different explicatory frameworks of these approaches are characterized by different strengths and deficiencies.

According to the economic logic of Yugoslavia's dissolution, politics is a surface that reflects objective economic interests. In a federalized and decentralized state characterized by different levels of development, politics reflects the different economic interests of its constitutive territorial units. Since these were incommensurable, so the argument goes, the country fragmented, while the actors that brought about the dissolution were simply following the economic interests of the territorial units they came from. The economic logic of the country's dissolution however, fails to capture anything specific about the CDU party in the 1989-1900 periods, since the same logic can be deployed to explain the political program of its key electoral competitor the League of Communists of Croatia-Party of Democratic Change.[16] It also represents the politicizations of 1989 in SR Croatia

[15]For summaries of the argument see: Dragović-Soso, "Why did Yugoslavia Disintegrate? An Overview of Contending Explanations", pp. 23-24; Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 21,26; and Wachtel and Bennett, "The Dissolution of Yugoslavia", pp. 27-28.

[16]The latter's program also included the demand for further economic decentralization and republicanisation, which reflected, according to this logic, the interests of a developed republic.

as a continuity of the reformist Croatian Spring movement of 1971, which operated in a radically different context. To account for the CDU's emergence in particular within the context of the economic crisis in the 1980s, it is necessary to depart from the presupposition that Yugoslavian politics was just a surface that reflected the economic interests of republics at different levels of development, since this assumption renders economic interests as fixed and neglects the transformations they undergo through interacting with other political interests at particular moments in time.

According to the constitutional logic of Yugoslavian disintegration, politics is a surface determined by constitutional rules, institutions and decision-making procedures. In this sense, the emergence of nationalist parties in Yugoslavia resulted from its structural form (a decentralized constitutional design) and the failures of this form. The strength of this approach is that it shows that the actors in the disintegration were bound by political rules and structures that shaped their interests. However, from this perspective, the emergence of the CDU party and its project are completely subsumed to this (failing) structure, leaving little room for seeing in it a (political) intervention into these rules that produced something conceptually new. This approach also fails to address the historical circumstances and struggles that gave rise to that particular type of constitutional order at the time it was drawn up, focusing primarily on its dysfunctionality in retrospect.

According to the national-cultural logic of Yugoslavian disintegration, politics is a surface determined by nations whose members are bound together by a shared cultural identity that differentiates them from other nations. From this perspective, the failure to forge a culturally homogeneous Yugoslavian identity brought about the dissolution of Yugoslavia's political order 'naturally', as the order lacked a coherent (political) subject. The CDU emerged as the political expression of an objectively existing Croatian cultural identity in a political terrain emptied out of a Yugoslavian subject. This perspective represents the 'nationalist' CDU as continuity with the reformist Croatian Spring movement (1971), since it too was one political manifestation of Croatian identity within the framework of Yugoslavian socialism. The strength of this approach is that it makes visible the 'deeper' identity issues at stake in Yugoslavia's dissolution and the emergence of the CDU,

something overlooked by previous accounts. The problem with this account, however, lies in its assumption that political identity is derivative of culturally unified national communities. It represents the position of the Yugoslavian regime as having faced an either-or choice; to deplete its constitutive nations and nationalities of their internal cultural substratum and forge a unified Yugoslavian national identity or to preserve their mutual differences and empty out the Yugoslavian identity of cohesive cultural matter. By choosing the latter, the regime set the country on a disintegrative course. This, however, seems to be a retroactive oversimplification of the issue; first, because the Yugoslavian identity successfully grounded the political order despite its internal cultural-national diversity, for decades and, second, because 'Yugoslavian culture' and its constitutive 'national cultures' were not understood as exclusive loci of identity, neither vis-à-vis each other, nor vis-à-vis the Yugoslavian identity.[17] In this sense, Yugoslavian politics could not have been (just) about nations as subjects, despite the politicizations of the 1980s.

According to the agency-focused approach to the dissolution, politics resembles a stage for individual actors to make decisions, weighing out different options with the aim of increasing their power in the decision-making process. Furthermore, they can be held morally accountable for the outcomes of the decisions that they make. The strength of this approach is that it introduces power-struggles into the debates regarding Yugoslavia's dissolution, by demonstrating that power-struggles underpinned economic and constitutional factors as well as the politicization of 'national' identities. In this sense, neither of these factors can be 'abstracted' out of politics and be said to be driving the dissolution. The limitation of this approach lies in downplaying the ideological and contextual constrains that bound agency. It completely subsumes structural factors to agency and (mis)represents the latter as strictly individual. It fails to consider collective actors – such as the LCY and the CDU – as a form of agency and simply assumes that they are 'extensions' of their leaders and the products of their will to power. It is also problematic

[17]See: Lenard J. Cohen. *Broken Bonds: Yugoslavia's Disintegration and Balkan Politics in Transition.* 2nd. Boulder: Westview Press, 1995, p. 25; and Lenard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragović-Soso, eds. *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia's Disintegration.* West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2008, p. 8.

because it deduces intents of actions from consequences.[18]

According to the ideological logic of Yugoslavia's dissolution, politics is a field of interaction between elite driven decision-making about (political) structures, the political and social consequences of their operation, and the social responses. This approach stresses the importance of focusing on the elite's belief system in the Yugoslavian context, precisely because a single (communist) party ruled the country and its members legitimized their decisions in reference to a set of defined ideological tenets and aims. The strength of this approach is its introduction of the ideological dimension into the debate about Yugoslavia's demise. It brings to light that, in order to understand economic interests, the Yugoslavian constitutional order, Yugoslavian political identity and the behaviour of agents, we must examine its ideological backbone. These features can be understood primarily through an internalist account that takes their ideological commitments seriously, rather than ignoring them or dismissing as 'irrational' and/or a-priori failed because of Yugoslavia's disintegration and the fall of Eastern European communism. The problem of this approach is that it focuses exclusively on the articulation of the idea of the 'state' within ideology and neglects its political identity-forming role. In doing so it fails to account for the politicization of national identities in the 1980s, and it reduces the emergence of the CDU to a state-centered argument regarding the dissolution of the country. If the ideology-focused approach were to be applied to the CDU itself, then understanding the party's emergence would necessitate examining its political program within the ideological context of Yugoslavia.

According to the exogenous logic of Yugoslavia's dissolution, politics in and of Yugoslavia was determined by the dynamic of the international political system. The fall of state-directed socialism and changing global conditions account for Yugoslavia's lack of political purpose and its economic decline. The strength of this approach lies in contextualizing the problem within the framework of the international power relations and tracking the genealogy of the state's development in relation to global trends. The limitation of this approach is that it fails to grasp why Yugoslavia collapsed into its constitutive terri-

[18]It is very difficult to prove that Milošević 'wanted' to be the new Tito or that Tuđman 'intended' to reinforceing enimities between Croats and Serbs, nor that any of them 'intended' to destroy Yugoslavia.

torial units, instead of transforming into a democratic state. In this respect, it is difficult to understand how the CDU in particular emerged within one of Yugoslavia's constitutive republics in the process of democratization and managed to become the dominant force in forging a new sense of political purpose. To be able to relate the Yugoslavian crisis of purpose to the rise of the CDU, one must examine the ways in which the movement 'read' the Yugoslavian crisis and articulated a new sense of purpose our of its reading.

In sum, this subsection has mapped out the strengths and limitations of the main existing arguments regarding Yugoslavia's demise, in light of their implications for the emergence of the CDU party. The economic argument reads the party's emergence as the expression of objective economic interests and traces a continuity between developments in the 1980s and the Croatian Spring movement (1968-1971). The constitutional argument sees the party's emergence as an outcome of particular (dysfunctional) political rules, failing to see the party as something new that intervened in the political landscape. The national-cultural logic of Yugoslavian disintegration also traces a continuity between the Croatian Spring movement and the politicizations of the 1980s, 'normalizing' it as a political expression of an existing Croatian cultural identity. The agency and ideology focused approaches complicate this picture and introduce power and meaning into the process. The former represents the CDU as Tuđman's project and as a 'natural' response to Milošević's instrumental nationalism. The later represents it as a state-forming doctrine that emerged 'naturally' out of the disintegrating ideological order. The last approach discussed introduces global political forces and brings to light that they shaped its purpose and the form of its dissolution. In the following subsection I examine the literature on Croatia's democratic transition which was triggered by the changing international dynamics identified as one of the causes of Yugoslavia's dissolution. While the body of literature discussed so far has dug into the past to explain Yugoslavia's fragmentation, the literature on democratic transition treats the socialist past as a (more or less) blank slate and focuses on the new political orders, in particular the Republic of Croatia, that emerged out of its ruins.

### 2.2.2 The Croatian democratic transition

In contrast to the abundant literature on Yugoslavia's disintegration, the body of literature on the Croatian post-socialist transition is remarkably scarce.[19] Broadly speaking, it can be sub-divided into two streams, depending on their respective understanding of democracy and their degree of engagement with the process of democratic consolidation. In this subsection I discuss both positions and examine the ways they have treated the CDU's emergence within the framework of their problematizations.

#### 2.2.2.1 Arguments and implications

Drawing on Robert Dahl, Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba the 'liberal' stream understands democracy in a broad sense to include both formal institutions and the civic values that underpin them. From this perspective, the Croatian post-socialist political landscape was determined by a struggle between (inclusive) liberal and (exclusive) nationalist forces for the domination of the trajectory of Croatia's development. This perspective sought to strengthen the liberal-democratic camp by fleshing out problematic aspects of the value system and suggesting policies for improving them.[20]

According to the theoretical framework underpinning the analysis, 'liberal democracy' and 'nationalism' are mutually exclusive political doctrines. Liberalism is understood an inclusive form of government, whereby political subjects are constituted as equal individuals and politics is based on the rule of law, the separation of powers, a the respect for human rights, and the inclusion of minorities. Nationalism, on the other hand, is

[19]This has to do with the difficulty to grasp Croatia's transition in comparative perspective because of the idiosyncrasy of Yugoslavia's transitions(s) in relation to other Central and Eastern European countries. The only comparative study is Sharon Fischer. *Political Change in post-Communist Slovakia and Croatia: from Nationalist to Europeanist.* New York: : Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. I will not discuss Fisher's book in particular since the liberal stream, which I do discuss, espouses its general position. Fisher's work focuses on making a broader argument about catalysing the process of European integration, and in this subsection I chose to focus on the literature that looks into the Croatian case in particular due to the topic of the thesis.

[20]See: Sabrina P. Ramet. "What's Love (of Country) got to do with it? Civic Values in Democratic Transition". In: *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media.* Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet and Davorka Matić. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007, p. 10; and Knut Vesterdal. "Conclusion: Building Liberal Democracy in Croatia". In: *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media.* Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet and Davorka Matić. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007, p. 374.

an exclusive 'affectivity' based on the identification of a particular state with a particular nation and the exclusion of minorities and non-members. Its central objective is the preservation of the body of the nation through the institutional system.[21]

Since the 'nationalist' CDU dominated the trajectory of the Croatian transition to democracy, the liberal steam focuses on identifying its negative impact on the quality of Croatian democracy in the 1990s. It does not problematize the emergence of the party in the context of Yugoslavia's dissolution because it focuses its attention on the process that came after the transition to a democratic system of representation had already taken place in a formal sense. The party's emergence, its electoral victory, and the construction of a democratic-institutional order out of the rubble of self-management, are simply subsumed under 'the first phase of transition' that spans from 1989 to 1995.[22] This period also includes the trajectory of the war that broke out in independent Croatia, in the territories with a substantial Serbian population, after the terms of the democratic settlement were codified in the 1990 Constitution. The CDU's electoral victory is attributed to the behaviour of voters,[23] the absolute majority electoral system, the simplicity of its platform for change, (eliminating communism and establishing an independent state), and its focus on the national reconciliation between Croatian fascists and communists.[24] This stream maintains that the war strengthened the party's position about the centrality of state-building and national unity.[25] The party had a negative impact on the quality of Croatian democracy only after 1995, when Croatia's state borders were consolidated, and institutions put firmly in place.[26] In this sense, the CDU party's emergence is simply not constituted as an object of analysis in itself, but 'normalized' under a phase of transition that was (also) a state-building process.

[21]Ramet, "What's Love (of Country) got to do with it? Civic Values in Democratic Transition", p. 4.

[22]Marius Søberg. "Croatia Since 1989: The HDZ and the Politics of Transition". In: *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media.* Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet and Davorka Matić. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007, p. 32.

[23]This argument is that the reformed communists lost the votes of Croatia's Serbs to the newly formed Serbian Democratic Party, while the voters that opposed CDU's 'nationalism' did not immediately cast their votes to their main competitors the reformed communists, but dispersed them between small newly formed parties and initiatives.

[24]Søberg, "Croatia Since 1989: The HDZ and the Politics of Transition", pp. 36,41.

[25]Ibid., p. 43.

[26]Ibid., pp. 46-47.

The second stream understands democracy in a narrower sense, to mean the particular set of rules and institutions that came into being through the transition process. Contrary to the liberal stream, this approach is neither explicitly positioned in a political struggle, nor does it prescribe political strategies for improving the quality of Croatia's democracy. Rather, it seeks to explain the features of the Croatian democratic order through theory-driven quantitative analyses.

One such approach draws on the work of Adam Przeworski, Giuseppe Di Palma, Guillermo O'Donnell, Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan. It understands transition as completed once the democratic 'rules of the game' (institutions and procedures) are settled down and views consolidation as a subsequent step which is about the degree of stability and the quality of functioning of these rules.[27] From this perspective, the Croatian transition was a two phased-dominant player game completed after the proclamation of the 1990 Constitution. The first phase was determined by the actions of the reformed communists, who called for multiparty elections in response to the conflicts within the federal LCY. The second phase was determined by the actions of the CDU, which came to power through elections and shaped the new democratic order.[28] This particular form of transition explains the instability of the new democratic order that came into being in the 1990s. Both steps followed the logic of unilateral decision making regarding the new institutions — the election law, the semi-presidential system, the borders of the state, and the constitutional position of Croatian Serbs— and these came to reflect partial interests as opposed to a democratically forged consensus. Furthermore, this perspective maintains that the CDU party itself failed to undergo the transition necessary for the consolidation of democracy, transforming from an opposition party in the socialist regime into a party in a democratic regime. Instead, it institutionalized into a new regime and transferred its values, vocabulary and interpretations of reality into the common symbolic and institutional patterns of the Republic of Croatia. The transition process therefore resulted in an 'authoritarian

[27]Čular, "Political Development in Croatia 1990-2000: Fast Transition-Postponed Consolidation", p. 31.
[28]Ibid., pp. 32-33.

democracy'[29] characterized by the low quality of the democratic game.[30] This perspective, thus, does not problematize the party's emergence. It subsumes the process under a phase dominated by the actions of the reformed communists and ascribes the party's electoral victory to its simple project of transition (Croatian state sovereignty) and its highly emotional, nationalistic and historically oriented populism, maintaining that they were 'suited' for this context.[31]

Another such approach explains the formation of the Croatian party system in the transition process by deploying Martin Lipset and Stein Rokkan's concept of political cleavages. Following this perspective, the political divisions, or cleavages, that shaped the Croatian party system in the post-socialist period originated in the national and industrial revolutions in Europe. Cleavages are understood as objective social facts, dichotomous in nature, which presuppose a coincidence between social group identity and political parties. They become part of party identity through mobilizations by elites.[32]

According to this approach, the parties that competed in the first multiparty elections drew on two existing cleavages, the territorial-cultural and the ideological-cultural. The former accounts for the opposing positions existing among the masses and the elite, regarding Croatia's relationship to the state centres it has historically been subject to and the relationship between Croatia as a state center and its minorities and regions. It is imbued with opposing–exclusive vs. inclusive–conceptions of national and state integration, and its origins are traced back to the first Croatian political movements in the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy.[33] The latter accounts for the opposing positions existing among the masses and the elites regarding the role of religion in society. It originates in the process

[29]The CDU regime did not abolish the democratic game; institutional constraints precluded the complete institutionalization of the party into the state and forced it to test its legitimacy at regularly held elections. Hence the syntagm 'authoritarian democracy'.

[30]Čular, "Political Development in Croatia 1990-2000: Fast Transition-Postponed Consolidation", pp. 36-38.

[31]Ibid., pp. 35-36.

[32]Nenad Zakošek and Goran Čular. "Croatia". In: *The Handbook of Political Change in Eastern Europe*. Ed. by Sten Berglund, Joakim Ekman, and Frank J. Aarebrot. 2nd. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2004, pp. 457, 471.

[33]Internally, 'centralism' overlaps with an exclusive understanding of culture and 'periphery' with non-exclusive conceptions, historically variations of Yugoslavism. According to this perspective, this historical cleavage emerged in the form of opposing national identities Croats vs. Serbs and Yugoslavs in the transition process. See ibid., p. 458.

of cultural modernization and secularization. The two cleavages were intertwined in the 1990s elections because the Catholic Church publicly embraced the notion of Croatian national autonomy and an exclusivist conception of national identity.[34] According to this approach, the CDU's emergence was the political expression of pre-existing social divisions; the party expressed the position of the segment of Croatian society which identified as Catholic Croats, demanded Croatian independence from Yugoslavia, opposed communism and understood national culture in an exclusive manner.

#### 2.2.2.2 Strengths and limitations

Despite focusing on the process of Croatia's transition to democracy, in which the CDU party played a pivotal role, the two streams discussed fail to account for the party's emergence within the context of Yugoslavia's disintegration. The liberal stream treats the first five years of the party's rule in an apologetic manner due to the war and state-building processes, thereby manifesting the limitations of its own assumptions regarding the exclusive relationship between 'liberal democracy' and 'nationalism'.[35] In the Croatian context, the coming to power of the 'nationalist' CDU and the transition to democracy were part and parcel of a single trajectory to such an extent that the democratic institutional order and the identity grounding it were 'created' by the party. By focusing exclusively on the negative practices associated with the party's rule in the post-war period, the liberal approach 'normalizes' a set of assumptions regarding the nature of that identity and its relation to the Serbian identity in Croatia, as well as their mutual relations to the state.

[34]Zakošek and Čular, "Croatia", p. 459 This research 'proves' that the cleavages were mobilized in the first elections by deploying a quantitative analysis of party-preferences and political attitudes. The data shows that those identifying as 'Croatian Catholic' were much more likely to support Croatian independence and multi-partyism than those that identified as 'Serbs' or 'Yugoslavs', while those identifying as 'Croatian atheists' were in between. Their results also show that those that voted for the CDU were much more likely to support Croatian independence and multi-partyism than those that voted for the reformed communists. Furthermore, those that voted for the CDU were much more likely to oppose self-management than those that voted for the reformed communists.

[35]For more on the problem of conceptualising 'nationalism' and democracy as mutually exclusive in the Croatian context see: Davorka Matić. "Is Nationalism Really that Bad? The Case of Croatia". In: *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media.* Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet and Davorka Matić. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007; and Garth Massey, Randy Hodson, and Duško Sekulić. "Nationalism, Liberalism and Liberal Nationalism in Post-war Croatia". In: *Nations and Nationalism* 9.1 (2003).

The 'scientific' stream treats the CDU in accordance with its theoretical apparatus about the transition process and the new institutions which came into being through it. The first approach sees in the CDU-directed authoritarian democracy the reason for the failure to consolidate the democratic game, while the second approach sees in the party the political re-emergence of historically determined social divisions whose political expression was 'blocked' in Yugoslavia. The first approach overlooks the struggles regarding the terms under which the new democratic subject would be forged in the post-socialist order, and it thus fails to address the central assumptions that were inscribed into the fabric of the new order and structured its institutional rules. The second approach maps out the voting preferences of those that were more likely to vote for the CDU, assuming the party was a channel for their (political) representation. This approach shows that conflicting conceptions of national identity and state competed in the 1990 elections, but precludes their problematization in the context of their emergence by tracing their origins back to modernity and not locating them in the context of existing political struggles.

Despite their critique of the practices associated with the CDU's regime in the 1990s, these accounts fail to address the implications of CDU's electoral victory for the representation of the (political) subject of the transition process, namely the (Croatian) 'nation' and (its) state. In the following subsection I examine the literature on Croatian national identity and nationalism, which places its analytic focus on the phenomenon of the nation as a political subject.

### 2.2.3 Croatian national identity

While the approaches discussed so far have placed the CDU's emergence within the context of Yugoslavia's dissolution and the transition from socialism to democracy, the literature on Croatian national identity and nationalism situates it within the field of the study of nations and nationalism.[36] In this subsection I focus on the different ways in which this body of literature has understood the notion of Croatian national identity in relation to

[36]For an overview of current debates on nations and nationalism see: Umut Özkırımlı. *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.

politics, and how these positions have been reflected in different treatments of the 'nationalist' CDU party.

#### 2.2.3.1 Arguments and implications

Drawing on the work of Ernest Renan and Anthony Smith, the primordialist perspective on Croatian national identification sees contemporary Croatian national identity as an expression of a particular (Croatian) South-Slavic ethnic community that was forged through a shared language, territory (the medieval kingdom of Croatia), culture (Slavic-Catholic) and historical ancestry (the Slavic tribe that migrated to the South-West Balkans in the $7^{th}$ century). This perspective identifies the medieval Kingdom of Croatia as a Croatian state, since the kings that were ruling over it identified as 'Croats' and entered into unions with different empires by their own will, assuring a continuity of (particular) Croatian statehood. According to this perspective, the creation of the Yugoslavian Monarchy and the integration of the Croatian nation into a South-Slavic national body (Yugoslavian) mark the end of this continuity and the loss of Croatian statehood. In this sense, the $20^{th}$ century was determined by national attempts to establish an independent, ethnically homogeneous state as a restoration of the medieval state and the affirmation of its national particularity. This process underpinned the constitution and dissolution of the proto-fascist independent state of Croatia (1941-1945), and the establishment of the Socialist Federal Republic of Croatia (1945-1990). It also 'caused' the emergence of the Croatian Spring movement (1971) which was an expression of the failure of the Yugoslavian regime to adequately resolve the national question. According to primordialists, the transition from single party rule to multi-partyism created the conditions for the free articulation of the nation's historic interests and its constitution into an independent political sovereign in its own state.[37] The CDU's leader and Croatia's first president, Franjo Tuđman, understood nations in primordial terms. In his own words:

> [nations are] the result of the development of all those material and spiritual forces

[37]Miroslav Vujević. "Nacionalna identifikacija u Hrvatskoj". In: *Društvena istraživanja-časopis za opća društvena pitanja* 16.3 (2007), pp. 392-394.

> which in an given area shape the national being of individual nations on the basis of blood, linguistic and cultural kinship, and the common vital interests and links of fate between the ethnic community and the common homeland and the common historical traditions and aims. The drive towards survival and the desire of a nation to live and retain its national identity, to assert itself and be free and recognized in the world community are invincible.[38]

Drawing on the work of Hans Kohn, Ernest Gellner and Benedict Andersen, the modernist perspective challenges the primordial account by maintaining that it projects contemporary ideas regarding the state and society back into the past. The modernists see the Croatian nation as a modern phenomenon that came into being through national mobilizations that accompany modern state-formation processes.[39] In this sense, the nation is understood as a new locus of identity, made possible by the termination of feudal relations, cultural standardization, the expansion of markets, and the emergence of print capitalism. The nation as a locus of identity is the product of 19th century romantic-nationalists who created it out of religious, linguistic and historical elements and defined it through differentiation from 'others'.[40] They did so to introduce the principle of self-determination, liberate Croatian society from foreign centres of power and 'catalyze' its transition from feudalism to capitalism. The process of transforming the Croatian 'people' into a 'nation' was completed through the political activities of the Croatian Peasant Party (CPP) at the beginning of the 20th century. The CPP took the intellectual endeavours of the political elite 'down' to the peasant-majority, thereby linking the different segments of society into a modern national body. In this sense Croatian nationalism, and the so-

[38]Franjo Tuđman. *Nationalism in Contemporary Europe.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1981, pp. 288-298.

[39]Duško Sekulić. "Civic and Ethnic Identity: the Case of Croatia". In: *Politička misao* 40.2 (2004); Edvard Kardelj. *The Nation and Socialism.* Belgrade: Socialist Tought and Practice, 1981; Nikša Staničić. *Hrvatska nacija i nacionalizam u 19. i 20. stoljeću [The Croatian Nation and Natonalism in the 19th and 20th Century].* Zagreb: Barbat, 2002.

[40]The literature differentiates between four definitions of the scope of the nation in the 19th century and maintains that they all drew on common ancestral origins to explain to the people who they were as Croats; one identified Croatian identity as primarily South Slavic and thus equivalent to other South Slavic 'ethnic' groups; one saw Croatia as a constitutive part of a federalized Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy; one based on an exclusive Croatian identity that saw the future Croatian state as independent; one, dominant among a segment of the nobility that wanted to preserve their feudal rights and saw Croatia as inextricably linked with Hungary. See: Sekulić, "Civic and Ethnic Identity: the Case of Croatia", p. 146 The Yugoslavian communists followed the same logic, although they maintained that the national interests articulated by the progressive intellectuals were infused with their particular class interests. At the time, these partially overlapped with the interests peasants and workers, despite their class antagonisms. See: Kardelj, *The Nation and Socialism*, p. 41.

cial entity produced through it, served the purpose of social emancipation.[41] According to modernists the Croatian nation came to be defined in exclusive terms because of the context of modernization. Since Croatian territories were under foreign rule, national mobilization occurred against existing state-formations.[42]

The League of Communist of Yugoslavia espoused a modernist conception of the nation, seeing in them modern completed formations with a 'socio-economic substance'. Nationalism was considered to be a retrograde bourgeois political doctrine which had exhausted its emancipatory potential.[43] After Yugoslavia's dissolution, modernists maintained that the demise of socialism was naturally paralleled by the politicization of national identity in exclusivist terms because the communists never challenged the primordial logics of national identification.[44] From this perspective, the emergence of the 'exclusivist' and 'nationalist' CDU party is seen as part and parcel of a modern process of state formation whose trajectory was determined by the context of Croatian modernization. Furthermore, CDU's political project is understood as part and parcel of a Croatian national state-forming process.[45]

More recently, scholars have come to question the terms of the debate regarding the Croatian nation, noticing that the academic field has, to varying degrees, been complacent in the reproduction of the positions of those in power. Although these approaches differ in terms of the literature that they draw on and the particular questions that they address, none of them understand nations as historically completed formations, but as

[41]Sekulić, "Civic and Ethnic Identity: the Case of Croatia", pp. 146-147.
[42]See: ibid., pp. 147-148; and Kardelj, *The Nation and Socialism*, pp. 51-53.
[43]Ibid., pp. 24, 27, 49.
[44]Sekulić, "Civic and Ethnic Identity: the Case of Croatia", pp. 151, 155.
[45]Staničić, *Hrvatska nacija i nacionalizam u 19. i 20. stoljeću [The Croatian Nation and Natonalism in the 19th and 20th Century]*, p. 138.

on-going political problems in need of exploration.[46]

Bellamy bridges the divide between the first and second perspective on Croatian national identity by drawing on the work of Liisa Malkki, Michael Billing, Sarah Radcliffe, Sally Westwood, Paul James and Katherine Verdery. From his perspective the Croatian nation is a much too complex phenomenon to be reduced to either an a-historic ethnic core or a particular kind of state-forming process shaped by modernity. Rather, he understands national identity as constituted at different levels of abstraction, which determine the degree to which it appears as a continuity.[47] From this perspective, Croats are constituted as a nation at the most abstract level through a shared belief in a continuous history of statehood tracked back to the medieval Triune Kingdom.[48] By looking at three different articulations of this abstract national narrative – the dominant CDU articulation, the articulations of the opposition parties, and the articulation of dissident intellectuals' and of the diaspora – Bellamy shows the different ways in which the 'nation' was imagined in 1990.[49] He also shows that the dominant CDU conception of national identity was challenged at the least abstract level of social practices.[50]

Bellamy does not problematize the emergence of the CDU such; he simply looks into the way the party 'imagined' the abstract narrative of statehood, understanding it as a structural backbone of Croatian national identification. His account is informed by the assumption that there is an abstract narrative that lays at the core of Croatian national identification, external to politics. Drawing on the insights of poststructuralist theories of identity, the following approaches I discuss reject this premise. In their own way, they

[46]Due to the scope of my research, I have left out the feminist perspective from the reviewed literature. For feminist accounts of Croatian nationalism and identity see: Biljana Bijelić. "Women on the Edge of Gender Equality". In: *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet and Davorka Matić. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007; Svetlana Slapšak. "Nationalist and Women's Discourse in Post-Yugoslavia". In: *Transitions, Enviorments, Translations: Feminisms in International Politics*. Ed. by Joan W. Scott, Cora Kaplan, and Debra Keates. New York: Routledge, 1997; Đurđa Knežević. "Affective Nationalism". In: *Transitions, Enviorments, Translations: Feminisms in International Politics*. Ed. by Joan W. Scott, Cora Kaplan, and Debra Keates. New York: Routledge, 1997; and Julie Mostov. "Sexing the Nation/Desexing the Body: Politics of National Identity in the Former Yugoslavia". In: *Gender Ironies of Nationalism: Sexing the Nation*. Ed. by Tamar Mayer. London: Routledge, 2000.

[47]Alex J Bellamy. *The Formation of Croatian National Identity: A Centuries-old Dream?* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003, pp. 27-29.

[48]Ibid., pp. 32-64.

[49]Ibid., pp. 66-95.

[50]Ibid., pp. 104-170.

understand 'nations' and 'nationalisms' as emerging in certain contexts and within specific systems of meaning that are produced and subverted through power struggles.

Ragazzi focuses on overlooked aspects of contemporary Croatian nationalism by drawing on the work of authors such as Michele Foucault, William Connolly, Pierre Bourdieu, John L. Austin, John R. Searle and Rogers Brubaker.[51] Ragazzi does not problematize the emergence of the CDU as such but focuses on the operation of the 'diasporic discourse' within its articulation of nationalism and national identity. He differentiates post-socialist Croatian nationalism from its preceding historical forms because of the centrality of the 'diasporic discourse' – the practices done in the name of the diaspora – in its political articulation.[52] His analysis shows the party deployed that discourse to translate an old notion of an ethnically clean and territorially expanded Croatia into acceptable terms for the post-socialist context.[53] Consequently, it redefined both the borders of the nation and the scope of state sovereignty.[54] By tracing a genealogy of the practices of the transnational control of populations in the 20$^{th}$ century, Ragazzi shows the extent to which the 'diasporic discourse' was conditioned by the normalization of the idea that the state can govern groups outside of its territorial borders as if they were within them. In doing so he renders visible that the party's project was shaped by the struggles and institutional forms that preceded it.[55]

Salecl draws on the work of Ernesto Laclau and Jacques Lacan to explain the emergence of nationalist politics in the former Yugoslavia.[56] She contends that nations come into being through identification processes that are driven by passions, emotions and affect. These processes are structured by enemy fantasies that threaten the nation and from which the nation has to be protected. From her perspective, right-wing parties operate by weaving enemy figures and positioning themselves as protectors of the nation.[57]

[51]Francesco Ragazzi. "The Croatian "Diaspora Politics" of the 1990s: Nationalism Unbound?" In: *Transnational Societies, Transterritorial Politics: Migrations in the (Post-)Yugoslavian region 19th–20th Century.* Ed. by Ulf Brunnbauer. Munich: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2009.

[52]Ibid., p. 144.

[53]Ibid., pp. 156-159.

[54]Ibid., p. 145.

[55]Ibid., pp. 156, 163.

[56]Renata Salecl. "The Crisis of Identity and the Struggle for New Hegemony in the Former Yugoslavia". In: *The Making of Political Identities.* Ed. by Ernesto Laclau. London: Verso, 1994.

[57]Ibid., pp. 211-212.

Within this framework, the emergence of nationalism in the former Yugoslavia can only be understood in the light of Yugoslavia's crisis of meaning in the 1980s. Once the Yugoslavian ideology failed to provide a backbone for identification and articulate a coherent vision of reality, a political space was opened up for a power struggle over defining a new identification framework.[58] Nationalist forces won in the struggle because they managed to subordinate all political problems to the problem of national identity and construct a symbolic space – filled out with images of hatred of other nations and of the happy future that would arrive after national liberation – from which individuals appeared likeable to themselves.[59] From her perspective, the CDU emerged out of Yugoslavia's crisis of meaning and became hegemonic due to the centrality that 'the nation' and its 'enemies' played within its discourse. The victory was predicated by the failure of other forces to place the nation at the forefront of their discourses.

Bowman draws on the work of Ernesto Laclau, Chantal Mouffe and Benedict Andersen to tackle the same problem as Salecl but focuses on the Croatian case in particular.[60] According to him, 'the nation' as a collective body emerges out of identification processes that are constituted through shared experiences of inflicted violence. These experiences propel individuals to unite through a state-forming project articulated in defence against the perceived antagonism. By identifying in such a manner they give rise to a nationalist imaginary horizon.[61] Bowman maintains that Yugoslavian communists preserved 'the nation' as an identitary category but tried to depoliticize it by constituting 'nationalism' as a threat and a potential source of violence against all Yugoslavian citizens. The shift to particularist nationalist imaginaries came after the break-down of Titoist ideology through the political interventions of republican politicians. They aimed to increase their own power by creating enemies and articulating nationalist myths in the process.[62]

[58]Salecl, "The Crisis of Identity and the Struggle for New Hegemony in the Former Yugoslavia", p. 208.
[59]Ibid., p. 225.
[60]Glenn Bowman. "Constitutive Violence and the Nationalist Imaginary. Antagonism and Defensive Solidarity in 'Palestine' and 'former Yugoslavia'". In: *Populism and the Mirror of Democracy.* Ed. by Francisco Panizza. London: Verso, 2005; Glenn Bowman. "Constitutive Violence and the Nationalist Imaginary. Antagonism and Defensive Solidarity in 'Palestine' and 'former Yugoslavia'". In: *Social Anthropology* 11.3 (2003).
[61]Bowman, "Constitutive Violence and the Nationalist Imaginary. Antagonism and Defensive Solidarity in 'Palestine' and 'former Yugoslavia'", p. 319.
[62]Ibid., pp. 329-332.

From this perspective, CDU's political project re-articulated the Yugoslavian state into an instrument for the realization of the Serbian national project and a source of violence against the 'Croatian nation'. It offered individual Croats an imaginary horizon to inscribe the instances of violence inflicted against them. Through these inscription(s) the Croatian nation as a collective body came into being.[63]

#### 2.2.3.2 Strengths and limitations

In the primordial account of Croatian national identity, the Croatian nation is abstracted out of politics and understood as an objective, synchronically and diachronically, unified entity that determines historical development. In this sense, the CDU's emergence is 'normalized' as but one expression of the nation's desires against those that have historically suppressed it. Nationalism as a form of politics emerges 'naturally' as the struggle of the nation against the enemies that oppress it. The strength of its approach lies in showing the theoretical presuppositions about the nature of national identity that underpinned CDU's own representations in the 1990s and the new democratic constitutional order. However, this is also its explicatory limitation since it fails to account for the emergence of that form of identity in the context of the 1990s, but merely reproduces the party's own representations.

The modernist approach maintains the nation is a product of structural factors that drive history and, to that extent, it introduces it into the political terrain. The strength of this approach is that it shows the limitations of the primordial account as well as the theoretical presuppositions of the Yugoslavian regime about nations and their place in history. Yet this approach falls short in accounting for the emergence of the CDU party in the context of dissolving Yugoslavia; the 'origins' of the CDU's representations of identity are attributed to structural factors that preceded the emergence of the party by a century. According to the modernists, these representations were not affected by the legacy of Yugoslavian socialism and were in fact just a continuation of an old identitarian

[63]Bowman, "Constitutive Violence and the Nationalist Imaginary. Antagonism and Defensive Solidarity in 'Palestine' and 'former Yugoslavia'", p. 333.

logic in a democratic context.

Bellamy shows that the nation was neither 'completed' nor 'formed' by the 1990s, but that it continued to be a contested locus of identity. He also shows that the CDU's particular articulation of the 'nation' – as realized through sovereignty and unity – despite its dominant position at the institutional level, was just one possibility. The limitation of his approach is that it focuses on continuities at the (abstract) political level and fails to account for 'newness' in the post-socialist representation of the nation as a political identity.

Ragazzi shows that the CDU's nationalism was a post-socialist novelty, although the discourses constituting it were shaped by past institutional practices beyond the party's control. His reading of Croatian nationalism shows tacitly that the party reinvented the notion of Croatian national identity out of the context of political struggles and institutional logics of Yugoslav socialism, and not just out of an abstract narrative of historical statehood. Yet his approach does not show alternatives to CDU's articulation of the nation but focuses on the CDU's deployment of the 'diasporic discourse' and its historical conditions of possibility.

Salecl shows that the politicization of national identities in the 1990s cannot be understood without considering the failures of Yugoslavian ideology. However, she fails to concretize the processes of failure and emergence, and accounts for them in terms of universal psychological drives and antagonistic inclinations. In this sense, she 'reduces' all national identities that emerged to the same mechanism and fails to engage with their particular representations in the post-socialist period and the historical context that shaped them. Bowman pays close attention to emergence of the CDU in the process of Yugoslavia's disintegration, and argues that the Croatian nation was brought into being during the 1990-1991 period through an identification process driven by national antagonisms. The strength of his approach lies in concretizing, the historical trajectory that brought national politicizations in Yugoslavia into being and fleshing out the political character of national identity. However, since he also maintains that the 'nation' existed as an identitary category in Yugoslavian socialism, the argument that the 'Croatian na-

tion' only came into being through the political intervention of the CDU in 1990s seems to suggest that the 'nation' was a somewhat unreal or unsubstantiated identitary category in Yugoslavian socialism.

Despite engaging with the ontological presuppositions of the primordial account, both Salecl and Bowman's reading paradoxically reproduce the CDU's position that the 'nation' became a 'proper' subject of politics in the 1990s. This paradox, I believe, originates in their understanding of national identity as emerging exclusively out of identification process driven by (national) antagonisms. Although both authors place Yugoslavia's crisis of meaning at the forefront of their account of the emergence of national identifications and imaginaries in the post-socialist period, they fail to explain how this crisis was reflected at the level of the political representation and the constitution of the nation.

### 2.2.4 Reflections on the existing approaches

In this subsection I have explored a wide range of literature dealing with the emergence of the CDU party in SR Croatia in the 1989-1990 period. Evidently, the reviewed literature is not all at the same level of abstraction and it does not all share a common object of analysis; each field of study focuses on its own particular 'objects' and explores them through idiosyncratic theoretical paradigms. However, the CDU party is a theme that cuts across these different approaches, despite the fact that they do not account for its emergence in a systematic and critical manner. I have illustrated how the literature on Yugoslavia's disintegration reduced the process to factors that 'caused' the break-up of Yugoslavia. In this sense, some accounts have rendered the CDU an expression of objective economic interests, institutional structures of national-cultural identities. Furthermore, the party's emergence has also been normalized as the continuation of the Croatian Spring movement (1971) or a 'reaction' to the politics of Slobodan Milošević and Serbian nationalism. In addition, I have illustrated the extent to which the literature on the Croatian democratic transition failed to constitute the emergence of the CDU party within the context of dissolving Yugoslavia as an object of analysis because of its focus on the new demo-

cratic institutions/values. These approaches problematize the practices associated with the party's rule in the post-socialist period and tacitly normalize assumptions derived from its political project about the meaning of Croatian national identity, its relation to the Serbian national identity in Croatia and their mutual relationship to the state. Lastly, I have illustrated the manner in which the party's emergence has been treated by the existing approaches to Croatian national identity and nationalism. I have shown that primordialism naturalizes the party's emergence as an expression of the political desires of the 'oppressed' Croatian nation, reproducing in a literal sense the party's own representations. I have argued that the modernist approach and Bellamy's 'narrative approach' fail to account for the political role that the party played in the representation of Croatian national identity in the post-socialist period. I have also maintained that poststructuralist accounts, despite placing the phenomenon of the Croatian nation in the ideological context of its emergence, have failed to concretize how the party's coming to power was reflected in the transformation of the nation's representation from the socialist to the post-socialist period. In this sense, by maintaining that 'nations' emerge exclusively out of antagonistic identification processes, Salecl and Bowman have reproduced the position of the 'nationalist' CDU, that the nation only became a political subject in the 1990s. In the following subsection, I map out my own theoretical apparatus to account for the party's emergence within the context of Yugoslavia's dissolution, which falls within the poststructuralist approach and draws on Political Discourse Theory. However, in contrast to Salecl and Bowman's reading, my theoretical apparatus is designed to account for the emergence of the CDU party by drawing out the historical context that has shaped its 'nationalist' project and by showing the limitations of its political representations of the 'nation'.

## 2.3 The Emergence of the CDU Party in the Context of Yugoslavia's Dissolution: a Discourse Analytic Reading

I do not aspire to develop a universal theory about Yugoslavia's disintegration, Croatia's transition to democracy or Croatian nationalism in this thesis. Rather, by drawing on insights from these fields of study, I aim to critically engage with the emergence of a particular nationalist party that came to dominate the manner in which the Croatian nation, state, and society were represented in the post-socialist period. By drawing on the ontological pre-suppositions and theoretical tools of Poststructuralist Discourse Theory (PDT), my thesis addresses the process of Yugoslavia's disintegration, Croatian nationalism, and democratic transition from the vantage point of political identity formation. In the following subsection, I map out the main concepts and ontological presuppositions of PDT that I deploy in the course of the analysis to draw out the context that has shaped CDU's emergence and to show the limitations of its political representations.

### 2.3.1 Poststructuralist Discourse Theory as a research paradigm

PDT assumes that all social objects and human subjects are meaningful and that meaning is conferred by systems of socially constructed rules that are produced politically.[64] In the case of Croatia, for instance, this means that one cannot assume the existence of a nation that pre-exists the practices that give meaning to the term and that are embedded in a particular historical context. Since all social objects acquire meaning only once they are inserted into language and rendered intelligible, no object or subject can be abstracted from the political process as an essence that grounds it and determines its trajectory.

Discourses are the theoretical horizons through which the meaning of objects, subjects, and social relations is constituted. They involve the exercise of power since their constitution requires the exclusion of certain possibilities.[65] In this sense, the CDU's na-

[64]David Howarth and Yannis Stavrakakis. "Introducing Discourse Theory and Political Analysis". In: *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: Identities, Hegemonies and Social Change*. Ed. by David Howarth, Aletta J. Norval, and Yannis Stavrakakis. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000, p. 2.

[65]Ibid., pp. 3-4.

tionalist project can be understood as a particular discourse which was oriented towards the production, exploration, and promotion of particular kind of nation and its identity.[66] Equally, 'Yugoslavian socialism' can be viewed as a particular form of discourse through which the meaning of various subjects, objects, and institutions was constituted. Although both discourses represented the same subject, the Croatian nation, the differences between them can be fleshed out in terms of the different theoretical horizons and exclusions through which the subject was constituted.

PDT views politics as a struggle that different discursive formations enter into so as to define the terms of forging social unity. Politics, in other words, is the process whereby the meaning of social objects, subjects, and relations is fixed, transformed and/or subverted.[67] In this sense, the national subject can acquire different connotations over time, depending on the relations of power grounding it and thus defining its meaning. For instance, this means that processes like the Croatian Spring (1968-1971), the protests of Kosovo's Albanians and Serbs (1980s), the anti-bureaucratic revolution of Milošević's supporters (1988-1990), and the coming to power of the CDU party, could not have been determined by national interests that pre-existed the concrete system of social relations and practices they were situated in. Rather, they can be viewed as struggles that aimed at transforming and/or subverting the terms of social unity, in response to which they emerged.

Furthermore, since the meaning of social objects, subjects, and relations is both fixed and changed through political struggles, there is nothing inevitable or determined in the outcome(s) that are produced. The meanings that become dominant, or hegemonic in PDT terms, are contingent upon the political process itself and the historical context that shapes it.[68] In this sense, the hegemonic representation of the Croatian democratic subject in the post-socialist period can be viewed as contingent upon the political strug-

[66]Finlayson, "Ideology, Discourse and Nationalism", p. 105.

[67]David Howarth. *Discourse*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2000, pp. 104-105; and Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso, 2001, p. 111.

[68]Ernesto Laclau. *The Making of Political Identities*. London: Verso, 1994, p. 3; Aletta J. Norval. "Theorising Hegemony: between Deconstruction and Psychoanalysis". In: *Radical Democracy: Politics Between Abundance and Lack*. Ed. by Lars Tønder and Lasse Thomassen. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005, p. 8; and Howarth, *Discourse*, pp. 109-110.

gles in Yugoslavia and the systems of meaning these struggles were embedded in. From this perspective, the new form of unity could thus not have been determined by Yugoslavia's economic, institutional and/or cultural practices exclusively, nor by teleological processes like democratic transition and/or nation-state formation. According to PDT, these practices and processes themselves were internal to the category of discourse, since they could not have been rendered intelligible outside of a meaningful system of representation.[69] While Yugoslavian economic, institutional and cultural practices and processes of democratization did impact the form that the CDU's nationalist discourse took, from this perspective they could not have caused it, nor determined its constitutive parts in a linear fashion.

PDT offers conceptual tools for tracing the constitutive practices behind discursive representations and accounting for the universalization of particular discursive formations into a shared common sense. For analytical purposes, it distinguishes between two dimensions of discourse; discourse as a process, which refers to its (particular) emergence and universalization, and discourse as a representative structure, which refers to its internal representations and the mechanisms which structure them. The first dimension treats discourse as a diachronic/genealogical phenomenon evolving over time, while the second focuses on its working at a particular point of time. Although in practice both dimensions are constitutive of each other to the extent that they cannot be fully grasped independently, for pragmatic and analytical purposes, different sets of conceptual tools are deployed to account for them.

#### 2.3.1.1 Discourse as a diachronic phenomenon: myth, imaginary, dislocation, identity and ideology

Accounting for discourses as horizons of intelligibility developing over time necessitates mapping their movement from the domain of the particular to the universal and/or vice-

[69]PDT understands discourses as more than sets of beliefs/ideas shared by politicians and social movements about the nature of social relations. They are horizons of representation constitutive of all social practices and relations. See: Howarth and Stavrakakis, "Introducing Discourse Theory and Political Analysis", p. 4.

versa. Since, according to PDT, reality always transgresses the boundaries of what is represented through political concepts and identities within discourses, the movement from the particular to the universal is contingent upon the historical context and relations of power that shape it. As such, universal forms of discourse are vulnerable to the forces that have been excluded in the process of their constitution and to events that are beyond their control, but can still disrupt the semantic efficiency of constitutive representations. For instance, the hegemonic representation of social unity in post-WWII Yugoslavia was constituted through the universalization of the discourse of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. During the war, the communist representation was a particularity that competed for hegemony with various other representations of social unity, most notably the ustaša (Croatian-Nazi) and the četnik (Serbian-monarchist) representation. The communist representation of the Yugoslavian identity, as the hegemonic form of social unity, was carved out of the war-context and the party's reading of history. However, this representation was refashioned after the Tito-Stalin split in 1948 to include the notion of workers' self-management. In this sense, discourses move from the domain of the particular to the universal, and universal representations transform in relation to changing circumstances.

This example also illustrates one of PDT's central assumptions, namely that there is always a surplus of meaning that can overflow signification fixed within a system of representation and subvert it.[70] Since the hegemonic representation of Yugoslavian identity was fixed in and through hegemonic struggles that originated in a particularity, it could potentially be subverted as it was by 1990, when different nation-centred systems of representation universalized in its constitutive republics. Precisely because there is always a surplus of meaning behind universal representations, already existing terms (such as 'nation', 'sovereignty', 'self-determination', etc.) could acquire different meanings in this process and form part of nation-centred systems of representation. Furthermore, since the surplus of meaning was present, although not necessary visible, even when the Yugoslavian system representation seemed like a universal common sense, there was always room for contestations and struggles about the meaning of terms, even within the scope

[70]This assumption is captured under the term 'field of discursivity' in PDT terminology. See: Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, p. 111.

of its universality. For instance, the Croatian Spring movement and the politicizations of Kosovo's Serbs/Montenegrins and Albanians were made possible precisely because the representation of the terms 'nation' and 'equality' could not be fully exhausted by the Yugoslavian horizon.

The subversion of a dominant system of representation – constitutive subjectivities, practices and institutions – boils down to instances when its representational failures become visible, and its terms of unity contestable. According to PDT, the moments (events) that disrupt representational orders are called 'dislocations'. The representative disruptions are the precondition of hegemonic struggles since the latter emerge as attempts to suture the former through (new) fixations of meaning.[71] For instance, in the Yugoslavian context, the introduction of market forces into a centrally planned socialist economy in the '60s and the death of Josip Broz Tito (1980), the effective hegemon in Yugoslavia, can be viewed as dislocatory events that opened up the space for contesting the hegemonic system of representation.

According to PDT, dislocations, hegemonic struggles and politics are possible precisely because it is impossible to base a particular form of social unity in an essence that transcends its discursive representation. If there was a fixed, extra-discursive point against which particular discursive representations of unity could be measured, it would mean that social reality, as a totality, could become fully and accurately represented. It would also mean that politics, as a struggle to define the terms of representing social unity, could be halted. In the Croatian case, for instance, this would mean that the nation could have been represented in its 'actual' form in the post-socialist period, after a history of its misrepresentation. Equally so, this would mean that the Yugoslavian communists could have calculated, as they claimed they did, an appropriate legislative and ideological formula to resolve 'the national question' once and for all. However, since, according to PDT, every representation of identity, 'socialist', 'democratic' or 'nationalist', is moulded out a

[71] Dislocation is the primarily ontological level of the constitution of the social and is a central phenomenon of the discourse analytical approach to the study of politics because it is the condition of its possibility. See: Ernesto Laclau. *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time*. London: Verso, 1990, p. 44. For an account on the relationship between dislocation and identity see: ibid., p. 39. For an account of dislocation in relation to the movement between myth and imaginary see: ibid., pp. 61-69.

particularity, its universality rests in power not in objectivity. From this perspective the 'nation' cannot be immutably fixed into an essence that transcends its representations. In the long run, through dislocations, the surplus of meaning will overflow the systems of representation within which it is constituted and new readings of its meaning emerge.

'Myth' and 'imaginary' are the conceptual tools that PDT deploys, to map the movement of a discourse from the particular to the universal and vice-versa. Bound up with them, as both their conditions of possibility and constitutive forms, are the concepts of 'dislocation', which I have already discussed, as well as 'demand', 'identity' and 'ideology'.

A myth is a discourse associated with the experience of a particular group.[72] It emerges in times of dislocation when a hegemonic system of representation fails to represent emerging social demands and operates by reading the situation under different terms, thereby constructing a new space of representation. In this sense, myths are associated with alternatives to existing spaces of representation, their constitutive institutions, practices and identities.[73] According to this perspective, the politicizations of Kosovo's Serbs/Montenegrins and Albanians can be viewed as new myths that emerged in moments when the hegemonic system of forging social unity failed to represent their demands. Similarly, the new democratic parties that emerged in SR Croatia can be viewed as attempts to construct new spaces of representation out of the failures of the Yugoslavian space to represent events on the ground.

A myth that does succeed in becoming a (new) universal space of representation expands into a horizon that acts as the surface of inscription for the ordering of all social relations and transforms into an imaginary. It is no longer of the same order as social objects, identities, relations and institutions. Rather, it becomes the limit structuring the social field and the condition of possibility for the constitution of all social objects, institutions, practices, rules of conduct and identities.[74] For instance, despite being the product of a particular (communist) party, Yugoslavism expanded into an imaginary hori-

[72]Aletta J. Norval. *Deconstructing Apartheid Discourse*. London: Verso, 1996, p. 9.

[73]Laclau, *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time*, p. 61; and Norval, "Trajectories of Future Research in Discurse Theory", p. 124.

[74]Laclau, *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time*, p. 62; and Norval, *Deconstructing Apartheid Discourse*, p. 9.

zon that ordered all social relations, institutions and identities on a delimitated territory, from 1945 until the dissolution of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in 1990. In this sense, Yugoslavism can be viewed as an imaginary horizon.

Myths and imaginaries signify a different discursive modality in terms of the inclusiveness of political demands; a myth is based on a demand associated with a particular group while an imaginary operates by incorporating a wide range of demands and groups within its representative field.[75] Once a myth has expanded into an imaginary, its mythical origins and the indeterminacy of the social are covered up.[76] From the diachronic/genealogical perspective, politics as a process is understood as this very movement and the question of identity formation and reproduction is central to it.[77] By representing society as a coherent entity and covering up indeterminacy, discourses also produce images for individual and collective identification. Both the Yugoslavian imaginary, and the nation-centred myths that emerged out of its ruins, produced particular systems of representative identities such as class, nation, citizenship and minority. According to PDT, these identities were not containers of innate characteristics that exhaust all possibilities of representation. They were instead produced through hegemonic struggles and acted as a symbolic cover for indeterminacy.

For pragmatic and analytic purposes, PDT views political identities as two-sided. On the one hand, they are conferred upon social agents in the form of 'subject positions' embedded in hegemonic horizons of meaning. On the other, social agents form them in moments when the conferred images fail to represent emerging social demands and agents become (active) 'political subjects'.[78] Although both cover over indeterminacy, subject positions perform that function within the imaginary order, and 'political subjectivities' within the mythical order of discourse. This distinction allows differentiation between the Yugoslavian socialist identity/Croatian democratic identity, as subject positions conferred upon social agents through institutional forms and instances such as the Croatian Spring, the protests of Kosovo's Serbs/Montenegrins and Albanians, and the emergence

[75]Howarth, *Discourse*, p. 111.
[76]Laclau, *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time*, p. 69.
[77]Norval, *Deconstructing Apartheid Discourse*, p. 301.
[78]Howarth, *Discourse*, pp. 108-109.

of democratic parties in 1989, as expressions of political subjectivity that contested the hegemonic system of representation and/or the institutional forms embedded in them. Although all of these examples can be viewed as expressions of political identity, they were significantly different in form.

According to PDT, the precondition for the emergence of political subjectivity is the failure of subject positions within a discursive horizon to offer a meaningful framework for representing emerging social demands.[79] In the previous example, this meant that the Croatian Spring movement, the politicizations in Kosovo, and the new democratic parties, were not just contestations of the institutionalised forms of identity, but that these contestations were preconditioned by the failure of the institutionalised forms. In the Croatian case, this means that understanding the emergence of the nationalist CDU party necessitates understanding the failure(s) of the subject positions rooted in the Yugoslavian imaginary, since these failures formed the discursive conditions of possibility for its emergence. Most importantly, the emergence of the party's 'nationalist' project cannot be accounted for in terms of an expression of the same national identity that manifested itself in the Croatian Spring, nor as a natural response to Serbian nationalism, which allegedly threatened the existence of the Croatian nation. From this perspective, the Croatian Spring and 'Serbian nationalism' were manifestations of political subjectivity that emerged in response to, and with the aim of refashioning, the terms of social division instituted by the Yugoslavian imaginary.

Furthermore, following the presuppositions of PDT, the relationship between the CDU's political discourse on the one hand, and the contestations of the Croatian Spring movement and Serbian nationalism on the other, can be understood in terms of the impact the two had on the terms of social division instituted by the Yugoslavian imaginary and thus on the context of the CDU's emergence. These impacts can be specified in terms of what James Tully calls the 'practices of freedom' of those governed by particular 'forms of government' and 'forms of subjection' constitutive of an imaginary horizon. As contestation processes, practices of freedom can take up two forms. They can be di-

[79]Laclau, *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time*, p. 61; and Norval, "Theorising Hegemony: between Deconstruction and Psychoanalysis", pp. 86-87.

rected at particular rules that are conferred through subject positions with the aim of their transformation without challenging the locus of power. Or they can be directed against the very terms of subjection, with the aim of their complete redefinition and the rearticulation of power relations.[80] Within this analytic framework, constitutional arrangements can be viewed as objects of the imaginary order of discourse, since their very aim is to constitute a unified representation of society by substantiating its identity and fixing institutional forms for its realisation. According to James Tully, subject positions, normative principles that inform identification, fixed rules of political conduct, fixed procedures and institutions for discussion, and the alternation of the hegemonic system of rules and constitutions, attribute a society with an identity.[81] I would add that, in doing so, they organize/structure the terrain of legitimate politics, which is situated within the boundaries of an imaginary. Tully's differentiation of political contestations in terms of their impact on the rules constitutive of an imaginary horizon makes an account of the relationship between the Croatian Spring, Serbian nationalism, and the nationalist CDU that does not reproduce the CDU's own representation of this relationship, possible. This can be done by examining their respective relations to the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon and its constitutive system of rules.

Following the ontological presuppositions of PDT, identity can only be grasped in terms of difference. Conferring subject positions through a constitutional order or creating new forms of political subjectivity through contestations, necessitates drawing together different demands and interests into a unified representative space and equalising them through a common denominator. To generate sameness, something external has to be fixed in relation to which all that is included is rendered identical. In this process, lines that delineate what is included from that what is excluded are drawn, giving rise

[80]Tully also identifies following the rules as a modality of 'practices of freedom'. However, since I am interested in the movements from subject position to political subjectivity, or from myth to imaginary, following the rules means basically following the conferred rules. See: James Tully. *Public Philosophy in a New Key.* Vol. Volume I: Democracy and Civic Freedom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 22-24.

[81]Tully does not deploy the term 'constitute' but to 'recognise'. Given the ontological assumptions discussed in the course of this chapter, Tully's term is, in the ontological sense limited, since it implies that there is 'something' external to these systems of rules, that can be better or worse recognised by the constitutional document. For that reason, I have modified his framework in line with the ontological assumptions of PDT. See: ibid., p. 195.

to a 'constitutive outside'[82] in relation to which identity attains a positive meaning. According to PDT, the lines that delimit identities and institute forms of social divisions are called 'political frontiers'.[83] Politics emerges out of the perpetual tension between what identities represent (sameness) and their origins (difference and/or exclusion). Ontologically, this means that all identities are non-sutured, although the extent to which their non-sutured character is visible depends on the political conjunction and the degree of the dislocation of the hegemonic system of rules.[84] From this perspective, both the Yugoslavian identity and the post-socialist Croatian identity were thus rooted in (particular) exclusions thorough which identity as sameness was produced. Understanding their nature necessitates examining both the exclusions they were forged out of and their operation in practice. Furthermore, since the drawing of political frontiers is not confined to the domain of dominant imaginary horizons/subject positions but is equally constitutive of political subjects/myths, the identities and demands articulated by the CDU, the Croatian Spring movement, and Serbian nationalist movement, were also founded upon particular exclusions that delimited these projects and in relation to which they attained meaning.

PDT views ideology as that which renders identity sutured and produces a sense that social fullness is founded in an extra-discursive essence that transgresses the political terrain. Ideology operates by eternalizing and naturalizing existing terms of social division, its myths of origin, its institutional rules and practices, and images for identification.[85] Furthermore, although ideologies are based on sets of ideas and beliefs about the nature of politics, according to PDT they are not confined to the semantic domain. Rather, ideology is understood as constitutive of the very process of identity formation and reproduction,

[82]Constitutive outside is a term coined by Henry Staten in his reading of Derrida. See: Henry Staten. *Wittgenstein and Derrida*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986 For Laclau's usage of the concept in relation to politics and identity formation see: Laclau, *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time*, pp. 17-18; and Lasse Thomassen. "In/Exclusions: Towards a Radical Democratic Approach to Exclusions". In: *Radical Democracy: Politics Between Abundance and Lack*. Ed. by Lars Tønder and Lasse Thomassen. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.

[83]Norval, *Deconstructing Apartheid Discourse*, p. 4 For a summary of the role frontiers play in the political process according to Laclau and Mouffe and the limitations of their account see: Aletta J. Norval. "Frontiers in Question". In: *Filozofski Vesnik* 18.2 (1997).

[84]Norval, *Deconstructing Apartheid Discourse*, p. 5. See in particular footnote 19, p. 308.

[85]Aletta J. Norval. "Review Article: The Things We Do with Words-Contemporary Approaches to the Analysis of Ideology". In: *British Journal of Political Science* 30.2 (2000), p. 316.

because it works by decontesting the bonds between political concepts, historical narratives, and identities.[86] In this sense, by gluing together the building blocks of discursive formations, ideology normalizes its forms of identification and their constitutive exclusions. For instance, in the Croatian case, the transition from (Yugoslavian) self-managing socialism to multiparty-democracy was represented as the end of ideological 'distortions' and the beginning of 'real' politics. Through this narrative, the new democratic subject was normalized into one that seemed not to be based in any exclusion. This point was made in contrast to the Yugoslavian order, which was highly ideologized, distorted, and exclusive. From the perspective of PDT, this very narrative can be viewed as the product of ideology. In this sense, the difference between the post-socialist and the socialist order is a matter of ideological form not of ideological presence and absence.

#### 2.3.1.2 Discourse as a synchronic phenomenon: discursive formations, logics of equivalence and difference, moments, elements, nodal points and empty signifiers

Accounting for discourse as a system of rules that confers meaning in a specific point of time necessitates explaining the linking of its constitutive parts (identities, concepts, demands) and the dissolution of bonds. Since reality always transgresses the boundaries of what is represented, 'discursive formations'[87] that appear decontested at a specific point of time can always be re-contested, internally transformed, or re-arranged into new semantic formations.

According to PDT, the processes of linking up and dissolving discursive building blocks

[86]Michel Freeden deploys 'decontestation' to explain the manner in which ideologies operate. He maintains that ideologies aim at ending the contentions of their constitutive political concepts by fixing their meanings. In this sense, ideologies understood to be configurations of decontested meanings of political concepts. See: Michael Freeden. *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 54-55, 76. I deploy 'decontestation' as a term that relates to both political concepts and political identification. For an analysis of the strengths and limitations of Freeden's understanding of ideology and decontestation from a poststructuralist perspective see: Norval, "Review Article: The Things We Do with Words-Contemporary Approaches to the Analysis of Ideology".

[87]The mutifarious subject positions, institutions, rituals and practices fixed into a system of difference through the practice of articulation. See: Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, p. 109; and Howarth, *Discourse*, p. 102.

follow two different logics, that of equivalence and that of difference.[88] The former refers to the process of dissolving particularities within a discourse, by equating various demands and condensing them under a common denominator.[89] Equivalence in difference is most radically forged once a common enemy is proclaimed and an 'antagonistic outside' defined.[90] For instance, national mobilizations against a common enemy are an example of the logic of equating differentiated social identities and interests and condensing them into sameness. In the Croatian case, the discursive field was structured by the logic of equivalence after the proclamation of the 1990 Constitution and the outbreak of the armed conflict between the Croatian Serbs and the Yugoslav People's Army on the one hand, and 'the Croatian nation' and 'its' army on the other. Within this discursive field, 'Serbs', 'Slobodan Milošević', and the 'Yugoslavian Army' were drawn together into a single representative system, antagonistic to the Croatian nation and attributing it with a positive meaning. This is an example of an antagonism that translated into a violent war, and it thus illustrates the logic of equivalence and antagonism in a very immediate manner. However, the same logic was also constitutive of the working class identity in Yugoslavia, which was the product of the homogenization of several differentiated identities (nation, gender, class, religion) and their representation as equivalent and united against a set of 'anti-social forces'.

The logic of difference refers to the process of dissolving an existing chain of equivalence and the emergence of differentiated demands and identities.[91] This process is characterized by the complexification of meaning and the visibility of different/particular interests within a community. In these instances, political frontiers are not articulated in antagonistic terms and the social field is criss-crossed with a variety of discursive formations. The same process can be illustrated with the examples of national identity and working-class identity. Once the common enemy threatening them is not pinpointed as a source that actively works against national or class interests, and thus gives these identities a

[88]See: Howarth and Stavrakakis, "Introducing Discourse Theory and Political Analysis", pp. 11-12 for examples of the workings of the logics of equivalence and difference and their relationship to political antagonisms.

[89]Howarth, *Discourse*, p. 120.

[90]Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, p. 125.

[91]Howarth, *Discourse*, p. 120.

meaning, these identities differentiate from within.

In the Croatian case, the process of internal (national) political differentiation into a variety of left wing, right-wing, and regional identities in the post-war period, led 'nationalists' to make a paradoxical observation. Namely, that Milošević, whom they deemed to be the enemy of the 'nation', could in fact be honoured with a statue in Croatia because he managed to generate a Croatian political homogeneity during the war, unlike any Croatian regime in the post-war period.[92] This position captures the logics of difference and equivalence underlying collective identity formation and shows the role that frontiers, antagonisms, and enemies play in creating sameness out of multiplicity.

The operation of these two logics in the construction of political frontiers can be further substantiated in reference to the Gramscian idea of transformism; or the gradual and continuous absorption and domestication of 'active elements' produced by allied groups, even those which come from antagonistic groups'. Expressed in terms of logics, a transformist political project is characterised by attempts to expand the systems of difference that define a hegemonic formation. A successful transformist project results in a decrease in antagonisms and the broadening of the hegemonic formation, while a failing one in the solidification of frontiers into clear-cut antagonisms.[93] For instance, the anti-bureaucratic revolution can be understood in terms of a Yugoslavian transformist project since it attempted to include the emerging demands of the Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins and the Serbian intellectuals within the framework of the hegemonic formation, through their absorption by LC Serbia. Its failure at the all-Yugoslavian level produced a discursive field characterised by clear-cut antagonisms, which eventually contributed to the dissolution of the country.

Although the two logics describe different states of the 'discursive field', they do not specify the nature of the constitutive parts of discursive formations. For this purpose PDT deploys the concepts of 'articulation' 'elements', 'moments', 'empty signifiers', 'floating signifiers', and 'nodal points'.

Articulation is the practice of establishing relations between basic discursive units,

[92]For instance, see: Vujević, "Nacionalna identifikacija u Hrvatskoj".
[93]Norval, "Trajectories of Future Research in Discurse Theory", p. 220.

or 'elements', in such a way that their meaning/identity is modified as a result of the practice and they are transformed into 'moments' of a particular discursive formation.[94] The practice of articulation results in the (partial) fixing of meaning of political concepts (freedom, equality, justice, democracy, etc.) and identities (workers, individuals, nations, minorities, women, etc.). Since reality always transgresses the boundaries of what is represented through articulatory practices, the same concepts and identities can attain different meanings within different discursive formations. Furthermore, depending on the political conjuncture and the state of the discursive field, different articulations of the same concepts and identities can also co-exist and/or compete for hegemony. The practice of articulation is possible precisely because the transformation of 'elements' into 'moments' of discourse is never fully completed.[95] For instance, in the Croatian case, the articulation of the term 'nation' had undergone a series of semantic transformations depending on the historical context that it was embedded in and the source of power that fixed its meaning. In 1945-1990, the same term travelled from being articulated within the framework of a broader Yugoslavian identity to being represented as an internally homogenous identity, sometimes politically different from, and at other times completely antagonistic to, other South Slavic identities. This semantic trajectory was possible precisely because 'nation' was never fully fixed into a 'moment', despite the fact that it often seemed as though this transformation was completed.

Ideology plays a central role in the articulation of elements into moments of discourses. Well-established ideologies, such as communism or liberalism, provide ordering principles for elements because they decontest certain conceptual patterns and discriminate against others in an a priori fashion. These conceptual patterns are translatable to political practices, identities, and institutions.[96] Communism, for instance, defines its enemies as 'imperialists', 'capitalists' and 'bourgeois nationalists' and articulates in opposition the subject position 'working class' that embodies a universal identity. This articulation of identity is bound up with a specific articulation of the elements 'nation', 'freedom' 'eman-

[94]Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, p. 105.
[95]Ibid., pp. 106-107.
[96]Freeden, *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach*, pp. 54-55; and Norval, "Review Article: The Things We Do with Words-Contemporary Approaches to the Analysis of Ideology".

cipation', 'democracy', and 'equality'. Within this semantic constellation, 'democracy' cannot be articulated with 'multi-partyism' nor can 'emancipation' be articulated with the 'bourgeoisie'. Similarly, liberalism defines 'democracy' through subject positions such as 'individual', 'nation' and 'minority'. The subject positions 'working class' and 'bourgeoisie' are in principle absent from the liberal constellation. This articulation of identity is bound up with a specific articulation of 'freedom', 'democracy' and 'equality. Within this semantic constellation 'democracy' is articulated with 'multi-partyism' and 'freedom' with 'individual'.

However, although well-established ideologies provide blueprints for articulatory practices, the particular context they are embedded in also has to be articulated through these constellations. In this sense, there is nothing determined about how a particular well-established ideology translates into a particular discursive system of representation. Without being enacted in a specific context, well-established ideologies remain at a level of abstraction and fail to found actual institutions, practices, and identities on the ground. In the Yugoslavian case, this means that one has to take the (universal) communist ideology seriously, as well as examine the particular demands, identities (subject positions and political subjectivity), institutions, and rules that were inscribed into its constitutive elements ('working class', 'justice', 'imperialism', and 'equality') to understand the hegemonic order. Similarly, to be able to understand the working of 'liberal democracy' in Croatia's transition, it is necessary to examine how the context was inscribed into the meanings of the elements 'citizen', 'nation', and 'freedom', etc., once the political landscape was pluralised. Neither can be understood exclusively in terms of the universal ideological framework which they claimed to embody.

To be able to grasp the working of ideology at the level of specificity and, at the same time, take into account the semantic biases constitutive of established ideologies, PDT deploys a set of conceptual tools for assessing the semantic force that specific moments of discourse exercise in defining the representative structure.

The concept 'nodal point' refers to elements of discourse that gather other elements together and colour their meanings. These moments are semantically privileged because

they dictate the common sense of the space of representation.[97] For example, articulating 'communism' or 'liberalism' with 'justice', 'freedom' and 'democracy' gives rise to radically different representative structures, precisely because the former terms are semantically privileged over the others. 'Communism' and 'liberalism' infuse 'justice', 'freedom', and 'democracy' with different meanings and the difference is translatable to social relations and institutions.

There are two further specifications of the points that partially fix meaning within a discourse. The concept 'empty signifier' denotes a nodal point that attempts to embody the impossible, the full closure of the social field and the fullness of a community. Empty signifiers are ideals around which a discursive structure is centred, but which can never be fully achieved.[98] Generally speaking, 'communism' can be understood as a nodal point that embodies the fullness of society, which cannot be achieved, although the ideology is structured around the belief that it will be achieved in the future. In the Yugoslavian case, 'self-management' can be viewed as an empty signifier through which the Yugoslavian working class, and its constitutive nations and nationalities were articulated into a coherent representative structure and the social field thus given a seeming closure. Similarly, in the Croatian case, the empty signifier the 'Croatia nation-state' played a unifying role; through this nodal point different identities were represented as constitutive elements of the Croatian national body, while others were expelled from it. Empty signifiers define and delimit the terrain in which political relations are constituted, and thus produce certain exclusions.[99]

According to PDT, 'hegemonic operations' are reflected in the presentation of the particularity of the group as the incarnation of the empty signifier that refers to the social order as an 'unfulfilled' reality.[100] Not every element is equally predisposed for taking

[97]Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, pp. 112-113. In the former example 'communism' and 'liberalism' are privileged over the elements 'democracy', 'freedom', and 'justice,' fix the meaning of the latter. Articulating 'communism' and articulating 'liberalism' with 'justice', 'freedom' and 'democracy' in a chain of equivalences gives rise to radically different representative structures.

[98]Laclau, *Emancipations(s)*, pp. 36-37.

[99]Norval, "Theorising Hegemony: between Deconstruction and Psychoanalysis", p. 86; and Thomassen, "In/Exclusions: Towards a Radical Democratic Approach to Exclusions", pp. 104-106.

[100]Laclau, *Emancipations(s)*, p. 44.

up the role of an empty signifier. The struggles for hegemony operate within particular contexts, with a particular historical baggage, and the outcomes of previous struggles are inscribed in the existing representative structures. In this sense, a particular context limits which nodal point can become an empty signifier and what that specific form of fullness will include and exclude.

Conceptually, the existence of empty signifiers in society corresponds with the notion of imaginary and subject positions. In the Croatian case, for instance, the signifiers 'Croatian nation-state', 'self-determination', and 'national identity', were not newly introduced in the 1990s. On the contrary, these terms were constitutive of the Yugoslavian imaginary and articulated within a representative structure whose fullness was incarnated in the empty signifier 'self-management'. This past inevitably shaped the meanings these terms could acquire in the post-socialist period. In this sense, understanding the emergence of the nationalist CDU party, without reproducing its own political discourse, necessitates looking into the semantic shifts that these terms underwent and fleshing out the political struggles underlying them.

According to PDT, 'floating signifiers' are terms that are subject to a great deal of contestation and, as a result, have no clearly delimitated meaning.[101] They are floating between being 'elements' and 'moments'. Due to their semantic indeterminacy, floating signifiers are sources of contestations and hegemonic struggles for fixing their meaning. A hegemonic crisis, in turn, is characterized by the floating of a vast array of signifiers, including the empty signifier, and the possibility of their re-articulation into antagonistic camps.[102] As it deepens, the very nature of social division upon which the political ordering of society rests is contested and the un-sutured nature of identity is rendered visible.[103] In the Croatian case, this means that the emergence of the nationalist CDU party can be viewed in the context of the League of Communists' failure to fix the meaning of the signifier 'nation' within the hegemonic representative structure, its 'floating'

[101]Norval, "Review Article: The Things We Do with Words-Contemporary Approaches to the Analysis of Ideology", pp. 331-332.
[102]Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, pp. 113, 135-136.
[103]Norval, *Deconstructing Apartheid Discourse*, p. 219.

and the consequent emergence of competing myths as attempts to fix it. Furthermore, this means that the emergence of Sloboan Milošević in the Socialist Republic of Serbia can be understood as part of the same political process without understanding the CDU's project as having been determined by the emergence in Serbian nationalism.

### 2.3.2 Yugoslavian dissolution and the emergence of the CDU party: a discourse analytical reading

Since PDT assumes that the social is discursively constructed through historically specific systems of rules, its analytical focus is placed on the various ways in which political forces and social actors construct meanings within incomplete and undecidable structures.[104] From this perspective, 'method' is not understood as pre-constituted framework that a researcher brings to bear on the object of analysis, but as an approach that results from an encounter with a particular case or a problem. Whether particular research focuses on myths, imaginaries, political subjectivity, subject positions, logics of difference, and/or equivalence, etc., depends on upon the specific problem addressed by the analysis. Although each new application of the concepts enhances the general understanding of the specific forms and moments of discourses, PDT's primarily concern is to offer new readings of events and practices. In terms of the materials of analysis, PDT looks at different empirical material and information as discursive forms. Speeches, reports, manifestos, declarations, historical events, interviews, policies, and institutions are viewed as sets of signifying practices that constitute discourses which, in turn, enable subjects to experience the world of objects, words, and practices.[105]

In the overview of the conceptual framework and ontological presuppositions of PDT, I have already signalled the multiple ways in which this approach facilitates an explanation of the emergence of the nationalist CDU party, without reducing it to something external to the political process and, equally importantly, without reproducing its own discursive representations of reality. Furthermore, I have also shown that the approach makes a

[104]Howarth, *Discourse*, p. 129.
[105]Howarth and Stavrakakis, "Introducing Discourse Theory and Political Analysis", p. 2.

critical account of the party's emergence possible, precisely because it is equipped with the necessary tools for rendering the historically constructed nature of its representations visible in a systematic manner. In the light of the themes addressed in the literature review and the PDT framework, I aim to show, in six steps, the historicity of the party's national discourse and thus the limitations of its representations.

First, I will examine the precise manner in which the hegemonic League of Communists of Yugoslavia articulated 'national identities' within the framework of a broader Yugoslavian identity into a meaningful system of difference. I will do so through a close reading of the LCY's Party Programme from 1958, which remained its official platform until the party's dissolution in January 1990. Due to its hegemonic position and the immutability of its general theoretical framework for 30 years, this programme is crucial for understanding, at an abstract level, the system of differences instituted by the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon. I will focus on the antagonistic frontiers that were drawn in this process and the manner in which the 'positive' inside and 'negative' outside were constituted.

Second, I will examine the politicization of the Croatian nation as a form of political subjectivity during the Croatian Spring, in relation to the system of differences instituted by the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon. I will look at the different actors that participated in the politicization in the 1968-1971 period, drawing out the relationship between their demands/strategies and the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon. In terms of the materials of analysis, will look at a wider range of textual material, including the 1963 Constitution, the Declaration of the Croatian Language, keynote speeches and excerpts from interviews with communist party members, the publications of the cultural institution Matica hrvatska, student banners, transcripts of LCY Congresses, as well as secondary literature. In terms of secondary literature, I draw mostly on the analysis of the late Dennison Rusinow,[106] who was in SR Croatia at the time and had written about the events of the 1970s. I also look at other secondary sources to contextualise these events. My aim is to focus as much as possible on the sources written in the language from the period,

[106]Dennison Rusinow was one of the leading scholars on Yugoslavia, who has written extensively about the country before, during and after its dissolution.

to challenge the representation of the CDU and the Croatian Spring as constitutive of a broad and coherent Croatian national project.

Third, I will examine the manner in which Yugoslavian unity was decontested into a hegemonic system of rules and subject positions through Yugoslavia's 1974 Constitution, promulgated shortly after the suppression of the Croatian Spring. I will focus on the fixation of elements such as 'nation', 'sovereignty', 'working-class', and 'self-management', and their translation to the new institutional set-up of the Yugoslavian imaginary. This constitution is cardinal for understanding the subsequent events because it formed the system of rules in which later contestations were embedded and in relation to which they emerged.

Fourth, I will examine the 1980-1987 period through the prism of the hegemonic crisis of the LCY, which I understand to mean a crisis of representation. I will look at the institutional limitations of the constitutional rules at the federal level and the protracted economic crisis which, in synergy with the institutional limitations, translated into a political crisis within the hegemonic LCY. I will focus on the (in)ability of the hegemonic LCY to suture the dislocated space of representation and the deepening of the crisis. I will differentiate between economic and political practices for pragmatic reasons and understand them as categories internal to a system of representation. In terms of the material of analysis, I will look at a wide range of textual material which includes the LCY's Long-term Programme of Economic Stabilization, its Critical Analysis of the Political System of Socialist Self-management, party documents and excerpts from interviews with communist party members as well as public intellectuals, and background and situation reports from Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's archive, which covered the situation in Yugoslavia at the time in great detail and contain many excerpts of statements and speeches by members of the governing party. I will also draw on secondary sources from the period, as well as those written subsequently, for the purpose of contextualising these developments and debates. My aim is to draw on sources from the time as much as possible as these debates were often retroactively (mis)represented as expressions of the national antagonisms that escalated into a war, given the dissolution of the country.

Fifth, I will examine the emergence of Slobodan Milošević in 1987, within the context of the politicization of Serbian/Montenegrin and Albanian national identities in the 1980s, through the prism of the hegemonic crisis. I will focus on the manner in which the existing terms of social division were contested and the new myths that emerged through these contestation processes. In terms of the materials of analysis, will look at a wider range of textual material, which includes the 1974 Constitution, LC Serbia's documents, excerpts from interviews, speeches and statements of LCY members, a petition drawn up by Serbian intellectuals, the Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences, as well as the archives of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. I will also draw on a wide range of secondary literature to contextualize the primary literature and to further substantiate it. My aim is to focus, as much as possible, on the sources written in the language from the period, to challenge the representation of the CDU as a natural response to the Serbian national project which threatened the Croatian national body.

Finally, I will examine the CDU's emergence in the Socialist Republic of Croatia in the context of the hegemonic crisis and as an attempt to resolve it through its own reading. I will focus on drawing out the contingency and historicity of its representation of the nation by looking at its political project, as well as the political project of the League of Communists of Croatia-Party of Democratic Change and the Serbian Democratic Party, in the electoral campaign for the Croatian Constitutive Assembly. In terms of the materials of analysis, I will look at a wide range of textual material, including LC Croatia's party documents, the electoral programmes of the parties, excerpts from interviews with party members in the electoral campaign, newspaper articles from the period, the archives of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, and the Croatian 'Christmas' Constitution from 1990. I will also draw on a wide range of secondary literature to contextualize the primary literature.

# CHAPTER III

# The Frontiers of the Yugoslavian Imaginary: Self-management and Brotherhood and Unity

## 3.1 Introduction

Drawing on the theoretical framework discussed in the previous chapter, in this chapter I examine the manner in which the hegemonic League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY), articulated a space of representation to universalize its project into an imaginary horizon that served as a surface for the ordering of all social relations and institutions. As in other socialist regimes, the pivotal mechanism in asserting and reproducing LCY's hegemony was its ability to universalize the working class identity while simultaneously putting itself froward as the cardinal articulator of its interests and translating them into the institutional fabric of the country. In the Yugoslavian case, the process of universalization operated by also fixing different national identities within a single space of representation. Through a close examination of the LCY's 1958 Party Programme in this chapter I look at the boundaries of the Yugoslavian 'society' and explore how Yugoslavia's identity was defined against a set of 'others' which imbued it with a 'positive' meaning. The 1958 Party Program remained the official platform for LCY's ideological and political action until its dissolution in January 1990. Therefore, the constitutional rules as well as the contestations that I discuss in the subsequent chapters emerged in relation to this programme, either as attempts to translate it into institutions, by challenging existing political practices to 'truly' realise it, or in opposition to the very system of social divi-

sion instituted by it.

In this chapter I argue that two discursive strands made the transition from the particular to the universal possible namely, the discourses of 'brotherhood and unity' and 'self-management'. The frontiers separating the 'positive' inside of the Yugoslavian identity and its antagonistic/hostile outside were drawn through these interwoven spaces of representation, stabilizing a system of differences into an undivided meaningful whole. I also argue that the articulation of the us/them divide on a terrain structured by these discourses had the effect of splitting the identities of Yugoslavia's constitutive nations and nationalities between a 'positive' inside and a 'negative' outside, thus instituting a system of social division whereby nations were represented as both different and united in an antagonism towards a set of 'others'.

In the first section, I map out the contours of Yugoslavia's socio-political landscape in broad strokes, to delineate the context out of which the 1958 Party Program was to produce coherence/unity. This context is paramount for understanding the themes explored in subsequent chapters. In the second section, I explore the system of differences instituted by the self-management discourse. I look both into the manner in which signifiers such as 'society', 'socialism', 'politics', 'democracy', 'state', 'nations and nationalities', etc. were articulated in positive terms and into the manner in which signifiers such as 'nationalism', 'bourgeois', 'centralism', 'bureaucratism', 'liberalism', etc. were articulated as enemies threatening to subvert the positive inside. In the third section, I explore the system of differences instituted by the brotherhood and unity discourse. Much like in the previous section, I look both into the way in which signifiers such as 'nations and nationalities', 'equality', 'peace', 'order', 'progress' etc. were articulated in positive terms while 'great-Serbian hegemonism', 'centralism', 'nationalism' etc. were articulated as enemies threatening to subvert it. In the concluding section, I point to the tensions between these two discursive strands and introduce the following chapter of the thesis.

Before moving on to the analysis, it is important that the limits of my discussion are clearly specified. Given the topic of the thesis, the point of this chapter is not to investigate the actual expansion of the myth of the Communist Party into an imaginary after its

victory in World War II and the institution of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia in 1945. Similarly, the point of this chapter is not to investigate the immediate post-war period that preceded the introduction of workers self-management in Yugoslavia. Rather, both WWII and the pre-1958 period are treated in terms of their representations within the system of differences instituted by the 1958 Party Programme.

## 3.2 The Contours of the Yugoslavian Socio-Political Landscape

Making sense of the frontiers shaping the Yugoslavian identity and delimiting the 'positive' inside from the 'negative' outside necessitates describing the structural components that shaped identity politics in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). In the light of the ontological presumptions discussed in the previous chapter, it is important to stress that the components described in this subsection are not understood as essential characteristics of collective identities and/or factors driving politics in themselves. To the contrary, they are understood as political only to the extent that they are articulated within a political discourse, be it a myth or an imaginary. This is important to bear in mind since it means that the different categories mapped out here could acquire multiple and contradicting meanings, depending on the manner and context of their articulation.

The SFRY was a multinational state composed of six nations: Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians, Montenegrins and, after 1971, Muslims. No nation formed an absolute majority in the federation, but the Serbian nation formed a relative majority. Furthermore, Yugoslavia was composed of eleven nationalities, whose homeland was outside of Yugoslavia: Albanians, Hungarians, Turks, Slovaks, Bulgarians, Romanians, Ruthenes/ Ukrainians, Czechs and Italians. The nations and nationalities spread over six Socialist Republics and two Autonomous Provinces and were thus not located in geographically discrete areas. Each federal unit was multi-national, but the degree of national heterogeneity per unit varied. The nations and nationalities of Yugoslavia were also divided in historical experiences (belonging to different empires, being on opposing sides in WWI and, to a large, extent in WWII, having different state-building trajectories) and religious affilia-

tion (Orthodox, Catholic and Muslim). Historical experiences, religious affiliation and national belonging were to a large extent incongruous with the territorial-administrative units. The republics still carried the names of nations, and particular republics were still represented as corresponding to particular nations, despite their internal heterogeneity.

Administratively, the SFRY was composed of six Socialist Republics (the SR Bosnia-Herzegovina, the SR Croatia, the SR Macedonia, the SR Montenegro, the SR Serbia and the SR Slovenia) and two Socialist Autonomous Provinces (the SAP Kosovo and the SAP Vojvodina). The two Provinces were formally part of SR Serbia, making Serbia somewhat of an anomaly within the framework of the Yugoslavian federation. SAP Vojvodina was ethnically very mixed and Kosovo predominantly Albanian, but an important nodal point of Serbian nationalism. The SR Croatia was predominantly Croatian, with a significant Serbian population that traced its settlement in Croatia back to medieval times. It was concentrated geographically in specific regions, but these regions were not expressed in the internal administrative division of SR Croatia.[1] I will return back to the case of SR Serbia and its constitutive provinces in Chapter 7 and to the relationship between Croats and Croatian Serbs in SR Croatia in Chapters 4 and 8 of the thesis. The point here is to make clear that the context out of which the the Programme was to construct unity was very heterogeneous, and that the contextual features that historically informed the identity formation of Yugoslavia's constitutive nations and nationalities varied greatly. Contrary to the heterogeneity of the society, the LCY served as the space of for forging its political homogeneity. It was the (only) space of legitimate politics and it that sense the realization of the principle of pure political spatiality, together with its affiliated organizations the Alliance of Socialist and the Socialist Youth.[2] To forge a common representative space, the LCY mobilized two strands of discourse, self-management and brotherhood and unity.

[1]See Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*, pp. 16-17; and Milojko Drulović. *Self-Management on Trial*. Nottingham: Spokesman Books for the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, 1978, pp. 16-17

[2]Laclau, *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time*, p. 69; and Laclau, *Emancipations(s)*, p. 21

## 3.3 The Differential System Instituted by Self-Management

Broadly speaking, the existing literature treats self-management either from the perspective of its inception and uniqueness or from the perspective of its failures in the 1980s. The former perspective tends to treat it as an qualitative 'improvement' in socialist practice vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and the so-called 'administrative socialist'/'revolutionary statist' order that characterized Yugoslavia's immediate post-war period, until its expulsion from the Cominform (1948).[3] Western social scientists from a socialist background explored it to resolve the problem of alienation in Western and East European economies within a non-reformist model of socialism.[4] It was also studied as a particular form of industrial relations and managerial techniques rooted in a high degree of worker's participation.[5] Furthermore, both its compatibility with single party rule[6] as well as its economic efficiency have been explored.[7] The second perspective focused on assessing the model's overall performance and exploring its possibilities and limitations in the light

[3]Drulović, *Self-Management on Trial*, p. 38.

[4]See for example: Alan Whitehorn. "Alienation and Workers' Self-Management". In: *Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 16.2 (1974); Alan Whitehorn. "Yugoslav Workers' Self-Management: A Blueprint for Industrial Democracy?" In: *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 20.3 (1978); Albert Meister. *Socialisme et Autogestion; l'Expérience Yougoslave [Socialism and Self-management: the Yugoslavian experience]*. Éditions du Seuil, 1964; and Albert Meister. "Où va l'Autogestion Yougoslave? [Where is Yugoslavian Self-management going?]" In: *L Homme et la Société* 17.1 (1970), quoted in:Bogdan Denitch. "Notes on the Relevance of Yugoslav Self-management". In: *Politics and Society* 3.4 (1973), p. 474.

[5]See for example: Jiri Thomas Kolaja. *Workers' Councils: the Yugoslav Experience*. London: Tavistock Publications, 1965; Sharon Zukin. "The Representation of Working-Class Interests in Socialist Society: Yugoslav Labor Unions". In: *Politics & Society* 10.3 (1981); Gary K. Bertsch and Josip Obradovic. "Participation and Influence in Yugoslav Self-Management". In: *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* 18.3 (1979); Ichak Adizes. *Industrial Democracy: Yugoslav Style*. New York: Free Press, 1971; Marius J Broekmeyer. "Self-Management in Yugoslavia". In: *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 431.1 (1977); and Ellen T. Comisso. "The Logic of Worker (Non) Participation in Yugoslav Self-management". In: *Review of Radical Political Economics* 13.2 (1981).

[6]See for example: April Carter. *Democratic Reform in Yugoslavia: the Changing Role of the Party*. London: Frances Pinter, 1982 and James F. Sitton. "On the Political Limitations of Self-Management Socialism". In: *Social Theory and Practice* 12.2 (1986)

[7]See: Saul Estrin. *Self-management: Economic Theory and Yugoslav Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

of its failure by 1990.[8] While both perspectives answer important questions regarding Yugoslavian self-managing socialism, in this section I look at it from a different vantage point. I explore its discursive (synchronic) role in drawing the boundaries between the 'positive' Yugoslavian inside and the antagonistic outside in LCY's Party Programme. In this sense, my analysis touches upon aspects from both perspectives but it looks at them from the vantage point of LCY's representation of social unity and division.

The LCY represented self-management as the social and political foundation of socialist-democracy in Yugoslavia, as a form of 'true democratic unity and a contributing factor to the internal stability of society'.[9] In economic terms it embodied a specific form of production relations, whereby it was possible to realise 'the principle of awarding everybody according to his labour in the forms corresponding to the achieved degree of development of the forces of production'.[10] Since it structured both the economic and the political terrain, the nodal point 'self-management' represented the very essence of Yugoslavian unity.

Cardinal political concepts were also represented within a discourse semantically defined by it. The element 'society' was articulated as becoming towards a community of self-managing producers.[11] Within this framework the term carried two meanings, signifying both the path to be taken to realise socialism and socialism as a state of collective being wherein social antagonisms are obliterated.[12] The element 'man' was also articulated through the nodal point self-management and the essence of his/her humanity represented as managing the products of his/her labour and cooperating with others in a self-managing socialist community.[13] The element 'politics' was also articulated through

[8]See for example: Josip Županov. "Self-Managing Socialism: the End of a Utopia". In: *Politička misao* 26.4 (1989); James Simmie and Jože Dekleva, eds. *Yugoslavia in Turmoil: after Self-management?* London: Piner Publishers, 1991; Saul Estrin. "Yugoslavia: The Case of Self-Managing Market Socialism". In: *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5.4 (1991); Diane Flaherty. "Self-Management and the Future of Socialism: Lessons from Yugoslavia". In: *Science and Society* 56.1 (1992); Monty L. Lynn, Matjaz Mulej, and Karin Jurse. "Democracy without Empowerment: the Grand Vision and Demise of Yugoslav Self-management". In: *Management Decision* 40.8 (2002); and Harold Lydall. *Yugoslavia in Crisis.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

[9]*Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije [The Programe of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia].* Beograd: Kultura, 1958, pp. 171, 181.

[10]Ibid., p. 159.

[11]Ibid., p. 135.

[12]Ibid., p. 133.

[13]Ibid., p. 154.

self-management, since it came to signify direct citizen participation in all spheres of life and the resolution of conflicts in the social spheres through (self-managing) participatory practices.[14] In this sense, it determined the meaning of the element 'Yugoslavian socialist democracy', since the latter was represented as the participation of the masses in economic and political decision-making through self-managing practices. By engaging in self-managing practices, the Yugoslavian working class would gradually bring about a new type of socio-political order and bridge the gap between particular and common (Yugoslavian) interests.[15] Furthermore, the element 'state' was also articulated through the signifier. In the course of time and with the development of self-managing practices, the state was to transform from being an instrument of power into being a channel for collective social self-management. This new state-formation would be rooted in the awareness of the shared interests of all working people and in the specific needs of their organizations of production.[16] 'Economic equality' was also articulated through self-management, since through its practise full economic equality was expected to be realised eventually.[17]

Self-management also played a cardinal role in the representation of the 'nations and nationalities'. Their (economic and cultural) equality was to be realised through decentralisation and the development of self-managing practices in the communes and republics, within the framework of common federal interests.[18] In this sense, the nodal point also fixed the meaning of the nations and nationalities as subjects of politics in the Yugoslavian federal order and of the territorial units as sites for national and working class self-management.[19] The link between the territorial units and the nations was not specified, leaving room for ambiguity and undecidability in their actual content. The territorial units were represented as corresponding to national differences but not expressing social divisions. This articulation was possible precisely because the essence of territorial units, and the shared interest of all the nations and nationalities were fixed by the the signi-

[14] *Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije [The Programe of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia]*, p. 153.
[15] Ibid., pp. 166, 171.
[16] Ibid., p. 121.
[17] Ibid., p. 133.
[18] Ibid., pp. 172, 192.
[19] Ibid., pp. 135, 172, 180-181.

fier self-management. In addition, the working class whose interests were identical with the progressive interests of mankind was represented as the primary subject responsible to bring about self-management, not the nations and nationalities. The latter were represented as realising their 'independence', 'self-determination' and 'cultural equality' through self-management, and were thus assigned a politically more passive role.[20]

In the economic terrain, the elements 'market', 'social property' and 'enterprise' were also represented through the nodal point; the first as controlled to be a tool for self-management, the second as an object of self-management and the third as the site of self-management.[21] The meaning of progress was also determined by the nodal point self-management as the transformation of producers into direct managers of the production and re-distribution process.[22] The role LCY was represented ambiguously within the discourse. On the one hand, it was defined as a weapon of the working class in the class struggle and a force that directs the workers efforts toward the positive aim of building self-management. On the other hand, its leading role was expected to disappear with the strengthening of direct participatory democracy/self-management. Much like the state, the LCY was expected to wither away in perspective and make room for workers' self-management.[23]

The 'positive' terrain articulated through the nodal point self-management was produced through a determinate relation to a set of 'others'. The presence of antagonistic forces was deployed by the party as a legitimization for its hegemonic role in society.[24] Broadly speaking, the forces antagonistic to self-management were subdivided into internal an external. The external enemies were fixed as 'Soviet-socialism' and 'bourgeois liberal democracy'. The former was articulated as a deviation from true Marxism, because it concentrated power in the state-apparatus and led to the appropriation of the value produced by the state instead of the working class:

> [In the Soviet Union] the Marxist-Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the prole-

[20] *Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije [The Programe of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia]*, pp. 143, 231.
[21] Ibid., pp. 135, 161.
[22] Ibid., p. 139.
[23] Ibid., p. 235.
[24] Ibid., p. 235.

> tariat as a political system of a state which is withering away and as an instrument of the struggle of the working class to dismantle the economic foundations of capitalism and creating the political and material conditions for the free development of new socialist relations [...] was transformed into Stalin's theory of the state which is not withering away, which is growing stronger in all areas of social life and whose apparatus itself plays the cardinal role in building socialism [...][25]

Soviet socialism was represented as a binary opposite of self-managing socialism since in the latter the state was not withering away and transferring power to various self-managing organizations to make the working class the primary agent in socialism. Bourgeois democracy on the other hand, was represented as a system rooted in the exploitative interests of the bourgeois class and a fundamental misrepresentation of the very essence of politics, as the LCY understood it:

> The system of bourgeois democracy [...] is just a specific form of political monopoly, shared by the leaderships of political parties. Through a sharp division of legislative and executive powers– the executive being de-facto in the hands of bureaucrats tied to the hegemonic class– the political forces of the bourgeois secure their power. This system in principle excludes direct influence of the people's masses on the execution of power and is organized so that party leaderships rule instead of the people.[26]

Bourgeois democracy was represented as a binary opposite of self-managing socialism since the latter was rooted in the universal interests of the working class which participates directly in the decision-making process.

The LCY forged Yugoslavia's identity on a terrain of positivity in between these two orders, as a fullness whose positive meaning was determined by their failures. The boundaries between the 'positive' Yugoslavian inside and the terrain of its negation were articulated as porous because the logics structuring the systems that negated and gave identity to Yugoslavian community externally were also represented as (constantly) threatening to subvert the community from within. The LCY represented these external enemies within as 'negative tendencies' that work to undermine the process of becoming towards self-management and drew 'two fronts of struggle' against them.[27]

The first front of struggle was against 'bureaucratism', and its manifestations repre-

[25] *Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije [The Programe of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia]*, p. 52.
[26] Ibid., p. 166.
[27] Ibid., pp. 55-57.

sented as 'centralism', 'etatism', 'selfish particularism' and 'nationalism'.[28] This 'enemy' would would disempower the working class and relocate power in the state's administration. The latter's interest would thus become antagonistic to that of the self-managing community of workers.[29] The LCY's programm represented bureaucratism as 'a disease which weakness the whole body of the socialist community and breaks the bonds between the leading political forces and the working class intensifying thereby internal social antagonisms'.[30] Although forms of bureaucratic centralism were represented as practices that were necessary for the consolidation of the (new) socialist order in the immediate post-war period they were represented as 'regressive' and 'dogmatic' at the present stage of development because they inhibited the 'necessary' process of the withering away of the state.[31] The second front of struggle was drawn against 'bourgeois ideology', 'opportunism', 'reformism' and 'anarchism' which worked to subvert socialism by amplifying social antagonisms, generating disorder and attempting to bring about a 'bourgeoisie liberal reform'.[32] 'Anarchism' was represented as a threat because it fully undermined the state and order and 'liberalism' because it undermined the socialist character of the state and its central role in the struggle against the remnants of bourgeoisie ideology.[33] The dissemination of bourgeois, anarchist, and liberal ideas among the working class was represented as 'regressive' since it inevitably gave rise to the need to empower the Yugoslavian state to fight them off.[34] The tendencies constituting the second front of struggle were not treated as a threat in themselves, but rather as a thereat that would inevitably give rise to the first enemy bureaucratic-centralism from within the regime. Thus, although the frontier against bureaucratic-centralism was represented as primary, it was acknowledged that the LCY would itself resort to bureaucratic-centralist practices in defence of the socialist order. This lead to a paradoxical position whereby the enemy bureaucratic-centralism was simultaneously de-legitimized and legitimized by the LCY, depending on

[28] *Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije [The Programe of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia]*, p. 149.
[29] Ibid., pp. 55, 123, 149.
[30] Ibid., p. 37.
[31] Ibid., pp. 36-55, 149-150.
[32] Ibid., pp. 56-57.
[33] Ibid., p. 122.
[34] Ibid., p. 57.

its own reading of developments on the ground.

The drawing of frontiers in this manner meant that social division did not correspond to national difference. The so called 'negative tendencies' were potentially present in all Yugoslavian nations and nationalities. The two fronts of struggle in fact cut through these identities, dividing them between the included and the excluded – 'bureaucrats', 'centralists', 'nationalists', 'liberals', 'opportunists', and/or 'anarchists' that threatened the whole community from within. The brotherhood and unity discourse, to which I turn in the next subsection, further cemented this frontier by grounding it in the WWII struggle on the Yugoslavian front.

## 3.4 The Differential System Instituted by Brotherhood and Unity

Compared to self-management which has been the topic of much academic research, the notion of brotherhood and unity of Yugoslavia's nations and nationalities is somewhat under-explored. It traces its origins to the Second World War struggle of the Anti-fascist Front in the territories of Yugoslavia. It had formed the backbone of the socialist state ever since its inception and preceded the introduction of self-management. During the war it served as a nodal point for drawing together a variety of different national identities into a common project which aspired to liberate the territories of the future SFRY from foreign occupation and to prevent the reinstitution of the old monarchical order. According to the existing literature, brotherhood and unity embodied the ideal of harmonious relations between nations and nationalities after the victory of the Communist Party and the establishment of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. The notion was 'not just a political slogan but also a key norm in the standard of relations in a multinational state'.[35] However, since it captured the very essence of the partisan victory in WWII that 'birthed' the SFRY also denoted the source of legitimacy for the socialist regime.[36] Tito's

[35]Vesna Godina. "The Outbreak of Nationalism on Former Yugoslav Territory: A Historical Perspective on the Problem of Supranational Identity". In: *Nations and Nationalism* 4.3 (1998), p. 413.

[36]See: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 54-61; and Drulović, *Self-Management on Trial*, p. 23.

speeches were marked by the constant appeals to the peoples of Yugoslavia to, above all else, preserve their brotherhood and unity.[37] Although the notion refers to about binding/connecting, it (also) operated by excluding and dividing. In this subsection, I explore brotherhood and unity from the vantage point of both social unity and the exclusions underpinning it.

The nodal point brotherhood and unity also fixed the meaning of moments into elements of discourse and delineated the 'positive' Yugoslavian inside from the 'hostile' outside that threatened to subvert it. However, while self-management embodied an ideal towards which the Yugoslavian community was to become in the future tense, 'brotherhood and unity' embodied its symbolic origins. Its meaning could not be fully separated from that of self-management because the very purpose of its preservation was to make the building of the self-managing future possible.

The brotherhood and unity discourse fused the present with the past by overdetermining the meaning of World War II on the Yugoslavian front. Through it the war was articulated as the 'National Liberation Struggle' of 'brotherly and unified' nations and nationalities against 'foreign imperialists' and 'domestic collaborators'. The victory of the communist-led Anti-fascist Front was represented as conditioned by its ability to draw members of different national background into a common struggle for 'freedom' and 'unity' against external and internal enemies .[38] Since the 'enemy' in the war was 'exceptionally strong', the victory of the materially weaker Front was attributed to the moral superiority of its brotherhood and unity strategy.[39] The war causalities and the moral superiority of the Front translated into an ethical imperative to preserve brotherhood and unity in the present and in the future. The necessity of its preservation was represented through its binary opposite namely, the intra-national slaughter on the Yugoslavian front during WWII. According to the LCY, if brotherhood and unity failed to materialize between the nations and nationalities, and national differences transformed into national

[37] Godina, "The Outbreak of Nationalism on Former Yugoslav Territory: A Historical Perspective on the Problem of Supranational Identity", p. 413.

[38] *Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije [The Programe of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia]*, p. 6.

[39] Ibid., p. 108.

divisions, WWII would be re-enacted.

The partisan's role in WWII was represented as morally superior and beyond questioning precisely because they struggled for the emancipation of the (universal) working class subject that included all the nations and nationalities and not for particular national interests. In this sense, the National Liberation Struggle and the Socialist Revolution were represented as synonymous elements within the discourse of the LCY.[40] Or to put it differently, the 'National Liberation Struggle' of the united nations and nationalities was represented as having been simultaneously the 'Socialist Revolution' of the working class:

> The peoples of Yugoslavia, the working class and the Communist Party, fighting for national liberation and socialist aims, found themselves in advanced positions and in the midst of acute international antagonisms. They had to tackle these antagonisms and accelerate social development by revolutionary means in fierce, long and bloody battles. Socialist Yugoslavia was born in and grew out of the National Liberation War and Socialist Revolution.[41]

Furthermore, the so-called 'national question' which divided the South Slavs in the Yugoslavian Monarchy and in the course of the war was represented as having been resolved through the partisan victory and the federal organization of new socialist Yugoslavia:

> The unresolved 'national question' was one of the fundamental contradictions that destroyed the socio-political order of bourgeois Yugoslavia. The Yugoslavian Communist Party has consistently articulated its position regarding the issue, which recognised the individuality, equality and self-determination of all Yugoslavian nations – the Serbs, Croats, Slovenians, Macedonians – and their unity rooted in a federal organization of the state [...] The unity of Yugoslavia is possible only on the basis of free national development and full equality of the Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians and Montenegrins, as well as national minorities. For this reason, socialist Yugoslavia was born as a federal state of equal and sovereign peoples. It could not have been created otherwise.[42]

The hegemonic LCY was represented as a bridge between the past and the present, since it attributed itself with the task of carrying on the revolutionary partisan legacy and providing the political space for materializing the unity of the nations, the nationalities and the working class.[43]

---

[40] *Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije [The Programe of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia]*, pp. 104-107.
[41] Ibid., p. 6.
[42] Ibid., pp. 191-192.
[43] Ibid., pp. 6-7, 213.

The relationship between the nations and the nationalities was also fixed through brotherhood and unity; the term brotherhood captured their differences while the term unity excluded the possibility of representing difference as (political) division. In this sense, national equality became the very essence of nations and nationalities because it was represented as the cardinal precondition of realising (their) brotherhood and unity.[44] Equality was represented as the inherent property of all regardless of population size. Or to put it differently, Yugoslavia was not attributed with minority and majority nations, neither at the federal level nor within the republics.[45] All nations, were to realise brotherhood and unity by participating equally in federal institutions and engaging in self-managerial practices.[46] The link between particular national interests and the interest of the Yugoslavian working class was also articulated in and through brotherhood and unity:

> [the brotherhood and] unity of Yugoslavia's nations is not just an national-political interest of each particular nation; it has become the social and material interest of every working man as such. Unity is based on the social character of the means of production which can be used to their fullest potential for the benefit of all only through the cooperation of all nations.[47]

In addition, the nodal points 'peace', 'order', 'progress' and 'Yugoslavian independence' were represented as preconditioned by the preservation of the brotherhood and unity of Yugoslavia's nations, nationalities and the working class in general.

The brotherhood and unity discourse fixed the limit of the 'positive' terrain in a determinate relation to a set of others around which political frontiers were constituted. Its 'enemies' derived from 'old' Yugoslavia and the 'National Liberation Struggle' which was represented as caused by its political failures. Old Yugoslavia was represented as the historical 'other' of socialist Yugoslavia because it was rooted in the interests of the Yugoslavian bourgeoisie and served as an instrument of class exploitation:

---

[44] *Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije [The Programe of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia]*, pp. 172, 191, 193-194.

[45] The term 'nationality' captured the meaning of a 'minority' but this again was not represented in numerical terms, but rather as nations whose homeland is outside of Yugoslavia. For example Hungarians, Albanians, etc.

[46] *Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije [The Programe of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia]*, p. 192.

[47] Ibid., p. 194.

> Yugoslavia came into being after the First World War, as the expression of the centuries old aspirations and struggles of the Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, Macedonian and Montenegrin people for unification. This unity was forged however, according to the terms imposed by Great Powers and it represented the class interests of the domestic bourgeoisie.[48]

Furthermore, the old order was represented as the expression of the interests of the Serbian bourgeoisie and the Serbian royal dynasty in particular, at the expense of both the Yugoslavian working class as a whole and the bourgeois classes of other nations.[49] The skewed distribution of power between the bourgeoisie of different nations in favour of the Serbian bourgeoisie was represented as the cause for the emergence of 'bourgeois separatist fascist formations' during WWII. These formations were represented as attempts to redistribute power *within* the different national bourgeoisies.[50] On the one hand, there was the bourgeoisie that affiliated its interests with the fascist occupation during WWII. These included the Croatian ustaša movement and Nedićevci and Ljotićevci in Serbia. They were represented as instruments of the foreign occupier who wanted to divide Yugoslavia from within, weaken it, and rule over it. On the other hand, there was the bourgeoisie affiliated with the old exiled government and its royal četnik army in Serbia. This 'enemy' wanted to re-establish the old order which was rooted in great-Serbian hegemony and centralism. The identity of the Communist Party was represented through its differentiation from these bourgeois enemies as the only political force capable of mobilizing the democratic forces and the working class in different nations through a universal Yugoslavian political movement against 'foreign occupiers', 'domestic supporters' and the 'old order'.[51] In this sense, according to the LCY, the antagonistic frontier between the 'particular' and 'divisive' bourgeoisie and the 'universal' and 'unified' working class drove the war in the Yugoslavian territories.

The enemies from the past also manifested themselves in the socialist present in the form of 'regressive forces' that threatened to subvert the 'positive' inside and divide the community from within. They took the form of 'national chauvinist tenden-

[48] *Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije [The Programe of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia]*, p. 93.
[49] Ibid., p. 94.
[50] Ibid., p. 95.
[51] Ibid., p. 102.

cies',‘particularistic egoistic tendencies', ‘centralism', and ‘nationalism', all of which were the expression of the the working class/bourgeoisie antagonism. The enemy from the past was externalized and frozen in time in the ‘enemy migration' which came to be overdetermined by signifiers such as ‘ustaše', ‘četnici', ‘bourgeoise' ‘Stalinists', all of those which worked towards undermining the brotherhood and unity institutionalised in Yugoslavia and overthrowing the constitutional order.[52]

The drawing of frontiers in this manner meant that social division did not correspond to national difference, since the enemies of brotherhood and unity were potentially present among all nations and nationalities. The front of struggle against them cut through these identities dividing them between (potential) ‘ustaše', ‘četnici', ‘bourgeoise', ‘royalistis' and the ‘positive' working class. Within this system of representation specific enemies were linked to specific nations in a binary manner, such as ‘good Serbs' vs. ‘četniks, royalists, centralists' and ‘good Croats' vs. ‘ustaše'. In their own way, all of the ‘enemies' around which the frontiers were constructed were represented as adopting a viewpoint foreign to the working class, the nations and nationalities and Yugoslavia as a whole.

## 3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have shown that the Yugoslavian identity as a terrain of positivity was constituted through two intertwined spaces of representation semantically determined by the signifiers ‘brotherhood and unity' and ‘self-management'. While brotherhood and unity fixed the mythical origins of the Yugoslavian imaginary in a particular interpretation of WWII, self-management fixed the meaning of that towards which the Yugoslavian

[52]The enemy migration was not mentioned explicitly in the LCY program, but it played a cardinal role in the manner in which the frontiers between inside and outside were constituted in practice. The enemy migration was represented as constantly trying overthrow the state and realise the different projects that the partisans fought against in WWII. In the post-1948 period, the Tito-Stalin split was also grafted into the signifier and it came to include ‘Stalinists' too. The manner in which the ‘nation' came to be represented in the post-socialist period was shaped by this system of exclusion. For an excellent overview of LCY's position regarding the multifaceted ‘enemy migration' see: Milenko Doder. *Jugoslavenska neprijateljska emigracija [Yugoslavia's Enemy Emigration]*. Zagreb: Centar za informacija i publicitet, 1989; for the manner in which the regime dealt with the emigration institutionally see: Ragazzi, “The Croatian “Diaspora Politics” of the 1990s: Nationalism Unbound?”

community was to become towards in the future. I have also argued that both discourses constituted frontiers that marked the limits of the Yugoslavian imaginary. Most importantly, I have argued that the two discursive strands operated by differentiating and equating national identities vis-a-vis each other while simultaneously naturalizing their internal division between included/excluded. It is only within the discursive horizon instituted by these two strands of discourse that Yugoslavian socialist patriotism attained meaning:

> [...] not antagonistic to the democratic national consciousness but its necessary internationalist supplement within the context of the socialist community of nations. It does not aspire to create a new 'Yugoslavian nation' to replace existing nations, but to [...] strengthen the socialist community of producers, the working people of all of Yugoslavia's nations, to affirm their mutual interests founded in socialist relations. This form of Yugoslavism cannot inhibit the free development of national languages and cultures, to the contrary it presupposes it.[53]

Lastly, it is important to make note of the tension between self-management, which carried the connotation of an indeterminate degree of de-centralisation and volutnarism and brotherhood and unity which implied indeterminate degree of centripentality and resonated with the notion of 'democratic centralism'. In this sense, the 'enemies' fixed by one space of representation could easily be articulated as expressed in the practices represented as legitimate within the other space of representation. This indeterminacy renders visible the non-essential character of both the 'enemies' and the Yugoslavian identity constituted in opposition to them. Any person or political movement both inside or outside of the party could occupy the 'enemy' position if the context permitted and the LCY saw necessary. Or to put it differently, the enemies were not fixed in a positive set of characteristics precisely because Yugoslavism as an identity did not have an authentic core beyond the difference from these 'others'. This constitutive indeterminacy was the condition of possibility for the emergence of the Croatian Spring movement in the late 1960s, to which I turn in the following chapter.

---

[53] *Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije [The Programe of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia]*, p. 195.

# CHAPTER IV

# The Croatian Spring: Transforming Rules and Crossing Boundaries

## 4.1 Introduction

Drawing on the theoretical framework of Chapter 2, and the social divisions discussed in Chapter 3, in this chapter I examine the politicization of the Croatian nation as a form of political subjectivity during the Croatian Spring, at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of 1970s. The 'mass movement', as it was called at the time, emerged in the context of the economic, political and constitutional reforms carried out by the LCY in the 1960s. Its main protagonists were the 'liberal' wing of the League of Communists of Croatia (LCC), the cultural institution Matica hrvatska and the Croatian Student Union. In December 1971, the movement was crushed by the LCY and many of its participants excluded from the public scene. As part of the regime's response, the leader of the Croatian Democratic Union and the first elected Croatian president Franjo Tuđman, was imprisoned for his publications in the journals of Matica hrvatska. In Chapter 8, I will show that the Croatian Spring became an important nodal point in the political project of the CDU, during the first democratic elections in 1990. In 1971, however, Belgrade's leading newspaper labelled the events as 'Yugoslavia's most serious post-war political crisis'.[1] To ensure there would be no conceptual confusion about the movement's nature, and to explain the 'objective' reasons for the exclusions in 1971, the Central Committee of the LCC adopted an

[1]Dennison I. Rusinow. "Post-Mortems of the crisis in Croatia [June 1972]". In: *Yugoslavia: Oblique Insights and Observations*. Ed. by Gale Stokes. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2008, p. 107.

extensive report which 'proved' its counter-revolutionary and nationalist character.[2]

The existing literature on the Croatian Spring can be subdivided into work published before and after Yugoslavia's dissolution. The former sees the movement as part and parcel of the federal reform of the party-state in the 1960s, and as rooted in the economic problems caused by the introduction of self-management in 1953.[3] The latter focuses on the relationship between the post-socialist democratic order and the repressed movement. Some authors trace a direct continuity between the Croatian Spring and democratic transition and see in the Croatian Spring an embryonic expression of political pluralism, national identity[4] and state independence.[5] Others contest this continuity, arguing that none of the actors involved articulated liberal-democratic demands.[6] Finally, some also maintain that the claims of continuity are just a retroactive inscription of the post-socialist present onto the socialist past, that forms part of the a broader struggle for a 'better past' in the post-1990 period.[7]

In this chapter I account for the movement without reducing it to the conditions of its emergence or to developments in the post-1989 period. I argue that its actors aimed at transforming the articulation of forces between federal and republican institutions within the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon and that the movement can only be understood in relation to the system of social division discussed in the previous chapter. In this sense, the Croatian Spring was neither the beginning of something that was only realised in 1990, nor an inevitable consequence of the political and economic reform initiated by the

[2]Savez Komunista Hrvatske; Centralni Komitet. *Hrvatsko proljeće: presuda Partije [The Croatian Spring: the Verdict of the Party].* Zagreb: Dom i svijet, 2003 An academic version of the CC LCC report also appeared in which the actors of the Croatian Spring were assessed against the official program of the LCY. See: Ivan Perić. *Ideje "masovnog pokreta" u Hrvatskoj.* Zagreb: Centar za aktualni politicki studij, 1974.

[3]See for example: Sabrina P. Ramet. *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991.* 2nd. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1992; and Dennison I. Rusinow. *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978

[4]Ivica Šušak. "Hrvatsko proljeće-početci političkog interesnog pluralizma [The Croatian Spring-the inception of political pluralism]". In: *Hrvatska i Komparativna javna Uprava* 8.3 (2008); and Vesna Pusić. "Korijeni hrvatskog političkog identiteta [The roots of Croatan political identity]". In: *Erasmus-Časopis za kulturu demokracije* 15 (1996).

[5]Marko Zubak. "The Croatian Spring: Interpreting the Communist Heritage in Post-communist Croatia". In: *East Central Europe* 32.1-2 (2005).

[6]Dušan Bilandžić. *Hrvatska moderna povijest [The Modern History of Croatia].* Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 1999.

[7]Tonči Kursar. "Prijeporni pluralizam 1971 [Disputable pluralism 1971]". In: *Politikča misao* 43.4 (2007), p. 153.

hegemonic LCY with the introduction of self-management. Furthermore, I argue that the actors that formed part of the movement problematized the rules fixing the federal-republican relationship in different ways and consequently 'activated' the notion of the Croatian nation, a form of political subjectivity, differently. The LCC remained within the boundaries of the imaginary horizon and its constitutive system of divisions despite demanding the re-articulation of its constitutive elements. The Matica hrvatska and the student movement transgressed the instituted limits and challenged the social divisions upon which the horizon was premised. Lastly, I argue that the regime's response to the heterogeneous movement was an act of hegemonization which operated by reducing the events, actors and demands to a single 'enemy' denominator, attributing them thereby with an coherence that could not be read off from the demands and strategies deployed. Despite of their substantive differences, the regime excluded all of the protagonists from the political field and absorbed the general logic around which the actors converged into the new rules constituting the Yugoslavian imaginary.

In the first section, I delineate the dislocations that characterised the context of the 1960s and made the emergence of new forms of political identification possible. In the second section, I disentangle the movement into its constitutive discursive practices and look into the manner in which the LCC, Matica hrvatska and the student movement articulated political demands and spaces of representation within the context of those dislocations in an attempt to suture them. More specifically, I map out their demands and strategies and examine their relationship to the system of social division instituted by the Yugoslavian imaginary. In the third section, I look at the regime's response in 1971 as an attempt to articulate the excess of the social in terms of the system of inclusions and exclusions which based the Yugoslavian imaginary. In the concluding section, after summarizing my main points, I point to the impact that the movement had on the manner in which social division became sedimented in institutional forms, and then introduce the following chapter.

Before moving on to the analysis, it is important that the limits of my discussion are clearly specified. Due to the scope of my thesis, in this chapter I will not look into

developments occurring simultaneously in other republics during the reform process; in particular the policies pursued by LC Serbia and the 1968 student protests in Belgrade. I will also not be looking into the debates about the constitutional reform that took place in federal institutions in the 1967-1974 period.[8]

## 4.2 Dislocations and Antagonisms: the Context of the Croatian Spring Movement

The 1963 Constitution was the first attempt to sediment the system of divisions discussed in the previous chapter, into institutional forms and subject positions. The 1963 Constitution entered history as 'the charter of self-management'[9] despite the fact that its 1974 successor, which I will examine in the following chapter, worked out the institutional forms for realising self-management in much greater detail. Conceptually speaking, the promulgation of the new constitution signaled the beginning of the decentralization already articulated in the 1958 Programme. Self-management became the inalienable right of all citizens and producers.[10] A degree of polycentrism in governance was introduced by granting republics the right to enter into agreements about some social and economic issues although the methods of decision-making were not worked out in detail.[11] Serbo-Croatian, Slovenian and Macedonian were recognized as the official languages in the federation, with equal rights of usage.[12] Citizens were granted the right to express their nationality, culture and to develop them, while the pursuance of national inequality was deemed unconstitutional.[13]

Decentralization had its limits; the workers and peoples realized their sovereignty in

[8]For an detailed analysis of these matters see: Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, pp. 139-307; and Dejan Jović. "The Constitutional Debate 1967-1974: Why did Serbia Accept the Kardelj Concept and the 1974 Constitution?" In: *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away.* West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2009. Chap. 5.

[9]Ivo Goldstein. *Hrvatska 1918-2008 [Croatia 1918-2008].* Zagreb: Europa Pressholding, 2008, p. 497.

[10]*The Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.* Beograd: Secretariat for Information of the Federal Executive Council, 1963, Article 9. and Article 34.

[11]Ibid., Article 101.

[12]Ibid., Article 131.

[13]Ibid., Article 41.

the federation and not in the socialist republics.[14] The republics were represented as territorial units based on the power of the working class and its self-management without any mention of their relationship to the nations and nationalities, despite the fact that they carried national names.[15] Four out of the five chambers constituting the supreme legislative body, the Federal Assembly, were composed following the principle 'one deputy to an equal number of inhabitants',[16] privileging in practice the more populous republics. The only chamber that did follow the logic of equal representation of republican and provincial assemblies was the Chamber of Nationalities, but it had minimal competencies.[17] The tension between what the LCY claimed to be doing – decentralizing power to realise the principle of working class and national self-management – and the possibility of realising its stated objective within the institutional forms sedimented through the constitution, was one of the dislocations out of which the Croatian Spring movement emerged.

During the VIII Congress of the LCY, the party recognised the limitations of the existing institutional forms. For the first time since the National Liberation Struggle, Tito claimed that the 'national question' had not yet been resolved in Yugoslavia because some party members still failed to understand the nature of social division:

> They confuse the unity of nations with the liquidation of nations and want to create something new and artificial: one integral Yugoslav nation. Their idea sounds closer to assimilation and bureaucratic centralism, to unitarism and hegemony [...] such people can do a great deal of harm. For any within the League of Communists it must be stated that there is no place for them in our League because of the harm that they do.[18]

At the VIII Congress it was decided that the republican LCs would henceforth hold their particular congresses prior to the all Yugoslavian congress, to come up with their own platforms for discussion.[19] The 'opening up' of the national question and the relative politicization of republican party branches loosened up the uniformity of the LCY and transformed it into a space for negotiating between different republican self-managerial

[14] *The Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Article 113.
[15] Ibid., Article 108.
[16] Ibid., Article 166.
[17] Ibid., Article 165.
[18] Josip Broz Tito. "Report to the Eight LCY Congress held in Belgrade from December 7 to 13, 1964". In: *The National Question*. Beograd: Socialist Thought and Practice, 1983, p. 111.
[19] Leslie Benson. *Yugoslavia: A Concise History*. 2nd. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p. 109.

interests.[20] In the following years, the LCY recruited a quarter of a million new members, one third of them workers and 80% under the age of 25.[21] These structural changes from within the hegemonic party created the conditions of possibility for the emergence of a younger leadership in the republican parties. The re-opening of the national question within the multinational federation, and the decentralization of the federal party within a single party system rooted in 'democratic centralism', had a dislocatory effect on the imaginary, and the Croatian Spring emerged in response to these dislocations, as an attempt to suture them.

Immediately after the VIII Congress, a market oriented reform of the centrally planed economy was introduced to integrate the Yugoslavian economy with the world economy, improve the living standards of workers and increase overall economic productivity.[22] The economic reform was also represented as part of the solution to the 'national question', since the decentralisation of the investment system was expected to destroy the 'material basis' of the 'centralist-hegemony' which threatened the freedom of Yugoslavia's constitutive nations.[23] The market reform strengthened the power of republics and enterprises at the expense of the powers of the federal government.[24] It also brought about an increase in unemployment, the migration of Yugoslavian workers to 'capitalist' Western-Europe and the growth of regional/republican inequalities.[25] The dislocation between the objectives behind the reform and its contradictory and uneven results was also a condition in response to which the movement emerged.

In July 1966, at the Brioni Plenum of the LCY, the head of the Internal Security Forces

[20]The Congress decided to further decentralise the economy by transferring the funds for extended production from state-organs to workers' collectives and by granting workers the rights to decide about the distribution of what was to be done with the incomes made in their enterprises. For an detailed discussion of the VIII Congress and the analysis of reports presented at it see: Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, pp. 168-175.

[21]Benson, *Yugoslavia: A Concise History*, p. 118.

[22]The reform aimed to create a capital intensive, high productivity manufacturing industry, capable of placing its goods on world markets, and to diversify investment into neglected branches of the economy, particularly agriculture and tourism. Subsidies to industries for domestic sales were ended and the dinar allowed to float against the US dollar. The proportion of net income disposed of by enterprises raised from 40% to 70%, in order to encourage innovation and savings. See: ibid., p. 112.

[23]Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, p. 167.

[24]Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, pp. 85-89.

[25]For the overall impact of the reform see: Goldstein, *Hrvatska 1918-2008 [Croatia 1918-2008]*, p. 499; and Benson, *Yugoslavia: A Concise History*, p. 113. For a detailed analysis of its implementation in different sectors see: Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, pp. 172-179.

Aleksandar Ranković was relieved from his party and state offices for opposing the economic reform, the decentralization of the federation, the 'federalization' of the LCY and for attempts to sabotage official party policies and impose 'conservative views' through the institutions under his competency.[26] Ranković's removal as head of the secret police was paralleled by the relative liberalization of the socio-political space; cultural institutions, news outlets and the broader public were given more room to discuss the present and future forms of the self-managing order. The purge of the 'centralist' Ranković and the opening up of the socio-political space for the inclusion institutions and actors external to the party into political debates within the framework of a single party regime also had a dislocatory effect on the system. The movement's emergence was both conditioned by this 'opening' as much as it attempted to suture it.

Lastly, after the re-opening of the national question, the relative decentralization of the LCY, the introduction of the market reform, the purge of the head of the security service and the 'liberalization' of the political space, the first set of amendments to the 1963 Constitution were passed in 1967. The amendments increased the power of the republics by broadening the competency of the Chamber of Nationalities in the Federal Assembly.[27] The constitutional debate gave rise to a variety of different positions regarding the future form of the self-managing order within the federal LCY. Some thought that decentralisation and the marketization had already gone too far and that further transformation was dangerous. Others, like the 'liberal' leadership of the LCC, claimed that further economic and political transformations were necessary for the realisation of self-managing socialism. In this sense, the constitutional debate formed the immediate context out of which the movement emerged as an attempt to, in different ways, transform the institutional form of the Yugoslavian imaginary.

[26]Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, p. 187.
[27]Ibid., p. 225.

## 4.3 Disentangling the Croatian Spring Movement

### 4.3.1 The Declaration: posing the 'national' problem in cultural terms

In March 1967, one year after Ranković was relieved of his offices, a group of 130 prominent Croatian intellectuals, 80 of them Communists, inscribed the unresolved national question into the context of SR Croatia by signing the 'The Declaration Concerning the Characterization and Status of the Croatian Literary Language' and contesting the representation of the Croatian language within the existing order.[28]

The Declaration came in response to the two published volumes of the Serbo-Croatian dictionary and it contested the practice of naming the language Serbo-Croatian for its 'centralist' and 'hegemonic' tendencies.[29] According to the Declaration, the existing language practices failed to capture the particularity of the Croatian language and thus blocked Croatian national equality. This position was articulated in reference to the existing social divisions and Tito's position at the VIII Congress; the Serbo-Croatian dictionary was represented as the expression of 'etatism', 'unitarism' and 'hegemony' because it promoted 'a unified state language' Serbian, under the guise of Serbo-Croatian. This was possible precisely because of Belgrade's dual and 'dominant' position, as the capital of SR Serbia and the capital of Yugoslavia.[30]

The Declaration demanded the transformation of the constitutional article about 'the Serbo-Croatian or Croato-Serbian language', and their representation as two separate literary languages, along with Slovenian and Macedonian. It also demanded the consistent usage of the Croatian literary language in the Croatian education system and in the public and political life of SR Croatia. This included civil servants, teachers and officials coming from other parts of Yugoslavia, who were expected to use the official language of the territorial unit in which they worked. This demand problematized the position of the Serbian bureaucrats working in SR Croatia and of the Croatian Serbs, who in practice

[28]Dennison I. Rusinow. "Facilis Decensus Averno [September 1972]". In: *Yugoslavia: Oblique Insights and Observations*. Ed. by Gale Stokes. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2008, p. 143.

[29]For more on the language debate see: Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, p. 225.

[30]For the full text of the Declaration to which I refer in this subsection see: "Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika [The declaration regarding the name and position of the Croatian language]". In: *Telegram* (17 March 1967).

spoke variants of Croatian although they identified as Serbian. It was met with an antagonistic response from a group of Serbian writers that drafted a reply demanding the use of Cyrillic on Belgrade television and the education of 700, 000 Serbs in Croatia in 'their own language'. Regardless of their appeal to national equality and the platform of the VIII Congress for realising self-management, the LCY and LCC maintained the Declaration was hostile towards the Yugoslavian community and it undermined its 'brotherhood and unity'. The party members that had signed the Declaration were punished or purged.[31]

In practice, the demands for realising equality translated national difference understood in cultural terms, into national antagonism. Similarly, the division between the 'positive' self-managing practices and the 'negative' centralist-bureaucratic forces constitutive of the Yugoslavian imaginary, transformed into national antagonisms because intellectuals articulated these frontiers for the purpose of realising the interests of their particular nations. These semantic slippages were possible precisely because the terms did not contain essential meanings beyond their discursive representations. These slippages appeared in different forms throughout the period discussed.

### 4.3.2 The LCC: contesting rules and politicizing the republican working class identity

The 'liberals' in the LCC, Mirko Tripalo, Savka Dabčević-Kučan and Pero Priker became hegemonic in the SR Croatia and leaders of the Croatian Spring on a platform 'decentralization, de-etatization and democratization'. Initially, they enjoyed Tito and Bakarić's support.[32] Although they condemned the Declaration, the 'liberals' weaved their political project around a similar problem, namely the position of SR Croatia within the federal

[31]Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, p. 225.

[32]Savka Dabčević-Kučan was the President of the Central Comitte of the LCC elected to the position in 1969. Mirko Tripalo was the President of the Executive Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia elected in 1966, later he became one of the members of the Presidency of the SFRY. Vladimir Bakarić was the Chairman of the LCC from 1948-1969 before Dabčević-Kučan took up the position. Pero Pirker was the major of Zagreb and replaced Tripalo as Secretary of the Executive Committee of LCC in 1969. For a detailed description of the Croatian leadership and their rise to power after the fall of Ranković see: Goldstein, *Hrvatska 1918-2008 [Croatia 1918-2008]*, p. 537; and Rusinow, "Facilis Decensus Averno [September 1972]", pp. 138-142.

order.

The central grievance expressed by the liberals was that the Croatian working class was being exploited in the existing federal order. Contrary to the proclaimed self-managerial tenet that workers should dispose of the surplus value they produce, they maintained that the surplus value of the Croatian working class was systematically appropriated by federal institutions in Belgrade. They problematized the federal redistribution practices for appropriating the foreign currency earned in SR Croatia, and for investing in SR Croatia much less than the republic contributed to the federal funds. They also contested the monopoly that companies in Belgrade held on export and maintained that they were accumulating capital. Furthermore, the liberals also contested the existing delegation practices in federal administrative bodies, on the grounds that the majority voting system 'empowered' the republics with more delegates, thereby putting the interests of their working class above the interests of others.[33]

In the light of these grievances, the leadership articulated a set of demands for reforming the Yugoslavian order as a whole, on the grounds that their realisation would suture the dislocated equality between the territorial units and bring about the realisation of true self-management. On the economic terrain they demanded that the federal capital be federalised and not centralized and that 'clear accounts' be established between republics. The realisation of these demands would make it possible for each republic to see exactly what it was contributing and receiving from the federation and to decide on future contributions. This would, they argued, kick-start Yugoslavia's stagnating economy by making economic redistribution more rational and fair and thus bring about the actual realisation of the objectives behind the economic reform. On the political terrain the liberals demanded the relaxation of rules of democratic centralism within the LCY to weaken the power of the federal (party) center and strengthen the republican (party) centres. They grounded this demand in the contention that the republican (party) centres were better attuned to the self-managerial interests of their republican working classes.

[33]See: Goldstein, *Hrvatska 1918-2008 [Croatia 1918-2008]*, p. 539; Rusinow, "Facilis Decensus Averno [September 1972]", pp. 145-146; Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, p. 248; and Benson, *Yugoslavia: A Concise History*, p. 119.

By decentralizing power, the republican working class would get involved in political decision-making more directly and their self-managing capacity would expand. Following the same rationale, they demanded that 'sovereignty' in Yugoslavia be represented as an attribute of republics and not the federation as a whole, that the principle of republican/provincial parity be deployed in the composition of federal institutions and that the delegates working in these bodies be accountable to their republican institutions.[34]

This political project was imbued with a 'positive' meaning in reference to the enemies 'bureaucratic centralism' and 'unitarism', constitutive of the Yugoslavian imaginary which were reaffirmed as the legitimate front of struggle during the VIII Congress of the LCY. In line with the rationale for the implementation of the economic reform, they represented the power of these enemies as rooted in their control of economic re-distributive instruments at the federal level.[35] In a speech delivered in the main square in Zagreb in front of a mass of supporters, Savka Dabčević Kučan specified the 'enemies' that were blocking the realisation of the Croatian and Yugoslavian political subject:

> The etatists, unitarists and great-Serbian chauvinists offer us the kind of Yugoslavia which we do not wish nor want. The Croatian chauvinists want to crush the Yugoslavia which is in our interest and that is in our interest and which we do want. Neither is able to understand the genuine socialist interests of the working class, the working people, the nation, independence and socialism. They all hold in reserve a reliance on something or someone, which does not represent their own people, working class and responsibility for the future. We do not want something which is not our own or foreign, we are the creators of our own socialism and future. Under the leadership of Tito and the LCY we will build our self-managing socialist society and a community of equals, as our people want it.[36]

Reiterating the position articulated in the 1958 Programme, the liberals maintained that the national problem was essentially a class problem and that the 'enemies' of the Croatian

[34]See: Mirko Tripalo. *Hrvatsko Proljeće [The Croatian Spring].* Zagreb: Globus, 1990, p. 127; Mirko Tripalo. "Suvremeni razvitak našeg društva i reforma SK [The contemporary development of our society and the LC's Reform]". In: *S Poprišta [From the Struggle].* Zagreb: Centar za aktualni politički studij, 1971; Mirko Tripalo. "Novi osnovi i problemi našeg razvitka [The New Bases and Problams of our Development]". In: *S Poprišta [From the Struggle].* Zagreb: Centar za aktualni politički studij, 1971; and Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, pp. 248-249.

[35]Tripalo, "Novi osnovi i problemi našeg razvitka [The New Bases and Problams of our Development]", p. 116.

[36]An excerpt from Savka Dabčević-Kučan's speech given in May 1971 at Zagreb's main square, quoted in: *The Problems of Contemporary Yugoslavia, 1971.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-10625; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:0f6ef817-95f3-4941-a744-879109cdb81d` (visited on 02/06/2016).

nation were potentially as present among Croats as they were among other nations. Mirko Tripalo explicitly stated this:

> The difference between us, the Croatian communists, and Croatian nationalists lays in our class understanding of the national question [...] We have always maintained that an independent and federal Yugoslavia, rooted in self-management is the only possible framework for the prosperity, future and independence of the Croatian nation [...] Those who are against this Yugoslavia, including the Croatian political emigration which is anti-communist, represent the biggest opponents of the realisation of our political project [...] That's why we are not interested in our common Slavic roots, nor in the common life in 'old' Yugoslavia, but in that which unites us all, our common socialist and class interests.[37]

From their perspective, resolving the problem of the appropriation of the surplus value of the Croatian working class and assuring that the Croatian working class participated directly in federal decision making would thus contribute to the resolution of the national question. Their class understanding of the nation was further evident in their representation of the Croatian nation in SR Bosnia and Herzegovina and AP Vojvodina. The liberals explicitly rejected the possibility of articulating its interests and maintained that, since the socio-economic interest of all the working people in SR Croatia were essentially identical, irrespective of their national background, the LCC was responsible for articulating the interests of the Croatian working class as a whole and protecting the equality, and brotherhood and unity between its nations and nationalities.[38]

The practical ramifications of their project became apparent in January 1970, on the 'historic' Tenth Session of the LCC CC.[39] The occasion for the session was a series of articles that Miloš Žanko – a Croatian communist and the Vice-President of the Federal Assembly – published in the federal newspaper Borba. Žanko presented an analysis of the activities of Croatian nationalists with a particular focus on the activities and publications of the cultural institution Matica hrvatska, which I will discuss in the following section. Žanko maintained nationalism was on the rise in SR Croatia and that the liberal leadership had failed to take more than verbal action against it, contributing to its

[37]Mirko Tripalo. "Klasni princip i nacionalno pitanje [The class principle and the national question]". In: *S Poprišta [From the Struggle]*. Zagreb: Centar za aktualni politički studij, 1971, p. 181.

[38]Mirko Tripalo. "Osnovi novog jedinstva [The basis for a new form of unity]". In: *S Poprišta [From the Struggle]*. Zagreb: Centar za aktualni politički studij, 1971, pp. 248-249.

[39]Bilandžić, *Hrvatska moderna povijest [The Modern History of Croatia]*, p. 557.

expansion.[40]

Savka Dabčević-Kučan, Mirko Tripalo and Vladimir Bakarić attacked the 'unitarist' understanding of socialism. They stressed that both 'nationalism' and 'unitarism' were two aspects of the same 'enemy' but that the communists had focused on fighting 'nationalism as a particularism' and neglected the struggle against 'unitarism' which was, according to the LCY's Programme, the expression of 'the hegemonic tendency of the biggest nation' (Serbian).[41] His publications were represented as part of a broader struggle against the leadership of the LCC, driven by 'unitarists' in federal state and party institutions. In the keynote speech, Savka Dabčević-Kučan maintained that, in this struggle, the 'unitarists' labelled the Croatian leadership 'nationalist' to manufacture party disunity and ultimately overthrow it. She also accused the 'unitarists' of empowering the 'nationalists' by undermining the hegemony of the LCC, the organ responsible for the struggle against nationalism in SR Croatia.[42] Following the logic that the national question was in essence a class question, the Tenth Session concluded that the continued struggle for realising socio-economic reform would organically remove the root causes of both unitarism and nationalism. Žanko was purged from the party for 'expressing views contrary to the official policy of the LCC' and for misinforming communists in other republics about the situation in SR Croatia.[43] For the first time in Yugoslavian history, a session of the Central Committee was televised on a republican TV, triggering a public debate about the political conjecture and the mobilization of the public behind the articulated official platform of the LCC. Retroactively, the Tenth Session has been fixed as the beginning of the Croatian Spring and the articulation of a Croatian project for the

[40]Contrary to the decentralizing demands of the LCC Žanko also demanded that the delegates to the Chamber of Republics and Provinces in the Federal Assembly represent all Yugoslav interests rather than particular republican interests, during the constitutional debate. For a summary of the debate see: Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, p. 277; Rusinow, "Facilis Decensus Averno [September 1972]", pp. 149-151; Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, p. 109; and Bilandžić, *Hrvatska moderna povijest [The Modern History of Croatia]*, pp. 563-567.

[41]Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, p. 109; Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, p. 278; Tripalo, *Hrvatsko Proljeće [The Croatian Spring]*, p. 112.

[42]Savka Dabčević-Kučan. "Bratstvo i jedinstvi na elementima onoga što nas spaja u samouprvnom socijalizmu". In: *Deseta sjenica Centralnog komiteta Saveza komunista Hrvatske [Zagreb 15,16 i 17. siječnja 1970]*. Ed. by Milovan Baletić and Zdravko Židović. Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1970, pp. 18-20.

[43]"Zaključci X sjednice CK SKH [The conclusions from the X Assembly of the CC LCC]". in: *Deseta sjenica Centralnog komiteta Saveza komunista Hrvatske [The Tenth Assembly of the CC LCC]*. ed. by Milovan Baletić and Zdravko Židović. Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1970.

transformation of Yugoslavia.

The following two years saw the expansion of the activities of the Matica hrvatska, the politicization of the student movement and the adoption of amendments to the 1963 Constitution which granted sovereignty to the republics in all areas except for foreign policy, national defence, the unified market and monetary and foreign trade policy. Republican and provincial parity were also introduced as procedures for constituting federal institutions.[44] The demand for separate republican foreign currency regimes articulated by the liberals was left unsatisfied because the Croatian delegates failed to forge alliances with the leadership of other republican parties on the issue.[45]

By the Twentieth Session of the CC LCC in May 1971, the clear line of demarcation within the LCC drawn at the Tenth Session was blurred because the LCC failed to maintain a unified platform regarding the nature of the politicizations external to it and the demand for foreign currency retention. The liberals repeated their position about the necessity of reforming the foreign currency system and in this, they enjoyed the support of the Croatian student movement and the Matica hrvatska. They also maintained that nationalist positions should be undermined through rational debate, the further development of socio-economic reform and not through repressive administrative measures and the prohibition of publications.[46] Others in the LCC's Executive Committee, including Vladimir Bakarić, grew increasingly critical towards what they interpreted to be the pluralization of the political space, representing it as a threat to LCY's hegemony.[47] Eventually, as I will elaborate later in the chapter, the liberals were purged from the ranks of the LCC.

In sum, the discourse of the liberal leadership was weaved around various demands that aimed at rearticulating the power relations between the republics and the federation, for the purpose of realising workers' self-management. The demands they articulated, and

[44]For a summary of the constitutional amendments see: Rusinow, "Facilis Decensus Averno [September 1972]", pp. 156-160.

[45]Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, pp. 296-297.

[46]Mirko Tripalo. "Samoupravljanje i avangarda [Self-managemen and the vanguard party]". In: *S Poprišta [From the Struggle]*. Zagreb: Centar za aktualni politički studij, 1971, pp. 156-157.

[47]Dennison I. Rusinow. "The Road to Karadjordjevo [September 1972]". In: *Yugoslavia: Oblique Insights and Observations*. Ed. by Gale Stokes. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2008, pp. 181-183.

the strategy of including the masses into politics, were represented as a continuation of the National Liberation Struggle and the Socialist Revolution. Furthermore, the lines of exclusion/inclusion articulated in their project remained within the system of divisions instituted by the imaginary. 'Belgrade', in antagonism to which they articulated their project, signified primarily 'the federal administrative center' and denoted 'outdated', 'centralist', 'regressive' tendencies. It also carried the meaning of the capital of former Yugoslavia, whose bourgeoisie, as discussed in the previous chapter, 'ruled' and 'exploited' other nations in the past.

The political subject articulated through their project was the republican working class whose self-managing interests they claimed to represent within the framework of the socio-economic reform process. Their demands were thus directed against particular rules conferred through the existing subject positions, without contesting the hegemonic party they themselves formed part of. Furthermore, their demands can be read as attempts to increase their own power vis-a-vis the federal party organs and not as attempts to undermine the socialist order as such.

The embeddedness of their project within the existing system of social divisions was even more evident in the position they took regarding the articulation of the element 'sovereignty' in the context of SR Croatia. Unlike the intellectuals associated with Matica hrvatska and the student movement, whose discursive practices I analyse in the following subsections, the liberal leadership never disputed the inclusion of the Serbian nation within the scope of 'state sovereignty'. It unequivocally maintained that, given the class essence of nations, 'sovereignty' in SR Croatia could only be represented as shared on equal terms between the Croatian nation and the members of the Serbian nation in Croatia.[48]

[48]Bilandžić, *Hrvatska moderna povijest [The Modern History of Croatia]*, p. 622.

### 4.3.3 Matica hrvatska: transgressing boundaries and antagonising national identities

Matica hrvatska, a 130-year old Croatian cultural organization that played a cardinal role in constructing Croatian 'national consciousness' during the last decades of the Hapsburg Monarchy, also got involved in the debate about the socio-political reform and the future form of SR Croatia. At its Annual Assembly in November 1970 it launched a membership drive and announced that it would expand its publishing activities to include economic and political issues. In 1971, it launched the political journal Hrvatski tjednik and the economic journal Hrvatski gospodarski glasnik through which it got involved in the debates about the socio-economic reform. The circulation of Hrvatski tjednik grew to over 100, 000 within six months after publication and the membership of Matica from 2,323 in 30 branches in November 1970 to 41,000 in 50 branches by December 1971.[49] Rather than articulating a coherent political project for Yugoslavia's transformation, Matica was more of a platform for floating disparate grievances and demands outside of the LCY. Its activities reflected a contradictory position vis-a-vis the liberals' project. Although the organization supported the platform of the Tenth Session and the rearticulation of the forces between the republics and the federation at the expense of the latter, the demands it floated contradicted the LCC's understanding of the nature of social division.

Characteristics of its articulatory strategy were transgressions of the social divisions instituted by the Yugoslavian imaginary. Its publishing activities focused on figures from the Croatian past – such as the leaders of the Croatian Peasant Party active in old Yugoslavia, Croatian medieval feudal kings Zrinski and Frankopan and Ban Jelačić– that were excluded from the Yugoslavian socialist imaginary as 'bourgeois', 'regressive', and 'anti-revolutionary'. The practice of revisiting the past in publishing activities was accompanied by pompous opening ceremonies of new Matica branches across SR Croatia, and celebrations of events in Croatian history and births and deaths of 'Croatian' heroes. The following two quotes from the opening ceremonies of new Matica branches capture this movement towards the excluded past:

[49]Rusinow, "The Road to Karadjordjevo [September 1972]", p. 167.

> Stjepan Radić founded his politics in the Croatian statehood right. He claimed that Croats were the only Slavic people that managed to preserve their statehood, albeit in a degenerate form, throughout their 1300 history in these territories. That is why he demanded that this statehood, which we have preserved in a degenerate form we must transform into full independence of our state.[50]

> The Zrinski and Frankopan's are the embodiment of heroism, militancy, devotion and willingness to sacrifice for the purpose of defending the Croatian homeland. That is the source of the cult [of Zrinski and Frankopan] and there is no other comparable in our history. They were feudal lords, but they were also fighters and embodiments of Croatian statehood.[51]

Similarly, in the spring of 1971, Matica published the demand to re-erect the public statue of Ban Jelačić, a 19$^{th}$ century military governor condemned by Marx as reactionary, on Zagreb's main square. The square was called Ban Jelačić Square before 1947 when the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, for ideological reasons, changed its name into the Square of the Republic.[52]

The rearticulation of these exuded elements into the meaning of 'Croatian statehood' formed part of the debate about the inscription of the notion of 'republican sovereignty' into the context of bi-national SR Croatia, opened up by the passage of the amendments to the 1963 Constitution.[53] Matica demanded that SR Croatia be constituted as 'the sovereign national state of the Croatian nation' whereby sovereignty signified the 'right to national self-determination including the right to secession'.[54] Its publications were filled with arguments about the incoherence and meaninglessness of conceptualising sovereignty as shared between different nations in a single territorial unit. According to the logic of Matica's publications, sovereignty was in essence an attribute of 'nations' and not of the

[50] An excerpt from Franjo Tuđman's speech hald at the opening of a Matica branch in Drniš 1971; transcribed from: Miljenko Bukovčan. "Episode 7: MASPOK". in: *Hrvatsko Proljeće*. (Documentary). Hrvatska Radio Televizija, 2010.

[51] An excerpt from Matica's president Ljudevit Jonke's speech held at the opening of the Matica branch in Sinj 1971; transcribed from: ibid.

[52] For a summary of the demand and the debate that emerged in the public regarding the name-change see: Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, p. 110

[53] The 1963 Croatian Constitution defined SR Croatia as 'the socialist democratic state community of the Croatian nation, established by the power of the working people' with no mention of sovereignty, since sovereignty was represented as realised by the working class at the level of the federation. See: ibid., p. 112

[54] For the positions articulated in the publications of Matica hrvatska see: Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, p. 305 and Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, pp. 111-113.

working class.[55]

Matica's position about the nature of sovereignty undermined the system of social divisions instituted by the Yugoslavian imaginary which, as discussed in the previous chapter, was founded upon the logic that national difference does not translate into political division. It also meant that those active in Matica understood the relationship between Serbs and Croats in SR Croatia as a relation of power, and the Serbs as a minority in a Croatian socialist state.[56] The articulation of the relationship between Serbs and Croats as a power relation was also manifested in a wave of publications about the national composition in employment. In these, Croats were found to be systematically under-represented in the army, factory management and the administrative organs of the federation and those of 'their own' republic.[57]

Furthermore, the publications represented the problem of Croatian economic exploitation as essentially a matter of national exploitation, as opposed to class. The publications suggested that the matter could only be adequately resolved by transforming SR Croatia into a 'socialist nation-state'. Beyond the demand for the retention of the foreign currency earned in SR Croatia and clear accounts between republics, Matica's authors also demanded a separate Croatian currency, a separate National Bank with a governor appointed by the republican leadership and the independent republican negotiation of foreign loans. Beyond the demand of giving more autonomy to republics in decision-making, the authors demanded that a Croatian National Assembly of Socialist Forces be constituted as the highest organ of power in SR Croatia, that Croatia be represented in the UN independently, and that Croatian frontiers be revised at the expense of Herzegovina and Montenegro.[58] These demands suggested that the solution to the existing problems lay in transforming republics from territorial units into units expressing national power and thus, political division.

[55]This is well documented in Perić, *Ideje "masovnog pokreta" u Hrvatskoj*.

[56]The debate was resolved with the inclusion of the 'Serbian nation' into the notion of 'sovereignty'. The SR Croatia was defined as 'the Socialist Republic of Croatia is the national state of the Croatian nation, the state of the Serbian nation in Croatia, and the State of the nationalities inhabiting it, until 1990. I will come back to this point in the the last chapter.

[57]Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, p. 124.

[58]For a summary of demands see: ibid., pp. 125-127; and Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, p. 305.

Despite the fact that the floated demands undermined the liberal leadership's premises about the nature of social division and unity, they were imbued with positive meaning in reference to the Tenth Session of the LCC, in opposition to 'unitarism' and 'bureaucratic centralism' and with the aim of realising socialist self-management. However, self-management was represented more as an instrument for empowering the nation through decentralization than as an end in itself.[59]

In sum, by drawing out the figures from the past and infusing the notion statehood with their national struggles within the context of the debate about the representation of sovereignty, Matica hrvatska undermined the central position of the National Liberation Struggle and the Socialist Revolution in the historical foundations of the present. The floated demands, situated within the context of the rearticulated past, were traces of the emergence of a new conception of social unity rooted in national divisions and expressed through territorial units. Within this constellation, 'Belgrade', 'unitarism' and 'bureaucratic centralism' took on the meaning of a threat to the Croatian nation in SR Croatia. Furthermore, the over-representation of the Serbian nation in employment in SR Croatia was read as an integral component of a 'Serbian' 'centralist' 'unitarist' project against the 'Croatian nation in SR Croatia'. Although it echoed the position of the liberal leadership about the necessity of the rearticulation of the relationship between the republics and the federation at the expense of the latter, unlike the leadership, Matica was thus articulating an alternative space of representation based on a socialist-nation-centred representation of social unity and division. The organization however, never mobilized politically to the extent that it linked up all these demands into an actual political project, nor did it explicitly contest the socialist order as such. The student movement, which I will discuss in the following section, did mobilize politically to exert pressure on the LCY.

[59]This is well documented in: Perić, *Ideje "masovnog pokreta" u Hrvatskoj*, pp. 98-102.

### 4.3.4 The Student movement: linking demands to action and transgressing the boundaries of politics

In April 1971, for the first time in Yugoslavian history, students that were not members of the LCY were elected as leaders of the Student Union at the University of Zagreb.[60] They organized a student movement which brought together the demands of the liberal leadership and themes from Matica hrvatska's publications.

In the debate about the constitutional definition of the republic, the Student Union was in agreement with Matica and it opposed the constitution of sovereignty in SR Croatia as shared. Furthermore, the students demanded that Croatia be constituted as a sovereign socialist state of the Croatian nation, that its statehood be represented continuous with historical traditions from the 10$^{th}$ century, a reform of the export and foreign currency system in Yugoslavia so that the money earned in SR Croatia stays in SR Croatia, changes in the composition of employment in the military apparatus in SR Croatia so that it was representative of SR Croatia's national composition, the usage of the Croatian language in the army administration in Croatia, and serving military service in one's own republic.[61] Echoing the opening ceremonies of Matica branches, in the summer of 1971 the student body commemorated the 100$^{th}$ anniversary of Stjepan Radić's death. After speeches delivered at the Student Centre in Zagreb, 1, 500 people marched across Zagreb to bring flowers to Radić's grave, carrying 'old' pre-socialist Croatian flags.[62]

Most importantly, on November 1971, the Student Union organized a strike claiming to be the most revolutionary segment of the working class, without consulting the hegemonic LCC/LCY. The strike was organized in the context of a growing disunity within the LCC about the foreign currency issue and the nature of the politicizations external to the party. The cardinal demand behind the student strike was the decentralization of

[60]The leadership included Dražen Budiša, Goran Dodig, Ante Padžak, Zvonimir Čičak. Zvonimir Čičak even told students accepting his nomination for the student pro-rector, that they should not vote for him because he was not a party member, but a Croatian patriot and a practising Catholic. See: Rusinow, "The Road to Karadjordjevo [September 1972]", p. 167.

[61]The students also articulated demands for the improvement of student living conditions. For a summary of student demands see: Goldstein, *Hrvatska 1918-2008 [Croatia 1918-2008]*, p. 547; and Tihomir Ponoš. *Na rubu revolucije: studenti '71 [On the Verge of a Revolution: the Students '71]*. Zagreb: Profil, 2007, pp. 123, 168-169.

[62]Ibid., pp. 135-137.

the foreign currency system for the purpose of realising self-management.[63] The student leaders represented their movement as 'an authentic movement, stemming from the problems of our homeland and our people, which [...] aims to contribute, in terms of content, to the struggle for a socialist, self-managerial Croatia'.[64]

Following the antagonistic frontiers set by the liberal leadership on the Tenth Session, the students imbued the strike with a 'positive' meaning by representing it as antagonistic to 'unitarists' and 'bureaucratic centralists'. They voiced their support for the liberal leadership's demand and declared that they expected the student strike to expand into a general one that would paralyze SR Croatia until the foreign currency demand was met.[65] The aim of the students was to bring a single demand to the fore and unite Matica, the liberals in the LCC, the students and the workers in SR Croatia into a common political project. However, the attempt to broaden the scope of the strike failed because only a few factories joined in. Furthermore, the liberal leadership condemned their strategy. They called for the resolution of the foreign currency issue through existing federal/republican institutions because the strike undermined their position in the LCC and in the debate about the foreign currency issue at the federal level.[66] The 12 day long strike was a breaking point in the progression of the Croatian Spring, as it meant that the 'liberal' leadership of the LCC was unable to maintain order in its own republic.

In sum, the student movement mobilized into a strike demanding the transformation of the rules about the distribution of foreign currency within the federation. Its objective was to expand to include the whole of the working class in SR Croatia and strengthen the position of the liberal fraction within the LCC. However, by striking, the students challenged the LCY's hegemonic position in organizing the working class in Yugoslavia, one of the central tenets of the Yugoslavian imaginary. Furthermore, the resemblance between Matica's publications and the debates in student meetings and publications, rendered visible that the students understood the working class which they mobilized in national

[63]For a collection of student banners and slogans see: Ponoš, *Na rubu revolucije: studenti '71 [On the Verge of a Revolution: the Students '71]*, pp. 179-180.
[64]Dražen Budiša quoted in: ibid., p. 157.
[65]Bilandžić, *Hrvatska moderna povijest [The Modern History of Croatia]*, pp. 626-627.
[66]Ponoš, *Na rubu revolucije: studenti '71 [On the Verge of a Revolution: the Students '71]*, pp. 185-186.

terms. They failed to articulate a political project that would draw together Matica, the liberals in the LCC and the national working class. Their transgressions within the context of a disunified LCC and the expansion of the activities of Matica hrvatska, were read as the expression and expansion of disorder by the central party and state institutions. In response, the central party organs applied so-called 'administrative measures'.

## 4.4 The Hegemonic Response: Excluding the Movement and Including the Logic

Although the strike failed to unify the actors into a common project and mobilize the Croatian working class, the Yugoslavian leadership represented it as the expression of the homogenization of the 'Croatian nation' and the co-optation of 'nationalist positions' by the 'liberals' in the LCC. The politicization of the student body under a non-communist leadership was also read as a sign that the liberalization of the political space went so far as to endanger LCY's hegemonic position in representing the interests of the working class.

On December 1st 1971, two days before the students halted the strike, at the Eleventh Session of the LCY Presidency in Karađorđevo, Tito distanced himself from the Croatian leadership because of their 'rotten liberalism' in the face of a developing 'counter-revolution'.[67] Aware that all actors imbued their demands with a 'positive' meaning by articulating them in opposition to the enemy 'unitarism', Tito claimed that they misrepresented and twisted the notion, to advance demands against the unity of Yugoslavia. In his own words:

> I disagree with speaking constantly about unitarism and have asked to determine once and for all what exactly is meant by unitarianism. If it means 'the unitarianism of the Yugoslavian Monarchy', then I oppose it. If it means 'the residues of dogmatic thought' I am also against it. But if it means 'the unity of our country' as an indivisible whole, then I stand for it. I am for a unified Yugoslavia. Then it does

[67] Ponoš, *Na rubu revolucije: studenti '71 [On the Verge of a Revolution: the Students '71]*, pp. 195-197; Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, pp. 129-130; andRusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, p. 308.

> not mean unitarism but simply our unity. [...][68]

Furthermore, he maintained that the constitutional amendments, which were passed to enhance the self-managing capacity of the republics, had already diminished the threat of 'unitarism' in Yugoslavia. In the post-amendment period, communists had to shift their forces to the struggle against 'nationalists' and 'chauvinists' who 'enjoyed a broad base of support in SR Croatia'.[69] The student strike was represented as 'counter-revolutionary' and Matica hrvatska as a 'very strong parallel party [...] which is against the Yugoslavian order' that 'advocates a Pavelić [fascist] type of state'.[70] Tito claimed that the condition of possibility for their emergence was the ideological crisis in the LCY. The events rendered visible that communists themselves failed to grasp the 'true' nature of anti-socialist phenomena.[71] The counter-revolution was possible because of LCY's disunity and the 'false' belief that the LCY is a 'federation of different Leagues of Communists' and that the federal party organs do not have the right to intervene in republican matters.[72] Furthermore, he criticised 'some communists' for dividing up the working class by republic, and reaffirmed the position that the working class is essentially indivisible and Yugoslavian.[73] Although Tito never named the liberals in the LCC explicitly, he was clearly referring to them when discussing the ideological crisis.

To resolve the problem of ideological confusion, Tito called for the re-affirmation of democratic centralism and the intensification of Marxist education in schools, workers organizations and in the party itself.[74] Furthermore, he maintained the deployment of 'administrative measures' was necessary because the events in Croatia rendered visible that 'Yugoslavian democracy was abused excessively by the enemies of the Yugoslavian

[68]Tito's keynote speech to the 21$^{th}$ Session of LCY Presidency in Karađorđevo, published in: Josip Broz Tito. "Korijeni, uzroci i klasna suština nacionalizma [The roots, cases, and class essence of nationalism]". In: *Nacionalno pitanje u djelima klasika marksizma u dokumentima i praksi KPJ-SKJ [The National Question in Marxists Classi and in LCY's Theory and Practice].* Ed. by Leopold Kobsa, Ines Šaškor, and Vjekoslav Koprivnjak. Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1978, p. 527.

[69]Ibid., p. 527.

[70]Josip Broz Tito. "Closing statement at the 21st LCY Presidency Session". In: *The National Question.* Beograd: Socialist Thought and Practice, 1983, p. 177.

[71]Ibid., pp. 164-165.

[72]Ibid., p. 170.

[73]Ibid., p. 171.

[74]Ibid., p. 166.

community'.[75] Tito's position became the legitimate representation of the events in SR Croatia. To re-establish order and suture the dislocated political space on the 28th Session of the LCC the liberals were forced to resign from the LCY; the leaders of the student strike were arrested and many imprisoned for counter-revolutionary activity. Matica hrvatska was shut down and its publications put out of commission for anti-constitutional behaviour. The purge continued throughout 1973 and included writers, film-makers, university professors in SR Croatia as well as the liberal leaderships of other republics.[76]

In sum, the regime responded to the events in Croatia by reducing them as a whole to a single 'nationalist' denominator and attributing the politicizations with a unity that they did not posses in themselves. All the actors were reduced to the expression of the enemy of the 'brotherhood and unity of Yugoslavia's nations and nationalities' and treated as expressions of a counter-revolution. Furthermore, the regime retroactively forged an alleged secret 'Counter-revolutionary Committee of the Fifty' which supposedly consisted of students, 'liberals' in the LCC, and Matica members, and coordinated the alleged nationalist counter-revolution.[77]

## 4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have examined the politicization of the Croatian nation during the Croatian Spring at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of 1970s. I have argued that a series of changes in the emerging conditions of the 1960s formed the conditions of possibility for the emergence of the movement. I showed that, in terms of demands and strategies, the movement was neither coherent nor unified. Rather, it consisted of a variety of demands that, in a very general sense, drew on the logic that republics in Yugoslavia should become sources of sovereignty and power. However, the different actors represented sovereignty and the nature of social divisions in conflicting and incompatible ways. While, the 'liberal' leadership remained within the boundaries of the Yugoslavian imaginary and its consti-

[75]Tito, "Closing statement at the 21st LCY Presidency Session", p. 173.

[76]For details about the purge see: Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, p. 131

[77]Tito, "Korijeni, uzroci i klasna suština nacionalizma [The roots, cases, and class essence of nationalism]", p. 525.

tutive system of social divisions, Matica hrvatska and the student body transgressed the boundaries of the 'sayable' by floating and articulating demands that translated national difference into social division. These demands were situated within spaces of representation that contested the representation of history the Yugoslavian imaginary was founded upon. Furthermore, the student movement challenged the rules of the existing order by calling for a general strike in SR Croatia and by attempting to forge an alliance between the working class, the 'liberals' and the Matica. I have also argued that the regime's reading of events gave the movement a unity that could not be read off from the articulated demands and deployed strategies.

Lastly, it is important to note that both the emergence of the Croatian Spring and the hegemonic act that reckoned with it and gave it meaning, were possible precisely because of the indeterminacy of the notion of Yugoslavian identity and the constitutive tension between self-management and brotherhood and unity. The advancement of demands for the realisation of the former and the decentralization of power, could easily be represented as endangering Yugoslavian unity. Furthermore, despite the exclusion of all of the actors the logic that they, shared in a general sense became part of the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon through the 1974 Constitution. Yugoslavian sovereignty was pluralized and constituted as derivative of the sovereignty of Yugoslavia's republics. In the following chapter, I will examine the manner in which the Yugoslavian identity, as a subject position, was sedimented through the 1974 Constitution and how the links between 'nation', 'republic', 'working class' were articulated into a coherent whole.

# CHAPTER V

# Decontesting Yugoslavian Identity: Unity, Hierarchy and Self-Management

## 5.1 Introduction

Drawing on the theoretical framework discussed in Chapter 2, in this chapter I trace the identitary logic through which a unified representation of Yugoslavian society was constituted and sedimented into institutional forms. I focus on Yugoslavia's last Constitution, which was promulgated three years after the political exclusions of the actors of the Croatian Spring discussed in the previous chapter. At the time, Yugoslavia's 1974 Constitution was the world's longest. It consisted of a long list of Basic Principles and 406 articles.[1] As I have discussed in Chapter 1, the constitution has been identified as a weakness that caused Yugoslavia's disintegration and the emergence of nationalism. The existing literature criticizes it for sending out contradictory messages, being incomprehensible to ordinary citizens and failing to adequately represent the members of the Yugoslavian community.[2] Some authors saw in it an attempt 'kill nationalism'[3], while others blame it for being the root of later problems in Yugoslavia.[4] However, at the time of its promulgation, the Constitution was represented by Tito as embodying a 'more consistent solution

[1]Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*, p. 326.

[2]John R. Lampe. *Yugoslavia as History: Twice there was a Country.* Cambrdige: Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 306.

[3]Lydall, *Yugoslavia in Crisis*, p. 238.

[4]Kate Hudson. *Breaking the South Slav Dream: the Rise and Fall of Yugoslavia.* London: Pluto Press, 2003, p. 5.

to the national question'.[5] The president of the Federal Assembly claimed that it had (re)arranged the relations within the federation in a unique way which 'had no precedent in the history of federal structures' and that it created the conditions of possibility for 'the working class to attain a dominant role in all spheres of social life'.[6] In this sense, the importance of Yugoslavia's constitutional arrangement lay primarily in its sedimentation, through institutional forms, of a specific conception of Yugoslavian unity/identity. Since its failures to forge unity in the long run were also the very cracks out of which new democratic and/or national identities emerged in the 1980s, understanding the CDU's emergence necessitates fleshing out the identitary logic that underpinned the order out of which the party emerged.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the manner in which Yugoslavian identity, understood here as a subject position through which individuals are produced as social actors, was decontested through this constitutional arrangement. I argue that decontestation operated in a hierarchical way, whereby an overarching working class subject position was designated as the primary site of legitimate politics and as containing, limiting and structuring different yet equal national subject positions. These positions were considered to be concomitant with the federal territorial units, but not politically identical to them. In this sense, I argue, the working class subject position determined the political essence of national and/or republican and provincial subjectivities. Furthermore, I argue that the hierarchical articulation between national/territorial subjectivities and the working class subject was cemented through the element 'self-management' and made possible by the multiple meanings it attained within the order. In this sense, 'self-management' can be understood as an empty signifier that embodied the impossible fullness of the Yugoslavian community.

Drawing on James Tully's conceptualization of constitutional identity as a four dimensional phenomenon, I advance this argument by first examining the prevailing system of

[5]Josip Broz Tito. "Yugoslav Sovereignty-the Sovereignty of all Republics". In: *The National Question*. Beograd: Socialist Thought and Practice, 1983, p. 177.

[6]Mijalko Todorivić. "Report on the Final Draft of the S.F.R.Y. Constitution by Mijalko Todorović". In: *The Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*. Ljubljana: Dopisna Delavska Univerza, 1974, pp. 41, 48.

rules (rights, duties and powers) through which the identities of political actors and their mutual relations was constituted. Thereafter, in the second section, I examine the basic principles, values and goods that were brought to bear on those identities. In the third section, I examine the systems of governance and procedures that were to guide their conduct as members of the Yugoslavian community. In the fourth section, I examine the institutions through which the unity of the community was both sedimented/reproduced and through which the terms of unity could be changed or amended.[7] In the conclusion, after rehearsing my main points, I reflect on the role that the element 'self-management' played in the hierarchical identitary logic, and the introduce the following chapter.

Before moving on to the analysis, it is important that the limits of my discussion are clearly specified. The point of this chapter is not to assess the ability of the constitutional rules to forge unity in practice, but simply to flesh out the identitary logic that grounded the order. In this chapter, I look at the 1974 Constitution as a hegemonic system of rules that sediment, in institutional form, assumptions about the essence, form, direction and unity of a community and draw out these dimensions. In the following chapters, I look into the effects that the hegemonic system of rules had in practice. In Chapter 6, I will look into the (in)ability of its institutional forms to forge unity within the context of the protracted economic turned political crisis in the 1980s. In Chapter 7, I will address the effects that the rules had on the position of SR Serbia in the Yugoslavian order, within the context of a broader argument about the politicization of national identities and the emergence of Slobodan Milošević. In Chapter 8, I will look into the manner in which elements from this Constitution became moments of new political myths, including the nationalist discourse of the CDU, which emerged during the first democratic elections in SR Croatia.

## 5.2 The System of Rules of Mutual Constitution of the Identities

According to the 1974 Constitution, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was:

[7]For Tully's conceptualization of constitutional identity see: Tully, *Public Philosophy in a New Key*, pp. 194-197

> [...]a federal state having the form of a state community of voluntary united nations and their Socialist Republics and of the Socialist Autonomous Provinces of Vojvodina and Kosovo, which are constituent parts of the Socialist Republic of Serbia, based on the power of self-management by the working class and all working people. It is at the same time a socialist, self-management democratic community of working people and citizens and of nations and nationalities having equal rights.[8]

The nations, the nationalities, the citizens, the working class and working people were represented as subject positions constituting a unified Yugoslavian identity. These subject positions were not constituted along the same axis. By being attributed with power, the working class and the working people were represented as superior vis-a-vis all other subject positions within the order. The working class was constituted as the primary subject of legitimate politics while the legitimate terrain of politics was constituted as determined by its demands.

Since they were not attributed with power in themselves, national subjectivities were constituted along a subordinate axis and 'fixed' as mutually equal. By constituting 'equality' as their very essence, demands for realising national equality were decontested into the legitimate political terrain for the expression of national subjectivities. However, since national equality was essentially a relational and binding attribute, this decontestation limited the content that the demands for realising equality could take on; they were legitimate within the existing order to the extent that they contributed to the creation of a level playing field for all national subjects.

The rights and duties attributed to Yugoslavia's nations and nationalities reflected the hierarchical relationship between the nation and the working class constitutive of Yugoslavism. National subjectivities were constituted as 'equal' through a set of rules on the cultural terrain. Citizens were given the right to opt for a nation or nationality, to express their culture and use their language and alphabet freely. Propagating and practising national inequality and inciting national, racial or religious hatred was represented as unconstitutional. The right of citizens *not* to identify with the national subject positions was also protected. In this sense, national identification was constituted as a choice, not

[8] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.* Ljubljana: Dopisna Delavska Univerza, 1974, Article 1.

as an essential attribute that political subjects a priori possess.[9] Nations and nationalities were decontested as subjects entitled to instruction in their own language on the territory of each republic and autonomous province.[10] However, the particular languages and the particular nations/nationalities they corresponded to were omitted from the federal constitution.[11]

The articulation of 'nations' with 'self-determination' and the 'right to secession', in the Basic Principles of the constitutional order, signalled that they possessed a degree of subjectivity that transgressed the cultural terrain. However, these attributes were represented as somewhat redundant in the post-National Liberation/Socialist Revolution period, since nations had, according to the constitution, already 'willingly' and 'freely' expressed the desire to unite into a socialist federation. Self-determination and the right to succession were not constituted as formal rights that define national subjects but as abstract attributes that did not translate into political power.[12] Furthermore, secession itself was deemed unconstitutional and all of the members of the community, including the nations and nationalities, attributed with powers to struggle *against* it:

> It shall be the inviolable and inalienable right and duty of the nations and nationalities of Yugoslavia, working people and citizens to protect and defend the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and the social system of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia[...][13]

By constituting 'equality' as the essence of national subjectivities and substantiating it in terms of cultural rights, the nations and nationalities were decontested as cultural attributes ascribed to an empowered overarching working class subject position.

The hierarchical relationship between the working class and the nations and nationalities was sedimented through the manner in which Yugoslavia's territorial units were constituted. Republics and autonomous regions were represented as sites for exercising 'the sovereignty of the people and the working class',[14] whereby 'the people' translated into particular national subjects in republican constitutions. 'The federation' was constituted

[9] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Article 170.
[10] Ibid., Article 171.
[11] They were constituted as particulars in the republican constitutions.
[12] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Basic Principles I.
[13] Ibid., Article 237.
[14] Ibid., Article 3.

as a site for exercising sovereignty on the (limited) terrain of 'common interests', that included security, independence, territorial integrity and the common market.[15] Unlike nations and nationalities, the republics were named in their particularity in the Constitution, signalling that they were more important elements of the federal order than the national subjects. The sovereignty attributed to republics within the federation was derivative of national and working class sovereignty. However, following the logic of the constitutional order which assigned power to the working class as a group and not to nations, the sovereignty of nations in republics was derivative of the working class subject, and not vice-versa. Although the republics 'belonged' to nations according to Article 1, their political character was thus grounded in the working class subject. The disarticulation of the link between 'territorial unit' and (particular) 'national subject' was further reflected in the decontestation of 'sovereignty' as shared between different nations/nationalities in republics. The SR Croatia, for example, was decontested as 'the national state of the Croatian nation, the state of the Serbian nation in Croatia and the state of all nationalities inhabiting it', and also as founded upon the sovereignty of the working people.[16] Paradoxically, as I will show when discussing the federal institutions, the rules for the constitution of federal bodies implied that there was a political congruence between nation/territorial unit.

The hierarchical relationship between class and nation was reflected in the constitutive role that the self-managing producer played in forging a sense of overall unity and coherence. The practice of self-management was constituted as the very essence of the working class subject and a channel to exercise his/her power within the existing order. Self-management was constituted as the right:

> [...] on the basis of which every working man, on equal footing with other working

[15] According to Article 244 this included sovereignty, equality, national freedom, independence, territorial integrity, security, social self-defence, the defence of the country, the international position of the country and its relations with other states and international organizations, the system of socialist socio-economic relations based on self-management, the unity of the political system, the basic democratic freedoms and rights of man and citizen, the solidarity and social security of working people and citizens, and the unity of the Yugoslavian market.

[16] *Ustav Socijalističke Republike Hrvatske [The Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Croatia].* Narodne Novine, 08/1974. [Electronic record]. URL: `https://www.pravo.unizg.hr/_download/repository/Ustav_Socijalisticke_RH_1974.pdf` (visited on 05/12/2016), Article 1. and Article 2.

> people, shall decide on his own labour and on the conditions and results of labour, on his own and common interests [...] and shall exercise power and manage social affairs;[17]

The centrality of the working class subject was reflected in the extensive list of workers' rights and duties, as well as those of labour organizations in the Constitution. Approximately 140 Articles served exclusively to delimit the working class subject and substantiate the channels for realising his/her self-managerial rights and duties. Since, as I will discuss in the following subsections, all institutions were understood as self-managing organs, the power of the working class was also embodied in the systems of governance and institutions for cooperation and discussion.

In the material sense, the practice of self-management was rooted in social ownership, constituted as the name of the objects that the workers manage, the basis of the production system and material foundation for various Associations of Labour. The latter were constituted as institutional forms wherein workers exercised self-management and enter into agreements about their economic interests and relations, thereby giving rise to an economic system based on deliberation in place of market mechanisms.[18] The Associations of Labour, as I will argue in the following subsections, fed into the systems of governance and institutions for discussion, as they were the sites out of which working class subjectivities were delegated from the work place upwards to higher instances of power.

Furthermore, self-management was constituted as the very basis, limit and direction for the realization of republican, provincial and communal rights and duties.[19] In this sense, the territorial units resembled the Associations of Labour and were decontested as channels for the self-management of the Yugoslavian working class. Territorial boundaries were thus constituted as administrative units and not as expressions of different national political subjects. As I will show in the following sections, the self-managing character of republics was central to the decontestation of Yugoslavian identity into a hierarchy between class and nation.

[17] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Basic Principles II.
[18] Ibid., Basic Principles III.
[19] Ibid., Basic Principles III.

Reflecting the reality of a single party socialist regime, the LCY was constituted as the only organized political actor empowered to substantiate the interests of the working class subject and maintain order. Its role was defined as:

> [...] the organized leading ideological and political force of the working class, working people in building socialism, realizing the solidarity of the working people and the brotherhood and unity of Yugoslavia's people.

and:

> [...] a primary initiator and exponent of political activity aimed at safeguarding and further developing the socialist revolution and socialist relations of self-management.[20]

In this regard, the LCY's role was transcendental because it aimed to reconcile, from within itself, existing and/or potential political differences, into a unified political body and securing its own hegemonic position. To broaden its platform of action, other socio-political organizations (the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia, the Federation of Trade Unions, the War Veterans Federation, and the Youth League) were also constituted as legitimate political forces but were placed under its strict tutelage. The role of the LCY and other socio-political organizations was:

> [...] to discuss social questions and take political initiative in all fields of social life, adjust views; take political positions regarding the solution of these questions, the guidance of social development, the realization of the rights and interests of the working people and citizens, the realization of the equality of the nations and nationalities, and the promotion of socialist self-management democratic relations, submit proposals for the solution of social questions, and issue guidelines to their delegates to the assemblies of socio political communities.[21]

In other words, the LCY and its affiliated organizations, were constituted as the very space of legitimate politics wherein the hierarchically decontested Yugoslavian identity was to be realised on a day-to-day basis. Furthermore, as I will argue in the following sections, these organizations also served as the pool for recruiting delegates for the governing institutions.

[20] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Basic Principles VIII.
[21] Ibid., Basic Principles VIII.

In sum, nations, nationalities, the working class, and the working people were all constituted as the members of the Yugoslavian community. Their relationship was fixed in hierarchical terms; the working class was constituted as the locus of power in the order and the primary subject of legitimate politics. National subjectivities were decontested as expressions of different cultural attributes accommodated within and determined by the working class subject. Within this constellation, their political essence was rooted in their mutual equality. The hierarchical relationship between class and nation, constitutive of Yugoslavian unity, was also reflected in definition of the territorial units as self-managing bodies founded upon the power of the working class and 'belonging' to nations. The LCY and its affiliated institutions were constituted as the space for realising the hierarchical logic in practice, articulating the meaning of 'self-management' and safeguarding 'brotherhood and unity'.

## 5.3 The Principles, Values and Goods Constituting Yugoslavian Identity

The system of values brought to bear on the identification of the members of the community further reproduced the hierarchical relationship between class and nation constitutive of the Yugoslavian identity. The system of values infusing the order with a 'positive' character, derived from the working class subject and the self-managing project constitutive of his/her identity. The principle basing the entire socio-political landscape was constituted as the tenet 'from each according to his abilities; to each according to his labour'.[22] Self-managing bodies and communities, state agencies, the working people and citizens were to structure their practices and cooperation in accordance with it.[23]

The realisation of this principle in practice, through existing institutional forms, was equated with the emancipation of the Yugoslavian working class subject. By practising self-management, s/he transcended historically conditioned socio-economic inequalities,

[22] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Basic Principles II.
[23] Ibid., Basic Principles IX.

eliminated the antagonism between labour and capital and precluded the return to a socio-economic system based on the exploitation and alienation of man.[24] The very raison d'état of the Yugoslavian order was constituted as the realisation of this emancipatory principle:

> The freedoms, rights and duties of the man and citizen, as spelled out by the present Constitution, are an inseparable part and expression of democratic socialist self-management relations in which man is becoming liberated from [...] exploitation and arbitrariness and with his labour creating the conditions for the all-round and free expression and protection of his personality and respect for human dignity.[25]

The values brought to bear on identification – freedom, equality and unity – derived from the principle underpinning the order and served the purpose of bringing it into being. To bring these values into being, cooperation between political subjects was to be conducted on the basis of reciprocity and solidarity. Working class unity was constituted as 'the awareness that the working people can only realise their lasting interests on the basis of these [reciprocity and solidarity] principles'.[26]

The institutional landscape delimiting the terrain of legitimate politics was constituted as stemming from this position of man and serving him/her and his/her role in society.[27] In this sense, the socio-economic system was constituted as a place for realizing'the economic and social security of working man', on the basis of 'solidarity, reciprocity and socialist humanism' and for equalizing 'the conditions of life and work' and transcending 'differences stemming from economic underdevelopment and other unequal conditions'.[28]

Within this constellation, self-management was constituted as a means for emancipating the working class subject and as the state of the full realisation of his/her freedom, equality, unity, reciprocity and solidarity. The whole constitutional order was weaved around a utopian future projection of a 'society of free producers' and the institutional forms structuring the terrain of legitimate politics were designed for the purpose of bringing that society into being. Consequently, the values brought to bear on the identification of national subjects, both derived from this emancipatory project and served the purpose

[24] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Basic Principles II.
[25] Ibid., Basic Principles II.
[26] Ibid., Basic Principles II.
[27] Ibid., Basic Principles II.
[28] Ibid., Basic Principles V.

of bringing it into being. The political interests of each nation and nationality separately as well as all together were constituted as:

> [...] socialist social relations based on self management by working people and the protection of the socialist self-management system; [...] the brotherhood and unity of the nations and nationalities; the uniform interests of the working class and solidarity among workers and all working people; freedoms for the all around development of the human personality and for the rapprochement of nations and nationalities [...]; the unification and adjustment of efforts to develop the economic foundations of a socialist society [...];a system of socio-economic relations and uniform foundations for a political system which will ensure the common interests of the working class [...] and the equality of nations and nationalities [...][29]

By defining the political terrain of national subjectivities in terms of the working class emancipatory project, all national subjects were decontested as forming part of a transcendental working class and participating in its emancipation on equal terms. In the process of resolving the labour/capital antagonism and bringing about the society of free producers into being, nations/nationalities were constituted as liberating themselves. The realisation of national equality was constituted as contingent upon the realisation of the emancipatory project and possible, in its fullness, only if the economic conditions of social life and work of the working people equalize across the federation. For the purpose of equalizing economic conditions, special attention to, and resources for, the development of underdeveloped republics and autonomous provinces were constituted as part and parcel of the common Yugoslavian interest.[30] In this sense, economic redistribution practices were constituted as the legitimate channel for resolving (potential) national antagonisms, together with the cultural rights and duties, discussed in the previous section.

The values constitutive of the emancipatory project were also brought to bear on the cooperation between republics and autonomous regions at the federal level. The basic principles structuring decision-making in federal agencies were agreement, solidarity, reciprocity and equal participation by territorial units and responsibility for the their own development as well as the development of the whole socialist community.[31] As discussed in the previous section, the territorial units were decontested as sites for realising workers'

[29] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Basic Principles I.
[30] Ibid., Basic Principles III.
[31] Ibid., Basic Principles I.

self-management. In this sense, both the values brought to bear on cooperation and the political content of that cooperation, were determined by the working class emancipatory project. However, although the content of cooperation aimed at realizing, in its last consequence, a society of free producers, the decision-making process also aimed at realising national equality. As I will show in in the following subsections, different institutional mechanisms at the federal level were put in place as channels for realising the mutual equality of nations and nationalities.

The education system was constituted as a channel for fostering and reproducing the values underpinning the order:

> The system of upbringing and education shall be based on the achievements of modern science, especially Marxism as the foundation of scientific socialism, and shall be instrumental in training young people for work and self-management, educating them in the spirits and achievements of Socialist Revolution, socialist code of ethics, self-managing democracy, socialist patriotism, brotherhood and unity, the equality of nations and nationalities and socialist internationalism.[32]

The constitutive role of self-management within the Yugoslavian system of values and principles was reflected in the representation of all practices distorting it as 'anti-constitutional'. These included:

> [...] any form of production management or other social activities, or any form of distribution that distorts social-relationships based on the above defined position of man[...]through bureaucratic arbitrariness, technocratic usurpation, privileges based on the monopoly of management of the means of production, the appropriation of social resources on a group property basis, any other mode of privatization of these resources, in the form of private property or particularistic selfishness, or through any form of restricting the working class in playing its historical role in socio-economic and political relations, in organizing power for itself and for all working people [...][33]

In other words, self-management embodied the very essence of the values and principles delimiting the Yugoslavian subject position.

In sum, the basic principles and values brought to bear on the members of the Yugoslavian community reproduced the hierarchical identitary logic, since they derived from the working class subject and its emancipatory project. The values brought to bear on

[32] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Basic Principles V.
[33] Ibid., Basic Principles II.

national subjectivities originated in the ideal of working class emancipation which, as a consequence, constituted also 'true' national emancipation. The centrality of the working class subject, apparent at the level of principles and values, was in stark contrast to the constitution of national identities as categories one can opt in and out of. National difference was not constituted as a value in itself, but as something to be contained and decontested within a broader working class emancipatory project.

## 5.4 The Relations of Governance, Rules and Procedures for Practices

The relations of governance constituting the Yugoslavian political landscape were a sedimentation of the hierarchical identitary logic of Yugoslavism. Two mutually constitutive systems of governance were introduced for the purposes of exercising power of the working class over itself and decontest national subjectivities as mutually equal.

The delegate system was founded upon the emancipatory project discussed in the previous subsection. It was constituted as a system of governance that would realise the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' in institutional form, 'an institutionally new and special kind of link between self-management and government' and as 'the universal principle underlying the entire socio-political system of Yugoslavia'.[34] The delegate system was basically a channel for transmitting workers' self-management from lower labour centred units (self-managing organizations and communities,[35] local communities,[36] and socio-political organizations[37]), to higher to socio-political territorial units (communes, provinces, re-

[34] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Appendix.

[35] These included: the Organizations of Associated Labour; the organizations of business associations; the banks; the insurance communities; agricultural and other cooperatives; the contractual organizations of associated labour; the self-managing communities of interests; the local communities and the work communities that performed affairs for state and other agencies and organizations. See:ibid., Appendix.

[36] Self-managing territorial units concerned with local issues. In rural areas, such communities were established for one or several villages and in urban areas for individual sections of a city. They did not perform any function of public power and in this sense differed from socio-political communities such as communes, provinces, republics and the federation. See: ibid., Appendix.

[37] Political bodies of working people organized on a programmatic socialist oriented platform. These include the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia, the Federation of Trade Unions, the War Veterans Federations and The Youth League. See: ibid., Appendix.

publics and the Federation). Through it, workers were directly exercising 'their rights, duties and responsibilities of organized participation in the performance of the assemblies of socio-political communities'.[38]

The delegate system sedimented a relation of governance whereby, in theory, workers were exercising power over themselves. Delegation, represented in contrast to representation, assured that the interests of the lower units were not (mis)represented by intermediaries, but delegated upward in their literal form. According to the constitution, the delegates were to take positions in accordance with what was previously decided in the bodies that had elected them to higher instances of power, thus, reflecting the lower levels without any alternations/modifications.[39]

The delegate system served as a mechanism for constituting a network of assemblies which formed the very backbone of the Yugoslavian institutional landscape. An assembly was constituted as 'a social, self-managing body and the supreme organ of power within the framework of the rights and duties of its socio-political community'.[40] In this sense, it was the very terrain for the working class subject to exercise power over him/herself. The members of delegations were to be elected by workers in basic self-managing organizations and communities from among their members, and the composition to be such as to ensure the delegation of the interests of workers in all phases of the working process.[41] The candidates for the members of delegations of basic self-managing organizations were appointed by the Socialist Alliance of the Working People or trade union organizations, which were extensions of the LCY.[42]

The assembly system was constituted as a channel for transforming self-management by the working people in various labour associations into 'a unified system of self-management by and for the power of the working class and all working people'.[43] The system expanded from the communal assemblies, which were constituted as the basic socio-political unit in the system, all the way up to the bicameral Federal Assembly. A list of candidates for

[38] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Article 133.
[39] Ibid., Basic Principles IV.
[40] Ibid., Article 132.
[41] Ibid., Article 134.
[42] Ibid., Article 135.
[43] Ibid., Basic Principles IV.

the assemblies of the communes would be drawn up within the Socialist Alliance of the Working People, including delegates from organizations of associated labour, local communities and socio-political organizations. The delegates in communal assemblies would, on the one hand, elect delegates for the Federal Chamber of the Yugoslavian Assembly directly while also electing the delegates to the assemblies of republics and autonomous provinces. These assemblies, in turn, delegated members to the Chamber of Republics and Provinces at the federal level.[44] I will discuss the differences in the constitution and operation of the two chambers of the Federal Assembly in the following subsection. For now, it is important to note that both chambers formed part of an extensive delegate chain, rooted in the self-management of the working class subject at the work place. Since all of the delegates to the assemblies were members of the socialist organizations under the competency of the LCY, the party was both the ideological hegemon and the 'source' for recruiting delegates at all levels of governance. In this regard, the systems of governance further sedimented LCY's hegemonic position within the Yugoslavian order.

In sum, the system of governance reproduced the hierarchical identitary logic constitutive of Yugoslavism, whereby a working class identity was designated as the primary site of legitimate politics and different national subjectivities decontested as mutually equal and included within the framework of the working class emancipatory project. Through the system of governance self-management transformed from a principle of organizing economic relations into a universal principle organizing the entire Yugoslavian institutional landscape. At the level of federal institutions, the delegate system also served as a channel for realising the mutually equality of national subjects, which, as I will show in the following subsection, were constituted as congruent with the territorial divisions of the SFRY.

[44] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Article 139.

## 5.5 Institutions for Discussion and Alternation of Rules and Relations

The institutional framework which delimited and defined the landscape of legitimate politics and organized it through fixed procedures of discussion, negotiation and decision-making, sedimented the hierarchical identity logic, albeit through different forms. As discussed in previous sections, the institutions and territorial units were decontested into self-managing sites founded upon a working class emancipatory project, and were to serve as catalysts for bringing the society of free producers into being and realising the mutual equality of nations and nationalities. Cooperation at the federal level followed the same logic. To decontest nations as equal, the federal institutional forms were constituted as self-managerial in content and plural in form. The plurality was sedimented primarily in territorial terms and, as a consequence, implicitly national. However, the political link between the 'nation' and 'territorial unit' was not fully substantiated within the framework of the constitutional order.

The Federal Assembly was constituted as a bicameral 'body of self-management and the supreme organ of power within the framework of federal rights'.[45] It was the site for electing delegates for the Federal Executive Council and the Federal and Constitutional Courts. Its rights and duties were split between two chambers which were constituted and operated acceding to different procedural logics.[46]

The Federal Chamber was composed of thirty delegates from self-managing organizations, communities and socio-political organizations from each republic, and twenty from

[45] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Article 282.

[46] The Article 283 constituted the competencies of the Assembly of SFRY as 1) to decide on amendments to the Constitution of the SFRY 2) discuss and lay down the fundamentals od the domestic and foreign policy of SFRY 3) adopt Social Plan of Yugoslavia, the Federal budget and the Federal Annual Balance Sheet 4) decide on the alternations of the boundaries of the SFRY 5) deciding on war and peace; ratify international treaties pertaining to political and military cooperation and those entailing the passage of new statues or amendments of existing ones 6) formulate the enforcement policy if federal statues and other regulations and enactments and lay down obligations for federal agencies 7) electing the President of the Republic and proclaim the election of the Presidency of the SFRY 8) elect and relieve of office of President and members of the Federal Executive Council 9) elect and relieve of office the President and the judges of the Constitutional court of Yugoslavia and Federal Court; nominating and relieving of office the Federal Social Attorney of Self-Management; nominate and relieve of office Federal Secretaries, the Federal Public Prosecutor, other officials of federal agencies, and members of collective bodies specified by present constitution 10) exercise political supervision over the work of the Federal executive council and federal administrative agencies (...)

each autonomous province. The list of candidates was drawn up by the SAWP and the delegates elected by the members of communal assemblies, the lowest level of the delegate system.[47] Due to a high level of decentralization in internal politics and foreign relations, which were under its competency, the Federal Chamber's cardinal political role was deciding on amendments to the constitutional order through a two-thirds majority vote and in agreement with the assemblies of all republics and autonomous provinces.[48] A minimum of thirty delegates in the Federal Chamber, the Presidency, the Federal Executive Council as well as any republican and provincial assembly, had the right to initiate amendments.[49]

The constitution of the Chamber sedimented the hierarchical identitary logic, although its decision-making process resulted in forging a single self-managing position and 'collapsing' difference. A variety of self-managing working class interests were delegated from the basic governing units up to the federal institutions following the logic of republican and provincial parity. The republics were decontested as mutually equal through the number of delegates to the Chamber, but relatively speaking more powerful than the provinces. In this sense, although constituted on the basis of plurality, the Chamber sedimented the power relation between republics and provinces. Furthermore, the parity rules were constituted as channels for realising the equality of nations and nationalities and decontesting national subjectivities but, in practice, this was not necessary realised, given the heterogeneity of the territorial units, which I've mapped out in Chapter 3. For instance, it could be that the delegates from Croatia were Serbs from Croatia and that the delegates from Vojvodina were Croats from Vojvodina. Equally so, the national distribution could be skewed within the body, as there could be an overrepresentation of a single nation through the system of parity territorial representation. However, given the identitary logic, which constituted delegates as workers not nationals in the political sense, this was not necessarily a contradiction. Furthermore, the decision-making rule within the Federal Chamber worked towards dissolving their differences and particularities into a majority-based decision, with no veto power granted to any of the delegations,

[47] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Article 291.
[48] Ibid., Article 401. and Article 402.
[49] Ibid., Article 399.

with the possibility of one delegation out-voting the other. In this sense, although the constitution of the body included elements of territorial delegation, the decision-making worked towards forging unity at the expense of plurality. The importance of this institutional logic within the order was reflected in its competency to amend the terms under which the Yugoslavian order was constituted. If the majority of the delegates chose to transform the constitutional rules and the minority had to accept it despite disagreeing.

The Chamber of Republics and Provinces of the Federal Assembly, was constituted as the site for 'the adjustment of positions' of the assemblies of republics and autonomous provinces on the terrain of its competencies.[50] In contrast to the Federal Chamber, the Chamber of Republics and Provinces played a cardinal role in the formation of legislation and policy, both independently and in agreement with the assemblies of republics and provinces.[51] It was composed of twelve elected delegates from each republican assembly and eight delegates from each provincial assembly. They were to retain their tenure in the assemblies that had elected them and articulate the positions of these respective assemblies.[52] The Chamber was to adjust the positions of the assemblies by deciding on matters unanimously, with the assent of all of its constitutive delegations.[53]

The Chamber was the site for delegating particular republican and provincial self-managerial interest that, due to the unanimous voting procedure, were to translate into

[50] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Article 286.

[51] According to Article 286, the assemblies of the republics and provinces, in agreement with the Chamber of Republics and Provinces, were responsible for: 1) adopting the Yugoslavian Social Plan 2) formulating policy and passing legislation in areas of the monetary system and currency issue, the foreign exchange system, external trade, credit and other economic relations with foreign countries;formation of money and foreign exchange reserves and their use; tariff and non-tariff protection; social price control for products and services; crediting accelerated development in economically underdeveloped republics and provinces; taxation of sale of goods and products; the system and sources of funds for financing the federation; determining the measures for the restriction of the market and the freedom of sale of goods and services and measures providing a basis for compensation; 3) determining the total volume of expenditure of the Federal Budget every year; 4) deciding on the establishment of federal funds and the incurring of federal obligations except for in the cases when federal agencies are authorized to do so independently; 5) ratifying international treaties that require alternations in legislation in areas within its jurisdiction. Independently, the Chamber was responsible for: 1) passing laws and temporary measures 2) determining on the proposal by the Presidency of the SFRY the sources and volume of finance and decide on the contraction of credits and other obligations for the needs of national defence and state security arising out of extraordinary circumstances 3) reviewing reports by the Federal Executive Council and federal administrative agencies, exercising supervision over them and through provision of guidelines direct their work 4) formulating the policy of enforcement of federal statutes, other regulations and enactments passed by it.

[52] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Article 292. and Article 296.

[53] Ibid., Article 295.

a decision that all delegations converge upon. Despite the difference in the number of delegates between republics and provinces, this Chamber was also an institutional site wherein their powers levelled out, since provinces were attributed with veto power just like republics. While the Federal Chamber of the Assembly was constituted as a site for the expression of different self-managerial interests, the Chamber of the Republics and Provinces was thus primarily the site for the expression of different territorial interests which were, in their last consequence, essentially self-managerial. Furthermore, since these territorial units were constituted as 'belonging' to nations and nationalities, the manner of the Chamber's constitution and decision-making were represented as institutional channels for realising the mutual equality of nations and nationalities. Just like within the Federal Chamber, the fact that nations and territorial units did not overlap was rendered irrelevant by the constitution of the working class as the locus of power within the territorial units. Despite being the main Chamber for discussion and decision-making within the Assembly, the decision-making rule made it more difficult and time consuming to forge a decision.

Similarly, the Federal Executive Council, the executive body of the Federal Assembly which was elected among its delegates, was also to be constituted in 'conformity with the principle of equal representation of republics and corresponding representation of provinces' while in the 'nomination of federal secretaries and other officials in charge of federal administrative agencies, national composition was to be taken into account'.[54] The judges of the Federal Court, the body responsible for eliminating inequalities in the common market by resolving economic disputes between individuals, organizations, republics and provinces, were also to be elected by the Federal Assembly 'according to the principle of parity representation of all republics and corresponding representation of provinces.[55] The judges of the Constitutional Court, responsible for preserving constitutionality and order by resolving disputes between republics, provinces and the federation, were elected by the Federal Assembly following the formula of two judges from each republic and one

[54] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Article 348.
[55] Ibid., Article 370.

from each autonomous province.[56] The parity mechanisms for the constitution of these self-managing federal institutions were put in place to decontest nations and nationalities as mutually equal within a socio-political order founded upon the power of the working class.

Lastly, the Presidency of the SFRY was constituted as the representative of Yugoslavia home and abroad, the protector of the constitutional order, the protector of equality of nations and nationalities, and the commander of the Armed Forces.[57] It was designed to be a collective head of state, composed from one member from each republic and province, delegated by his/her republican or provincial assembly.[58] Just like the Chamber of Republics and Provinces, the Presidency was to 'work on the basis of adjustment of views of its members', with veto powers given to all of its members.[59] The Presidency was thus the terrain upon which republics and provinces were positioned on a completely equal footing, both in terms of voting power and number of delegates. Furthermore, the Presidency was the only institutional site constituted explicitly as responsible for realizing the equality of nations and nationalities. For the purpose of its operational unity, the function of the President of Presidency was to be fulfilled through the yearly rotation of its constitutive delegates. This rotation mechanism was meant to assure the equal participation of territorial units and thus also of nations and nationalities.[60]

In practice, however, both the institution of the President of Presidency and the collective head of state were suspended, and Josip Broz Tito was constituted as the President of the Republic for life. According to the constitution, Tito occupied a special position within the order due to his:

> [...] historic role in the National Liberation War and the Socialist Revolution, in the creation and development of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the development of Yugoslavian socialist self-managing society, the achievement of the brotherhood and unity of the nations and nationalities of Yugoslavia, the consolidation of the independence of the country and its position in international relations[...][61]

[56] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Article 381.
[57] Ibid., Article 313.
[58] Ibid., Article 321.
[59] Ibid., Article 330.
[60] Ibid., Article 327.
[61] Ibid., Article 333.

As President of the SFRY, Tito exercised the powers of the Collective Presidency until 1980 as well as that of the head of the hegemonic LCY. As a representative of Yugoslavia home and abroad, the head of the armed forces and the hegemonic party, Tito was the embodiment of Yugoslavism as such and the ideological arbiter in conflicting national, republican, and ideological demands emerging from within the ranks of the hegemonic LCY. After his death, his role was to be replaced by the Presidency and the institution of the President of the Presidency, following a yearly rotation mechanism. Furthermore, the decisions Tito was making, as an individual, were meant to be replaced by a decision-making procedure which granted veto powers to each delegate in the institution. Due to the unique position that Tito, as an individual, occupied in the foundation and the operation of the Yugoslavian order, it was difficult to replace him with a body of 'anonymous' delegates from territorial assemblies.

On assuming office, the President of the Republic (Tito), the members of the (collective) Presidency of the SFRY and its President, and the members of the Constitutional Court made a formal declaration which summarized the essence of the institutional position they occupied and captured the very terms of Yugoslavian unity:

> I hereby declare that I will fight for the protection of the sovereignty, independence and integrity of the country and the achievement of power by the working class and all working people, that I shall strive for the achievement of brotherhood and unity and the equality of nations and nationalities, for the development of socialist self-management society and for the realization of the common interests of the working people and citizens of the socialist Federal republic of Yugoslavia, and that I will abide by the Constitution of S.F.R.Y [...][62]

In other words, they were occupying positions of power to exercise the power of the working class and realise the equality of nations of nationalities and bring the society of free producers into being.

To sum up, the institutions for discussion and alternation of rules defining the Yugoslav community sedimented the hierarchical identitary logic constitutive of Yugoslavian identity, albeit through different procedural forms. The Federal Chamber of the Federal Assembly was the institutional site for forging a unified self-managing position out of a variety of self-managing interests expressed in the communes, and attributed primarily with

[62] *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Article 397.

the power to amend the constitutional rules. The Chamber of Republics and Provinces, which played the central role in the formation of legislation, was the site for 'adjusting' the potentially conflicting positions of Yugoslavia's constitutive territorial units and, in doing so, realising the mutual equality of nations and nationalities. The Federal Executive Council and the Federal Court were to be constituted following the principle of the equal representation of republics and the corresponding representation of provinces. While the Presidency, which was effectively suspended until 1980, was to operate on the principle of completely equal republican and provincial power. The most striking aspect of Yugoslavia's federal institutional forms was its overall-constitution following the assumption that republics and provinces reflected national identities although they were not decontested as (particularly) national in the political sense. This potential inconsistency was rendered coherent through the nodal point self-management, which linked the elements 'nation', 'class' and 'territorial unit', infusing them with a sense of sameness they did not necessary possess, given the national heterogeneity of each territorial unit.

## 5.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that the identitary logics underpinning the Yugoslavian order was based upon a hierarchical relationship between an empowered working class subject and mutually equal national subjectivities, which were embodied in territorial delegation via the mechanisms for the constitution and operation of federal bodies. Furthermore, I have maintained that particular nations were decontested as not congruent with particular territorial units, yet assumed to be congruent in the federal mechanisms for realising their equal participation. My analysis also shows that this (potential) contradiction was rendered coherent within the Yugoslavian order through the nodal point 'self-management'.

First, as I have argued, 'self-management' fixed the hierarchical relationship between national and working class subjectivities by determining the political essence of the 'nation' in a class based emancipatory project. Second, my analysis shows that, this con-

stitutive role was not contained to the relationship between 'class' and 'nation'. The meaning of the nodal point 'self-management' expanded to include: the essential rights of every human being; the basis of the economic system; the basis, limit and direction for the power of the territorial units; the basis of the LCY's hegemony; the basis of the system of values brought to bear on the identification of the members of the community; the essence of the society Yugoslavia was becoming towards; the reasons for the existence of the entire political landscape; the essence of the delegate and the assembly system; the different institutional forms and decision-making rules of Federal institutions; and the very state that was to be brought into being by the institutional forms sedimented through the 1974 Constitutional order. In other words, 'self-management' became the empty signifier defining and delimiting the terrain on which political relations in Yugoslavia were constituted through the promulgation of the 1974 Constitution. The emptiness of its meaning, which resulted from the variety of different meanings it could take in practice, founded the entire institutional landscape and its attributed subject positions. Elements such as 'nation', 'territorial unity', 'freedom' ,'working class', etc. were articulated together into a meaningful whole through 'self-management' and were further sedimented in institutional forms and subject positions.

Following a series of dislocations that culminated in a full-fledged hegemonic crisis of the LCY by the end of the 1980s, the hierarchical decontestation of Yugoslavian identity and the presupposition that territorial parity translates into national equality were contested. Gradually, elements derived from the 1974 Constitution became part of a broader set of political antagonisms that subverted the system of social division, discussed in Chapter 3, upon which the Yugoslavian order was premised. These processes of contestation, which I will discuss in detail Chapters 7 and 8, went hand in hand with the failure of 'self-management' to fulfil the function of an empty signifier and serve as a source of unity. I will map out this failure, on the economic and (federal) institutional terrains, in the next chapter.

# CHAPTER VI

# Hegemonic Crisis: the 'Floating' of Self-management

## 6.1 Introduction

Drawing on the theoretical framework of Chapter 2, and the terms of constituting the Yugoslavian subject discussed in Chapter 5, in this chapter I examine the 1980-1986 period as one characterised by a deepening crisis of LCY's hegemony. I focus on the interplay of institutional and economic practices that undermined the unity of the LCY and formed the context within which the 'national problem', which I discuss in detail in the following chapters, was situated. In this sense, in the present chapter I look at the economic and institutional dimensions of the 1980s crisis and in the next chapter I focus on the politicization of Serbian national identity in the same period. In Chapter 8, I look into the developments in SR Croatia prior to and during the first democratic elections in 1990, which were shaped by the broader processes that I discuss in this chapter and the following. Although SR Croatia had been characterized as the 'silent republic'[1] after the repression of the Croatian Spring movement and the purges within the League of Communists of Croatia (LCC), the failures of the self-managing order, and the contestations that emerged out of its cracks, impacted both the ability of the LCC to maintain order in its 'own republic' and the new forms of social divisions that competed for hegemony in the 1990 elections.

[1] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 26 May 1989.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-219-7; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:f6e36c90-37bd-4365-ad57-3ce8294862c5` (visited on 02/15/2016).

Some authors claim the 1980s were characterised by a rivalry among republican parties that 'turned into a full blown ethnic politics'[2] and the 'simmering' of nationalism in all parts of Yugoslavia.[3] In contrast, in 1988 Dennison Rusinow maintained that Yugoslavia's economic crisis had expanded into a political and social crisis, but also that:

> [...] it remains possible that Yugoslavia, a country historically improbable in many ways, is taking a unique, if extremely difficult, path toward economic development and democratization.[4]

The differences between these interpretations of the period are exemplary of the trend of 'reading history backwards' and focusing on what points to the dissolution of the country at the expense of possibilities that suggested otherwise, something characteristic of the post-1990 literature on Yugoslavia.[5] As Rusinow's assessment renders visible, and as I have observed while examining sources, evaluations and debates written in the period, as late as 1988 it was still unclear how the Yugoslavian crisis would play itself out and which political forms would emerge out of it. The very fact that nation-states became solutions to the crisis after the first elections, has led researchers to focus on the national dimension of the 1980s crisis and overlook the indeterminacy that marked the period.

In this chapter I argue that the period was characterised by the floating of the signifier 'self-management' which organized the economic, political and social terrains, embodied the fullness of Yugoslavian society and secured LCY's hegemony. My contention is that this process was gradual and uneven and that it came about as a consequence of the regime's inability to articulate a coherent self-managerial response to suture the dislocatroy effects of the deepening debt crisis. These dislocations led to various problematizations of the constitutional order discussed in the previous chapter, both within the hegemonic LCY and outside of it. Eventually, as I discuss in detail in the following chapter, the crisis grew to include wider social groupings which contested the subject positions constitutive of the imaginary.

---

[2]Lampe, *Yugoslavia as History: Twice there was a Country*, p. 325.

[3]Perica, *Balkan Idols: Religion and Nationalism in Yugoslav States*, p. 133.

[4]Dennison I. Rusinow. "Introduction". In: *Yugoslavia: a Fractured Federalism.* Ed. by Dennison I. Rusinow. Washington: The Wilson Center Press, 1988, p. 7.

[5]For an account of this problem in the context of researching former Yugoslavia see: Bieber, Galijaš, and Archer, *Debating the End of Yugoslavia*, pp. 1-2.

As discussed in Chapter 2, a hegemonic crisis entails a crisis of a hegemonic system of representation, whereby its representational failures become visible and political struggles emerge in an attempt to suture meaning. It is related to the incurable structural contradictions upon which forces of opposition organize. These contradictions entail the entire imaginary horizon and, thus, include both the institutional and economic terrains. A hegemonic crisis is marked by the regime's inability to maintain and control social divisions and gives rise to a broad socio-historical critique. It differs from a conjunctural crisis which only gives rise to political criticism of a minor character. In other words, the difference between a hegemonic and conjunctural crisis is located in the different effects that discourses of reform and/or resistance have on the imaginary horizon.[6] Retrospectively, the events of the Croatian Spring discussed in Chapter 4, can be characterised as a conjunctural crisis because the hegemonic LCY was able to suture it within the framework of the existing imaginary by representing the events and demands into expressions of 'counter revolution' and 'nationalism' and situating them within the hegemonic system of social divisions. In contrast, as I will show in this and the following chapter, the 1980s were marked by the inability of the hegemonic LCY to control social divisions as different positions within it, regarding both the nature of and potential solution to the crisis, gradually divided the party from within.

In the present chapter I map out the structural contradictions that marked the 1980s and resulted in the weakening of the dominant imaginary. I advance my argument by firstly highlighting the impact that Josip Broz Tito and Edvard Kardelj's deaths had on the rules structuring the imaginary horizon and the (in)ability to forge a consensus regarding ideological, political and economic matters. Thereafter, in the second section, I examine the economic crisis of the 1980s and the attempts of the Federal Executive Council (FEC), the institution constituted as responsible for the unified Yugoslavian market, to stabilize the economic terrain through 'radical measures'. In the third section, I look into the (in)ability of the institutional order to translate these measures into political practices and the gradual visibility of the failures of the self-managing order to contain

[6]On the distinction between a 'conjunctural' and 'hegemonic' crisis and a post-Marxist account of the Gramscian conception of a hegemonic crisis see: Norval, *Deconstructing Apartheid Discourse*, pp. 119-221.

the crisis. I show that the visibility of this failure operated by dislocating more elements of the system, and opened up the question of the viability of the existing institutional landscape. In the third section, I look at the debates within the LCY in light of these developments and its (in)ability to articulate a coherent and unified reading of the causes of and solutions to the deepening crisis. In the concluding section, after rehearsing my main points, I situate the rise of Slobodan Milošević in LC Serbia (1987) within the context of the deepening crisis at the federal level and the LCY's disunity, while also introducing the following chapter.

Before moving on to the analysis, it is important that the limits of my discussion are clearly specified. The point of this chapter is not to assess the extent to which economic and/or institutional factors caused the crisis and the break-up of Yugoslavia. Rather, I take the division between these terrains as an analytic device for mapping out, in broad strokes, the discursive terrain within which the national problem was situated and evolved in the same period. I believe that this chapter will render visible that the economic and institutional terrains mutually implicated one another to such an extent that neither can be isolated into a self-contained factor that determined the trajectory of the Yugoslavian crisis.

## 6.2 Subtracting Tito and Kardelj: 'Rotating' the Hegemonic Centre

On May 4th 1980, the President of Yugoslavia, the head of the LCY and the commander-in-chief of the Yugoslavian Army, Josip Broz Tito passed away. In 1978, two years prior to his death, Tito established a rotating collective leadership of the Central Committee based on quotas from territorial units, akin to the Collective Presidency discussed in the previous chapter.[7] While Tito was alive, the collective leadership at both levels functioned smoothly as, according to observers at the time, his authority 'spread over them like the

[7]Steven L. Burg. "Political Structures". In: *Yugoslavia: a Fractured Federalism.* Ed. by Dennison I. Rusinow. Washington: The Wilson Center Press, 1988, pp. 13-14.

wings of a guardian angel'.[8] Within the context of this thesis, the importance of Tito's subtraction from the order lay in its effect on the ability of the constitutional rules to produce a consensus. Tito's hegemonic position enabled him to be the last arbiter in disputes within the ranks of the LCY and to prevent the escalation of a conjectural crisis into a fully-fledged crisis of hegemony. With his death, decision-making power was decentered into collective rotational systems which, in the words of a commentator at the time, made it 'difficult for his successors (the collective leaderships) to rule as easily as when he was alive' and 'equally difficult for any single person to proclaim himself to be the new Tito'.[9]

One year before Tito's death, in February 1979, the 'father of self-management'[10] and 'Yugoslavia's number two leader'[11] Edvard Kardelj passed away. As much as Tito was central to the decision-making process, Kardelj was central to theoretical and ideological matters. Since he was the father of the Yugoslavian theory of self-management, Kardelj had the power to inscribe and/or exclude emerging demands from the signifier 'self-management' and substantiate the 'real' meaning of the path towards its realisation. In this sense, his absence impacted the degree of fixity and ambiguity that the notion could attain in the 1980s context. Furthermore, in his last theoretical work, Kardelj argued that the precondition for the realisation of a self-managing society was the reflection of the plurality of working class interests in the political system:

> The starting point for the future development of our democratic political system has to be the gradual overcoming of the [existing] pluralism of political monopolies and the realisation of true self-managing political pluralism, in other words, a pluralism of authentic self-managing subjects [...]. Even the working class is multi-layered, so its interests cannot be reduced to one political formula.[12]

Kardelj's representation of self-management as a plural political system that should, albeit

[8] *The Tito Era in Yugoslavia, 5 May 1980.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11669; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:2b11a530-9551-48e8-a307-b4d2b8d05b3c` (visited on 02/20/2016).

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

[11] *Kardelj's Death and the Consequences, 14 February 1979.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11517; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:59a9265e-4af5-4e28-97f7-92f8c158ebca` (visited on 02/20/2016).

[12] Edvard Kardelj. *Pravci razvoja političkog sistema socijalističkog samoupravljanja [Self-management and the Political System].* 3rd ed. Beograd: Komunist, 1980, p. 113.

at some unspecified future point, undermine the existing pluralism of political monopolies created theoretical confusion. Although the idea was not fully worked out, it could be interpreted as a critique of the notion that party unity was a necessary precondition for bringing self-management into being.

In the Croatian context, as I will discuss briefly in Chapter 8, the notion of 'self-managing political pluralism' was deployed to justify the pluralization of the political landscape in 1989. However, the impact of Kadrelj's concept was already evident in 1981, when a debate about how different positions within the party should be treated emerged, in response to the economic crisis. Some members demanded 'the necessary differentiation within the League of Communist', in the light of the economic problems the country was facing, so that 'every party member who has lost the essential characteristic of a communist is held accountable and expelled'.[13] Others, in contrast, called for a broad dialogue within the party and between the party and other socialist forces, citing the necessity of coordinating the plural interests existing in the system and thus defending a degree of pluralism.[14] The debate was never fully settled and it marked a point of constant division within the ranks of the hegemonic LCY. Furthermore, the notion that a degree of political pluralism is necessary for the realisation of self-management further complicated the decision-making process. It opened up the possibility for delegates and party members to legitimately disagree with policies and/or party directives on the grounds of exercising their self-managerial rights and reflecting Kardelj's pluralism of authentic self-managing subjects.

Kardelj's and Tito's deaths were a particular manifestation of a general trend that marked the 1980s. The old guard that had first-hand experience of the National Liber-

[13]This was the position taken by the Montenegrin party theorist Radovan Radonjić, and some Army generals. See:*Discussion of Internal Situation in Yugoslavia Continues, 5 February 1981.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11836; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:631f973a-feca-4d69-ad7b-26f9adb18ac9` (visited on 02/20/2016).

[14]This was the position of Milojko Drulović, Aleksandar Grlickov and Mitja Ribičić. See: *Two Groups in Yugoslav Party Fighting over "Ideological Purity", 13 February 1981.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11832; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:bf3eb554-ce05-4703-9cdb-926cd201585f` (visited on 02/20/2016).

ation Struggle was gradually being replaced by a younger generation for whom the war was a memory of parental struggle and not an experienced event. As discussed in Chapter 3, the National Liberation Struggle/Socialist Revolution, played a central role in the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon. It was represented as the origin of the 'brotherhood and unity' discourse and the historical foundation of the order as such. In this sense, it was a myth that both legitimized the party's hegemonic position and normalized the social divisions instituted by the imaginary horizon. According to an academic in 1985, 'the legitimating effect of the wartime liberation was less effective for those for whom the war [was] no more than a memory of their parents' generation' and 'the relevance of the liberation [had] decreased in effectiveness over time'.[15] The 1980s were also marked by a proliferation of literary and academic works that questioned the hegemonic representation of the National Liberation Struggle and the moral infallibility of the Communist Party.[16] During the course of the 1980s, as the debate about the economic crisis turned into a debate about the political order as such, the question of responsibility for the crisis brought about the re-thinking of Tito's persona and the historical role of the LCY.[17] As early as 1986, for instance, at a symposium organized by the CC LCY, Yugoslavian Marxists maintained that the victory of socialism was a possibility but not a historical necessity

[15]George Schöpflin. "Political Decay in One-Party Systems in Eastern Europe: Yugoslav Patterns". In: *Yugoslavia in the 1980s*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet. Boulder: Westview Press, 1985, pp. 312-313.

[16]This is well documented in: Goldstein, *Hrvatska 1918-2008 [Croatia 1918-2008]*; Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*; and Jasna Dragović-Soso. *Saviours of the Nation: Serbia's Intellectual Opposition and the Revival of Nationalism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2002. For an account from the time, see: Sabrina P. Ramet. "Apocalypse Culture and Social Change in Yugoslavia". In: *Yugoslavia in the 1980s*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet. Boulder: Westview Press, 1985.

[17]As reported in: *Yugoslav Dissidents Accused of Demeaning Tito's Memory, 22 June 1984*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12246; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:1ff4e326-1182-4d1c-acce-f70bdf5ff6c4` (visited on 02/21/2016); *The Fourth Anniversary of Tito's Death, 17 May 1984*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12254; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:690f2697-a163-4f29-abb9-df47aae027e3` (visited on 02/21/2016); and *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 10 December 1985*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-215-10; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:54b0debe-2689-4acd-9351-6eb896d98764` (visited on 02/21/2016).

and that a number of communist dogmas had failed to measure up to expectations.[18] Although it is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss the way in which the re-articulation of the founding myths of the Yugoslavian imaginary were inscribed into the particular contexts of Yugoslavia's constitutive republics, I will briefly discuss this process in the context of SR Serbia in the following chapter.

In sum, in the words of a member of the rotating CC Presidium, the 1980s were 'a historically new situation', since 'Tito and Kardelj, the great creators and authorities' were no longer present.[19] Their deaths were an anticipated yet contingent development, since the broader context in which they occurred and the impacts of their absence were not predetermined by the fact that they passed away. In the immediate sense, their subtraction from the Yugoslavian system changed the institutional functioning of the political landscape and increased the degree of contingency within the self-managing ideology.

## 6.3 The Economic Crisis: the Failures of the Emancipatory Project

In Chapters 2 and 5 I discussed the centrality of the utopian image of the society of self-managing producers for forging unity and including different national identities into a single working class emancipatory project. The entire constitutional order was represented as a means for realising the principle of 'from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs'. In this sense, I have argued, the terrain of legitimate politics was circumscribed by the signifier self-management and the legitimacy of the order based on a society that the present order was expected to realise in the future. The economic crisis that shook Yugoslavia in the 1980s gradually rendered the limits and failures of the self-managing project visible, both in material and ideological terms.

In July 1980, immediately after Tito's death, the President of the Federal Executive Council Veselin Djuranović made public that a number of serious economic problems were threatening Yugoslavia politically and socially. He demanded the immediate imple-

[18] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 27 March 1986.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-216-4; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:786a52b0-4ad4-48f4-bc11-7e99562e9ff5` (visited on 02/06/2016).

[19] *Two Groups in Yugoslav Party Fighting over "Ideological Purity", 13 February 1981.*

mentation of a number of radical macroeconomic measures to counteract these economic problems. He maintained that these problems were caused by:

> [...] insufficient market motivation and a highly buoyant domestic market which has discouraged exports while stimulating imports; unrealistic development ambitions, which could only be satisfied by raising indebtedness abroad; and inconsistent and inadequate application of systemic solutions in this sphere.[20]

The solution, he argued, was to be found in a 'greater influence of market laws with full respect for self-management'.[21] The manner in which the expansion of market laws was to be combined with the full respect of self-management was not substantiated. The economic problems that were made public in 1980 were not new, although they were received with great surprise after a decade of economic expansion. In the second half of the 1970s, economists had already been warning party officials about the low efficiency of Yugoslavian industry, its dependence of foreign technology, high rates of inflation, and the growth of foreign debt. While Tito was still alive, capital was created artificially by printing dinars to return loans and generate investments for future economic projects. In May 1979, the FEC had introduced restrictions on car use and increased gasoline prices and the late 1970s also saw a reduction in imported goods (tropical fruits, coffee, washing powder and the electrical supply to households).[22]

According to the existing literature, the economic crisis had both an internal and external dimension. On the one hand, the world economic situation was worse than it had been since the country's foundation. The 1970s oil crisis and the increase in the price of oil caused a sharp deterioration of Yugoslavia's terms of trade, while the ensuing world recessions in 1974-1975 and 1980-1983 reduced demand for Yugoslavian exports. Economic conditions worsened further with the increase in real interest rates and tightening of global lending conditions.[23] In 1973-1981 Yugoslavia borrowed approximately US$16,5

[20] *Yugoslavia's Economic Situation Discussed, 7 July 1980.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11737; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:da44302f-190a-4941-831a-6361e80d7eee` (visited on 02/12/2016).

[21] Ibid.

[22] Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 150-151.

[23] Chris Martin and Laura D'Andrea Tyson. "Can Titoism Survive Tito? Economic Problems and Policy Choices Confronting Tito's Successors". In: *Yugoslavia in the 1980s.* Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet. Boulder: Westview Press, 1985, pp. 184-185.

billion dollars from foreign banks and institutions, and its foreign debt increased from US$4,663 billion to US$21,096 billion. Furthermore, many short-term loans were taken out in 1977-1980, precisely when interest rates on global markets rose from 5.5% to 16.8%, and these were due to be repaid in the 1982-1985 period. The explosion of interest rates in the global market increased Yugoslavia's debt, relatively speaking, and necessitated a dramatic reduction in the amount of money borrowed on global markets to cater for its economic activity.[24]

On the other hand, the 1974 Constitution transformed both the political and economic terrains into decentralized units that bargained and entered into 'social compacts' thereby directing economic activity. Although these rules were in line with a particular representation of social unity, they fragmented the Yugoslavian market, giving rise to factory duplications and inefficiencies. First, as a result of the changes in the investment systems, banks and small enterprises lost control over decisions to regional authorities and managers of the largest enterprises. These in turn focused on the objectives defined within the parameters of their respective subunits, without taking the structure of the Yugoslavian economy into account, thus leading to an increase in import substitution and the duplication of factories across the federation. Furthermore, since existing economic relations were based on contractual agreements and economic plans, there were no constraints on enterprise budgets and investment decision-makers were not exposed to risk. This economic constellation led to 'investomania' in 1976-1980, inflationary credit creation and an explosion of foreign debt.[25] Second, as a result of economic decentralization, federal institutions lost control over the amount and structure of foreign loans taken out by various economic subjects as well as the economic plans of Yugoslavia's territorial units. The FEC had issued a warning to the republics in 1975 to be cautious with their foreign debt, but its warnings fell on deaf ears.[26]

The failure of the existing decentralized structures to give rise to a stable and efficient economy rendered visible that the articulation of powers between the territorial units,

[24]Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 147-148.
[25]Martin and Tyson, "Can Titoism Survive Tito? Economic Problems and Policy Choices Confronting Tito's Successors", p. 187.
[26]Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 148.

self-managing subjects and the federal institutions was in need of transformation. However, the exact form of this re-articulation could not be read from the economic conditions themselves. For instance, the change could have involved the expansion of the existing constitutional rules about the duties of republics, provinces and self-managing subjects towards the Yugoslavian market as a whole. They could have included extensively decreasing their rights and expending the economic rights and duties of federal bodies. In addition, and this was how the problem was eventually resolved in 1989, the solution could have been the liberalization of the market and the abolition of self-managing economic relations in the economy.

The changing economic conditions in the first half of the 1980s suggested that the economy was fragmented and that dealing with the existing economic problems necessitated some form of economic centralization at the all-Yugoslavian level for the purpose of synchronizing the market's constitutive elements. However, given the system of divisions instituted by the imaginary and the centrality of the self-managing capacity of the Yugoslavian working class, any call for centralisation could be represented as anti-constitutional and anti-Yugoslavian. In addition, given that the economically decentralised system was represented as the channel for realising the self-managing rights of nations and nationalities, demands for expanding the powers of federal bodies on the economic terrain could be represented as a centralist hegemonic tendency that undermined their rights. In practical terms, a decision to re-shuffle power from territorial units and large enterprises to the FEC had to be made in the Federal Assembly and would require territorial and economic subjects to willingly decrease their powers and grant them to federal bodies. Instead of opening up the question of the articulation of forces in the federation, the FEC thus remained within the boundaries of the existing constitutional order and, when delegates in the Assembly failed to pass its austerity recommendations, they would be imposed top-down as 'temporary measures'.[27]

The official response to the economic crisis was articulated in the Long-term Programme of Economic Stabilization that was drawn up in 1983 by the Kreigher Commission

[27]Burg, "Political Structures", p. 11.

in consultation with 350 leading politicians, economists and experts.[28] The Stabilization Programme called for an increase in the reliance on market forces, as opposed to economic plans, in the regulation of the market; the establishment of a compulsory domestic market in convertible currency; a movement towards making the dinar convertible by gradually introducing world prices in the Yugoslavian market; a realistic exchange rate and real interest rates; a greater integration of the units of the Yugoslavian economy; exposing investment decision-makers to risks and tougher action against unprofitable enterprises; and limitations on international borrowing.[29]

The solutions were articulated through the language of self-management and embedded in the hegemonic conception of social division. The economic crisis was represented as having exposed Yugoslavian society to

> [...] increased pressure by various anti-self-management and anti-socialist ideas of nationalism, liberalism, bureaucratism, statism and pseudo-liberalism and the value system our fundamental ideas and results of the material transformation of our entire socialist self-managing community as a whole are contested.[30]

The necessary changes specified in the Stabilization Programme were represented as part and parcel of

> [...] the development of social relations and productive forces, changes which for the given stage of development provide answers as to how to resolve the accumulated social and economic contradictions in the long-term development of self-management and the strengthening of the federal character of the Yugoslavian community.[31]

Furthermore, the changes were represented as necessary for realising 'the constitutionally determined socio-economic status of workers' and for ensuring 'the consistent development of self-managing socio-economic relations defined by the 1974 Constitution'.[32] Although the necessary changes were represented as cardinal for the realisation of the 1974 Constitution, traces of a critique of its decentralising effects were visible in calls for eliminating

[28]Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 159.

[29]For a summary of the main points of the Stabilization Program see: Burg, "Political Structures", p. 11. For Kraigher's account of the logic behind the Stabilization Program see: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 159-162. For the conclusions of the Stabilization Program see: The Federal Commission on Economic Stabilization Problems. *The Concluding Party of the Long-Term Programme of Economic Stabilization.* Belgrade: Jugoslavenski Pregled, 1983.

[30]Ibid., p. 100.

[31]Ibid., p. 100.

[32]Ibid., pp. 7, 11.

'all forms of autarky, regional isolation and restriction' and demands that delegate assemblies expand their understanding of the common Yugoslavian terrain and 'take care of it'.[33] The Stabilization Programme demanded that the whole working class, nations and nationalities unite in the struggle to overcome existing economic contradictions and that the institutions of the political system bear responsibility for the implementation of the necessary economic changes.[34] As was noted in academic circles at the time, the obstacles to the implementation of the Stabilization Programme lay in their political implications. The realisation of the changes in the economic terrain would have undermined the powers of republics, provinces and enterprises to intervene in the economy.[35] Consequently, although the Stabilization Programme was accepted by the LCY, the Presidency and the Federal Assembly, as the basis for a unified self-managerial response to the emerging economic problems, it not only failed to suture the dislocatory effects of the economic crisis but further expanded its scope to include the institutional landscape, since the territorial units and enterprises simply ignored its recommendations.

Furthermore, since Yugoslavia was unable to service its foreign debt despite the initial austerity efforts of the FEC in the 1980-1983 period, the IMF also got involved in the economic stabilization process.[36] The FEC negotiated a series of stand-by agreements and financial aid packages with the IMF that further substantiated the necessary economic changes from the Stabilization Programme to include large devaluations of the dinar (in relation to a basket of currencies of the main industrial countries); 'realistic'

[33]The Federal Commission on Economic Stabilization Problems, *The Concluding Party of the Long-Term Programme of Economic Stabilization*, pp. 111-102.

[34]Ibid., p. 108.

[35]Burg, "Political Structures", pp. 11-12.

[36]For the administrative measures introduced by the FEC in the period and the reasons for their failure see: *Yugoslavia Devalues the Dinar, 13 June 1980.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11749; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:df27763d-65b1-4bcb-b829-87da16547aaa` (visited on 02/15/2016); *Yugoslavia's Economic Difficulties, 14 August 1980.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11717; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:daba2835-6d84-4a64-8e4a-42d55fdba6a3` (visited on 02/15/2016) and *Yugoslav Government Introduces Drastic Austerity Program, 20 October 1982.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11989; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:9e3d988b-14d7-45ee-9376-c172f0813879` (visited on 02/15/2016).

internal borrowing rates (which should reach the level of 1% above the rate of inflation); the free-market formation of prices, goods and services and lowering of individual and social consumption.[37]

In July 1983, in order to be able to guarantee the repayment of loans, and under the threat of the resignation of FEC's President if rejected, the Yugoslavian Federal Assembly adopted a set of laws drafted in cooperation with the IMF. The laws made the National Bank of Yugoslavia a direct debtor and the Federation a guarantor of all the credit the country received, regardless of the subject that took them out (enterprises, workers association and/or territorial units). The law on foreign currency was designed to prevent Yugoslavian enterprises and corporations from taking out foreign loans that could not be repaid. The President of the FEC Milka Planinc called for unity in the implementation of the measures, and warned that every citizen would need to make sacrifices for their realization. According to reports from the time, the adoption of the rules marked a 'turning point in the country's modern history' and 'the beginning to the real post-Tito era'.[38] Since the new rules put in place to 'save' the economy rearticulated the relationship between the federal banks and the enterprises/territorial units, at the expense of the latter, and were drafted in cooperation with the 'capitalist' IMF, they gave rise to criticism of the FEC, from communists in the territorial units, veteran organizations, and the Army. They claimed that the measures were anti-constitutional and undermined the very foundations of the self-managing order.[39]

Despite the passage of the laws and the declared support of the Stabilization Program, in the discussion of the 1984 budget in the Federal Assembly, the republics and provinces opposed every single reform measure, leading to the resignation of the Finance Minister in

[37]Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*, p. 96; and Martin and Tyson, "Can Titoism Survive Tito? Economic Problems and Policy Choices Confronting Tito's Successors", pp. 189-190.

[38]*First Radical Changes Inaugurated in Yugoslavia's Economy, 13 July 1983.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12160; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:9d206522-287b-4e66-bec9-b9b3e837a757` (visited on 02/15/2016).

[39]Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 157.

protest.[40] The inability to both implement the Stabilization Programme through existing institutional forms and to contain the economic crisis gave rise to constant tensions in the 1980s between the FEC and the Assembly and within the LCY. The FEC Presidents in the period – Djuranović (1977-1982), Planinc (1982-1986) and Mikulić (1986-1988) – were unpopular and constantly criticized. Mikulić and the sitting FEC members he presided over, were even forced to resign in 1988, a development unprecedented in the history of socialist Yugoslavia. At the time of their resignation, Yugoslavian inflation had reached 250%.[41] Although the FEC was constantly applying temporary measures (freezing and de-freezing prices, devaluing the dinar, freezing wages, etc.) it failed to manage inflation, increase productivity, improve the balance of payments deficit, or prevent a drop in the standard of living. In 1987 it made public that, despite all efforts, Yugoslavia would not be able to service its foreign debt and that by 1990 the debt would grow to US$40, 000 million.[42] The dramatic drop in the standard of living and the central position the FEC had in the economic terrain and made it a target of a growing number of workers' strikes.[43] As I will discuss in detail in the following chapter, Slobodan Milošević capitalized politically from workers' discontent.

The inability of the regime to contain the crisis opened questions of responsibility,

[40] *Yugoslavia's Finance Minister Resigns, 29 December 1983.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12104; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:cf4d40f1-1294-4f02-80a5-559304d774ea` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[41] For more about the deadlock between the FEC and other institutions see: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 153-155. For an account of Mikulić's resignation see *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 17 January 1989.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-219-1; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:58ca551e-0fa2-4cc9-a77d-834bb1f43781` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[42] In 1987, according to the FEC, the Yugoslavian debt was 9$^{th}$ in the world and estimated to be somewhere between US$23, 000-25, 000 million. Of that 71.9% was the accumulated debt of republics and provinces, which were unable to pay anything toward reducing the debt, leaving the whole burden on the federation. Furthermore, Yugoslavia's internal debt, the amount that self-managing enterprises owed to each other had reached US$20, 000 million. See: *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 16 September 1987.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-217-8; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:c1f118ed-9a22-46ef-971c-de7cf59f9c98` (visited on 02/15/2016).

[43] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 18 December 1987.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-217-12; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:880d5db0-59e4-489a-8125-d8d97af54b0f` (visited on 02/16/2016).

legitimacy and the nature of the constitutional order. In order to bring about a society of free producers in the future, the powers of the working class to autonomously manage the products of its labour had to be limited by austerity plans and administrative measures in the present, which in turn failed to contain the crisis. As the regime was failing to resolve the economic crisis solutions were discussed in academic circles. These included the recognition of labour and capital markets as indispensable segments of the market economy, changes in the principles of self-management, the replacement of social property with the concept of collective property, and the restoration of a truly mixed economy.[44] By 1987, some economists were arguing that the resolution of the crisis necessitated the introduction of private enterprise and the depoliticization of the economy, and were questioning the possibility of realising self-management in a context marked by the concentration of economic power in the LCY.[45] They were articulating links between the economic crisis and the functioning of the political order and looking for solutions in the political terrain in place of instead of trying to stabilize 'objective' (macroeconomic) factors. In doing so they were revealing that the self-managing order was not rooted in objective material forces and historical antagonisms, but rather in the power of a particular party, the LCY.

In sum, the economic crisis rendered the limits and failures of self-management to organize economic relations and generate economic prosperity visible. It is important to note that the worsening economic conditions did not in themselves determine the (in)ability of the regime to contain them, nor the recommendations and laws articulated in response to them. The changing circumstances indicated a need to reform, but the form of change could not be read from the conditions in a linear fashion. In addition, the deepening of the economic crisis indicated that Yugoslavian society was not becoming towards an utopian image of free producers, since the producers' standard of living was dropping. In the most immediate sense, however, the failure of existing institutional forms to tackle the economic problems in a systematic manner exposed the limitations of the decision-making process structuring the Yugoslavian imaginary, thus dislocating the horizon further.

[44]Jože Mencinger. "From a Capitalist to a Capitalist Economy?" In: *Yugoslavia in Turmoil: after Self-managemenet?* Ed. by James Simmie and Jože Dekleva. London: Piner Publishers, 1991, p. 80.
[45]*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 18 December 1987.*

## 6.4 The Crisis of Federalism: Institutional Forms Fail to Decontest and Deliver

In Chapter 5, I argued that the system of governance and institutions for discussion sedimented the hierarchical identitary logic that underpinned the order. The delegate and assembly systems anchored federal institutions in lower-level (territorial units, communities, enterprises, etc.) self-managing subjects while cooperation at the federal level followed the principle of equal participation of the territorial units for the purpose of realising national equality and self-management. In all financial, monetary and investment issues, the delegations of Yugoslavia's constitutive units were granted the right to veto decisions that were contrary to their self-managing interests.[46]

Although these rules were in line with a particular representation of social unity, in the context of the changed economic conditions that marked the 1980s, they failed to deliver a systematic response to the economic crisis. The laws proposed by the FEC as necessary for the realisation of the Stabilization Programme were either vetoed by delegations in the Chamber of Republics and Provinces, or selectively applied since their implementation lay in the hands of the territorial units.

Examples of the failures of the institutional landscape during the period at stake are numerous. In November 1980, for instance, Yugoslavia's social plan for the upcoming 1980-1985 period, drawn up by the FEC, was not adopted on scheduled time due to a failure of delegates to agree on the terms of financing the development of underdeveloped regions, social production, national defence and Yugoslavia's common monetary policy.[47]

[46] Burg, "Political Structures", p. 10; and *What's Wrong with Yugoslavia's Economic System, 10 November 1982*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11983; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:45e19006-d297-42d5-a562-35a17f3b7146` (visited on 02/12/2016).

[47] *Differences over Yugoslavia's Five-Year Social Plan, 24 November 1980*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11770; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:d5ae1ffc-654d-4fd4-92b2-4d903ce1bb54` (visited on 02/16/2016).

This failure to agree was represented as a minor crisis and it prompted the LCY to produce a report on the Ideological and Political Aspects of the Plan to Assure the Continuation of the System of Socialist Self-Management.[48] At the time, the conflicts over the Five-Year Plan were represented in an optimistic manner, as evidence that 'the provisions of the constitution promulgated in 1974, aimed at protecting the interests of Yugoslavia's constituent republics and provinces, are being taken seriously'.[49] In 1981, delegates from SR Slovenia vetoed a draft of a regulation to tax every departure from the country, while in January 1982 a scheduled federal price-rise regulation was not passed in the Assembly due to the failure to forge a consensus between the delegations. Both laws were drafted by the FEC and formed part and parcel of its attempt to curb Yugoslavia's indebtedness through administrative measures.[50]

The tensions between the FEC and the delegates in the federal institution of discussion were visible by November 1981. The delegates of the Chamber of Republics and Provinces criticised the FEC for Yugoslavia's economic failures and demanded that the institution as a whole or its individual members be held responsible for the past mistakes that brought about the accumulation of economic problems. By not assuming responsibility for its actions, a delegate from Slovenia claimed, the FEC was undermining self-management. The institution was to be held accountable for the economic problems since 'it had initiated the measures to be taken in almost 100% of the cases'. In response, the President of the FEC defended the FEC and asked the Assembly to see the extent to which republics and provinces were the ones to be blamed for the existing economic problems.[51] Of 25 major laws to be adopted by the Federal Assembly in 1983, only eight were passed, with the re-

[48] *Yugoslavia's Five-Year Plan Suggests Sociopolitical Continuity, 19 December 1980.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11757; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:e8a67072-3236-43a6-931f-4480f98087e7` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[49] *Differences over Yugoslavia's Five-Year Social Plan, 24 November 1980.*

[50] *What's Wrong with Yugoslavia's Economic System, 10 November 1982.*

[51] For a summary of the debate at the Assembly see: *Yugoslavia's Parliamentary Style, 14 December 1981.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11900; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:8328edcf-0591-4183-8f88-2792bdf68b2c` (visited on 02/15/2016).

maining 17 left awaiting further negotiation.[52] In December 1983, the Yugoslavian finance minister who negotiated with the IMF and Western creditors, resigned in protest of the 1985 federal budget and the new draft law to regulate the allocation of foreign currency. The FEC, in coordination with the IMF, had demanded the creation of a unified foreign currency market in Yugoslavia, but this failed to translate into a set of regulations, leaving foreign currency in the hands of enterprises and territorial units.[53] In July 1985 again, two laws proposed by the FEC to regulate foreign currency revenues failed to obtain the necessary majority in the Chamber of Republics and Autonomous Provinces, and were only implemented as temporary measures.[54]

Even when laws were passed in the federal institutions for discussion, their practical implementation was still in the hands of the republican/provincial institutions and organizations. In cases of dissatisfaction with a particular law, territorial leaderships could chose not to enforce it.[55] In 1982, for instance, republican and provincial delegates failed to implement a law adopted by emergency procedures requiring them to allocate set sums of hard currency to the Yugoslavian National Bank and, in doing so, subsidise the import of crude oil whose price had sky-rocketed. The failure forced refineries to borrow dollars from domestic or foreign banks and pushed the FEC to limit oil-consumption even more.[56] By the end of 1983 it became apparent that the austerity measures, drafted in cooperation with the IMF and passed under pressure, had not been implemented in a systematic manner by territorial units, prompting the LCY to convene and examine the

[52] *Crisis and Dissent in Yugoslavia, 23 October 1984.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12218; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:115a5462-bcca-4ad8-a780-437c91a6eea3` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[53] For an analyisis of the Yugoslavian foreign currency market in the 1980s see:Martin and Tyson, "Can Titoism Survive Tito? Economic Problems and Policy Choices Confronting Tito's Successors", pp. 194-195. For details about Florijančić's resignation see: *Yugoslavia's Finance Minister Resigns, 29 December 1983.*

[54] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 12 August 1985.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-215-8; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:b4a00b2c-d15f-4039-b4c3-8f82c7ab13d2` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[55] Burg, "Political Structures", p. 12.

[56] *Oil Supply Problems in Yugoslavia, 15 March 1982.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11953; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:0b3cc454-5941-44b5-955d-950a92ff6cba` (visited on 02/16/2016).

problem.[57]

The inability of existing institutional forms to suture the dislocations on the economic terrain gave rise to problematizations of the institutional landscape. Najdan Pašić, a member of LC Serbia and the CC LCY, was the first to question the practices associated with the 1974 Constitution within the context of the economic crisis, and to articulate a set of 'causes' and 'solutions' that included the institutional landscape. According to Pašić, the stagnation of self-management was caused by the concentration of power in republican, provincial and communal institutions. These units were effectively behaving like states, alienating the power of the working class and blocking the process of the withering away of the state. The entire existing institutional landscape was dislocated according to Pašić:

> We have come close to a situation in which almost everyone has the right to veto every decision and thus block any decision-making process, even in cases when it is necessary to make a decision beneficial to the common public interest [...] delegations and assemblies composed of various delegations are squandering all their energy on lengthy procedures designed to harmonize various interests, without having the strength or time to control the executive agencies, these agencies behind the backs of assemblies make and implement 'practical policy'. We cannot have a system of self-management without a system of responsibility required by such a system [...] One must know is responsible to whom and for what.[58]

Pašić demanded the establishment of a Commission to systematically analyse the operation of the institutional landscape, focusing on three aspects in particular. First, the manner in which socio-political communities (communes, provinces, republics and the federation) translated their constitutional rights in the economic terrain into practice and the extent to which they were transgressing constitutionally defined boundaries. He maintained that the transgressions of the constitution resulted in the 'institutionalization of partial interests' and obstructed the articulation of a unified Yugoslavian policy. Second, he demanded that the electoral system be examined and new forms considered in order to institute a 'chain of responsibility' and bring the delegate system under public control.

[57]Burg, "Political Structures", p. 15; and *Crisis and Dissent in Yugoslavia, 23 October 1984*.

[58]An interview with Najdan Pašić printed in Danas, 12 October 1982, quoted in *Discussions in Yugoslavia of Changes in the Political System, 6 December 1982*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11980; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:80026a32-1180-4c6f-bf4e-513a392c68a0` (visited on 02/16/2016).

He maintained that the responsibility of office holders currently was a mere formality that failed to materialise in practice. Third, Pašić demanded that the bureaucratic machinery in the socio-political communities be examined and new ways of curbing its powers designed. He claimed that, given the size of the bureaucracy, Yugoslavian socialism was still a form of state-socialism. Similarly, he argued that the existing order was sustained by 'an exaggerated use of the state's legal power' and that social relations, the conditions of work and production were all over-regulated. The bureaucracy and the plethora of laws, acts and prescriptions were all blocking the free and spontaneous development of self-management and rendering the working class into a mere object of state-tutelage, 'lost in a jungle of laws'.[59]

Despite disagreements with Pašić's diagnosis of the problem in the LCY, the demand for an examination of the political system was accepted and a special Commission for that purpose established. In 1985, after three years of discussion and negotiations with experts, academics and party members, the Commission drafted the Critical Analysis of the Functioning of the Political System of Socialist Self-Management. According to the conclusions of the Critical Analysis, the inability to articulate a common Yugoslavian policy to tackle the economic problems was caused by the 'statist' behaviour of the delegates from territorial units and the failure of workers' organizations to associate across territorial units. In other words, the failures were not represented as inherent to the decision-making rules and the general provisions of the 1974 Constitution.[60] The Critical Analysis reasserted that

> [...] the constitutional principle of consensus is a means for realising the full equality of nations and nationalities and for constituting the common interests in Yugoslavia, and there can be no majoritarian decision-making on this [common] terrain.[61]

Rather, the problem was located in the minds of the delegates who were acting exclusively

[59] *Yugoslav Leaders Disagree about Reforming the System, 22 April 1983.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12059; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:0d5ef8c2-cd14-48c5-a41d-5f02c02520dd` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[60] Josip Vrhovec. "Uvodno izlaganje [Introduction]". In: *Kritička analiza funkcionisanja političkog sistema socijalističkog samoupravljanja [A Critical Analysis of the Functioning of the Political System of Socialist Self-management].* 24. Sednica CKSKJ. Beograd: Izdavački centar Komunist, 1986, pp. 32-33.

[61] Ibid., p. 33.

from the 'narrow' perspective of their own (republican/provincial/communal) interest and thus failing to take the common Yugoslavian interest into account.[62]

To fix the problem, the Critical Analysis proposed substantiating existing articles about the unity of the Yugoslavian market (Article 251 and Article 252) and the specification of the legal consequences in cases of failure to implement federal directives (Article 273 and Article 278).[63] Much like the Stabilization Programme, the Critical Analysis was embedded in the hegemonic conception of social division and articulated through the language of self-management. It claimed that the Stabilization Programme could only be implemented if communists forged a unified theoretical-political position regarding social development withini the LCY and then mobilized the working people in the institutions of the political system to realise that position in practice.[64] In this sense, the solution to the deepening crisis lay in forging a 'high degree of theoretical and practical unity of all socialist subjects in society'.[65] For this purpose, the Critical Analysis demanded that the constitutional role of 'the internal driving and unifying forces of the delegate and political system, the key carriers of the historical interests of the working class and the development of socialist self-managing socialism' be further substantiated, referring to the LCY, the Socialist Alliance and Trade Unions.[66] The lack of unity within the LCY was represented as stemming from the unwillingness of its members to 'democratically adjust positions' and their neglect of the 'historical interests of the working class'.[67]

In a nutshell, the Critical Analysis concluded that there was nothing essentially wrong with the terms under which order was constituted and it thus represented its failures as caused by a misinterpretation of the rules and the misbehaviour of political subjects. In this sense, the Critical Analysis concluded that the solution to the crisis lay in specifying and removing 'observed weaknesses, deformations and problems' in the constitution's

[62]Vrhovec, "Uvodno izlaganje [Introduction]", p. 34.
[63]Smiljko Sokol. "Ostvarivanje ustavnog koncepta društveno-političkih zajednica u svjetlu 'Kritičke analize' [Realizing the constitutional concept of the socio-political community in the light of the 'Critical Analysis']". In: *Politička misao* 23.2 (1986), p. 56.
[64]Vrhovec, "Uvodno izlaganje [Introduction]", p. 40.
[65]Ibid., p. 35.
[66]Ibid., p. 39.
[67]Ibid., p. 35.

'practical functioning, to realise its basic principles'.[68] An academic at the time maintained that the Critical Analysis simply reflected 'the constraints on innovation inherent in the system'.[69]

The debate about the relationship between the existing institutional forms and the deepening crisis was not confined to party circles. The issue was discussed in the media and in academic circles and a variety of positions were articulated which went beyond the stance that the inability to contain the crisis was cause by the misinterpretation of the constitutional rules. In 1983, for instance, at the Marxist Center of the CC LC Serbia, Yugoslavian sociologists and party members organized a discussion about the functioning of the political system, and concluded that the solution to the crisis lay in transforming the electoral system so that citizens could elect the best among many candidates from the LCY and 'improve' the political system.[70] Similarly, Slavoljub Đukić, a prominent journalist and political commentator, argued that resolving the economic crisis necessitated cadre changes, since the power-holders in territorial units would never introduce changes 'by means of which their own positions would be endangered'. Solving Yugoslavia's deepening crisis necessitated a purge of all 'decentralized etatists' from positions of power.[71] The sociologist Radoš Smiljković criticised the sitting party leaderships for holding on to power despite their inability to resolve the crisis, while the sociologist Dragomir Drašković represented the existing hierarchical party system as the source of the 'manipulative opportunism' of party leaders that refused to take responsibility for their mistakes.[72]

In a series of articles published in the newspaper Borba, the Zagreb University professor Jovan Mirić maintained that the 1974 Constitution itself was causing the existing

[68] Vrhovec, "Uvodno izlaganje [Introduction]", p. 22.

[69] Burg, "Political Structures", p. 19.

[70] *Debate Continues on Reforming the System in Yugoslavia, 1 June 1983.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12043; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:b186ee66-dd0a-4585-b893-5c7ccc7719f0` (visited on 02/06/2016).

[71] Danas, 3 May 1983, quoted in *Who Actually Rules in Post-Tito Yugoslavia, 18 May 1983.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12049; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:c77c5074-19fa-48fe-a22b-219eca0057db` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[72] Večernje Novosti (Belgarde), 13 February 1986 and Duga (Belgrade), 24 January 1986; quoted in *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 27 March 1986.*

crisis because it strengthened the autonomy of the republics and provinces at the expense of the powers of the federal government. The decentralization of power led to the destruction of the unified Yugoslavian market and constant interference in market mechanisms.[73] One of the country's leading experts in constitutional law and the co-writer of the 1974 Constitution Jovan Đorđević, articulated a broader critique of the existing system when calming that order was characterised by a dislocation between 'reality' and 'theory'. He illustrated this gap with the 'fact' that:

> [...] we are ostensibly building a federation, while in fact what we have is a confederation; that we are are ostensibly building a self-managing society, while in reality we are strengthening and broadening the state bureaucracy; that we are supposed to be building a free society, while in fact we are imposing limitations, coercion and repression on society.[74]

Both Mirić and Đorđević were in effect maintaining that the deepening crisis was in essence political and implying that its resolution necessitated amending the 1974 Constitution. As I will discuss in the following chapter, similar ideas informed the LCS's transformist project which was weaved together in the second half of the 1980s. In contrast, the Zagreb University professor Zdravko Tomac, defended the 1974 Constitution and, in line with the Critical Analysis, argued that the problem lay not in the rules themselves but in their practical application.[75]

Svetozar Stojanović, a well-known professor of sociology associated with the journal Praxis, maintained that the LCY misrepresented the problems Yugoslavia was facing. While the Stabilization Programme represented the crisis as being caused the economic contradictions associated with the existing stage of development, Stojanović argued that the economic crisis was produced by the political order. Yugoslavia was marked by the

[73] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 30 November 1984.* [Electronic record].HU OSA 300-8-47-214-1; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:418ca94d-3420-4bba-8bba-ac38e0bf1ed1` (visited on 02/27/2016).

[74] Jovan Đorđević in a discussion at the Faculty of Political Science at the University of Belgrade, quoted in: ibid.

[75] Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 208.

total dominance of the political over every other terrain, including the economic.[76] In this sense, the causes and solutions to the crisis lay not in 'objective' macroeconomic parameters but in the distribution of power within the system. To resolve the deepening crisis, Stojanović proposed a gradual institutionalization of political pluralism. First, the democratization of the LCY from within; second, the separation of the Socialist Alliance from the LCY and its transformation into an independent political organization participating in power; third, the separation of Trade Unions and their transformation into a genuine vehicles of self-management; and fourth, the strengthening of the federal structure. This process was to be paralleled by the introduction of a mixed economy open to private ownership within the context of a fully integrated Yugoslavian market.[77]

In sum, the worsening economic conditions that marked the period and the inability of the institutional landscape to produce a unified, even, and systematic policy to contain the economic crisis further dislocated the Yugoslavian order. As the republican/provincial delegates in reference to their self-managing interests either rejected or impeded the decisions made by the FEC which represented the same decisions as paramount for stabilizing the self-managing order, the signifier 'self-management' gradually attained a floating character. These contradictions opened the question of the functioning of the political system and, in expanding the scope of the debate, simply dislocated more of the elements constitutive of self-managing socialism. A variety of self-managing solutions to the crisis were put forward that were either incompatible with one another or were dealing with different aspects of the existing order. Given the hegemonic role of the LCY, the contradicting positions about the nature of the crisis and the solutions to it reflected differences within the party itself and the inability of its leadership to converge on a set of working causes, effects and solutions to the crisis.

[76]Die Welt, 14 May 1983; quoted in: *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 1 March 1985.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-215-3; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:2614d69b-554f-4925-a63b-a5823124a7f7` (visited on 02/27/2016).

[77]Die Welt, 15 and 17 November 1983; quoted in: *Crisis and Dissent in Yugoslavia, 23 October 1984.*

## 6.5 The Crisis in the LCY: Disunity and the Inability to Redefine the Order

In Chapter 3 I argued that the LCY's hegemony was predicated upon its ability to universalize a working class identity and fix different national identities within a single space of representation. Furthermore, in Chapter 5 I traced the identitary logic through which a unified representation of society was constituted and sedimented into institutional forms. The LCY's hegemony was sustained by its ability to forge a unified Yugoslavian political subject out of different self-managing and national identities. By the 1980s the LCY was substantially territorialized in the same way as the federal institutions. Its organs were composed of members delegated by republican/provincial organizations and responsible to them in practice, while its central leadership rotated in accordance with territorial quotas.[78] The inability to implement the Stabilization Programme and the tensions and conflicts between the delegates in the Assembly and the FEC reflected the differences in positions within the LCY, since the delegates were also members of the LCY. In this sense, the changing economic conditions and the inability of the institutional landscape to suture their dislocatory effects further exacerbated the differences in an already territorially differentiated party.

The central topic of the Eleventh Plenum of the CC LCY that convened in June 1980, one month after Tito's death, was unity. The leadership pledged to follow Tito's path, further develop the revolution and self-managing socialism, and it praised the successful struggle against Yugoslavia's internal and external enemies.[79] After the economic crisis was made public, the leadership articulated an ambiguous and contradictory response at the Fifteenth Plenum of the CC LCY. The economic problems were represented as caused by the stagnation of self-management and the failure to make the workers in enterprises decision-makers in income distribution. The leadership called republics and provinces to remain responsible for their own markets and stressed the importance of the unified Yu-

[78] Burg, "Political Structures", pp. 13-14.

[79] *The Yugoslav Central Committee's 11th Plenum, 16 June 1980.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11746; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:f36af2f8-b9c9-4a36-9978-0cc9d6595e1e` (visited on 02/16/2016).

goslavian marke. It also criticised the neglect of market laws without criticising central planing.[80]

The discussions that unfolded in preparation for the first LCY Congress following Tito's death, held in June 1982, were marked by a debate about the relationship between republican/provincial party organizations and central party organs, with two different positions emerging. Some called for the deepening of democratic centralism and the increase in the power of the federal party leadership, while others demanded further pluralisation from within the LCY. Both positions centered on the notion of further developing self-management, the latter citing Kardelj's pluralism of political interests as central to a self-managing order.[81] Furthermore, the republican/provincial party congresses, that took place in preparation for the LCY Congress, stressed different elements of the self-managing discourse as central in the post-Tito era. On the one hand, the LCs Croatia and Slovenia articulated an opposition to any changes in the federal decision-making rules that were circulating as potential solutions to the crisis, labelling them as 'unitarist' and contrary to the self-managing rights of the nations and nationalities.[82] The tone of the LC Serbia, Vojvodina and Kosovo's Congresses were shaped by the Kosovo protests that shook SR Serbia in 1981. Although I will discuss these protests in great detail in the following chapter, for now it is still important to stress that the Kosovo Albanian protesters demanded the 'upgrading' of the Autonomous Province of Kosovo into a republic and that their demands were read as an attempt to fragment SR Serbia that could lead to the secession of

[80] *Yugoslav CC Plenum Deals with Economic Crisis, 10 December 1980.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11761; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:3273af84-edef-4bcb-a819-ef8c2cc218dd` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[81] *Precongress Struggle in Yugoslavia over Party Statutes, 27 January 1982.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11970; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:e460e9b9-a655-47da-ac50-6ce4317f05c4` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[82] *The Aftermath of the Slovenian Party Congress, 28 April 1982.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11935; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:33067039-ced5-40ec-8113-aab2032c907d` (visited on 02/16/2016); *Three More Regional Party Congresses, 24 May 1982.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12026; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:c0036ce5-7bb9-4644-9ce5-163fa1dfff34` (visited on 02/16/2016).

the province from Yugoslavia. At the Serbian congress, the Serbian leadership stressed the importance of the struggle for unity and the common interest in both Yugoslavia and SR Serbia. The Kosovo protests were represented as an exemplar of what would come about if so called 'particularisms' enter the political terrain. Similarly, the provincial delegation of AP Kosovo reaffirmed its unity with both SR Serbia and Yugoslavia and condemned all attempts to re-articulate the balance of forces between provinces and republics. The Montenegrin and Bosnian congresses also focused on unity. The former concluded that republics and provinces were politically insignificant since the working class within them, which forms part of the broader Yugoslavian working class, was the actual subject of politics. The latter strongly condemned national particularism and pledged to protect the country's and party's unity. The congress of LC Vojvodina, the second autonomous province of SR Serbia, criticized 'unitarism' and 'centralism' and was closer in tone to LCs Slovenia and Croatia.[83] It is important to note that all congresses still operated within the system of divisions discussed in Chapter 3, although they stressed the centrality of different aspects of the order (unity or decentralization). As discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, the tension between these two logics characterised the imaginary horizon.

The first post-Tito Congress of the LCY, held in June 1982, was described by observers at the time as 'the congress of disagreements' that ended with 'formless compromises'.[84] The delegations failed to agree on the rules that would structure the internal operation of the LCY. The resolution adopted verbally reaffirmed the importance of democratic centralism in the LCY, but failed to substantiate how it would be realised in practice given the territorially differentiated nature of the LCY. It reaffirmed the central role of differences between the republican and provincial party organizations for the development

[83] *Three More Regional Party Congresses, 24 May 1982*; *Yugoslavia's Last Two Regional Party Congresses, 16 June 1982*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12020; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:d7231b3f-8892-4371-acaf-aae9c08c638c` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[84] Wolfgang Höpken. "Party Monopoly and Political Change: The Lague of Communists since Tito's Death". In: *Yugoslavia in the 1980s*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet. Boulder: Westview Press, 1985, p. 34.

of LCY policy and the realisation of workers' self-management.[85] Furthermore, although the congress adopted the Stabilization Programme as a platform for the struggle of the working class against worsening economic conditions, the manner in which it was to be translated into concrete economic practices was not substantiated.[86]

Between the 1982 and 1984, six of the 12 meetings of the CC were devoted to the deepening economic crisis but, due to different views, they failed to produce a workable blueprint for translating the recommendations of the Stabilization Programme into specific practices. The dependence of the economy on the IMF loans and the involvement of the institution in the attempts to stabilize the economy called for the readjustment of the LCY's ideology vis-à-vis Western market capitalism, and caused further internal party disputes.[87] The differences were not articulated into coherent antagonistic blocks/projects. For instance, many of the supporters of the Stabilization Programme and IMF conditions, also criticised the strengthening of the FEC which accompanied the austerity measures and thus came close to those that opposed the arrangement altogether.[88] Pašić's critique of the existing institutional forms discussed in the previous section was yet another point of internal differentiation. Since he effectively called for the restriction of republican, provincial and communal powers on the economic terrain, and given the central role those rules played for the realisation of national equality and self-management, his analysis was perceived by some as anti-constitutional.[89]

The Thirteenth Plenum of the CC LCY held in June 1984, convened to resolve ideo-

[85]For an analysis of the different positions regarding the functioning of the LCY before and during the Twelfth Congress see: Höpken, "Party Monopoly and Political Change: The Lague of Communists since Tito's Death", p. 36. For the resolution adopted by the Congress regarding cadre policy and the functioning of the LCY see: The League of Communists of Yugoslavia. *Tweelfth Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia*. Belgrade: Socialist Thought and Practice, 1983, pp. 146-148.

[86]*The Aftermath of the Yugoslav Party Congress, 20 July 1982.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12017; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:d38e8012-488e-49d9-a6f3-7c400cb9bca7` (visited on 02/16/2016); and The League of Communists of Yugoslavia, *Tweelfth Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia*, pp. 165-171.

[87]*Ideological Struggle Intensifying, 1 March 1983.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12080; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:0aaf30cc-b7ff-4a9d-ac6d-ace7a4c2ffbe` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[88]Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*, p. 99.

[89]See: Höpken, "Party Monopoly and Political Change: The Lague of Communists since Tito's Death", p. 38; and *Yugoslav Leaders Disagree about Reforming the System, 22 April 1983.*

logical differences within the party, again failed to produce a blueprint for the implementation of the Stabilization Programme. According to reports from the discussions, the 163-member CC LCY disagreed on every point but one, namely that a multi-party system could not be the solution to the deepening crisis.[90] The leadership was compelled to acknowledge that 'differences in understanding and implementing certain positions and decisions from the Stabilization Programme', including 'differences and disagreements even in the understanding of certain essential questions' were paralysing it from within.[91] Observers noted that the LCY was experiencing a semantic crisis since the cardinal nodal points of Yugoslavian self-managing socialism – unity, self-management, responsibility, change, Marxism and Titoism – were 'taking on different meanings for different factions within the LCY'.[92] Disunity in the central party organs had reached such a degree that the resolution prepared by the Presidium could not be adopted and the CC decided to present the text for an organized discussion to the whole LCY membership (2, 200, 000) in an attempt to forge a consensus regarding the future of the order.

The results of the party-wide discussion, which were reported to the CC LCY in March 1985, brought to light that the membership did not share the same differences of opinion as the central party organs. Most importantly, it also showed that the differences of opinion among the membership did not overlap with the territorial subdivisions of the party.[93] The results rendered visible that the upper leadership, which was meant to assure party unity, was effectively more divided than the party base. In an attempt to fix the problem, at the Eighteenth Plenum of CC LCY held in 1985, the CC reaffirmed democratic centralism by passing a resolution that threatened all party members, including the Presidium and the CC members, with expulsion if they acted against positions/policies adopted by the CC. In practice, this intervention gave the CC the right the supervise republics and provinces, and was put in place to counter the federalization of the party

[90] *The Aftermath of the Yugoslav Central Committee Plenum, 28 June 1984.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12241; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:e6fc40b6-1f8c-4711-9ed9-ee972674045c` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[91] Komunist, 10 July 1984 (supplement), p. 3; quoted in: Burg, "Political Structures", p. 16.

[92] *The Aftermath of the Yugoslav Central Committee Plenum, 28 June 1984.*

[93] Burg, "Political Structures", pp. 16-17.

and the transformation of internal differences into divisions along territorial lines. According to the new rules, which ultimately aimed at creating the conditions of possibility for implementing the Stabilization Programme:

> [...] the agencies of the republican and provincial CC's will be obliged to inform the CC LCY regularly about how the resolutions of the CC LCY have been implemented and their results. All attempts to deny the principle of democratic centralism should be energetically resisted, regardless of whether centralist, bureaucratic uniformity is in question or liberal ideas leading to the federalization[of the party]; they objectively constitute an attack on the LCY as a united revolutionary organization.[94]

However, although the resolution put in place rules for policy implementation, and was incorporated in to the statute of the LCY at the Thirteenth Congress in June 1986, it failed to resolve the problem of translating the Stabilization Programme into a set of practices accepted by the central party organs.[95]

The leadership of LC Serbia was the first to articulate a coherent position regrading the causes, effects and solutions to the crisis of self-management by in November 1984.[96] Contrary to other republican and provincial LCs that were marked by internal differences regarding the content of the reform, the Serbian leadership drew up 38 theses regarding the nature of and solution to the deepening crisis that were binding to all of its members. By 1984, as I will discuss in detail in the following chapter, SR Serbia had already experienced a series of mutually antagonistic protests by Kosovo's Albanians and Serbs/Montenegrins that contested the notion of national equality and the terms under which unity was constituted. The republican reform proposal was an attempt to suture both SR Serbia's internal dislocations as well as the all-Yugoslavian crisis.

The reform proposal articulated by the Serbian leadership was overdetermined by the signifier 'unity'. It called for the strengthening of the enterprises as the basic economic unit; the strengthening of the executive branch of the government; the democratization

[94] *Yugoslav Central Committee Demands Discipline, 3 September 1985.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12262; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:53191264-2359-471e-a160-d6b99324c536` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[95] Ibid.

[96] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 20 December 1984.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-214-2; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:88282ad7-ace8-4fed-a266-6ae1954e5fc5` (visited on 02/16/2016).

of the electoral system; and the strengthening of unity within SR Serbia by concentrating power in the hands of the republican institutions and at the expense of the two autonomous provinces. It reiterated elements of Pašić's critique from 1982, such as the problem of the institutionalization of partial interests and the lack of responsibility of office holders, but it added more elements to the critique. To resist administrative interventions of territorial units in the economy, LC Serbia proposed the strengthening of the role of enterprises to enable them to manage their activities in accordance with the needs of the Yugoslavian market. This would 'naturally' integrate the fragmented Yugoslavian market. The proposal also stressed the need for closer institutional cooperation between the Federal Assembly and the FEC, demanding that severe sanctions be imposed in cases when adopted legislation is not implemented in the republics/provinces. To create a culture of responsibility in the delegate system, the proposal demanded that multiple candidates be nominated for each legislative level. In order to counter the territorial differentiation of the central party leadership, the proposal called for the election of delegates in the CC LCY by the LCY Congress and not by republican/provincial organizations. In contrast to the transformations at the federal level, which would have resulted in the decrease of power of the republics and provinces, the leadership demanded the strengthening of the power of the SR Serbia vis-a-vis its constitutive provinces. The proposal, however, rejected any substantial changes to the constitutional order and interventions in the rules structuring decision-making in federal institutions.[97]

The proposal of the Serbian leadership was received with criticism. The leadership of Vojvodian in particular rejected it as an expression of unitarism and argued that, instead of suturing the deepening crisis, it would simply contribute to further divisions within the LCY. In response these criticisms, Slobodan Milošević, at the time a fairly anonymous member of the Belgrade League of Communists City Committee declared:

> We have been threatened with a political crisis if we continue to [do nothing more than] discuss these problems. All right then, let us enter that political crisis. This

[97] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 30 November 1984*; for an academic analysis of the proposals from the time see: Höpken, "Party Monopoly and Political Change: The Lague of Communists since Tito's Death", pp. 38-41; and Dennison I. Rusinow. "Nationalities Policy and the "National Question"". In: *Yugoslavia in the 1980s*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet. Boulder: Westview Press, 1985, pp. 152-153.

> crisis is going to produce a great uproar about the question of unity and separatism. In such a crisis separatism will not prevail, because the people have accepted unity. The leaders incapable of seeing this will lose the public's confidence. If separatism is not opposed, our country will have no prospects for the future. It can only disintegrate.[98]

He explicitly rejected the critique that the Serbian communists were unitarist, claiming that the label which, as discussed in Chapter 3, originated in the unitarist project of the Serbian bourgeoisie in 'old' Yugoslavia, was constantly deployed to exclude Serbian demands and proposals. He added that the Serbs were tired of this rhetoric and that 'we Serbs have no reason whatsoever to bow our heads to anyone'.[99]

The Serbian reform proposal and Milošević's representation of the proposal, are important because they rendered visible that elements of what in 1988 became the anti-bureaucratic revolution were already in circulation in 1984. Furthermore, it is also important to note that the Serbian reform proposal which, as I will show in the following chapter underwent changes after Milošević became the de-facto leader of LC Serbia in 1987, was initially not articulated in national but rather working class terms. Yet its particularistic origins were visible in the sense that it was put forward by a particular republican leadership with the aim of suturing the dislocated Yugoslavian order. In the following chapter I will discuss the Serbian attempts to reform the order and its effects in greater detail.

In sum, despite all efforts, the Yugoslavian leadership failed to suture the conceptual dislocations that the changing economic conditions and failing institutional landscape gave rise to in the 1980s. The territorially differentiated leaderships within the LCY began privileging particular elements of the self-managing order over others, and giving the signifier 'self-management' a floating character. This, in turn, further weakened the Yugoslavian imaginary and made the forging of a unified solution to the deepening crisis more difficult. Within this context, the first attempt to suture the dislocated order emerged within the ranks of SR Serbia. Eventually, as I will show in the following chapters, internal party differences crystallized into antagonistic divisions and resulted in the

[98] Politika, 24 November 1984; quoted in: *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 30 November 1984.*
[99] Ibid.

dissolution of the LCY in January 1990.

## 6.6 Conclusion

In this chapter I have looked into the interplay of institutional and economic factors that undermined the unity of the LCY and rendered the disorderly guise of the Yugoslavian order visible. By drawing out the main themes and developments in the 1980-1986 period, I have shown that the crisis Yugoslavia was experiencing is irreducible to a single factor. I have argued that economic, institutional, and theoretical-ideological issues affected one another and reflected a deepening disunity within the hegemonic LCY. I showed the extent to which the 1980s were a 'historically new situation' due to the deaths of Yugoslavia's two leaders and their impact on the ability to sustain order. Furthermore, I have argued that economic crisis rendered visible the inability of the self-managing order to generate the working class prosperity it was premised upon. The changing economic circumstances were, in turn, bound up with the institutional landscape since they exposed its limits in delivering a systemic/even response to tackling the worsening economy. Different republican/provincial delegates rejected decisions made by the FEC in reference to their self-managing rights, while the FEC demanded their implementation for the purpose of 'saving' the self-managing order. I have also shown that the dislocatory effects produced by the changing economic conditions and the failing institutional landscape reflected in a growing disunity within the hegemonic LCY. The inability of the LCY to substantiate a systemic response to the economic crisis weakened the Yugoslavian imaginary by dislocating more and more of its constitutive elements. An observer in 1984 captured the irreducibility of the crisis to a single factor in claiming that it 'runs deeper than any of its economic, social or political aspects viewed alone' and that it 'runs through the entire Yugoslavian system and is inherent to that system'.[100]

Overall, my main point in this chapter has been that in and through these developments the signifier self-management floated and its failure to provide a source of unity

[100] *Crisis and Dissent in Yugoslavia, 23 October 1984.*

in purpose/direction became more and more visible. The changing economic conditions indicated the Yugoslavian order was not becoming a prosperous self-managing society, while the institutional deadlock showed that self-management acquired different meanings to different republican delegates and institutional actors. Lastly, the representational failures of self-management were also reflected in the inability of the LCY to maintain unity and articulate a single Yugoslavian space of representation to suture the dislocated order. The Serbian party was the first republican branch of the LCY that articulated a platform to suture the structural dislocations and further develop self-management. The platform was centred on the notion of unity and operated within the boundaries of the existing imaginary. In the following chapter, I look at the national dimension of the crisis and map out the ways in which the hegemonic system of social division, based on a hierarchy between nation and class, was gradually disarticulated by the end of the 1980s.

# CHAPTER VII

# Hegemonic Crisis: Politicizing National Identities in the Socialist Republic of Serbia and the LCS's Transformist Project

## 7.1 Introduction

Drawing on the theoretical framework of Chapter 2, in this chapter I examine the politicization of national identities in SR Serbia within the context of the deepening crisis of the LCY's hegemony. While in the previous chapter I looked at the economic and institutional dimension of the hegemonic crisis, in this chapter I thus focus on its national dimension.

In the review of the existing literature on the dissolution of Yugoslavia, I have discussed the tendency to represent the emergence of Croatian nationalism in general, and the CDU in particular, as a 'normal' reaction to the emergence of Serbian nationalism and the consolidation of Slobodan Milošević's power within the ranks of the LC Serbia (LCS). In addition, as I will show in the following chapter, developments in SR Serbia in the second half of the 1980s were important nodal points in the CDU's own representation of its origins and aims in the first democratic elections.

The aim of this chapter is to account for the politicization of Serbian national identity from within its discursive context – the crisis of self-managing socialism and the dislocation of the hegemonic representation of national identities – precisely because Serbian nationalism plays a cardinal role in explaining the emergence of the CDU. To provide an

account of the politicization of the Serbian national identity as a process rather than an essence, and explain the role that Slobodan Milošević played in it, my analysis centres around the Gramscian idea of transformism. As discussed in Chapter 2, transformism is a process of gradual and continuous absorption of the active elements produced by social groups, including those that seem irreconcilably hostile and antagonistic to the power-holders.[1] The aim of a transformist strategy is to maintain or deepen the power of the existing regime by expanding the basis of its legitimacy.[2] A successful transformist project results in decreasing the antagonistic potential of the remaining excluded elements and the broadening of the hegemonic block, while a failed transformist project leads to the expansion of the logic of equivalence, the drawing of clear-cut political frontiers and the deepening of antagonistic relations.[3] The degree of legitimacy of the existing order, the distribution of power within its institutions as well as the types of demands raised and strategies used to advance them, all come to bear on the form and outcome of a particular transformist project. Accounting for it therefore necessitates looking into the types of demands being raised, the addressee of those demands and the way in which they operate within the framework of the existing institutional system. Do they, for instance, just aim to modify it or amount to a full-fledged refusal to be governed under its terms?[4]

The argument advanced in this chapter is that Slobodan Milošević's political project can best be accounted for as a particular form of transformism that operated by absorbing the demands produced by active social elements in SR Serbia and deepening the legitimacy of the LCS. It moved the LCS's position closer to that of social groups that articulated their demands in national terms, even those that were initially antagonistic to the socialist regime and the LCS. However, this strategy brought about the deepening of divisions between republican parties constitutive of the LCY and the disarticulation of the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon. In the first section, I discuss the impact that the 1974 Constitution had on the distribution of power within SR Serbia and the republic's specific

[1]Norval, "Trajectories of Future Research in Discurse Theory", p. 220.
[2]Norval, *Deconstructing Apartheid Discourse*, pp. 198-199.
[3]Norval, "Trajectories of Future Research in Discurse Theory", p. 220.
[4]Aletta J. Norval. "Pictures of Democratic Engagement: Claim-making, Citizenization and the Ethos of Democracy". In: (Forthcoming), p. 7.

position in the Yugoslavian order. In the second section, I map out the contestations of national equality by Kosovo Albanians and Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins and the failures of the regime to suture the political space dislocated by their intensification. I also look into the role that intellectuals in Belgrade played in the politicization and antagonization of national identities in SR Serbia and Yugoslavia. In the third section, I relate the failure of the sitting Serbian leadership to suture the political space dislocated by the national contestations to the emergence of Slobodan Milošević within the ranks of the LCS. I flesh out the manner in which the new constitutional concept articulated by the LCS under his leadership absorbed some of these demands and the LCS's strategies to deepen its hegemony within a weakened Yugoslavian imaginary. I also show the precise manner in which Milošević's transformist project had a divisive effect on the LCY and how it contributed to the dying of the Yugoslavian imaginary. In the concluding section, after rehearsing my main points, I introduce the following chapter.

Before moving on to the analysis, it is important that the limits of my discussion are clearly specified. Given the scope of my thesis, in this chapter I will not examine the constitutional concept that emerged in SR Slovenia, nor the social demands articulated in that context.[5] Furthermore, in my analysis of the discourse of the Belgrade intellectuals, I will focus on their articulation of the Kosovo problem, and the Serbian nation in relation to it, exclusively in two documents; a petition written in support of the demands of Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins and a Memorandum drafted by the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences. I will not look at the different debates that marked Belgrade's intellectual scene at the time, which were of course much more heterogeneous.[6]

## 7.2 The Constitution of SR Serbia in the Yugoslavian Imaginary

The 1974 Constitution discussed in Chapter 5 divided SR Serbia internally and placed it in a very distinct position within the Yugoslavian order. It further decentralized power

[5]For an excellent analysis of both see: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 312-343.

[6]For an excellent analysis of the Belgrade intellectual scene in the 1980s, see: Dragović-Soso, *Saviours of the Nation: Serbia's Intellectual Opposition and the Revival of Nationalism.*

and substantiated the autonomy of its constitutive provinces, AP Vojvodina and AP Kosovo. This resulted in SR Serbia's fragmentation into three elements: two provinces defined by the constitution and 'narrow Serbia' (SR Serbia minus the provinces) that was constitutionally undefined. In this sense, the 1974 Constitution had an uneven effect; on the one hand it strengthened the power of republics vis-a-vis the federation, but it also weakened the power of SR Serbia vis-a-vis its provinces. This articulation of forces followed a particular logic, namely that the vesting power at lower institutional levels within a multi-national political context would bring about national equality and the decontestation of national identities. The same logic extended to the autonomous provinces. Precisely because of their difference from 'narrow Serbia', in terms of historical experience and national composition, the decontestation of national identities and the maintenance of order was represented as contingent upon a degree of provincial autonomy. AP Vojvodina and AP Kosovo differed greatly in practice. AP Vojvodina was economically developed and nationally very heterogeneous, with a narrow Serbian majority.[7] AP Kosovo was the least developed territorial unit in Yugoslavia with an overwhelming Albanian majority and a relatively small Serbian minority.[8]

The Albanian nationality occupied a peculiar subject position within the framework of self-managing socialism. The Albanians were constituted as a nationality rather than a nation. Although they formed a minority in Yugoslavia as a whole, they formed an absolute majority in AP Kosovo. The Serbs occupied a diametrically opposite subject position. They were constituted as a nation and, while they formed a relative majority

[7] According to the 1981 census, Vojvodina's population was 54.6% Serb, 14% Hungarian, 5.4% Croatian, 8.2% Yugoslav and 17.8% composed of other national minorities. In other words, the Serbs formed a narrow majority in SR Vojvodina. See: *Vojvodina: A "Paradise" for National Minorities?, 30 December 1983.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12101; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:60f3f633-50ab-4ca6-ad40-9ea58a36e2d7` (visited on 03/29/2016).

[8] According to the 1981 census Kosovo's population was 77.4% Albanian, 13.2% Serbian, 3.7% Muslim, 1,7% Montenegrin, 0.8% Turkish and 3.1% as other. In other words, Serbs formed a minority in AP Kosovo and Albanians an absolute minority. See: *Exodus of Serbs from Kosovo, 18 May 1981.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11890; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:100212b5-23c9-4013-8c35-ff8a5c7438f3` (visited on 02/16/2016).

in Yugoslavia, they formed a clear minority in AP Kosovo.[9] In addition, the historical territories of Kosovo and Metohija played a central role in Serbian state and identity formation because they encompassed the centre of the medieval Serbian state and the Serbian Patriarchy.[10]

The constitution of Albanians as a nationality, and the Serbs as a nation within the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon, sedimented a hierarchical relationship between the two groups. The Yugoslavian-Albanians were represented as forming part of a nation whose native country borders Yugoslavia, while the Serbs were represented as native to Yugoslavia.[11] Furthermore, the hierarchy was reproduced by the fact that Albanians are not Slavs. In this sense, the existing system of divisions implied that the Serbs were 'more' Yugoslavian than the Albanians in an a priori fashion, both because of their non-Slavic ethnicity and their association with a foreign socialist country that was ideologically hostile to Yugoslavia's variant of socialism. In other words, the terms under which national equality was constituted within the framework of the order already placed the Albanians in an unequal position.

The constitution of sovereignty in the post-1974 period dislocated the power relations in SR Serbia. On the one hand, the working people, nations and nationalities were represented as realising 'their sovereign rights in the autonomous provinces'. On the other hand, republics were constituted as 'states based on the sovereignty of the people'.[12] In other words, although sovereignty was exercised both in the autonomous provinces and in SR Serbia, the republic was constituted as the exclusive carrier of statehood. The two representations of sovereignty complicated the political landscape of SR Serbia and

[9]For a discussion of the position of AP Kosovo and the Albanian nationality from a historical perspective see: 'Kosovo between Yugoslavia and Albania', pp. 15-48 in: Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*.

[10]The Kosovo was also the site where the Serbs lost from the Ottoman armies in 1389, marking the end of the Serbian medieval state. This has given rise to a 'two edged' myth of Kosovo within the Serbian national discourse. It is both a place to be avenged and a place of glory because the Serbian army was said to chose to struggle despite certain defeat rather than just capitulate in front of the Ottoman army. See: *The Kosovo Events in Perspective, 28 April 1981.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11799; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:5fe7713f-b32a-434e-aa38-c6d4288fe60f` (visited on 02/16/2016)

[11]According to the Constitution, this was the difference between nations and nationalities. See: *The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Appendix.

[12]Ibid., Article 3 and Article 4.

created the conditions of possibility for complaints from both the republican and provincial perspective. The constitutional rules could be deployed to legitimise demands for further expanding the power of the provinces as a means to 'truly' realise the sovereignty of the nations, the nationalities and the working class. Equally, the existing rules could be deployed to demand the limitation of provincial powers to prevent the hollowing out of the statehood attributed to SR Serbia. In addition, 'narrow Serbia' did not have institutions independent of the two autonomous provinces. Their delegates participated in the Serbian Assembly, Presidency and Executive while the delegates from 'narrow Serbia' had no presence in the organs of the provinces. As discussed in Chapter 5, the provinces were also represented as a particularity in federal institutions and thus resembled the republics. They were granted veto power in the Chamber of Republics and Provinces and enjoyed both equal numerical representation as republics and veto power in the Collective Presidency. In this sense, the provinces were granted rights to delegate their particular interests to federal instances without consulting the institutions of SR Serbia. In practice, the delegates of SR Serbia at the federal level covered only 'narrow Serbia', a territory that was neither mentioned in the constitution nor defined as a constitutive element of the Yugoslavian federal order.[13]

The first problematization of the dislocatory effects that the 1974 Constitution had on SR Serbia was articulated in 1977 in an internal document of the LCS. The Serbian leadership criticised the provincial leaderships' tendencies to pursue independent policies in the fields where SR Serbia (as a sovereign state) had rights, thus undermining SR Serbia's statehood. They requested the modification of existing practices, to bring them in line with the constitutional rules, but their requests were ignored and the issue swept under the carpet.[14]

In sum, it is important to bear in mind that the 1974 Constitution placed SR Ser-

[13]For a detailed analysis of the constitutional position of SR Serbia, AP Kosovo and AP Vojvodina see: Dimitrijević, "Sukobi oko ustava 1974 [The Conflicts arround the 1974 Constitution]"; and Vesna Pešić. "Serbian Nationalism and the Origins of the Yugoslav crisis". In: *Peaceworks* 8 (1996).

[14]In a 1977 session of all the relevant leaders in the LCY CC (Vojvodina and Kosovo included) no compromise on the issue was reached. The Kosovo leaders maintained that the document was a 'bible of Serbian nationalism' and accused the Serbian leadership of undermining provincial autonomy and acting in contradiction to the constitution. For an analysis of events and the position of the Serbian leadership in 1977 see: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 173-176.

bia in a particular position within the order, not comparable to that of other republics. However, this position was not the product of a predetermined project against Serbia as a state or the Serbs as a nation. Rather, SR Serbia's position was linked to the terms under which unity and division were represented and the outcome of struggles for their substantiation into rules. Furthermore, it is also important to bear in mind that the Serbs and Albanians occupied diametrically opposite subject positions and that a hierarchical relationship between the two already formed part of the constitutional order. The fact Serbs were constituted as 'more' Yugoslavian than Albanian was reflected the regime's differential treatment of their contending demands, even before the coming to power of Slobodan Milošević. These structural factors shaped the trajectory of the contestations on the ground and the regime's response, but they did not predetermine them in an a priori fashion, since they could be represented in multiple ways.

## 7.3 Contending Demands for Constitutional Change in AP Kosovo and the Emergence of the Serbian National Myth

### 7.3.1 Kosovo Albanian protests and regime response

As argued in previous chapters, the Yugoslavian identity was decontested into a hierarchy in which an overarching working class identity determined the political content of Yugoslavia's national identities. The essence of these identities was represented as their mutual equality. The members of the Albanian nationality in AP Kosovo were the first to contest the hegemonic representation of their position as equal, and to articulate demands for constitutional change.

On March 11 1981, a student protest denouncing poor accommodation and living conditions broke out in the capital of AP Kosovo, Priština. Initially, the student demands were articulated on the socio-economic terrain. They expressed their dissatisfaction with high unemployment, poverty, backwardness and social inequalities in AP Kosovo. They marched to LC Kosovo's headquarters chanting 'we want deeds not words' and 'some sleep

in arm chairs while others don't have bread'. Kosovo's leadership recognized the student demands as legitimate, but condemned their articulation through a public demonstration claiming that their dissatisfactions could also be mobilized by the 'enemies' of socialist Yugoslavia.[15] In preparation for the celebration of deceased Tito's birthday on March 23 1981, the provincial leadership ordered the round-up of all student leaders, claiming they might use the celebration to generate disorder. In response, students joined by other citizens took to the streets to demand their release and denounce Kosovo's inferior position in Yugoslavia. Their core demand was that Kosovo be transformed from a province to a republic.[16] This demand was articulated through national signifiers, such as: 'we are Albanian not Yugoslavian', 'unity with Albania', and 'Trepča works, Belgrade builds'. The provincial leadership maintained that the protests were of a nationalist counter-revolutionary character and police violence was used to reinstitute order.[17] On March 30, the students of the three largest faculties in Priština University declared a boycott of teaching and, by April 2, the protests had spread across the province. Factory workers joined the students and citizens, and there were reports of protest actions being prepared among the Albanians in SR Montenegro.[18] There were also reports of the demolition of Serbian/Orthodox Holy Sites such as churches, monasteries and cemeteries.[19] On April 3, a state of emergency was declared in the province and federal troops were sent in to establish order. Official sources reported twelve dead and 150 wounded but alternative sources claimed the casualties were higher.[20]

The demands of Kosovo Albanians were articulated violently and extra-institutionally, and suggested that the Albanian protesters felt unequal because they did not have their

[15]Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*, p. 15; and *Kosovo: One Year after the Riots, 17 March 1982.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-298; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:53f675ee-28ff-4113-bb8c-4af6ba639d2a` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[16]Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*, p. 16.

[17]Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 185.

[18]Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, p. 196.

[19]*Desecration of Serbian Graves in Kosovo, 21 May 1981.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11885; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:53f675ee-28ff-4113-bb8c-4af6ba639d2a` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[20]Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*, p. 16; Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, p. 196; and *Kosovo: One Year after the Riots, 17 March 1982.*

own republic. This meant that, contrary to their constitution as a nationality, they effectively raised their demands as a nation and appropriated Kosovo on numerical grounds. Furthermore, by making references to a unified Albanian nation and calling for unity with Albania, their demands transgressed the boundaries of the Yugoslavian imaginary. The demand for transforming Kosovo from a province into a republic, within the context of a broader Albanian identity different from the Yugoslavian, implied that the protesters wanted Kosovo's secession from Yugoslavia.

Due to the content of the demands and the strategy deployed in their articulation, the provincial, republican and federal leaderships represented the events as part and parcel of a counter-revolution plotted by the enemies of Yugoslavia.[21] The leadership maintained that the demand 'Kosovo-Republic' was articulated just to create the conditions of possibility for Kosovo's secession from Yugoslavia.[22] To re-establish order, hundreds of LC Kosovo members were expelled from the LCY and some of the sitting leaders were forced to resign. Students and faculty members associated with the protest were expelled from the University of Priština.[23] The provincial police claimed it had uncovered 30 illegal groups in AP Kosovo, the biggest of which were the Marxist-Leninist group of Kosovo and the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Albanians which were allegedly linked to the People's Socialist Republic of Albania.[24]

In line with the hegemonic representation of the nature of social divisions, discussed in Chapter 3, the federal leadership represented the protests as a counter-revolution driven by a part of the Albanian population in Kosovo and as antagonistic to all nations and nationalities in Yugoslavia. From their perspective, despite being articulated exclusively by Albanians as Albanians, the demands were not the expression of the Kosovo-Albanian na-

[21] *The Kosovo Unrest - The Causes and the Consequenes, 7 April 1981.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11798; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:29b463a2-6d2c-40cc-9341-6be4b2f02d35` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[22] *A Separate Kosovo Republic in Yugoslavia, 16 June 1981.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11875; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:4b831271-e2cd-4664-95e4-74590f8f6288` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[23] Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*, p. 9; Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, p. 197; and *Kosovo: One Year after the Riots, 17 March 1982.*

[24] Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*, p. 13.

tional interest but antagonistic to it. In this sense, the federal leadership maintained that the demands had nothing to do with 'the attitude of the large majority of working people and citizens of Kosovo, with the interests of the Albanians, Serbs, Montenegrins, and members of other nations in AP Kosovo'.[25] The federal leadership placed the province's economic backwardness at the centre of its explanation, claiming the deepening economic crisis was making Yugoslavia more susceptible to all forms of nationalism, and that the protests were just an expression of this negative trend.[26]

The Serbian leadership added a particular element to the federal leadership's interpretation of the events in AP Kosovo. It represented the protests as the consequence of SR Serbia's failed statehood that was caused by the misinterpretation of the 1974 Constitution. The Serbian leadership claimed that the behaviour of provinces as republics in practice created the conditions of possibility for thinking of them as republics and formulating demands for changing their formal status. From their perspective, the Kosovo protests resembled the refusals of AP Vojvodina's leadership to submit to the position of the central leadership in Belgrade on multiple issues, since both practices developed under the assumption that the provinces were in fact republics. To solve both problems, the Serbian leadership demanded a stricter implementation of the existing constitutional rule about republican sovereignty. They claimed that the puzzle to be solved was how to develop the 'autonomy of the provinces in the [Serbian] republic while respecting the elements of their constitutionality within Yugoslavia's federalism' and also to 'strengthen the togetherness in the [Serbian] republic and the unity of the Serbian state'.[27]

AP Vojvodina's leadership contested the equation of Vojvodina and Kosovo and reproached the Serbian leadership for instrumentalizing the counter-revolution in AP Kosovo

[25] Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 188.

[26] *Yugoslav Government Concerned about Internal Security, 15 November 1983.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12114; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:3ff07804-dd7c-4c53-9f1f-7f31239ae6a1` (visited on 02/16/2016); and Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 188-191.

[27] *The Serbian Question - One of Yugoslavia's Major Internal Problems, 26 January 1982.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11972; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:7c8184f0-63c8-4dfc-8c42-f0dfc2af11d7` (visited on 02/16/2016).

to contest the autonomy of the provinces in general. From their perspective, the LCS was trying to increase its power at the expense of that of the provincial leaderships. The generalisation of the Kosovo problem into a problem of provincial autonomy was thus, according to them, the expression of 'nationalism', 'unitarism', 'centralism' and therefore antagonistic to the self-managing order.[28] It is important to stress that critique of the LCS's representation of events came mostly from Serbian nationals in CC LC Vojvodina.[29]

### 7.3.2 Kosovo Serb/Montenegrin protests and regime response

Despite the regime's representation of the protests as driven by class antagonisms, the protesters were exclusively Kosovo Albanians and they protested as Albanians. Furthermore, the protests were staged in an Albanian majority province, in a context that already granted AP Kosovo a significant degree of autonomy and protected the cultural and linguistic rights of its Albanian population. Their demands and strategies dislocated already complicated national relations in the province. They were interpreted by Serbs/Montenegrins as directed against them and as a threat to their own position in the province.

The dislocation was exacerbated by the publication of the 1981 census which showed that the Serb/Montenegrin population of AP Kosovo was progressively decreasing.[30] In the aftermath of the 1981 Kosovo protests the number of Serb/Montenegrin emigrants from AP Kosovo had increased and different interpretations of the causes behind their demographic decline in the province emerged.[31] These interpretations ranged from those focusing on economic factors, those focusing on the practical ramifications of the 1974 Constitutional rules, to those representing the decline as the product of an systematic attempt to 'cleanse' AP Kosovo of the Serbian/Montenegrin nations by so called 'Albanian

[28] *Three More Regional Party Congresses, 24 May 1982.*
[29] Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 196-197.
[30] *Exodus of Serbs from Kosovo, 18 May 1981.*
[31] Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, p. 198.

nationalists'.[32] The latter formed the backbone for the contestation of the regime's representation of the Kosovo problem by self-declared delegates of the Serbian/Montenegrin nations in AP Kosovo.

Before the 1981 protests, there had hardly been any mention of the immigration of Serbs/Montenegrins from Kosovo. By 1982, in the words of observers from the time, the demographic decline and the migration became 'one of the most pressing political issues of the Yugoslav federation as a whole and of the province of Kosovo and the republic of Serbia in particular'.[33] In March 1982, just as Albanian students took to the streets to mark the first anniversary of the 1981 protests, a group of Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins drew up a petition addressing federal institutions and demanding more effective measures to stabilize national relations in the province.[34] In the same year, orthodox priests drew up a petition addressing federal and republican institutions to 'raise their voice for the protection of the spiritual and biological being of the Serbian nation in Kosovo and Metohija'.[35] In August 1983, 100,000 people gathered at the funeral of Aleksandar Ranković, the former head of Yugoslavia's State Security Service and a staunch centralist, whose purge I discussed within the context of the Croatian Spring movement in Chapter 4. The gathering at his funeral was said to be a statement of support for his strong-arm policy against Albanians in AP Kosovo.[36] In May 1985, a Kosovo Serb army employee was allegedly attacked by Kosovo Albanians and impaled with a bottle while working his land in the province. The Belgrade media picked up the case and represented it as an exemplar of the position of the entire Serbian/Montenegrin nation in AP Kosovo. A massive public

[32] *Why Are so Many Serbs Leaving Kosovo?, 16 November 1982.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-15197; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:a46d2d71-fffc-4adc-9c39-fb3a369138b0` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[33] Ibid.

[34] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 27 March 1986.*

[35] This marked the beginning of the open involvement of the Orthodox Church in SR Serbia's politics. For an detailed analysis of the role the Serbian Orthodox Church in the politicization of the Serbian national identity in the 1980s see: Radmila Radić. "Crkva i "srpsko pitanje" [The church and the serbian question]". In: *Srpska strana rata: trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju Srpska strana rata: trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju [The Serb Side of the War: Trauma and Catharsis in Historical Memory].* Ed. by Nebojša Popov. Beograd: Republika, 1996.

[36] *Yugoslav Government Concerned about Internal Security, 15 November 1983.*

uproar followed, although the truthfulness of the allegations was highly questionable.[37]

In October 1985, self proclaimed delegates of Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins drew up a petition signed by 2,016 people, in which they expressed that they were discriminated in AP Kosovo and demanded that the Serbian and federal institutions establish order and protect their constitutional rights. They also accused the sitting provincial leadership of tacit approval of the migrations of Serbs/Montenegrins. They demanded the return of Serbian/Montenegrin migrants to AP Kosovo; the annulment of sales contracts between Albanian buyers and Serb sellers; the prohibition of the usage of the Albanian flag; and the implementation of Serbian language laws to counteract the Albanian language laws in the province. They also called for the removal of all 'Albanian chauvinists and Serbian opportunists' from positions of power.[38]

The Kosovo Serb/Montenegrins continued exerting pressure on the Serbian and the Yugoslavian leadership throughout 1986. In February, 95 complained to the Federal Assembly in Belgrade that Albanians were buying up property in Kosovo and circumscribing Serbian/Montenegrin communities. They also accused the provincial police of ignoring sexual crimes against non-Albanian women, and their general complaints as non-Albanians. To fix the problem they demanded that the authorities protect them more effectively from the Albanians and they threatened to migrate if their demands for order and equality were not met. Their demands were represented as a matter of social unity in the province, and they declared that they would 'either live united in Kosovo' or leave.[39] In April, 500 Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins expressed their concern over the lack of equality in Kosovo, and threatened that they would migrate if their national position was

[37] The facts of the case were and remain completely unclear. Martinović latter claimed that the injury was self-inflicted and thereafter he withdrew his allegations. The police and army investigated the case but were unable to converge on a conclusion. For more on the Marković case see: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 240; Sell, *Slobodan Milošević and the Destruction of Yugoslavia*, p. 78; and Nebojša Vladisavljević. *Serbia's Antibureaucratic Revolution: Milošević, the Fall of Communism and Nationalist Mobilization*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, p. 98.

[38] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 27 March 1986*; and Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 242.

[39] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 15 December 1986*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-216-12; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:77148eca-41a6-45c8-92bc-76ebc7c9f984` (visited on 02/16/2016); and *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 27 March 1986*.

not improved and their rights protected. In June, the police forcibly halted an organized mass migration of Serbs/Montenegrins from Kosovo Polje.[40] In November, in response to a rape case involving an 11 year old Serbian girl by a 17 year old Albanian in AP Kosovo, a self-proclaimed delegation of all Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins marched to Belgrade to protest to officials in the Federal Assembly. They maintained that the rape was nationally motivated, protested their worsening national position, and threatened to resort to violence. In the words of one of the delegates:

> Let us say that you [the Yugoslavian government] cannot guarantee our safety and civil rights. If you do not help us then you will be to blame for our actions, and don't be surprised if you hear that we have resorted to killing one another [...] raping women and children is not sexually motivated but is [committed as] an act of nationalistic hatred. Brotherhood and unity cannot be built in this way.[41]

They demanded a special session of the Federal Assembly to deal exclusively with AP Kosovo and the implementation of measures that would guarantee their constitutionally granted equal rights. Furthermore, they explicitly linked the worsening position of their nation in the province to the constitution of Kosovo within the existing order. This is how they articulated the issue:

> We, the Serbs from Kosovo are for a strong and harmonious Yugoslavia. This is why we have come to the Federal Assembly, to ask for the return of the civil rights we have lost in Kosovo [...] The constitution has created the current situation, and it must be changed. The politicians of our province, from top to bottom are the culprits [...] We will no longer remain silent![42]

The politicization of Kosovo Serb/Montenegrins was represented as a response to a threat they were facing as a nation. This threat emanated from the Albanians as a nationality, who were seen as having taken over and undermined national equality. They articulated their demands in terms of equality and justice and blamed the provincial leadership for failing to address their position as a national group. They were not undermining the hegemony of the LCY nor were they questioning its legitimacy. They represented the Kosovo problem as a dislocation of national equality in AP Kosovo, and demanded that those in

[40] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 15 December 1986.*
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.

power to suture it and re-stablish order. However, their demands were articulated in opposition to the 1974 Constitution. They blamed the terms under which national equality was decontested for undermining their position as a nation in AP Kosovo and represented the rights granted to the Albanian nationality (education in their own language, national symbols etc.) as a threat to their own identity. Furthermore, they also represented the provincial leadership as complicit in undermining their national position.

The regime's response to the protests of Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins was ambiguous. Although provincial, republican and federal authorities condemned the protests, they also acknowledged that their migration as a nation group formed part of the Kosovo problem. Consequently, the regime represented its reversal as central to suturing the dislocated relationship between national identities in AP Kosovo.[43]

The AP Kosovo leadership acknowledged that the migration of Serbs/Montenegrins was a product of overt and covert pressure and policies were introduced to reverse it. To redress the unequal position of the Serbian/Montenegrin nation in Kosovo, the Provincial Commission for the Prevention of Emigration was established and the Municipal Assembly took steps to guarantee jobs for the Serbs/Montenegrins that wished to return to Kosovo.[44] These practices were represented as attempts to foster harmonious national relationships in the province, but in practice they discriminated against locals in employment and politicized national difference.[45] The provincial leadership maintained that the principle of national equality should not be undermined when struggling against nationalism, and that all Albanians should not be grouped under the nationalist denominator.[46] In doing so, the provincial leadership worked towards de-antagonising Albanian

[43] *Rise of Tension in Kosovo Due to Migration, 28 June 1983.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12166; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:97db0e37-5591-41ba-ab43-77a65e5c4b42` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[44] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 15 December 1986.*

[45] See Fadil Hoxa and Ilijaz Kurtesi statements in: *Rise of Tension in Kosovo Due to Migration, 28 June 1983.*

[46] For instance, Sinan Hasani's statement about the Kosovo problem in *Solutions Sought to the Kosovar Problem, 19 April 1984.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12172; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:1db78e36-39a3-490b-b6a1-26044ad449dd` (visited on 02/16/2016), and the report in *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 27 March 1986.*

and Serb/Montenegrin identities in the province and remained within the boundaries of the hegemonic system of social division. The cardinal concern of the provincial leadership was to keep the involvement of SR Serbian and federal institutions in AP Kosovo to the minimum. To be able to do so, they represented the relationship between nations and nationalities in Kosovo as continually improving.[47] This 'positive' image conflicted with Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins' contention that the situation in AP Kosovo was a 'lawless and unbearable'.[48]

The federal leadership also acknowledged the migration of Serbs/Montenegrins to be a problem and instituted rules to reverse it. From their perspective, the migrations were caused by AP Kosovo's economic underdevelopment and high unemployment rate, while the economic conditions made Kosovo's working class susceptible to all forms of nationalism.[49] In November 1986, the Yugoslavian Presidency held a special session devoted to AP Kosovo and the problem of emigration. The Prime Minister instructed all socialist organizations in SR Serbia and AP Kosovo to work together towards developing Kosovo's economy and, in doing so, reverse the migrations. The Croatian delegate in the State Presidency, stressed that the 'stabilization of [...] Kosovo must be the affair of the entire country' and criticised the counter-revolutionary attempts of Albanian irredentists 'to break the chain of socialism in Yugoslavia at its most sensitive link'. He also criticised the Kosovo Serb/Montenegrin protesters for representing all Albanians as 'foreigners' that furthered the interest of irredentists and traitors, and for contributing to the emigration of their own nation from the province.[50]

Although federal institutions did not represent the Kosovo problem in national terms, the rules implemented as a solution to the problem exacerbated divisions along national lines. For instance, groups composed of federal and SR Serbian officials were set up to oversee investigations and decisions in legal cases involving Albanians against non-Albanians.

[47] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 27 March 1986.*

[48] In contrast to the provincial leadership's representation, and to legitimize their own demands and mobilize more protesters, the Serbs/Montenegrins engaged in rumour campaigns and exaggerated the scale of activities against them. See: Vladisavljević, *Serbia's Antibureaucratic Revolution: Milošević, the Fall of Communism and Nationalist Mobilization*, p. 105.

[49] *Rise of Tension in Kosovo Due to Migration, 28 June 1983.*

[50] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 15 December 1986.*

The burden of proof in these cases was placed on Albanians. Furthermore, the right of Albanians to acquire property from Serbs/Montenegrins was suspended through a ban of so called 'ethnically motivated' sales of property.[51] The acknowledgement that the provincial legal system was possibly nationally biased, the introduction of nation specific bans of property sales, and the fact that the (national) migration was discussed at the federal level as part and parcel of the Yugoslavian crisis, were all evidence of the regime's responsiveness to the pressures exerted by Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins.

The leadership of SR Serbia used the protests of Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins to legitimise the position that its ability to secure law and order was impaired by the ambiguous definition of the relationship between the provinces and SR Serbia in the constitution. On the LCS's initiative, the Presidency set up a Constitutional Commission to investigate, among other things, the constitutional position of SR Serbia as part of the Yugoslavian crisis. In 1986 the Commission included the status of SR Serbia in a set of issues that need to be considered when proposing constitutional amendments.[52] However, the Serbian leadership did not endorse the demands articulated by the protesters. To halt the protest marches to Belgrade the head of the LCS Ivan Stambolić visited Kosovo Polje in April 1986. He urged Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins not to leave the province and warned them of potential manipulations of their justified discontent by the enemies of Yugoslavia. He remained within the boundaries of the hegemonic system of social division in claiming that:

> I am convinced that in the Kosovo League of Communists, among the Albanians as well as among the Serbian and Montenegrin nations [...] there is enough strength to beat the counter-revolution [...] Do not allow a bunch of irredentist [...] to

[51] Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*, p. 71; *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 17 July 1986.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-216-7; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:3c05ac96-dfc7-4091-bb7a-84c90f0d4b7b` (visited on 02/16/2016); and *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 15 December 1986.*

[52] The others issues included the status of public ownership, the relations between the republics/autonomous provinces and the central government, creating a unified Yugoslav market, protecting the common interests of the country as a whole and federal system of planning. Thus the position of SR Serbia was represented as forming part of the Yugoslavian crisis by 1986. See: *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 20 November 1986.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-216-11; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:78f759fc-a4ae-45a4-9f33-532de5d78006` (visited on 02/16/2016).

> poison relationships between Serbs and Albanians here, and do not allow a bunch of Serbian nationalists to do the same![53]

However, Stambolić's speech failed to pacify the protesters and they continued marching to Belgrade throughout 1986. In response, the Serbian leadership ordered the police to block the roads to the capital and prevent the protest marches.[54] The inability of the sitting Serbian leadership to acknowledge their demands and represent their interests only antagonised the protesters further, and expanded the discontent with the provincial leadership to include the LCS's leadership.

The ambiguity of the regime's response to the protests of Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins, in contrast to the straight forward exclusion of those staged by Albanians in 1981, can be accounted for through the different subject positions the groups occupied in the order, as well as by the content of their demands. Since the leadership had already represented the Albanian protests in the province as a fermenting counter-revolution driven by nationalists, the enemy of the regime, and the enemy against which Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins articulated their demands, overlapped at one level. In this sense, part of their grievances were in continuity with the official representation of the Albanian protests. In addition, given the difference in the manner in which the two groups were constituted within the order, the Serbian/Montenegrin's were a priori relatively more included, since their protests could not be represented as driven by an external antagonistic nation. Unlike the Albanian protesters, the Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins neither questioned the integrity of Yugoslavia nor the legitimacy of the order as such. They simply blamed the provincial leadership for failing to impose order and protect their constitutionally granted rights. They gradually extended their dissatisfaction to include the sitting Serbian leadership, on the same grounds. The Albanians, on the other hand, demanded a territorial reorganization of the federation which, if realised, would have dislocated the constitutional position of other republics and provinces.

It is important to note that the legal practices instituted in response to the protests of Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins indicated that the regime acknowledged their particular

[53] An excerpt from Ivan Stambolić's speech in Kosovo Polje quoted in: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 246.
[54] Ibid., p. 248.

position as unequal vis-a-vis the Albanians in the province. However, these practices contributed to the politicization of national difference. On the one hand, the attempts to suture the dislocations discriminated against Albanians as a national group while, on the other, they failed to absorb the demands of the protesting Serbs/Montenegrins in an all-encompassing way. The regime could not absorb the demands of protesting Serbs/Montenegrins within the framework of the existing order, without altering the balance of forces articulated through it. Satisfying the demand to remove the provincial leadership, for instance, would have meant that an alliance between extra-party forces and the Serbian leadership was forming, and that it was antagonistic to fellow communists in the leadership. Furthermore, the sitting provincial leadership was installed in response to the 1981 protests precisely because it was in line with LCY's interpretation of the events. Satisfying the demand to take back the rights granted to Albanians as a nationality for instance, would have transformed the terms under which national equality was decontested within the order and altered the subject positions of other nations and nationalities.

The demands of both protesting groups resembled one another in linking the dislocation of their freedom and equality to the existing constitution and demanding its alteration. Their discourses were antagonistic because they demanded constitutional changes in diametrically opposite directions (decentralise-centralise), but their underlying logic was very similar. Both politicised national difference and equality with the aim of transforming the balance of forces articulated through the existing order. In a broader sense, the contending claims about equality, justice and the constitutional order rendered visible the failure of the existing constitutional rules to decontest national identities into subject positions. Their nation-centric articulation also rendered visible the limits of the regimes' reading of events as forming part and parcel of the working class struggle constitutive of the existing imaginary. These discursive failures were picked up by a group of Serbian intellectuals and, after Milošević came to power in 1987, they also made their way into the LCS's discourse on Kosovo.

### 7.3.3 The Serbian intellectuals: the mythical dimension to the Kosovo problem

In contrast to the Serbian leadership, a group of intellectuals in Belgrade endorsed the demands of the protesting Serbs/Montenegrins, inscribed them within the context of the all Yugoslavian crisis and articulated an alternative space of representation centered around a unified Serbian national subject. Their reading of events ran against the hegemonic conception of social unity and the representation of nations as constitutively divided into members that are included (class) and those that are excluded (counter-revolutionaries, nationalists, liberals, etc.). It flipped the relationship between the Yugoslavian and the national upside down, by making the national central to politics, and rendering Yugoslavian identity contingent upon it. To do so, they first represented the existing order as already underpinned by national particularities.

In January 1986, 212 Serbian intellectuals signed a petition addressing the Federal and the Serbian Assemblies in support of the October 1985 petition of Kosovo Serbs/ Montenegrins.[55] To add political weight to the petition they represented it as a plebiscite, signalling it articulated a universal position rather than a particular reading of events. The intellectuals represented the condemnation of the petition-plebiscite by the regime as the reason for their involvement in the debate. They expressed their support for the demand for 'radical measures that would ensure the nation and all of its constitutional rights and prevent the forced exodus from its ancient hearths'.[56] Furthermore, the intellectuals maintained that the dislocations experienced by the Serbian nation in AP Kosovo were also caused by the failure of the Serbian state to 'help and protect its nation'.[57] The protesting Serbs/Albanians articulated their demands against the provincial leadership

[55]According to Magaš, the petitioners were representative of Belgrade intellectuals. The signatories included 52 professors and among them 34 members of the Serbian Academy of Sciences, six retired army generals, and 1 member of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Orthodox priests. The petition was also signed by three former Praxis editors which formed part of the so called 'Yugoslavian critical left': Zagorka Golubović, Mihailo Marković and Ljuba Tadić. The petition was also supported by Milan Kangrga a Praxis editor from Croatia. Magaš claims the petition marked the 'consolidation of [...] a political gravitational centre outside of the LCY and to its right'. For her analysis of the petition and its significance see: Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*, pp. 52-53.

[56]"Petition by Belgrade Intellectuals". In: *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*. London: Verso, 1993, p. 49.

[57]Ibid., p. 50.

for failing to secure law and order and never mentioned the Serbian state as a protector of their national identity.

The intellectuals' position was articulated in a dramatic and emotionally-laden tone. They spoke in the name of:

> All of those who have been shaken by the suffering of Serbs and other nationalities in Kosovo and Metohija, all those who are concerned for the destiny of Serbia and Yugoslavia, all those in whom conscience and a sense of responsibility are not dead[...][58]

Those that failed to respond to the suffering of Serbs were represented as apathetic towards Serbia and Yugoslavia within their discourse. In this sense, they equated the destiny of the Serbian nation in AP Kosovo with the destiny of the Yugoslavian order as such.

The experience of national suffering and the migrations from the province were not represented as caused by the 1974 Constitution nor the counter-revolutionary activities of enemies. According to the petition, they were part of a 'chronicle of a long, destructive genocide on European territory [...] going on for three centuries'.[59] The new element in the sequence of historical abuses was the enemy embodied in the Albanian state and the ruling institutions in Kosovo associated with it, which were working towards making Kosovo ethnically pure. Developments on the ground were articulated as products of a systematic policy of genocide that could expand to include the territories of Serbia, Macedonia and Montenegro.[60] The Albanians were represented as the national minority that had 'the greatest constitutional rights in the world' while the Serbian nation in AP Kosovo as one whose right to autonomy had been systematically undermined and abused. Furthermore, the entire legal-constitutional order of the country was deemed complicit because it was being 'harnessed to hide such a crime'.[61] Their discourse was thus antagonistic to any position that defended the existing constitutional order on the grounds that it tacitly supported the genocide in Kosovo.

The Belgrade intellectuals also contested the regime's reading of the situation in Kosovo by representing it as mere 'ideological babble' that served as an 'alibi' for them to

[58]"Petition by Belgrade Intellectuals", p. 50.
[59]Ibid., p. 50.
[60]Ibid., pp. 50-51.
[61]Ibid., p. 51.

remain in power.[62] Speaking in the name of the Serbian nation as an undivided political subject, the petition asserted that 'no nation willingly gives up its right to exist' and that the Serbian nation would 'not be an exception to this rule'.[63] To prevent genocide in Kosovo they demanded a deep social and political transformation of Yugoslavia that included: changes in the relationship between the autonomous provinces and SR Serbia, the right to spiritual identity, the right to defend the foundations of Serbian national culture and the right to 'the physical survival of the nation on its land'. The protesters, in contrast, did not raised their demands as part of a broader national subject that shared a common spirit and culture with Serbs across Yugoslavia. Furthermore, while the protesters never mentioned any systemic transformation of the Yugoslavian power structure but simply demanded that the LCY protect their rights, the Belgrade intellectuals demanded 'democratic reforms' to ensure 'a firm juridical order and ensure equal rights for all citizens'.[64] In this sense, the petition expanded the scope of the contestations significantly.

A Memorandum drafted by Serbian Academy of Sciences in September 1986 further substantiated critique of the existing order and the role of the Serbian nation, as a unified subject, in its transformation.[65] The logic underpinning the Memorandum was that the 1974 Constitution, formed part and parcel of (a) particular national project(s) and was not, as the LCY maintained, the expression of a universal self-managing project and the interests of the Yugoslavian working class.

The deepening economic crisis and the leadership's inability to resolve it were represented through elements that formed part of the debate on the issue, as discussed in Chapter 6. The Memorandum represented Yugoslavia's economic crisis as caused by the decentralised and fragmented economic system. The failure of the leadership to resolve the problems was represented as a deliberate strategy of the republican leaderships to pre-

[62]"Petition by Belgrade Intellectuals", p. 51.
[63]Ibid., p. 50.
[64]Ibid., pp. 50-51.
[65]For a detailed analysis of the activities of the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences see: Olivera Milosavljević. "Zloupotreba autoriteta nauke [The abuse of the authority of science]". In: *Srpska strana rata: trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju Srpska strana rata: trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju [The Serb Side of the War: Trauma and Catharsis in Historical Memory].* Ed. by Nebojša Popov. Beograd: Republika, 1996.

serve their own hegemony. To resolve the problem, the Memorandum claimed, they would have to go beyond their particular interests and go against the constitutional order that secured their hegemony. The Yugoslavian economic terrain was represented as fragmented into eight economic areas rooted, ideologically, in the notion of 'national economies'[66] and the regime as a symbiosis of 'nationalism, separatism and power-love'.[67] It is important to note that, in interpreting the crisis, the Belgrade intellectuals represented the existing order as the embodiment of national particularism. The sitting leaderships were not delegating the interests of their republican classes according to the Memorandum, but exclusively of their nations.

The 1974 Constitution, discussed in Chapter 5, was represented as inconsistent with its premises. It claimed that Yugoslavia was a federation while in reality, due to the decision-making rules, procedures for constituting federal bodies, the centrality of the republics in implementing federal laws and the absence of an institution that represents the Yugoslavian working class as a whole, it transformed Yugoslavia into a confederation.[68] Furthermore, the existing system of power was represented as underpinned by the 'primacy of the national' because republics were granted statehood while federal powers were hollowed out. In this sense, the Memorandum maintained, the political realities in Yugoslavia were in complete contradiction with the LCY's universal working class project. The gap between 'reality' and 'theory' was to be blamed on the 1974 Constitution, which brought about the institutionalization of national particularism.[69]

The inconsistencies were not unintended failures or shortcomings. Rather, they were represented as produced by the consolidation of the national projects of Yugoslavia's two most developed republics, SR Slovenia and Croatia. From this perspective, what was represented as incoherent, with its own premises, attained coherence. The 1974 Constitutional rules were articulated as designed exclusively by the two republics which 'tailored

[66]The Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences. *The Memorandum (a draft).* Autumn 1986. [Electronic Record]. URL: `http://pescanik.net/wp-content/PDF/memorandum_sanu.pdf` (visited on 04/02/2016), p. 2.
[67]Ibid., p. 5.
[68]Ibid., pp. 7,10.
[69]Ibid., p. 9.

the social and economic system of Yugoslavia, according to their own needs'.[70]

The idea of self-management, the signifier basing and limiting the imaginary horizon, was articulated as infused by the same particularism. The Memorandum maintained it was subject to the hegemony of 'territorialized leadership' which defined its scope, form and meaning. In this sense, it was just an instrument for realising their power and not a social formation that Yugoslavia was becoming towards.[71] The Memorandum represented self-management as 'a beautifying principle, not the foundation of society' and claimed that all of the elements of order were structurally dislocated, since there was 'no real economic planning, nor market, nor state'.[72] The delegate and assembly systems were added to the chain of failures, since territorial leaders decided on the delegates and not the workers themselves.[73] The Memorandum's reading of the existing order thus unmasked self-management's mythical character and revealed there was nothing beyond the political terrain grounding it. The Memorandum added the LCY's legitimacy to the chain of failures and claimed that it was based exclusively on the 'revolutionary currency' earned during WWII. In the present, the party had 'coalesced' with the state and transformed into a conservative force whose only function was to 'engage in long and fruitless discussions that created the illusion of political activity'.[74] The party talked about revolution but prevented any change in practice.

Due to this chain of failures, the Memorandum represented the Yugoslavian crisis as moral rather than economic or political. It maintained that the value system of the Yugoslavian society was 'unknown'.[75] To suture it, the Memorandum demanded the transformation of Yugoslavia into a democratically integrated federation, in which institutions were 'democratically constituted' and decision-making driven by 'a free, rational, public dialogue'. In contrast, the existing system was represented as driven by 'the combinatorics of self-declared and self-elected protectors of national interests, taking place behind the

[70]The Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences, *The Memorandum (a draft)*, p. 9.
[71]Ibid., p. 6.
[72]Ibid., p. 7.
[73]Ibid., p. 10.
[74]Ibid., p. 12.
[75]Ibid., p. 14.

scenes'.[76]

It was only after this all-encompassing critique of the existing order that the Memorandum carved out a new political agent that could transform it. The agent was the Serbian nation represented as a coherent unified identity, that was both the victim of the existing order and the only universal position from which Yugoslavia could be transformed and 'saved'.

To politicize Serbian national identity, the Memorandum contested the tenet that nations were equal within the self-managing order, and mapped out the ways in which the Serbian national question was in reality 'unresolved'.[77] These included the failure to constitute Serbia as a state of the Serbian nation, the failure to protect the rights of Serbs outside of SR Serbia and in the provinces, as well as the economic exploitation of SR Serbia by SRs Slovenia and Croatia.[78] Furthermore, the Memorandum maintained that the very frontiers of the Yugoslavian imaginary, discussed in detail in Chapter 3, were drawn in antagonism to the Serbian nation. The hegemonic system of social unity and division was put in place to subjugate and pacify the Serbian nation by representing it as 'oppressive, unitarist, centralist, police-like' and imbue it with a paralysing sense of guilt. While the LCY claimed that the nations were constitutively split between those that were included and excluded, the Memorandum thus maintained that, in practice, the entire nation was represented through the attributes of the 'old' Serbian bourgeoisie. It concluded that 'despite having sacrificed itself the most for the creation of socialist Yugoslavia, the Serbian nation had failed to realise its national equality'.[79]

The Memorandum omitted that the frontiers of the Yugoslavian imaginary worked to decontest *all* nations and nationalities, and not just the Serbian. Furthermore, it represented the Slovenian and Croatian nations having already realised their fullness in the 1974 Constitution and 'through long term politics against Serbia'.[80] The differences between SR Slovenia and Croatia were dissolved and the two republics represented as the

[76]The Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences, *The Memorandum (a draft)*, p. 8.
[77]Ibid., p. 16.
[78]Ibid., p. 18.
[79]Ibid., p. 20.
[80]Ibid., p. 18.

same due to 'a common historical destiny, religion, desire for greater independence and, as the two most developed countries [...] the same economic interests'. Furthermore, they united politically to 'forge a lasting coalition in the struggle for power'. The Memorandum represented Josip Broz Tito and Edvard Kardelj as embodiments of this anti-Serbian coalition, simply because Tito was Croatian and Kardelj Slovenian.[81] Following the same logic, the entire order was in fact the working of the Croat-Slovene coalition that was driven by the principle of 'a weak Serbia for a strong Yugoslavia'.[82] The failure to define 'narrow Serbia' constitutionally, in contrast to the constitutionally defined autonomy of SR Serbia's provinces, was also represented as a deliberate strategy against the Serbian nation.[83] In contrast to the sitting LCS leadership, the Memorandum claimed that this was 'not about the legal interpretation and proper implementation of the existing constitution' but about 'the Serbian nation and its state [and] the fact that after four decades of living in Yugoslavia, the Serbs do not have their own state'.[84] This was 'the worse possible defeat in peace-time imaginable'[85] and the 'exodus' of Serbs from Kosovo was just a 'spectacular witness of this historical defeat'.[86]

Lastly, the Memorandum was very critical of the sitting Serbian leadership because it failed to address the unequal position of the Serbian nation and criticise the institutional divisions erected to divide it from within. It represented the leadership as 'unprepared for the historical task arising from the exceptionally difficult constellation of forces in the Yugoslavian community'.[87]

The Memorandum's reading of the Yugoslavian crisis was based on the conception that national difference translates into political division. Although this was a new conception of the nature of social division, the Memorandum represented the hegemonic order as already structured by this logic. Furthermore, it carved out a Serbian national identity as the only agent that could subvert the existing balance of forces and 'save' the universal

[81]The Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences, *The Memorandum (a draft)*, p. 20.
[82]Ibid., p. 22.
[83]Ibid., p. 31.
[84]Ibid., p. 23.
[85]Ibid., p. 23.
[86]Ibid., p. 25.
[87]Ibid., p. 21.

Yugoslavian project.

The implications of the petition and the Memorandum were far reaching. On the one hand, they showed that an alliance outside of the LCS was forming between the protesting Serbs/Montenegrins and the intellectuals in Belgrade. On the other hand, this alliance was weaved together through a new conception of social unity that was articulated through the signifier (Serbian) nation and contested the hegemony of the LCY. The Yugoslavian leadership denounced the Memorandum as an expression of 'destructive anti-socialism' and maintained that it would implement stern measures against forces that were working to reverse 'the direction of socialist self-management'.[88] The sitting Serbian leadership, drew on the hegemonic conception of social division and contested the Memorandum's representation of the nation and its interests, by claiming that it was in fact against its 'real' interest. According to Ivan Stambolić the Memorandum was:

> [...]the old chauvinist concern for the fate of the Serbian cause with the well-known formula that Serbs will win wars but lose in peace [...] In short, the so called Memorandum, more precisely, [...] could be entitled 'In Memoriam' for Yugoslavia, Serbia, socialism, self-management, equality, brotherhood and unity [...] Essentially, it is diametrically opposed to the interests of Serbs throughout Yugoslavia.[89]

In sum, the contending demands for national equality emerging in AP Kosovo and the failure of the regime to suture the dislocations opened up the space for alternative readings of events on the ground. The Belgrade intellectuals articulated the Kosovo problem within a new system of representation that centred on the notion that national difference translated into political division. They also expanded their critique to include the legitimacy of the LCY and questioned its hegemonic position. It was within this discursive context, that Slobodan Milošević became a hegemonic figure in the LCS after 1987.

[88] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 20 November 1986.* The LCY decided to cut public funding to the all institutions at odds with socialist criteria. See: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 252.

[89] An excerpt from Ivan Stambolić's speech at Belgrade University from October 1986, quoted in: Julie Mertus. *Kosovo: How Myths and Truths Started a War.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999, pp. 140-141.

## 7.4 Slobodan Milošević's Transformist Anti-bureaucratic Revolution and the New Constitutional Concept

Slobodan Milošević weaved together a transformist project that absorbed the demands emerging from society, by putting himself and the LCS forward as part of the Yugoslavian institutional order that would improve the position of Kosovo's Serbs/Albanians, transform the constitution of SR Serbia and resolve the Yugoslavian crisis. While this strategy worked to consolidate the legitimacy of the LCS in its republican context, and to decrease the antagonistic potential of the Serbian intellectuals and the protesting Serbs/Montenegrins, the strategy had a divisive effect on the LCY. Gradually, a clear cut political frontier between the LCS and LC Slovenia crystallized within the federal party, and led to a total break between the LC Slovenia and the LCS leadership in 1989.

### 7.4.1 The rise of Slobodan Milošević and the absorption of social demands

During a visit to AP Kosovo in April 1987, Milošević, then the President of Serbia's Party Presidency, listened to the grievances of Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins who stormed a meeting of delegates he was attending. He defended them against the provincial police which tried to prevent them from entering, by stating that 'nobody neither now nor in the future has the right to beat you'. Thereafter, the protesting Serbs/Montenegrins saw in him a representative of the institutional order that understood and acknowledged their difficult position as non-Albanians.[90] Milošević pushed for a a special session of CC LCY on Kosovo in June 1987 and in it he demanded the formulation of and efficient systematic approach to the Kosovo problem. This included holding former communist party leaders, that worked towards granting Kosovo autonomy in the 1970s, accountable for the 1981

[90]Between 10,000 and 15,000 Serbs/Montenegrins stormed into the meeting of delegates. For details about the event see: *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 4 May 1987.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-217-3; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:b78fccf4-fad4-46a4-b290-b00c7181fe8a` (visited on 02/16/2016); and Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*, p. 227.

riots and for supporting Albanian nationalists.[91] Defending the protesters in Kosovo from the provincial police, and acting in accordance with their demands, marked the beginning of a new alliance forged between a segment of the LCS and the forces external to the party. The alliance was based on the agreement that the protesters would 'channel their initiatives towards official organizations and halt non-institutional action' in return for Milošević's support in institutions.[92]

After forging an alliance with forces external to the party, Milošević used the critique against the sitting LCS leadership to consolidate his hegemony within it. Up until 1987, the LCS was committed to the struggle against all nationalism, Albanian and Serbian, on equal terms. Milošević, and the LCS after he became its central figure, articulated a new position regarding the Kosovo problem and nationalism, one grounded in a differentiation between Albanian terrorism and Serbian nationalism. Between September and December 1987, those that maintained that Serbian and Albanian nationalism presented an equal threat to Serbia and Yugoslavia were purged from the LCS because of their 'soft-approach' to the problem.[93]

The purges and the new discourse on Kosovo articulated by the LCS also brought it close to the position articulated by the intellectuals. This was evident in Milošević's representation of the purges in the LCS and the Kosovo problem as part and parcel of a pressing historical task:

> A great, virtually historic mobilization is under way in the Serbian party and Central Committee. Solving the Kosovo situation is no longer just a political task; it is a matter of out honour before history and our children [...] the situation in Kosovo cannot be resolved by pen-pushing, and there is no place for pen-pushing

[91] His requests resulted in the purge of the by then retired Fadil Hoxha, the former head of LC Kosovo and Yugoslav Presidency, for ignoring the essence of national equality and the struggle against great Albanian nationalism. By calling into question his credibility, Kosovo's autonomous status, achieved under his leadership, was also questioned. See: Vladisavljević, *Serbia's Antibureaucratic Revolution: Milošević, the Fall of Communism and Nationalist Mobilization*, pp. 68, 101.

[92] Ibid., pp. 102, 104.

[93] For detailed analysis of the Eight Session of CC the LCS after which Milošević became the leader of the LCS see: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 268-282. For an analysis of the divisions within the Serbian party before the purges see: *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 22 October 1987*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-217-10; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:6102a925-344b-4015-933b-0d355f239c91` (visited on 02/16/2016). For an account of the purges from the time see: *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 18 December 1987*.

> phraseology.[94]

It sounded like a reply to the Memorandum's critique of the old LC Serbian leadership, in the form of an assurance that the new leadership knows exactly what is at stake. Furthermore, this discursive shift was also marked by a new representation of the existing constitutional order that resembled that of the intellectuals. From being a matter of properly implementing the 1974 Constitution, the issue was now represented as a matter of the Serbian state, its diminished power within the existing order, and the discontent of its people. Regarding these issues Milošević claimed that:

> Serbia is the only republic in Yugoslavia [...] that does not have the basic rights of a state on its territory; this cannot go on any longer [...] Serbia did not take it upon itself to have two provinces in order to become a second class republic and abolish itself [...] The people will not tolerate this![95]

In practical terms, the new leadership sought to integrate a 'truncated' Serbia by establishing a unified judiciary, defence, and security system, a single foreign policy, and a social/financial plan on the whole of its territory.[96] In demanding unification in this form, the LCS was contesting the autonomy of the provinces and challenging the power of the provincial leaderships. The demands for centralising in this direction overlapped completely with the intellectuals' solution to the problem. However, since the provincial leaderships had to consent to all amendments to SR Serbia's constitution according to existing constitutional rules, realising these demands necessitated forging alliances between the provincial leaderships and the new Serbian leadership. Furthermore, these leaderships had to willingly consent to a transformist political project that would result in a decrease in their own power.

---

[94] *Yugoslavia's "Serbian Question", 22 July 1988.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12271; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:3963aa13-db55-44bf-bc19-7cf6a139bedd` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[95] Ibid.

[96] Ibid.

### 7.4.2 The anti-bureaucratic revolution: deepening the LCS's hegemony and the new constitutional concept

To be able to change the constitution of SR Serbia, the LCS forged alliances with social forces antagonistic to the sitting leadership of LC Vojvodina and forced their resignation. Similar events, albeit more dramatic, unfolded in SR Montenegro. Faced with a completely different set of circumstances in AP Kosovo, the Serbian leadership purged the sitting AP Kosovo leadership on the grounds that it had failed to implement its new Kosovo policy. Through these events, and the political divisions that they gave rise to, the meaninglessness of the hegemonic system of social division was rendered even more visible.

Before moving on to an analysis of the events and reactions that emerged in response to them, it is necessary to explain the broader logic that gave them a degree of unity. The events in AP Vojvodina, SR Montenegro and sporadic rallies in 'narrow Serbia' were, according to their participants both 'rallies of solidarity' and an 'anti-bureaucratic revolution'. The rallies attempted to mobilize as many people as possible behind the demands of Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins and represented Milošević as the 'positive' segment of the institutional order that would meet their demands and resolve the Serbian problem. Since they centred on the notion of the Serbian nation, understood as a unified subject, they usually failed to draw the support of non-Serbs and in practice worked towards unifying the Serbian population across Yugoslavia into a single project. Eventually, as I will discuss in the following chapter, they also expanded to Serb majority parts of SR Croatia. However, the rallies also expanded their scope of reference to a broader critique of the Yugoslavian order and represented it as paralysed by the bureaucracy's unwillingness to introduce reforms. In contrast, Slobodan Milošević was praised as the 'positive' power holder, willing to implement revolutionary changes and rid the working class and citizens of the evil bureaucracy. In this sense, the contestations also addressed the struggle of the working class against the bureaucracy alienating its power and could be inclusive of the entire working class. Because of this ambiguity, the contestations amounted to the expansion of the chain of equivalence between the LCS, the intellectuals, the dissatisfied

Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins and the members of the working class that supported socialism and wanted reform.

The first rallies of solidarity were staged in AP Vojvodina in the summer of 1988 by members of the local branch of the Socialist Alliance that supported the LCS's demands for change and a newly formed Committee of Kosovo's Serbs and Montenegrins. The speakers demanded that the provincial leadership support the LCS's position with regards to AP Kosovo and Serbian unity. Initially, the provincial leadership rejected these demands and claimed the rallies were just 'a power ploy aimed at reducing provincial autonomy by playing on Serbian national emotions'.[97] In September 1988, a rally of 30,000 Serbs/Montenegrins was held in the southern part of Serbia to denounce the harassment of Serbs in AP Kosovo and mobilize Serbs living outside of the province behind their cause. The speakers at the rally criticized the Yugoslavian regime for 'tolerating Albanian nationalism', supported Milošević's 'hard-line on Kosovo' and the amendments that would put the two provinces under Belgrade's control.[98] Thereafter, six consecutive rallies involving around 100,000 people were held across 'narrow Serbia', SR Montenegro and AP Vojvodina. Those gathered chanted 'we want arms', 'Kosovo is Serbia, Vojvodina is Serbia', 'we want freedom in Kosovo' and 'we love you Slobodan'. They were also organized by the local bodies of the Socialist Alliance and the Committee of Kosovo Serbs and Montenegrins. The crowds comprised of a mix of local inhabitants and Serbs/Montenegrins from Kosovo.[99] The Committee of Kosovo Serbs and Montenegrins asked for permission to hold rallies in SR Slovenia and SR Bosnia and Herzegovina, but their requests were rejected by the republican authorities.[100] By October, the rallies in AP Vojvodina expanded to include workers dissatisfied with wages and unemployment, as well as students. Under pressure from a massive two day 'anti-bureaucratic' protest, estimated to include between

[97] *Yugoslavia's "Serbian Question", 22 July 1988.*

[98] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 23 September 1988.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-218-8; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:9acfd12b-8aa2-4f1c-addc-0751c67811de` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[99] Ibid.

[100] Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 308.

20,000 and 100,000 people, the sitting leadership of LC Vojvodina resigned.[101] The new leadership was in line with the LCS's transformist project.

The LCY was divided internally about the nature of the rallies and their relationship to the existing order. On the one hand, the leaderships of SR Slovenia, SR Croatia, and SR Bosnia and Herzegovina supported AP Vojvodina's leadership, while the Kosovo leadership represented them as identical to the counter-revolutionary protests of Albanians in 1981.[102] The LCY ordered all republics to act against the rallies, demanding that the LCS to do likewise and prevent them from occurring in the future.[103] The Yugoslavian Presidency maintained that the rallies were 'forms of pressure and undemocratic methods' that were 'causing immeasurable damage to all nationalities of Yugoslavia'.[104]

The LCS, on the other hand, rejected this interpretation all together and represented the rallies in a completely different light. First, the Serbian leadership claimed the rallies were not expressions of nationalism, since those gathered came in support of the victims of (Albanian) nationalism and could not be equated with the Albanian separatist offenders.[105] To justify the uni-national mobilization driving the rallies, which ran against LCY's representation of social division, Milošević explained that:

> People can gather only on the grounds on which they feel attacked and endangered. They are attacked as Serbs and Montenegrins; they are leaving their homes as Serbs and Montenegrins, and therefore they defend themselves as Serbs and Montenegrins. They cannot defend or gather as Dutch or Protestants, or as cotton plantation workers, since none of them is threatened for being one of these.[106]

Second, the protests against the sitting Vojvodina leadership were represented through

[101] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 11 October 1988.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-218-9; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:dfa06996-70df-4ef3-b6b2-0f2c551d0786` (visited on 02/16/2016). For an detailed analysis of events and circumstances see: Vladisavljević, *Serbia's Antibureaucratic Revolution: Milošević, the Fall of Communism and Nationalist Mobilization*, pp. 157-160.

[102] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 23 September 1988*; and Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 309.

[103] Vladisavljević, *Serbia's Antibureaucratic Revolution: Milošević, the Fall of Communism and Nationalist Mobilization*, p. 147.

[104] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 23 September 1988.*

[105] Vladisavljević, *Serbia's Antibureaucratic Revolution: Milošević, the Fall of Communism and Nationalist Mobilization*, p. 147; Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 309; and *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 23 September 1988.*

[106] Excerpt from Slobodan Milošević's speech at the joint Session of the Serbian state and party presidencies held in September 5, 1988. Quoted in: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 310.

the self-managing discourse, as expressions of popular discontent with the bureaucracy that tried to preserve the status quo. In what amounted to a 'justified' anti-bureaucratic reaction, the people had taken politics into their own hands. According to Milošević:

> The demand of the working people and citizens gathered in Novi Sad [Vojvodina] that the provincial leadership submit its resignation expresses the views and will of the great majority of the working people and citizens of Vojvodina, because through its policy and attitudes toward the key problems of the Socialist Republic of Serbia and Yugoslavia, the provincial leadership has lost its reputation and the trust of the people and thus the ability to represent their demands and interest.[107]

The day after the resignation of Vojvodina's leadership, massive demonstrations of industrial workers, students and citizens broke out in SR Montenegro. They lasted, on and off, from October 1988 until January 1989. The protesters demanded the resignation of the republic's leadership, higher wages, a hard line against Albanian separatists in Kosovo, and supported the constitutional changes proposed by the Serbian leadership. They clashed with the police and, in an attempt restore order, the state of emergency was introduced for the first time since the Kosovo Albanian riots in 1981. In January 1989, under immense social pressure, Montenegro's leadership resigned and was replaced by supporters of the LCS's transformist project.[108]

The LCY divided along the same lines regarding the events in SR Montenegro. Initially, the leaderships of SR Slovenia, SR Croatia, and SR Bosnia and Herzegovina supported the leadership of SR Montenegro. The Slovenian leadership accused the LCS of driving the protests and deliberately creating disorder.[109] The spill over of protests from SR Serbia into another republic raised concerns in SR Croatia and SR Bosnia and Herzegovina in particular because of their national composition. Their leaderships feared the rallies could spill over to the territories under their control and demand their own resignation. The federal party leadership and the Federal Presidency also supported the sitting Montenegrin leaders and declared a state of emergency in the republic to protect it and re-establish order. The central party leadership claimed that nationalist forces were demanding personnel changes and manipulating workers' protests, and that the Serbian

[107] Excerpt from Slobodan Milošević's speech from the special session of the Presidium of the LCS, held in October 6, 1988. Quoted in: *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 11 October 1988.*
[108] Ibid.
[109] Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 311.

nationalist platform sought to undermine the Yugoslavian order.[110]

In contrast, the Serbian leadership publicly supported the protests in SR Montenegro and represented them as embodying 'the justified demands of the workers and citizens of Montenegro [...] their socialist character and orientation towards brotherhood and unity'.[111] They also demanded evidence for the Slovenian contention that the LCS was organizing protests in other republics. The accusation was represented as forming part and parcel of LC Slovenian's attempts to destabilise Yugoslavia by antagonising national identities.[112]

In AP Kosovo, the Serbian leadership faced a completely different set of circumstances. Unlike Vojvodina and Montenegro, where pressure against the sitting leadership could be exerted through existing social grievances about the position of Kosovo's Serbs/Montenegrins, economic dissatisfaction and demands for constitutional change and leadership resignation, in Kosovo Milošević could only put himself forward as a leader that could bring about favourable changes among the relatively small group of Kosovo's Serbs/ Montenegrins. Consequently, the LCS's hegemonic aspirations could not have been articulated as the democratic struggle of the people against 'evil' bureaucrats that were preventing constitutional changes. In response to the circumstances in the province, the Serbian leadership proceeded by repeating the same scenario top down. They pushed for a purge of AP Kosovo's leadership on the grounds that it encouraged anti-Serbian feelings and actions among Albanians, and for their responsibility for the 1981 protests in the province.[113] This move was supported by the federal party leadership and was scheduled to take place on November 17 1988 at a session of CC LC Kosovo.

In opposition, 2,000 Albanian miners organized a protest defending the sitting leadership and demanding that the main features of the constitutional order remain unchanged. They were joined by industrial workers, university students and school pupils from all

[110] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 11 October 1988.*
[111] Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 311.
[112] Ibid., p. 312.
[113] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 11 November 1988.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-218-10; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:528468b7-1a60-4dbe-b424-36ad9dc6b91f` (visited on 02/16/2016).

parts of Kosovo and their protest lasted for five days. By November 18 50,000 people were protesting on the streets in support of the sitting leadership. They chanted pro-Yugoslavian slogans such as 'Tito-Party', 'long-live the LCY' and 'long live brotherhood and unity'. Failing to respond to their demands, the leadership of LC Kosovo resigned and a new leadership that supported constitutional change took its place. The new leadership denounced the workers 'protests as antagonistic to LCY's Kosovo policy and deemed them counter-revolutionary. In this sense, the 1988 pro-Yugoslavian protests articulated by the Kosovo working class were equated with the 1981 protests of Kosovo's Albanians as Albanians, although the demands put forward were diametrically opposited.[114]

In February 1989, 1,300 miners organized an underground hunger strike in the Trepča mine, just as the Serbian Assembly was gathering to vote on the amendments to SR Serbia's constitution. They protested the practice of 'equating the entire Albanian population as separatist and nationalist', demanded the immediate resignation of Kosovo's new leadership, the improvement of the socio-economic conditions in the province, and the rejection of the amendments. They also called for federal party leaders and Slobodan Milošević to come and speak to them directly.[115] The day the Serbian Assembly passed the constitutional amendments, the Trepča strike expanded into a general strike that included mines, large state enterprises and students, and brought the province to a standstill. In an attempt to pacify the situation the new provincial leadership resigned, but as soon as the miners left the pits, a state of emergency was declared and the leadership that voted for constitutional change re-installed.[116] In March 1989, after the amendments were ratified by the AP Kosovo Assembly, the general strike transformed into riots and direct confrontations with the police and the federal army. The authorities made wholesale arrests, that included the purged leader of AP Kosovo, Azem Vallasi, who was charged

[114]Vladisavljević, *Serbia's Antibureaucratic Revolution: Milošević, the Fall of Communism and Nationalist Mobilization*, pp. 182-183; and *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 11 November 1988*.

[115]*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 8 March 1989*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-219-4; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:768e38c7-8b39-4eee-98e0-e8b566461d4d` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[116]Vladisavljević, *Serbia's Antibureaucratic Revolution: Milošević, the Fall of Communism and Nationalist Mobilization*, pp. 184-185; Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 333; and *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 8 March 1989*.

with having plotted a counter-revolution.[117]

Although the federal organs supported both the cadre changes in AP Kosovo and the constitutional changes in SR Serbia, the rejection of the pro-Yugoslavian demands of Trepča miners, and the introduction of special measures, transformed the already existing tensions between SR Serbia and SR Slovenia into clear cut antagonistic frontiers. SR Macedonia, SR Bosnia and Herzegovina, AP Vojvodina and SR Montenegro supported the introduction of emergency measures, while SR Slovenia opposed them, and demanded the resignation of the newly installed leadership in AP Kosovo out of humanitarian concern for the striking miners. Furthermore, a meeting in support of the Trepča miners, attended by the leader of LC Slovenian Milan Kučan was organized by the Ljubljana branch of the Socialist Alliance. The speakers opposed the introduction of the state of emergency and demanded peace and togetherness in Kosovo. Kučan stressed that the rights of all nations had to be respected on an equal footing, otherwise there could be no 'stability, common life, and peace in Kosovo, Serbia and Yugoslavia'.[118] Furthermore, mounting social opposition to the rallies of solidarity developed in SR Slovenia. The Socialist Alliance in SR Slovenia, for instance, represented the anti-bureaucratic protests as 'uncivilized and contributing to demagoguery, primitivism and intolerance'.[119] In contrast, its Serbian counterpart was actively involved in organizing and coordinating them. The leader of LC Slovenia described the protests against the bureaucracy and rallies of solidarity as 'fueling the darkest human and nationalist passions'. In contrast, his counterpart in the LCS saw them as a legitimate democratic overthrow of those who had lost the support of the people.[120] The critique of the links between the LCS and the anti-bureaucratic protests and solidarity rallies increased once the events in AP Kosovo rendered fully visible that the LCS was primarily interested in the expansion of its own hegemony within the exist-

[117] Approximately 240 Albanian 'nationalists', intellectuals, writers and businessmen were placed in 'isolation' sometimes for merely advocating opposition to Serbian control of Kosovo or even for just feeding the strikers and demonstrators. Anyone suspected of Albanian nationalism and separatism was also arrested. See: *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 17 August 1989.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-219-10; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:73380124-a7e8-42ef-9368-7ba40ecad85c` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[118] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 8 March 1989.*

[119] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 23 September 1988.*

[120] Ibid.

ing order, and supported social demands selectively to the extent that they contributed to this. Furthermore, after the passage of the amendments to the Serbian constitution Milošević declared that the hegemonic struggle would not be contained to SR Serbia and that the LCS's transformist project would expand to include the entire Yugoslavian order:

> Those who expect that now, when she has finally become a republic, Serbia will join the defenders of the status quo and opposed changes to the 1974 Constitution are deluding themselves. Serbia did not become a state to sleep on the wreath of glory, but [...] to forcefully initiate democratic changes to make Yugoslavia a strong community of equal nations and nationalities, able to break with the crises, poverty, and humiliation in which she now lives. Of course those who do not care about Yugoslavia claim that our intentions and plans are unitarist and hegemonic.[121]

In this vein, he represented LC Slovenia's critique of the events in Kosovo as 'primitive, vengeful aggressiveness incompatible with the culture of present-day Europe' and a 'fascist display of irrational hatred' that only deepened Yugoslavia's social and economic crisis. He called for the closure of all debates in Yugoslavia, the implementation of radical reforms and the establishment of a new kind of socialism.[122] By now, the articulation of forces within the existing order had shifted, and through the protests, delegates that were in line with the LCS's transformist project occupied positions of power in four out of seven territorial units. He publicly rejected the invitation of the Slovenian leadership to hold a meeting and resolve the problems between the two republics.[123]

In sum, the social demands articulated by Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins were absorbed by the LCS to expand its hegemony and consolidate it through constitutional change. After the coming to power of Milošević, the party also adopted the language and positions of the Serbian intellectuals and decreased their antagonistic potential. In the process, Slobodan Milošević came to occupy an ambiguous position; he was both in power and the addressee of an evolving movement that demanded changes within the existing order without contesting the hegemony of the LCY as such. From this position, he could put himself forward as the potential leader of a new transformed Yugoslavia. However, the

[121] Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, pp. 283-294.

[122] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 27 June 1989.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-219-8; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:81d42585-44c6-4403-a023-104bf46ff232` (visited on 02/16/2016).

[123] Ibid.

transformist project was deeply rooted in the contestations that emerged in the context of SR Serbia in the 1980s. The transformist strategies of the Serbian party exacerbated the differences within the LCY and brought about the drawing of clear-cut antagonistic frontiers between LC Slovenia and Serbia.

## 7.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have mapped out how national equality was contested, first by Kosovo Albanians and thereafter by Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins and how the regime failed to integrate these contestations into the hegemonic system of social division. I have also showed how the inability of the regime to maintain and control social divisions on the ground opened up the space for alternative readings and gave rise to a broad socio-historical critique by Serbian intellectuals. Their reading of events on the ground represented nations as unified subjects and the Serbian nation in particular as unequal and blocked under the terms of the 1974 Constitution. Furthermore, the intellectuals contested the LCY's hegemonic position and represented self-management – the empty signifier constituting the fullness of the Yugoslavian society – as structurally dislocated. They sutured this dislocated space through the constitution of a nation centred space of representation that subverted the hegemonic system of social division, discussed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 5.

I have argued that the rise of Slobodan Milošević can only be understood within this particular context, as an absorption of the demands emerging from society and the deepening of the LCS's hegemony. The demand for constitutional change was central to linking the LCS and broader social groupings together into a transformist project, whereby the antagonistic potential of social demands was diffused. Gradually, through the so called 'solidarity rallies' and the 'anti-bureaucratic revolution', the Serbian branch of the LCY consolidated its hegemony and made the changing of Serbia's constitution possible. However, the weaving together of a transformist project and the co-optation of (Serbian) nation centred demands by the LCS, had a massive impact on the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon. Their inclusion gradually blurred the lines of inclusion and exclusion

that shaped the Yugoslavian self-managing community. The contradicting position the LCS took regarding working class demands completely blurred the frontiers that based the imaginary horizon. On the one hand, it included the social demands emerging in AP Vojvodina and SR Montenegro on the grounds that they expressed legitimate working class demands and discontent. On the other hand, it excluded the demands of Kosovo's miners, that were articulated through Yugoslavia's founding discourses, and equated them with the demands of Kosovo's protesters in 1981, that were articulated in opposition to the existing constitutional order and Yugoslavia. In doing so, the LCS rendered visible that its central aim was not to satisfy working class demands but to expand its own hegemony. The events in Kosovo (1989) thus rendered the particularistic nature of the LCS's transformist project visible and also shed a new light on the meaning of the anti-bureaucratic revolution and the solidarity rallies. These developments gave rise to the realignment of forces within the LCY and the gradual drawing of an antagonistic frontier between the LCS and the LC Slovenia. The introduction of a political antagonism within the ranks of the party that was meant to embody the unity of the working class meant that the LCY was undergoing a fully- fledged hegemonic crisis and that the Yugoslavian imaginary was dissolving.

It is within this context that the LC Croatia decided to pluralise the Croatian political landscape and call for democratic elections. The first elections were in fact a hegemonic struggle about the new terms under which unity and division would be constituted in the post-1990 period in SR Croatia. In the following chapter I examine the discourses of three parties that competed in the elections and the impact the CDU's victory had on the new terms of constituting unity.

# CHAPTER VIII

# The Articulation of Democratic Identities in the Socialist Republic of Croatia

## 8.1 Introduction

Drawing on the theoretical framework of Chapter 2, and the insights from previous chapters, in this chapter I aim to reactivate the creative moment of constituting a new order out of the dying Yugoslavian imaginary in SR Croatia. The first multi-party elections, that were held between April and May 1990, brought the Croatian Democratic Union (CDU) to a hegemonic position in the process of building a democratic order out of the dying Yugoslavian imaginary.[1] The specific historical conjecture, characterized by the crisis of the LCY's hegemony and the unravelling of state-socialism across Eastern Europe, in synergy with the absolute majority electoral system, made it possible for the CDU to play an exceptionally creative role after coming to power. The party shaped the trajectory of Croatia's transition from a socialist republic in a federal state to an independent market oriented multi-party democracy, and fixed the new terms of forging social unity and division. Furthermore, the hegemonic position it acquired after the elections enabled the party to cover up the particular mythical origins of the post-socialist imaginary. The party's discourse provided a horizon of intelligibility for explaining the past and

[1]The CDU claimed 205 out of 356 seats in the Assembly, even though the party got only 41,9 % of the overall vote. The League of Communists of Croatia Party of Democratic Change got 35% of the vote and only 107 seats in the Assembly. The electoral victory gave the CDU the power to realize its constitutional conception, since it dominated the first assembly by a two-third majority. For details about the electoral outcome see:Kasapović, "Electoral Politics in Croatia 1990-2000".

the present while its sedimentation into an imaginary contributed to the intensification of national antagonisms and the dissolution of Yugoslavia. As discussed in the introductory chapter, the CDU governed the Republic of Croatia through a secession process, the war that broke out as a result of the secession, and the consolidation of state sovereignty on pre-war territories.

As I maintained in Chapter 2, the party's negative impact on Croatia's democratic transition has been widely discussed in the existing literature. However, existing accounts have failed to problematize the content of the party's project in the run up to the first elections, when the logics for grounding the democratic order were opened to contestation. Furthermore, in categorizing the CDU as 'nationalist' and the League of Communists of Croatia Party of Democratic Change (LCC PDC) as a 'reformed communist' party, these accounts seem to imply that the CDU's emergence somehow reflected existing national identities that a former communist party failed to express in the new context. In doing so, these accounts partially reproduced the discourse of the CDU and its representation of its aims and origins. This problem is not contained to academic circles. Even 26 years after the first democratic elections the argument is constantly deployed by the CDU and its supporters to discredit the political position of the Social Democratic Party (SDP), the successor of the LCC PDC. The CDU has taken on itself to express the 'true' interests of the Croatian nation, while the SDP is constantly labelled as a 'Yugoslavian', 'communist', even a 'četnik' party, and discredited on the grounds that it is unable to reflect the 'true' interest of the Croatian nation.

To reactivate the creative moment of constituting a new order out of the dying imaginary in the Croatian context, and show the contingency behind the CDU's articulation, I analyse the political projects of three important players in Croatia's transition to a democratic order – the LCC PDC, the CDU and the Serbian Democratic Party (SDP). To avoid the limitations bound up with categorizing and separating the parties into nationalist and/or reformed-communist, I bring all three under a single analytic framework and examine the ways in which each moulded itself to the political context by weaving a

political project that attempted to define and shape it.[2] Much like in previous chapters, by national identity I do not refer to a particular set of people whose (essential) interests can be (better or worse) represented by a political party. Rather, I understand it as s a signifier that constitutes political projects that aspire to become hegemonic through the articulation of demands. From this perspective, the signifier 'nation' is understood as an element contingent upon the broader context and the particular political project it circulates in.[3]

By conceptualizing the nation as a signifier rather than an extra-discursive essence, in this chapter I unpick its articulations in the project of a party conventionally *not categorized* as 'nationalist' while showing that the articulations of the signifier 'nation' by two parties *categorized* as 'nationalist' are grounded in a contingent articulation of that signifier. To unpick the different articulations of the signifier that lay at the center of these projects, I focus my analysis on three aspects. First, the manner in which each project was situated in the context of the dying imaginary and the particular demands that constituted it. Second, the inscription of the past into the pluralized context to universalize each project. Finally, the particular representations of unity/division and political subjectivity constitutive of each project.[4]

To show that the CDU's articulation of national subjectivity was contingent, in the first section I map out the context in which the LCC, then a branch of a dissolving LCY, gave up its hegemonic position in SR Croatia. In the second section, I analyse the projects of the three parties following the above considerations. Through this analysis I show that, despite articulating antagonistic political projects, the CDU and the SDP both represented relations between nations as relations of power and thus subverted the terms under which unity was constituted in the Yugoslavian imaginary. I also show that

[2]Finlayson, "Ideology, Discourse and Nationalism", p. 104.

[3]In this sense the 'nation' can become an articulatory principle that defines unity as such. Equally, it can circulate in discourses that articulate unity through other signifiers, such as class or citizen for example. The implication of this framework is that neither one nor the other reflects the 'real' meaning of the signifier 'nation', since the 'nation' as a political reality does not exist prior to its articulation in a discourse. See: ibid.

[4]My focus is based on Laclau's conceptualization of political discourses (myths) as principles of reading a given situation that are associated with the experience of a particular group aspiring to become hegemonic. See: Laclau, *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time*, p. 61.

the LCC PDC reiterated the identitary logic of the dying imaginary and de-contested national relations within its project. In the concluding section, after summarizing my main points, I reflect on the implications of each project, and the sedimentation of the CDU's project in particular, into a new democratic imaginary horizon.

Before moving on to the analysis it is important that the limits of my discussion are clearly specified. Given the scope of my thesis and the trajectory of Croatia's transition after the elections, I have chosen to omit the Social Liberal Union and the Coalition of Peoples Accord from my analysis. The former because it failed to gain a significant amount of votes and the latter because it dissolved after the first elections. In contrast, the CDU and the successor of LCC PDC (The Social Democratic Party) have remained, to this day, the two major parties in Croatian politics. Although the Serbian Democratic Party did not gain a significant amount of votes in the elections, the antagonism between its political project and the CDU dominated regime that came to govern SR Croatia after the elections escalated into the first armed conflict of the War of Yugoslavian Dissolution. In this sense, the Serbian Democratic Party's project shaped the frontiers of the new imaginary horizon in a profound way.

## 8.2 The Hegemonic Crisis of the LCY and the Introduction of multi-partyism in SR Croatia

As discussed in Chapter 7, the contestations of the Yugoslavian imaginary were predominantly located in SR Serbia and, in the second half of the 1980s, in SR Slovenia too. In different ways, the leaderships in both republics grew increasingly tolerant to extra-party politicizations and gradually absorbed social demands into their solutions to the Yugoslavian crisis. In 1989, the Slovenian leadership called for further decentralization and proposed the transformation of Yugoslavia into an asymmetrical federation.[5] Fur-

[5]Mitija Žagar. "The collapse of the Yugoslav federation and the viability of asymetrical federalism". In: *The Changing Faces of Federalism: Institutional Reconfiguration in Europe from East to West.* Ed. by Sergio Ortino, Mitija Žagar, and Vojtech Mastny. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005, pp. 124-125.

thermore, in 1989 Yugoslavia's first opposition party was formed in SR Slovenia and it demanded, among other things, the introduction of political pluralism, the transformation of Yugoslavia into a contractual union, and the drafting of a new Slovenian constitution.[6] In contrast, for reasons discussed in Chapter 7, the Serbian leadership had a broad base of support in its republic and it worked towards expanding its power to the entire Yugoslavian order. It demanded the centralisation and integration of the federation and the introduction of the 'one man one vote' voting principle in the LCY, which would have dissolved territorial delegations all together.

Commentators from the period described Croatia as 'the silent republic'.[7] There were no social demands contesting the existing constitutional order while the Croatian leadership focused on uniting Yugoslavian communists into a common struggle against all anti-socialist forces in the federation.[8] Initially, the Croatian leadership supported Milošević's rise and recognized the need to change Serbia's constitution to resolve the Kosovo problem. It expressed discontent with developments in SR Serbia only after it became apparent that the LCS was in fact expanding its hegemony through the anti-bureaucratic revolution possibly at the expanse of the LCC's. Its critique of the anti-bureaucratic revolution was accompanied by a critique of demands for political pluralism articulated in SR Slovenia. Following the frontiers of exclusion that formed the basis of the Yugoslavian imaginary discussed in Chapter 3, the Croatian leadership labelled the anti-bureaucratic revolution 'neo-Stalinist' and the social demands in SR Slovenia as 'traditional liberalism', and representing both as equally antagonistic to the self-managing order.[9]

[6] Milan Jajčinović. "Ulazak u višepartijski sistem: što znači osnivanje odbora, saveza i udruženja koja se deklariraju kao demokratska [Introducing mutlipartism: the meaning of committes, leagues and associations that idenfity as democratic]". In: *Danas* (24 January 1989).

[7] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 26 May 1989.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-219-7; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: `http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:f6e36c90-37bd-4365-ad57-3ce8294862c5` (visited on 04/14/2016).

[8] The 'White Book' drawn up by the Croatian Central Committee quoted all of the works in the cultural sphere, mostly from Slovenia and Serbia, that were unacceptable and anti-socialist. See: Zvonimir Despot, ed. *Bijela knjiga Stipe Šuvara: originalni dokument Centra CK SKH za informiranje i propagandu [Stipe Šuvar's White Book: the Original Documents of CC LCC's Propaganda and Information Centre].* Zagreb: Večernji edicija, 2010. For more about the implications of the position of the Croatian leadership see: Jović, *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*, p. 235; and Goldstein, *Hrvatska 1918-2008 [Croatia 1918-2008]*, pp. 613-615.

[9] *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 26 May 1989.*

Although the LCC distanced itself from both developments, their very unfolding had a detrimental effect on its own hegemony, which was contingent upon the overall unity of the LCY. By assigning antagonistic meanings to concepts constitutive of the Yugoslavian imaginary, these developments had rendered its mythical character visible and put into question the LCY's hegemony and the universality of the self-managing project. The expansion of solidarity rallies to the Serb-majority part of SR Croatia in mid-1989 had a particularly detrimental effect on the LCC's hegemony. The Serbs in Croatia that organized rallies of solidarity also articulated their support of the LCS's conception of Yugoslavia's future form and protested the LCC's support of the striking Trepča miners. They claimed that the Croatian leadership was conservative and prevented necessary changes, just like the protesters in AP Vojvodina and SR Montenegro.[10] Their politicization made visible that the LCC was failing to de-contest the Serbian national identity in SR Croatia and delegate the interests of Croatian Serbs.

Drawing on Kardelj's conception of the 'pluralism of self-managing interests', the Croatian leadership proposed the pluralization of the political space via reformed self-managerial institutions and the transformation of SR Croatia into a 'non-party democracy'. In doing so, the LCC hoped to retain its hegemony in the republic.[11] The meaning and application of the concept became a source of debate, both within the LCC and the wider public, and the proposed solution failed to suture the dislocated political space.[12] In December 1989, a Coordinating Body of the Croatian Opposition was established and it drafted a petition which demanded the legalization of political parties and their equal

[10]For more about the expansion of the anti-bureaucratic revolution in Croatia see: *Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 26 May 1989*; and Ivo Goldstein. *Dvadeset godina samostalne Hrvatske [Twenty Years of Independent Croatia]*. Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2010, pp. 70-72

[11]The leadership wanted to transform the Socialist Alliance into a site for expressing competing socialist ideas and projects. It maintained that non-party democracy would pluralize the political space without reducing politics to a mere intra-party struggle. Due to the multinational context, the leadership argued, multipartism would bring about the politization of national identities and the emergence of nationalism. See: Davor Pauković. "Politička tranzicija u Hrvatskoj 1989-1991". PhD thesis. University of Zagreb, 2010, p. 70; and Jasna Babić. "Ustavne brane: Ustav SFRJ ne zabranjuje saveze, nego političke stranke [Constitutional obstacles: SFRY's constitution doesn't prohibit alliances, but political parties]". In: *Danas* (7 March 1989).

[12]Pauković, "Politička tranzicija u Hrvatskoj 1989-1991", pp. 70-73.

participation in politics.[13] Concurrently, for reasons discussed in Chapter 7, LC Serbia and LC Slovenia broke off all political ties and introduced an antagonistic divide into the LCY.

Under pressure from the disarticulation of the identitary logic of the Yugoslavian imaginary at the federal level, the expansion of the solidarity rallies to SR Croatia and the emergence of social demands contesting its own universal position, the LCC legalized all political parties and called for the democratic election of a Constitutive Assembly. The leadership concluded that the future form of the federation was an issue of such importance and contestability that decision-making necessitated a new social consensus.[14] By pluralizing the political space and calling for elections, the Croatian leadership recognized that its own position regarding the issue was not universal. Furthermore, at its Extraordinary Congress in January 1990, the LCY dissolved, bringing about the complete collapse of the universal working class subject and the Yugoslavian self-managing project. The elections to the Croatian Constitutive Assembly were to be held in two rounds between April and May 1990, following the absolute majority electoral procedure.[15]

The elections took place in the context of the complete disarticulation of the brotherhood and unity and the self-managing discourse discussed in Chapter 3. The elements that were once fixed into moments within a Yugoslavian space of representation were now opened to re-articulation within new spaces of representation that competed for hegemony. In the following section I analyse the political projects articulated by three parties

[13]The petition addressed the Croatian Parliament and Presidency demanding: the legalization of political parties and their equal participation in the elections visa-a-vis the LCC, the release of all political prisoners, that the sitting leadership protects the sovereignty of the Republic and works towards resolving the crisis by protecting the rights of all individuals, nations and groups, the holding of free elections within a month for a Constitutive Assembly. This body consisted of then still illegal opposition organizations, initiatives and citizen associations, that included the Croatian Democratic League, the Croatian Democratic Union, the Association for a Yugoslavian Democratic Initiative, the Transnational Radical Party, the Croatian Peasant Party, the Croatian Socio-Liberal League, the Society for Yugoslavian-European Cooperation, the Initial Committee of the Croatian Socio-Democratic League, the Croatian Christian Democratic League, the Initiating Committee of the League of Students of the Zagreb University and the Croatian Society for the Protection and Promotion of Human Rights. See: Pauković, "Politička tranzicija u Hrvatskoj 1989-1991", pp. 142-143; and Davor Pauković. "Posljednji kongres Saveza komunista Jugoslavije: uzroci, tijek i posljedice raspada". In: *Suvremene teme* 1.1 (2008).

[14]Pauković, "Politička tranzicija u Hrvatskoj 1989-1991", pp. 144-145.

[15]The opposition parties strongly disproved of the leaderships choice of a 'winner takes it all' electoral system, but the leadership claimed the specificity of the historical conjecture and the crisis called for a clearly articulated political project. See: ibid., pp. 175-176.

that took part in the elections.

## 8.3 The Myths and Subjectivities Articulated in the Electoral Campaign

### 8.3.1 The Croatian Democratic Union

#### 8.3.1.1 The project: democratic transformation, confederalism and the ambiguous 'nation'

According to the CDU, the political context was characterized by an all-encompassing structural crisis. Internally, Yugoslavia was experiencing an economic, political, social and national crisis. It was torn between the (Serbian) centralist state-forming project, that rejected the terms of the federalism of the existing constitution, and the (Slovenian/Croatian) decentralized project, that demanded the expansion of the confederal rules. Internationally, the single-party socialist ideology that determined and structured the Yugoslav political landscape was collapsing.[16] The party maintained that a (new) order could emerge out of the (existing) disorder only through a complete 'democratic transformation' of the Croatian society.[17] It defined politics as the space for creating:

> [...] a spiritual and material climate that would prevent the democratic decline of the Croatian masses and [catalyize] the revival of the economic and cultural life.[18]

Traditional parliamentary democracy was articulated as the adequate institutional framework for conducting politics in the above sense. The new order was to be organized around the nation as 'the highest form of social association', while the universal principle grounding it was to become 'the internationally recognized right of every state [...] to choose its economic, social and cultural system in accordance with the will of its nation'.[19]

[16]For the party's account of the crisis see:Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Prednacrt programske osnove [A Preliminary Draft of the Party Program]", p. 59; for the party's account of the two mutually exclusive state-forming concepts see: Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Programske zasade i ciljevi [The Program's Foundations and Objectives]", p. 73.

[17]Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Prednacrt programske osnove [A Preliminary Draft of the Party Program]", p. 59.

[18]Ibid., p. 61.

[19]Ibid., p. 65.

The 'democratic transformation' did not transgress the boundaries of SR Croatia to include the whole of the Yugoslavian political space. Rather, the signifier 'Yugoslavia' was articulated as a mere condition of possibility for its realization. The CDU demanded that 'republican consensus' become the only decision-making procedure in the federation so that decisions could not be imposed on republics by federal institutions. The party demanded Yugoslavia's transformation into a confederation so that 'the Croatian nation [can] decide about its own future'.[20]

A similar logic structured the party's position on economic issues. It opposed any form of federal centralization that would limit republican sovereignty.[21] Its project failed to specify which articulation of forces between the federation and the republics it advocated. The party articulated 'the draining of the national income from SR Croatia to other parts of Yugoslavia' as the main problem to be tackled, justifying its choice of focus by reiterating the arguments advanced by participants of the Croatian Spring regarding the detrimental effects of the Yugoslavian economic re-distribution policy on the economy of SR Croatia.[22] While these demands were raised as a means to increase the ability of the republican working class to dispose of its surplus value in 1971, their grounding in the new context became 'the realization of full national sovereignty in the territory of the SR Croatia'.[23] In this case the signifier nation did not attain an exclusivist meaning but remained within the signification attributed to it by the LCY and it included the (economic) interest of (all) the citizens of the republic.

The decision by the Serbian leadership to cut-off all ties with SR Slovenia was represented as an expression of 'great-Serbian expansionism' that posed a threat to 'the Croatian nation and SR Croatia'.[24] In response, as a means to protect the nation from this threat, the party demand the constitution of 'the territorial integrity of the Croatian

[20]Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Programske zasade i ciljevi [The Program's Foundations and Objectives]", p. 78.

[21]Ibid., p. 79.

[22]Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica. "Programska deklaracija osnivačke skupštine HDZ-a [The Declaration of the CDU's Constitutive Assembly]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj.* Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, p. 65.

[23]Ibid., p. 65.

[24]Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica. "Proglas građanima i Saboru SRH i cijelome hrvatskom [A Declaration to SRC's Citizens, its Assembly and to all Croatian people]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj.* Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, p. 70.

nation in its historic and natural borders'. It is important to note that the party did not demand the protection of the territorial integrity of the Croatian nation within the current borders of SR Croatia. This would have meant that the members of the Croatian nation living in other republics were not in need of protection. The adjectives 'natural' and 'historical' expressed the desire of the party to defend the nation as a whole, and not just that segment of it that lived in SR Croatia. The articulation of the signifier 'nation' as including the Croatian nation living in republics other than SR Croatia revealed that the national subject of CDU's democratic transformation project transgressed the territorial unit in which the party was running for elections.

It is important to note that the signifier 'nation' carried two meanings within the party's discourse. In the economic terrain, 'nation' was identical to the citizens of the republic. However, when it came to issues pertaining to territoriality and borders, 'nation' included Croats in other republics at the expense of excluding the Serbs in Croatia. The double signification of the term 'nation' made it possible for the party to raise demands for full republican sovereignty and legitimize them in reference to the existing constitution, as well as articulating demands that equated 'territory', 'nation' and 'sovereignty', subverting the identitary logic sedimented through the constitution.

#### 8.3.1.2 Universalizing the project: weaving the myth of the nation- state

Contrary to the party's articulation of demands, in its reading of the past the signifier 'nation' carried only the exclusivist meaning. The party's reading of the past inscribed the particular demands it articulated into a history completely determined by an older project that transcended both the CDU and the dying imaginary. To construct a universal foundation for its project, the party articulated elements from Croatian history preceding the socialist period, together with the socialist period, thus producing a continuity. The party claimed:

> [...] we found our program upon three important determinants of recent Croatian history. First, Ante Starčević's notion of the Croatian historic state rights, articulated through the libertarian ideas of the glorious French Revolution. Second, Stjepan Radić's formulation of the idea of universal-humanist republicanism which

> transferred the state-forming Croatian consciousness from the higher to the lower social strata. Third, the positive core of the Croatian left which claimed the Croatian nation's self-managing rights [...][25]

In doing so, the CDU weaved together elements into a political myth that were previously not articulated into moments in a single political discourse. The party even added the 'Independent State of Croatia' – a proto-fascist puppet state in opposition to which, as discussed in Chapter 3, 'brotherhood and unity' came into being – to this myth:

> The Independent State of Croatia was not just a quisling formation and a fascist crime. It was also the expression of the historical aspirations of the Croatian nation to posses its own independent state and the recognition of those aspirations by big international powers, in this case the government of Hiter's Germany.[26]

In articulating a continuity between the proto-fascist puppet state that directed its extermination policies against Serbs and its own project, the CDU signaled that its project constituted the relation between the Croatian and Serbian nation in SR Croatia as a power relation. The party also re-articulated Yugoslavian history through the national signifier and split its legacy into positive and negative elements determined by their contribution to the formation of a Croatian national state. This reading emptied the imaginary horizon from its primary subject which, as I showed in Chapters 3 and 5, was the working class. The party programme maintained that:

> The Yugoslavian socialist state was founded by the principles of equality of all nations and their right to self-determination and secession. Tito could reconstruct the spiritually and materially disintegrated Yugoslavian state [the Monarchy] only because he swore by those [national] principles. [...] Later that [national] right became a mere catchphrase because of the absolute power of the centralised Communist Party [...] which was constantly trying to promote the illusion of creating a socialist Yugoslav identity [...][27]

The founding myth of the Yugoslavian socialist imaginary, the National Liberation Struggle, was also re-assessed against its contribution to the constitution of a Croatian national state and certain elements from it were included into the foundations of the CDU's

[25]Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Prednacrt programske osnove [A Preliminary Draft of the Party Program]", p. 60.

[26]Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Programske zasade i ciljevi [The Program's Foundations and Objectives]", p. 75.

[27]Ibid., pp. 76-77.

project.[28] In the light of its reassessment of the dying imaginary, the party concluded that:

> [...] the existence of SR Croatia as the national state of the Croatian nation, regardless of the extent of our unhappiness with this state, is the foundation for [Croatian national] sovereignty [and for] further exertions to realize this sovereignty fully [...][29]

The fact that SR Croatia was also the national state of the Serbian nation living in Croatia according to the existing constitution was omitted, and traces of (Croatian) sovereignty articulated as being present but not yet fully realized.

The Croatian Spring, also discussed in Chapter 4, was an important constitutive element of the foundations of the party's project. Its reading equated the hegemonic response of the regime, discussed in Chapter 4, with contemporary developments in AP Kosovo, discussed in Chapter 7, maintaining that 'Croatia was Kosovized in 1971 [...] because all progressive and national currents were removed from the society'.[30] This historical inversion created the discursive space for the party to equate 'Tito's hegemonic response to the Croatian Spring' and 'Milošević's response to the politicization of Kosovo Albanians' and rendering the party's project antagonistic to both. Through this inversion the CDU put itself forward as the continuation of a political movement repressed in the past, while simultaneously emptying out the demands of the movement from the context they were articulated in, and within which, as I have argued in Chapter 4, they attained meaning.

The constant historical objective of the nation to constitute itself as independent in its state was manifested in dispersed historical formations – ranging from the writings and activities of Ante Starević (19$^{th}$ century) and Stjepan Radić (beginning of the 20$^{th}$ century), to the proto-fascist ustaša movement, all the way until the constitution of the Socialist Republic of Croatia. The CDU articulated its particular demands as the final

[28]The positive elements of the anti-fascist struggle were: the establishment of SR Croatia at the end of WWII since it 'moved' the Croatian nation to the victorious side of the war after the defeat of the Independent State of Croatia; the inclusion of Istria into the territories of Croatia for the first time; and the re-integration of Rijeka, Zadar, Cres, Lošinj and Lastavo (territories lost to Italy during WWII) to the homeland. See: Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Programske zasade i ciljevi [The Program's Foundations and Objectives]", p. 77.

[29]Ibid., p. 77.

[30]Ibid., p. 73.

realization of this 'old' objective.[31]

#### 8.3.1.3 Social division and unity: the reconciled nation as a subject of politics

The identitary logic articulated by the CDU subverted the terms under which nations were constituted as political subjects in the dying imaginary. The party claimed to represent:

> [...] all members of the Croatian nation that demand the democratic transformation of the national, social, political and economic life, regardless of their world-view, ideological position and religious conviction.[32]

In other words, those that were excluded from the nation as a political subject through the divisions that based the dying imaginary, were included back into it through the party's project.[33] This re-articulation was represented as a national reconciliation that eliminated all social divisions and ideologies from the political terrain:

> The adjective 'socialist' should be removed from the name (of the Republic) because it is a mere ideological insignia. This change of name signifies that the Second World War has finally come to an end in Croatia and that the nation can reconcile [...] if future generations continue dividing themselves into the descendants of friends and foes, there will be no peace in Croatia [...][34]

The party reduced the 'old' socialist universal back to a myth and put its own (national) political subject forward as the (new) universal. Following the logic of including the excluded, the party included the Croatian diaspora into the political body of the nation, claiming that order and stability necessitated its re-integration with 'the homeland'.[35] As discussed in Chapter 3, the diaspora was represented as embodying fascism, nationalism, anti-socialism and capitalism and excluded from the Yugoslavian imaginary. The Croatian nation in SR Bosnia and Herzegovina was also drawn into the (national) political subject the party articulated:

---

[31]Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Programske zasade i ciljevi [The Program's Foundations and Objectives]", p. 75.

[32]Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Prednacrt programske osnove [A Preliminary Draft of the Party Program]", p. 62.

[33]Following the same logic of including excluded elements, the CDU problematized the exclusion of the Catholic Church from society and advocated its inclusion. See:Pauković, "Politička tranzicija u Hrvatskoj 1989-1991", p. 224

[34]Šeks, "Ciklus tribina: Izbori u Hrvatskoj-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990 [The Cycle of Discussions: Elections in Croatia-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990]", p. 52.

[35]Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Prednacrt programske osnove [A Preliminary Draft of the Party Program]", p. 61.

> Those in Croatia that do not see that [...] it is necessary to speak from the position of the historical-geopolitical interest of the Croatian nation, can surely not be asked to speak in its name. In articulating our demands, we kept in mind that, even according to the present constitution, Bosnia and Herzegovina is [also] the national state of the Croatian nation. The demand [...] is the expression and continuation of the perspective of Croatian historians from the past [...] who have considered Bosnian and Herzegovina to be, geopolitically united with Croatia [...].[36]

Forging social unity around the signifier 'nation' which included the Croatian nation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Croatian diaspora had repercussions for the position of the Serbian nation in Croatia within the party's discourse. Despite being sovereign in SR Croatia according to the existing constitution, within the party's discourse the Serbian nation in Croatia was represented as a minority living in a territorial unit that belonged to the Croatian nation. The Serbian nation in Croatia was not a priori included in the party's conception of unity, but had to prove its alliance to the Croatian nation by supporting the CDU's nation centred democratic transformation project. In this light, the party maintained that it was 'open to all citizens that identify with the Serbian nation or any other national minority [...] to the extent that they are willing to participate in the democratic reconstruction [that the party advocates]'.[37] The meaning of the 'reconstruction project' was further substantiated in a speech by a party member:

> [...] we don't accuse anyone nor do we segregate; all of those [people] with honourable intentions that love the Croatian homeland, the ones that feel the homeland's history, present and democratic future as their own, are included [...][38]

In other words, the CDU represented an undivided nation as the subject of its democratic project. The realization of the fullness of that subject, through the constitution of a sovereign nation state, determined the political terrain and the (new) frontiers of inclusion/exclusion around which social unity was forged. The party maintained that it was the expression of that unity and that it would be the agent for realizing the fullness of the nation in an independent state.[39]

[36]Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Programske zasade i ciljevi [The Program's Foundations and Objectives]", p. 76.

[37]Ibid., p. 76.

[38]Neven Jurica. "Ciklus tribina: izbori u Hrvatskoj-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990 [The Cycle of Discussions: Elections in Croatia-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, p. 83.

[39]Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, "Programske zasade i ciljevi [The Program's Foundations and Objectives]", pp. 24-25.

In sum, the CDU's political project centered on the democratic transformation of Croatian society. Within the party's discourse the signifier 'democratic transformation' carried the meaning of the constitution of the Croatian nation as a sovereign political subject in its own state. The future of the Yugoslavian federation was articulated as completely contingent upon the realization of national sovereignty. Although the party deployed a dual articulation of the nation when raising demands – one that included the Serbian nation in Croatia and one that excluded it – its reading of the past and its conception of unity constituted relations between nations in SR Croatia as relations of power. Within the party's discourse the signifier 'Serbian nation in Croatia' carried the meaning of a 'minority' that inhabits a republic 'belonging to' the Croatian nation. The political subject that came into being through the party's discourse was a mirror image of the divided national subject that based the Yugoslavian imaginary since it was articulated through the inclusion of elements previously excluded from it.

### 8.3.2 The League of Communists of Croatia–The Party of Democratic Changes

#### 8.3.2.1 The project: legitimacy, democratic socialism and federalism

According to the LCC PDC, the political context was characterized by the termination of the state socialist phase of the development of Yugoslavia and the transition into a new phase. The transition brought about the end of the old communist party which ruled without the expressed will of the majority.[40] Within the discourse of the LCC PDC, the first elections were articulated as a means to attain the democratic legitimacy its predecessor lacked in the state socialist phase. The fact that the LCC gave up its universal position and called for elections was represented as a sign that the party running for elections did not have anything in common with the 'old' party that governed without the expressed will of the majority of the citizens.[41] In this light, the party claimed that:

[40]Savez Komunista Hrvatske-Stranka Demokratskih Promijena. "Izborni program [The Electoral Program]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, p. 273.

[41]Ibid., p. 274.

> [...] the LCC PDC has entered a new constitutive phase [...]. It is forging a new identity and becoming a contemporary European left-wing party at the doorstep of the 21st century [...]. This deep political and cultural transformation includes the re-evaluation of its historical heritage and the creation of new forms and contents. [...] Marxism ceases to be the only theoretical and ideological foundation; ideological unity ceases to be the determining factor for forging party unity.[42]

Despite distancing itself from the LCY, LCC PDC's political project drew extensively on elements and logics that formed the basis of the dying imaginary. The party retained the signifier 'socialism' and maintained that democratic socialism was the organizing principle best suited for the new phase of development. Within the party's discourse democratic socialism was represented as an upgraded version of self-managing socialism because of its expanded conception of rights and freedoms and its endorsement of political pluralism. The signifier weaved together the elements 'parliamentary democracy', 'separation of powers', 'individual rights', 'citizens' rights', 'workers' rights', 'social justice' and 'free marketeering', and tied these in with the notion of 'equality' reiterated from the program of the LCY and attributed too 'citizens', 'nations' and 'republics'.[43]

The party's project was oriented towards Yugoslavia and it called for its transformation into a 'democratic federal state community'.[44] The LCC PDC reiterated the constitutional definition of Yugoslavia, signaling that the basic tenets of the constitutional order should not be changed:

> [Yugoslavia] was created and exists as the permanent right of every nation to self-determination, which includes the right to association as well as the right to secession. In the SFRY sovereignty rests in the republics; a new constitution can be made only with the consensual agreement of republics.[45]

The party demanded cosmetic changes to the existing terms of division sedimented by the constitution. These included an unambiguously defined division of powers between the federation and the republics, as well as the inclusion of articles protecting human rights and freedoms to the existing constitution. Regarding the division of powers, the party demanded that the republics be given the explicit right to manage their internal affairs

[42]Savez Komunista Hrvatske-Stranka Demokratskih Promijena, "Izborni program [The Electoral Program]", pp. 273-274.
[43]Ibid., pp. 275-276.
[44]Ibid., p. 285.
[45]Ibid., p. 276.

and that federal bodies remained responsible for macroeconomic policy and the territorial integrity of the country.[46] The party also expressed its intention to forge alliances with political parties from other republics once party pluralism was introduced across Yugoslavia.[47]

#### 8.3.2.2 Universalizing the project: reiterating the national liberation myth

The continuity between the LCC PDC and the dying imaginary was apparent in its reading of the past. The party reiterated the founding myth of the LCY, discussed in Chapter 3, as the origin of its Yugoslavian democratic socialist project. It articulated its continuity with:

> [...] the libertarian and democratic traditions of the Croatian and Yugoslavian national liberation movement and the working class movement and their achievements in the struggle for social and national liberation [...][48]

It also cited 'anti-fascism, anti-Stalinism, federalism',[49] 'Titoism, [...] national equality, independence'[50] as the elements inherited from the LCY. Since, as discussed in Chapter 3, these elements differentiated Yugoslavian socialism from real socialism in the Eastern Block, the party inscribed them into the present to normalize the possibility of maintaining the successor of the old hegemon in power despite changed circumstances:

> Despite the resemblance of the current changes encompassing the socialist world, they cannot be repeated in Yugoslavia [...] We are a different country and have always had a different kind of socialism from the Eastern Block. We have kept our position with our own power. Our destiny cannot be the same as the destiny of those communist regimes that collapsed like a house of cards when the external force keeping them in power [USSR] disappeared.[51]

[46] Savez Komunista Hrvatske-Stranka Demokratskih Promijena, "Izborni program [The Electoral Program]", p. 285.

[47] Ivan Šiber. "Ciklus tribina: izbori u Hrvatskoj-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990 [The Cycle of Discussions: Elections in Croatia-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj [Parties in Croatia]*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, p. 297.

[48] Savez Komunista Hrvatske-Stranka Demokratskih Promijena, "Izborni program [The Electoral Program]", p. 273.

[49] Ibid., p. 273.

[50] Ivica Račan. "Veliki javni razgovor [A big public talk]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj [Parties in Croatia]*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, p. 299.

[51] Savez Komunista Hrvatske-Stranka Demokratskih Promijena, "Izborni program [The Electoral Program]", p. 273.

By deploying the founding myth of the dying imaginary the party represented its social democratic project as in organic continuity with the 1945-1989 period. However, the political subject that formed the basis of the dying imaginary – the working class – was not mentioned in its articulation of the past.

#### 8.3.2.3 Social division and unity: the plural citizen as a political subject

The LCC PDC reiterated the identitary logic of the dying imaginary but substituted the working-class with the individual-citizen as the political subject basing the new order. Through it, the LCC PDC, like the LCY, decontested different national identities and incorporated them into its democratic socialist project. To begin with, the LCC PDC re-articulated the relationship between collective and individual rights by maintaining that the former served the purpose of protecting the 'the plural form of the individual'.[52] It represented the individual citizen as the new subject of politics:

> The system of pluralist parliamentary democracy is rooted in the citizen as the source of constitutional power and the subject out of which governing republican institutions are formed.[53]

The LCC PDC reiterated LCY's articulation of sovereignty as an attribute of territorial units and shared between different nations in them. SR Croatia was represented as:

> [...] a sovereign democratic state of all citizens, as the national state of the Croatian nation, as the state of the Serbian nation in Croatia, as well as the state of all nations and nationalities that live in it. All power [in SR Croatia] is vested in the hands of the citizens of SR Croatia.[54]

The different nations in SR Croatia were united in a common interest to live in a modern democratic state community:

> The essence of the nationality policy [...] is the existence and development of SR Croatia as a modern, developed, democratic state community. This is also our understanding of the fundamental national interest of the Croatian nation, [...] the Serbian nation in Croatia and all other nations and nationalities living in our republic – the interest of all of our citizens.[55]

[52]Savez Komunista Hrvatske-Stranka Demokratskih Promijena, "Izborni program [The Electoral Program]", p. 277.
[53]Ibid., p. 285.
[54]Ibid., p. 285.
[55]Ibid., p. 284.

Reiterating the logic basing the dying imaginary, the LCC PDC maintained that the signifier 'nation' was not a political subject that determined the frontiers of inclusion and exclusion. Within its discourse the notion circulated as a folkloric form rather than a source of power:

> The history of the peoples living on the territory of our republic is tightly knit, our cultural heritage is [...] shared and this commonality should be fostered [...] Multi-nationality and difference should be seen as richness and not as a source of political antagonisms [...] Croatia has always been characterized by cultural regionalism[...] We advocate the expression of cultural (linguistic, customary, historical etc.) particularities and identities of Croatia's constitutive regions.[56]

The LCC PDC maintained that order as such could not be realized separately in one territorial unit. Rather, federal order was the condition of possibility for republican order and vice-versa:

> The aim of LCC PDC's nationalities policy is securing the universal and free development of each nation and nationality in Croatia and Yugoslavia. This is possible only within the framework of an equal and democratic Yugoslavian community. None of the national questions in Yugoslavia can be resolved in their singularity, just for themselves, but are always contingent upon the [Yugoslavian] totality.[57]

The party drew an antagonistic frontier between its project and all discourses that equated 'nation' with 'territorial unit' and articulated relations between nations as relations of power. It maintained that the identification of the former with the latter would give rise to 'national exclusivity, hostility, divisions, antagonisms and clashes'.[58] It reactivated the frontiers grounding the dying imaginary, discussed in Chapter 3, to articulate its enemies:

> We are against national imperatives and single-mindedness. We say NO to all forms of totalitarianism, be it fascist or Stalinist. We've said that in the past and we repeat it today.[59]

It condensed the meaning of LC Serbia's transformist project with the CDU's project under the denominator 'totalitarianism' and represented its own project as antagonistic

[56]Savez Komunista Hrvatske-Stranka Demokratskih Promijena, "Izborni program [The Electoral Program]", pp. 289-290.
[57]Ibid., p. 284.
[58]Ibid., p. 285.
[59]Račan, "Veliki javni razgovor [A big public talk]", p. 289.

to both.[60]

In sum, LCC PDC's political project was characterized by an attempt to strike a balance between the old and new. The new order that the party evoked was not in discontinuity with the dying imaginary, but akin to its democratic upgrade. The party deployed 'Yugoslav democratic socialism' as the new empty signifier that weaved together a variety of democratic institutional forms and national identities into a single project for both SR Croatia and the Yugoslavian federation. The party demanded cosmetic changes to the existing constitution and reiterated the founding myths of the dying imaginary to universalize its project. The new subject that would base the new order was constituted through the reiteration of the identitary logic of the LCY with the substitution of the working class with individual-citizen as the locus of power. Through this subject the party represented different national identities as politically united. Furthermore, the party represented order and stability as preconditioned by the articulation of sovereignty as an attribute of republics and shared between nations.

### 8.3.3 The Serbian Democratic Party

#### 8.3.3.1 The project: national equality, territorial autonomy and Yugoslavian democratic federalism

According to the SDP, the political context was characterized by the structural crisis of the existing party-state order. The party maintained that a (new) order out of the (existing) disorder could emerge only through the termination of the rule of one party and the pluralization of the political space.[61] Within the framework of political pluralism, the party centered its project around the Serbian nation in Croatia:

> We will be concerned with the position of all of the diasporas of the Serbian nation in Yugoslavia; in particular we will monitor the state of the Serbian nation in Croatia.[62]

[60]Račan, "Veliki javni razgovor [A big public talk]", p. 299.

[61]Srpska Demokratska Stranka. "Osnovna načela [Basic Principles]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj [Parties in Croatia]*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, p. 336.

[62]Ibid., p. 337.

The party articulated democracy as the condition of possibility for the realization of the interest of the Serbian nation, both in SR Croatia and Yugoslavia.[63] It also equated its particular project with the Serbian national interest and represented the latter as a mere reflection of the former. At the level of SR Croatia, the party articulated its central objective as the realization of equality between the Serbian and Croatian nation. To realize it, the party demanded the establishment of an autonomous region in SR Croatia that would reflect 'the national composition of the territories the Serbs inhabit'.[64] The creation of a new autonomous region was articulated as the necessary precondition for protecting the will of the Serbian minority from the Croatian majority:

> The general democratic Yugoslavian principles that negate the hegemony and majorization [of a nation over other nations] in Yugoslavia [...] should be inscribed into the Croatian context. The party demands the establishment of institutions that will limit every majoritarian and arbitrary will directed against minorities.[65]

The assumption underlying the demand was that the Serbian and Croatian nations in SR Croatia were essentially different, and the difference was political. Consequently, the party demanded the introduction of new institutional divisions that would reflect and, thus reproduce, this constitutive difference. To legitimize this demand, the SDP re-articulated the signifier 'Serbian nation in Croatia' into a 'minority' living in a territorial unit identified with the Croatian nation.

Articulating 'equality' through a demand whose practical ramifications decreased the power of the Serbian nation in SR Croatia seemed incoherent at the republican level. Coherence emerged only through the demands the SDP articulated at the federal level. According to the party, the future of the Serbian nation in Croatia was determined by the transformation of Yugoslavia into a 'democratic federal state'.[66] Within the party's discourse, 'federalism' attained a completely different meaning from the one sedimented by 1974 Constitution. First, its realization necessitated the creation of new autonomous regions and revoking the autonomous status of Vojvodina and Kosovo. New autonomies

[63] Jovan Rašković. "Ciklus tribina: izbori u Hrvatskoj-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990 [The Cycle of Discussions: Elections in Croatia-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj [Parties in Croatia]*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, p. 339.

[64] Srpska Demokratska Stranka, "Osnovna načela [Basic Principles]", p. 338.

[65] Ibid., p. 338.

[66] Ibid., p. 335.

were necessary if 'the population inhabiting territories with a different ethnic composition or cultural historical identity decides so on a referendum'.[67] The legality of existing autonomous provinces was contested on the grounds that it did not reflect the democratic will of its inhabitants:

> Our democratic federal praxis has to be enriched with a new stance towards Autonomous Provinces [...] the single party regime adopted the conception of autonomous provinces from the Soviet Union without proper conceptualization. Later, the regime transformed the autonomous provinces into states. Constituted in such way and [containing] monstrous political projects, the Provinces become disorderly elements in the states that contain them [...].[68]

Second, the SDP contested territorial representation at the federal level which, as discussed in Chapter 5, served as a rule to realize national equality, on the grounds that it failed to translate the size of the Serbian nation in Yugoslavia into political power. To redress the 'injustice' that placed the Serbian nation in an unequal position, the party demanded the introduction of the principle 'one citizen one vote' at the federal level:

> Yugoslavian federalism can be in harmony with democratic principles if the new order [...] guarantees the equality of [all Yugoslavian] citizens. We are against the notion of 'citizen equality' instituted by the single-party regime because it contracts and expands the notion of 'the citizen' contingently. In that system, a Slovenian citizen is equal to, and politically represented as, five Serbian citizens. We demand the institution of the principle 'one citizen one vote'.[69]

Within the party's discourse 'national equality' translated into power that was proportional to population size. Akin to the Belgrade intellectuals' discourse discussed in Chapter 7, equality was not represented as an inherent attribute of each Yugoslavian nation, irrespective of size. This articulation ran against the representation of nations as a priori equal within the framework of Yugoslavian self-managing socialism. Consequently, the signifier 'Yugoslavian citizen' did not circulate in the party's discourse as a subject position that linked different, a priori equal, nations into a common political project. Rather, it was articulated as the solution to the problem of the fragmentation of the Serbian nation between different republics and provinces brought into being by the 1974 Constitution. In

[67]Srpska Demokratska Stranka, "Osnovna načela [Basic Principles]", p. 336.
[68]Ibid., pp. 335–336.
[69]Ibid., pp. 335-336.

this representation the SDP project again echoed the myth articulated by Serbian intellectuals and discussed in Chapter 7. Although the party's project aimed at realizing the equality of the Serbian nation in SR Croatia, it thus also formed part of a broader political project that was gradually weaved together in the second half of the 1980s in SR Serbia.

#### 8.3.3.2 Universalizing the project: weaving the myth of the military frontier

The party read the past in a manner that legitimized its demand for territorial autonomy and disarticulated the link between the Serbian nation in Croatia and SR Croatia constitutive of the dying Yugoslavian imaginary. It inscribed the medieval past[70] into the present, pointing to the failure of the former to reflect the latter:

> The regional subdivision of Croatia [...] does not reflect the historical interests of the Serbian nation. In the past Krajine [medieval military frontiers of the Hapsburg Empire in the wars against the Ottoman Empire] were constituted and had their own names and insignia. These entities have been broken up through regional divisions; [...] We don't have the impression that the administrative changes have been made in the interest of constituting a Serbian identity in Croatia.[71]

Subverting the existing system of divisions, the SDP identified the Serbian nation in Croatia primary with the Serbian homeland and represented it as a (medieval) diaspora whose right to territorial autonomy was grounded in a (medieval) sacrifice:

> The Serbian diaspora in Croatia and its historical sacrifice [against Ottoman Empire] is older than the pressures of Starčević's Party of Rights and the WWII genocide. But every sacrifice is best defended through democracy and freedom. This is the reason why the Serbian nation in Croatia has a particular need to unite in democratic principles of equality and freedom.[72]

In other words, this 'historical sacrifice' was articulated as the very essence of the Serbian diasporic subjectivity, whose interests the SDP claimed to express in the context of the

[70]The territories of SR Croatia formed part of the military frontier of the Hapsburg Empire. The Hapsburgs encouraged the orthodox population from Serbian territories, then part of the Ottoman Empire, to inhabit the border territories of the Hapsburg Empire and become peasant-soldiers. The settled Orthodox population formed a buffer against Ottoman incursions.

[71]Srpska Demokratska Stranka, "Osnovna načela [Basic Principles]", p. 338.

[72]Rašković, "Ciklus tribina: izbori u Hrvatskoj-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990 [The Cycle of Discussions: Elections in Croatia-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990]", p. 339.

first elections. The signifiers 'democracy', 'equality' and 'freedom' constitutive of SDP's political project were articulated as strategies to defend the sacrifice in the present. The logic underlying the party's reading of the past was that all the Serbs in Croatia had a common origin which determined their political interests in context of the 1990s elections. It is important to note that theme of sacrifice against Ottoman incursions resonated with the arguments advanced by the Serbian intellectuals to revoke the autonomy of AP Kosovo, discussed in Chapter 7.

#### 8.3.3.3 Social division and unity: the Serbian nation in Yugoslavia as a political subject

The identitary logic articulated by the SDP operated through the disarticulation of the link between the Serbian nation in Croatia and SR Croatia constitutive of the dying Yugoslavian imaginary. According to the party, the Serbian nation in Croatia could become a political subject only by forming part of a broader Serbian national body. The party maintained that its existing identification with SR Croatia was a form of political misrepresentation:

> Nations cannot be equated with the federal units that they inhabit [SR Croatia]. This can only be realized by creating the conditions of possibility for the full affirmation of the spiritual and cultural identity of each Yugoslavian nation separately, regardless of the federal unit it inhabits. [...] The segments of the nation that live outside of their 'mother' Republic [SR Serbia] should be given the right to fully (nationally, culturally and spiritually) identify with their nation [...][73]

In other words, the party articulated unity along national as opposed to republican lines. The articulation of nations as political subjects transgressing republican divisions meant that the party re-articulated sovereignty from an attribute of Yugoslavia's republics to an attribute of nations as unified subjects within its discourse. This representation, again, completely contradicted the terms of unity and division that formed the basis of the dying Yugoslavian imaginary.

The party's articulation of unity as determined by the signifier (Serbian) 'nation' resulted in the articulation of the Serbian nation in Croatia and the Croatian nation as

[73]Srpska Demokratska Stranka, "Osnovna načela [Basic Principles]", p. 337.

essentially different and antagonistic.[74] To mark the political difference between, on the one hand, the Serbian nation in Croatia (and itself as the articulator of its will) and, on the other hand, the Croatian nation, the SDP drew an antagonistic frontier between itself and the entire political landscape in SR Croatia:

> Pluralism can be paradoxical; it can eliminate itself through itself. In SR Croatia pluralism took up the form of croatocentric etnomonoism. Even the League of Communists of Croatia has accepted this position. The LCC is not facing an opposition in the newly formed party's. Rather, it has been dissolved into an ethnomonoistic identity shared with other so-called opposition and alternative parties. This trap is also offered to us, it is offered to the whole Serbian nation in Croatia.[75]

Irrespective of the radical difference between the CDU and the LC PDC project, the SDP subsumed both under the same particularistic identitary logic and put its own project forward as embodying 'truly' universal values:

> Despite the fact that our party has an ethnic name, in essence it is an ethical party. It demands tolerance and political freedoms [...] Despite our name, we are a universal democratic party; our demands are federal and our practices democratic.[76]

In other words, the SDS claimed its project was universal, democratic and plural simply because it articulated the demands of a national minority that was, given the ethnomonoistic logic grounding the Croatian political landscape, also a political minority. However, since the SDP articulated division and unity through national signifiers, its project simply reproduced the particularist logic it claimed to oppose through a different (Serbian) national signifier.

In sum, the SDP's political project was articulated through a string of demands that would bring about the constitution of the Serbian nation as a federal political subject. In SR Croatia, the party's project focused on the realization of the equality of the Serbian nation which was understood to be identical to Serbian territorial autonomy in SR Croatia. To legitimise this demand, the party re-articulated the Serbian nation in Croatia into a national minority and, thus, a political minority. At the federal level, the party

[74]Srpska Demokratska Stranka, "Osnovna načela [Basic Principles]", p. 337.
[75]Ibid., p. 340.
[76]Ibid., pp. 340-341.

demanded the transformation of Yugoslavia into a democratic federal state so that, following the principle 'one man, one vote', the size of the Serbian nation could translate into political power in a proportionate manner. Its reading of the past rendered the Serbian nation in Croatia into a diaspora of the Serbian nation in SR Serbia. The party disarticulated the link between the Serbian nation in Croatia and SR Croatia and between sovereignty and republic. These links, as discussed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 5, were constitutive of the dying imaginary and their sedimentation made it possible to decontest national identities in Yugoslavia. Furthermore, the party represented sovereignty as an attribute of nations that transcended the territorial divisions of the existing order. The party represented the Serbian nation in Croatia and the Croatian nation as essentially different and antagonistic and precluded the possibility of their inclusion into a common political project.

## 8.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I have analyzed the political projects of three parties that took part in the elections to the Constitutive Assembly of SR Croatia. I have fleshed out the particular demands that each party articulated, as well as the identitary logic that grounded their demands. I have shown that, despite the fact that each party deployed the signifiers 'nation', 'democracy', 'Yugoslavia', 'order', 'stability', these were articulated in different ways into moments within their respective discourse. Whereas the CDU and the SDP articulated relations between nations as relations of power, the LCC PDC retained the identitary logic of the dying imaginary and decontested national identities through a common democratic socialist project. Consequently, both the CDU and the SDP articulated the 'Serbian nation in Croatia' as a national minority, while the LCC PDC retained its existing constitutional definition.

Each party articulated sovereignty in different ways. The CDU's discourse operated through a dual articulation of the concept, as both an attribute of republics in the federation as well as the Croatian nation in SR Croatia. The SDP articulated it as an attribute of nations transgressing republican borders in the federation, and represented republics

as administrative units, that were insignificant in the political sense. The LCC PDC attributed sovereignty to all citizens of SR Croatia irrespective of national belonging. In this sense, the LCC PDC retained the identitary logic of the dying imaginary, discussed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 5, that national difference does not translate into political division. Whereas both SDP's and LCC PDC's democratic projects were, albeit in completely different ways, oriented towards transforming Yugoslavia as a whole, the CDU's democratic project focused primary on the constitution of the fullness of the (sovereign) undivided Croatian national subject within its own (sovereign) republic. Furthermore, although both the CDU and SDP's political projects were constituted through the same identitary logic – that national identity translates into political subjectivity in a linear fashion – the political demands that they raised were mutually exclusive. Whereas the former articulated SR Croatia as indivisible and historically 'belonging' to the Croatian nation, the SDP demanded the administrative restructuring of SR Croatia to form territorial autonomies that reflect the national composition of the republic. Likewise, whereas the former demanded the transformation of the federation into a confederation of sovereign nation-states, the latter demanded the federalization of Yugoslavia into sovereign nations and the introduction of the principle 'one man, one vote'. Despite the differences in the content of their political projects, they both placed the national at the centre of politics and rendered the meaning of Yugoslavia contingent to it.

Despite having attained only 41% of the electoral vote, the CDU had an absolute parliamentary majority in drafting the first democratic Constitution of the Republic of Croatia. Through its rules, the party's political discourse expanded into an imaginary horizon, thereby excluding LCC PDC's articulation of the signifiers 'nation', 'democracy', 'citizen', 'Yugoslavia' and reinforcing SDP's position regarding the threat to the Serbian minority in Croatia. The CDU's hegemonic position was reflected in the new constitutional rules to such an extent that the constitutional document read as its electoral program. The Croatian national subject was constituted as 'millennia old' and expressed through various state-forms listed in the Preamble. These embryonic state-forms had been developing since the seventh century all the way through to the 1974 Constitution.

The 1990 elections were constituted as the expression of the will of the state-forming national subject to become sovereign in its own state. The Republic was constituted as a 'unitary and indivisible'[77] 'Croatian nation-state and the state of national minorities'.[78] Sovereignty was constituted as an 'indivisible and nontransferable' attribute of the Republic[79] as well as the 'inalienable, indivisible, nontransferable'[80] right of the Croatian nation in the Republic. The Republic was constituted part of Yugoslavia formally, 'until a new agreement is reached by the republics or until the Croatian Parliament decides otherwise'. Institutional rules were put into place for protecting the sovereignty of the Republic from Yugoslavian federal organs, organs of other republics or provinces and members of the federation.[81] In this sense, the institutional conditions of possibility for secession were put in place. The Serbian nation in Croatia was constituted as a minority and equated with all non-Yugoslavian minorities. The Croatian diaspora in turn was reintroduced as an element of the nation and the Republic constituted as responsible for the protection of the Croatian nation living in other states. This included Croatian nationals living outside of Yugoslavia as well as those living in other Yugoslavian republics.[82] The limits of the new order were constituted as 'unity, territorial integrity and independence of the Republic' and political parties that contested these elements were banned by the constitution.[83]

[77] *Ustav Republike Hrvatske [The Constitution of the Republic of Croatia]*, Article 1.
[78] Ibid., Basic Principles.
[79] Ibid., Article 2.
[80] Ibid., Basic Principles.
[81] Ibid., Article 41.
[82] Ibid., Article 10.
[83] Ibid., Article 6.

# CHAPTER IX

# Conclusion

This thesis critically examined the emergence of the 'nationalist' CDU party in the context of Yugoslavia's dissolution, without reproducing the party's own essentialist representations of its origins and political objectives. It has done so by analysing the discursive constructions of the nation in Yugoslavia (1958-1990) and accounting for the party's emergence within its broader historical and immediate electoral context. By showing that the 'nationalist' discourse formed part and parcel of the movement from the universal Yugoslavian political imaginary to the particular myths that emerged as it was weakening in the 1980s, this thesis has showed that the CDU's project was a particular and contingent representation of social unity whose very conception was made possible by the historical conjecture of its emergence. The contention that one cannot assume the existence of a 'nation' that pre-exists the practices giving meaning to the term and that are embedded in a particular historical context, was central to this analysis. This perspective unlocked the possibility for a new reading of the conditions of emergence of the party that did not reduce the phenomenon to factors external to the process of collective political identity formation and dissolution. By way of conclusion, I reiterate the main points of the argument concerning the relationship between the emergence of the CDU's nationalist discourse and its context, drawing out general mechanisms about nationalist identitary logics, and suggest avenues for future research.

To render the contingency behind CDU's essentialist representation of the national subject visible, I first examined the discursive terms under which nations were represented in and through the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon. The analysis showed that

the hegemony of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia was premised upon its ability to fix different national identities within a single space of representation, articulated around a universal working class subject. This was made possible by 'brotherhood and unity' and 'self-management' discourses, which defined the boundaries of the Yugoslavian community and imbued that what is included within its scope with a positive meaning. The enemies of the Yugoslavian community were represented as always potentially present among all of Yugoslavia's nations and nationalities. In this sense, the frontiers that shaped the imaginary horizon differentiated between national identity as potential enemies, and as 'good' working class nationals. Nationalism was represented as one of the many enemies of Yugoslavian self-managing socialism and, it was paramount to LCY's hegemony that the 'good' members of the (Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian, Albanian etc.) nation/nationality prevent the emergence of exclusionary nationalist logics within their communities. National difference was understood primarily in cultural terms, and not as a nodal point for drawing frontiers of inclusion/exclusion. The analysis further showed that the imaginary was marked by a tension between the decentralization/voluntarism associated with 'self-management', and centripetally associated with 'brotherhood and unity'. In this sense, the enemies of self-management could be and were represented as manifesting themselves in practices legitimised in and through the brotherhood and unity discourse, and vice-versa.

The CDU represented its 1990 electoral programme as in continuity with what it claimed were 'the progressive national currents of the Croatian Spring', which were oppressed by the Yugoslavian regime. In so doing, the CDU retroactively reduced the Croatian Spring to the expression of its very own nationalist electoral programme, for the purpose of establishing the 'objectivity' of the Croatian nation that it evoked in and through its political project. The thesis rendered the limitations of this representation visible by showing the extent to which the politicizations of Croatian national identity in the 1968-1971 period were embedded in the system of social unity and division that underpinned the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon. These politicizations were conditioned by the dislocations that were produced by Yugoslavia's economic reform, the re-opening

of the so-called 'national question' by the hegemonic LCY, the constitutional reform process, as well as the liberalization of the socialist political landscape that characterized the 1960s. Broadly speaking, the contestations pertaining to the Croatian Spring aimed at transforming the articulation of forces between Yugoslavia's socialist republics and the federal institutions for the purpose of expanding the self-managing capacity of the working class in the republics. The nation that was articulated in and through the contestation practices that marked the period was represented as antagonistic to the enemies of self-managing socialism. Furthermore, the analysis showed that the Croatian Spring was not a united or coherent movement. The differences between the 'liberals' in the LCC, the Matica and the student movement were manifested in incompatible representations of national sovereignty, the demands of each, as well as the different articulatory strategies deployed. Unity of purpose was attributed to the movement retroactively by the Yugoslavian regime's hegemonic practices, which excluded all of the actors but included the demand for republican sovereignty into the rules that structured the imaginary horizon. The LCY reduced all actors to an allegedly coherent Croatian nationalist project that was portrayed as threatening the brotherhood and unity of Yugoslavia's nations and nationalities. In claiming continuity with the Croatian Spring, the CDU drew on the LCY's representation of the movement and simultaneously emptied the contestation practices from the system of social division in response to which they emerged and in the context of which they made sense.

Central to CDU's electoral programme in 1990 was the contention that the 1974 Constitution of Yugoslavia legitimized the right of the Croatian people to constitute themselves as a sovereign national body in their very own nation-state. This very objective, the CDU maintained, was reflected in the constitution of the Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia, which represented SR Croatia as the nation state of the Croatian nation. This thesis showed the limitations of CDU's representation of the Yugoslavian constitution in two important ways. First, the analysis rendered visible that the transformation of sovereignty from an attribute of the Yugoslavian federation, to an attribute of its constitutive republics, came about through debates and struggles that were embedded in the

Yugoslavian system of social division. Second, it fleshed out the hierarchical identitary logic between nation and class that underpinned the entire Yugoslavian institutional landscape and through which Yugoslavian identity was forged. The thesis showed that the tenet that self-management determines the political essence of both nations and territorial units was central to that particular constitutional order. The hierarchical identitary logic made it possible to constitute sovereignty as shared between different nations in republics. The analysis thus rendered visible that the CDU only evoked those elements from the constitution that established the 'objectivity' of the Croatian nation that it claimed to embody in 1990 while omitting completely the broader logic that underpinned it and through which nations were constituted within it. I have argued that the real importance of Yugoslavia's constitutional order for the emergence of the 'nationalist' CDU's lay in the failures of its rules to sustain social unity in the changing circumstances of the 1980s and the possibilities that those failures opened up. I mapped out the ways in which LCY's unity was undermined through interplay of institutional/ economic factors, and different interpretations thereof. The analysis showed that the signifier of self-management, which was central for the linking up of different national identities into a common working class subject, attained a 'floating' character because of the inability of hegemonic LCY to contain the economic crisis.

Central to CDU's electoral programme in 1990 was the contention that its programme embodied a much-needed national defence strategy against the politics of Slobodan Milošević and Serbian expansionism. This 'threat' made it possible for the party to infuse its particular nation-state forming project with an objective urgency. This analysis showed that Milošević impacted on the party's emergence to the extent that the LCS's transformist project under his leadership contributed to the disarticulation of the class-centred system of social division and the legitimation of nation-centred political demands. The weakening and ultimate dissolution of the Yugoslavian social of division made it possible for the 'nationalist' CDU to articulate alternative myths. I furthermore argued that the transformist project was not the expression of an 'objective' Serbian national interest or a pre-conceived Serbian expansion attempt. Rather, it was carved out of the failure of the

Yugoslavian regime to 'fix' the contending demands for national equality that emerged in AP Kosovo in response to the 1974 Constitution, within the hegemonic system of social division, and the new (Serbian) nation-centred and anti-regime myths that the intellectuals in Belgrade articulated in response to that failure. Milošević came to power in and through this context. Under his leadership the LCS absorbed the nation-centred demands of Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins, reinterpreted the Kosovo problem, adopted elements of the discourse of the Belgrade intellectuals and lessened their anti-regime potential.

The analysis showed that Milošević came to occupy an ambiguous position after 1987; he was both in power and the addressee of an evolving movement that demanded the transformation of the existing order by overthrowing the so-called 'bureaucracy' that was paralyzing the constitutional reform process. The movement amounted to the expansion of a chain of equivalence between the LCS, Serbian intellectuals, the dissatisfied Kosovo Serbs/Montenegrins, and the workers that supported socialism but demanded its transformation. It was primarily about the transformation of the terms under which the Yugoslavian federation was constituted and the expansion of the power of LC Serbia within the existing order. The weaving together of the LCS's transformist project through the co-optation of (Serbian) nation-centred demands contributed to the progressive weakening of the Yugoslavian imaginary horizon and the blurring of the lines of inclusion and exclusion that based it. Already existing differences in position within the LCY were exacerbated by this co-optation strategy and they eventually crystallized into a clear-cut antagonistic frontier between LC Serbia and LC Slovenia. The introduction of a political antagonism within the ranks of a party whose very hegemony was premised upon the unity of the universal Yugoslavian working class meant that the LCY was undergoing a full-fledged hegemonic crisis. Consequently, it also meant that the political imaginary that accommodated different nations and nationalities into a single space of representation ever since the 1950s, was dissolving.

Lastly, I have argued that the first democratic elections in the Socialist Republic of Croatia formed part and parcel of the hegemonic crisis of Yugoslavian self-managing socialism. They were in effect a political struggle about the new terms under which social

unity and division would be constituted in SR Croatia and the ways in which the Croatian republican community would relate to Yugoslavia. As a result, they were also about the ways in which the relationship between Croatia's constitutive nations would be represented. The specific historical conjecture, characterized by both the hegemonic crisis of the LCY and by the collapse of communism across Eastern Europe, made it possible for the victorious party to play an exceptionally creative role after assuming power. In this sense, the thesis has showed that the first democratic elections were 'historic' because of the degree of indeterminacy that marked the context in which they were held and not because, as it has later been claimed, they allowed for the nation to articulate its centuries old desire for sovereignty. Rather, the first democratic elections were a battle for the terms under which democratic social unity would be forged in the SR Croatia.

The nationalist CDU party came into being shortly before the pluralization of the political space in SR Croatia and its political project was but one possible reading of the past, the present and the democratic future. The party forged a Croatian national identity, whose essence it claimed to embody, by differentiating it from the socialist context, and claimed it was the 'true' political identity emptied out of socialist-ideological dogmatism. However, the 'old' identity was still constitutive of its representation of the Croatian nation to the extent that the 'new' nation was forged by subverting the terms under which the Croatian socialist nation was fixed within the dying imaginary; it reintroduced those elements that were previously excluded, into the nation as a subject of politics (fascist, liberals, etc.) To normalize this subversion and imbue it with a sense of objectivity, the CDU situated the national subject in a history that contained and transcended the socialist context. The 'new' national subject was said to be present in incipient form ever since the 7th century but was only making itself fully visible in 1990 through the CDU's democratic transformation project. The CDU represented the nation it evoked in 1990 as having been present in Yugoslavia all along, but 'blocked' by the Communist Party deliberately for the purpose of promoting an 'illusionary' Yugoslavian identity. The 'fact' that communism was collapsing across Europe was weaved into the project as a legitimation strategy for the claim that Yugoslavia identity was always already illusionary and that it

forged its 'reality' at the expense of the 'true' Croatian national identity.

To substantiate the nation in 1990, the CDU invoked the Yugoslavian past in so far as it contributed to the nation's alleged historical objectivity. This thesis has showed that, in doing so the CDU reduced the Yugoslavian imaginary back to a myth because it articulated Yugoslavia as having always been a particular (mis)representation of a universal 'older' struggle of the Croatian nation for state-sovereignty. The manner in which the signifier Yugoslavia was articulated within the party's discourse was completely contingent upon the signifier Croatian nation-state. The party demanded the transformation of the federation into a confederation as part and parcel of its democratic transformation project so that the Croatian nation could express its will fully.

Despite CDU's claim that it had abolished all political divisions within its program, this thesis has showed that the nation that the CDU evoked in 1990 was still carved out of political frontiers drawn against 'Great Serbian expansionism' in response to which the nation had to establish itself as sovereign with 'natural' and 'historic' borders. The CDU maintained this was the only reasonable perspective from which the future democratic order could be conceived. Furthermore, the analysis has showed that the party's project was underpinned by an ambiguous articulation of the signifier Croatian nation. On the economic terrain it included all those that lived in SR Croatia including Serbs in Croatia, and it did not refer to Croats living in other Yugoslavian republics or the Croatian diaspora. When it came to matters of national subjectivity and territory in a more explicit sense, the nation included all Croats in Yugoslavia and as well as the diaspora, while excluding the Serbian nation in Croatia.

Furthermore, its representation of the Croatian nation implied that an adequate response to 'Serbian expansionism' would be the inclusion of the territories of Bosnia and Herzegovina that were inhabited by Croats to the territories of SR Croatia. However, the refashioning of Yugoslavia's territorial units following the principle of 'natural national' borders would have legitimised the 'Serbian expansionism' into Serb majority parts of SR Croatia that the CDU claimed to defend the Croatian nation from. Although the Serbian nation was not a priori included in the party's conception of Croatian social unity, the

party also did not a priori exclude it. Rather, the thesis showed that the CDU set the terms under which the Serbian nation could be included within the democratic community and these terms boiled down to supporting the party's own democratic transformation project. This thesis also showed that 'full' Croatian national and state sovereignty became the new empty signifier around which the 'nationalist' CDU weaved its democratic myth. This signifier demarcated those that would be included within the scope of the new Croatian democratic community and those that were excluded. Thus, the frontier was not drawn in terms of national belonging exclusively, but in terms of supporting or not full Croatian state sovereignty. In this sense, Croatian nationals that contested the notion that state sovereignty was the exclusive attribute of a Croatian majority in the republic would also be excluded from the scope of the new democratic community.

My analysis showed that the electoral programme of the League of Communists of Croatia Party of Democratic Change offered an alternative to CDU's nationalist representations. However, its project did not seem like an alternative within the discursive context of the 1990 because it drew extensively on the elements and logics from the dying imaginary. The LCC PDC retained the signifier 'socialism' that formed the basis of the dying imaginary, and claimed it should continue to shape the new democratic order. Unlike the CDU, the LCC PDC oriented its project towards the democratization of the entire Yugoslavian political landscape and it expressed its willingness to form coalitions with parties from other republics once political pluralism was introduced across Yugoslavia. Furthermore, it retained the existing terms under which sovereignty was constituted and demanded only cosmetic changes to the existing constitution of Yugoslavia. The party also deployed the founding myths of the dying imaginary as the basis of its programme and represented its socialist democratic project as an organic continuation of the 1945-1989 period. Most importantly, the analysis revealed that the party retained the terms under which national identities were represented in the dying imaginary and replaced the working class subject with the individual-citizen as the common denominator that would bond different national identities into a single democratic-socialist community in the post-1990 period. Hence, it represented the republic of Croatia as a sovereign demo-

cratic state of *all citizens*, and the nation state of the Croatian nation and the state of the Serbian nation in Croatia. It reiterated the frontiers grounding the dying imaginary to delineate the political identity it claimed to embody. It explicitly declared it project to be in antagonism to all nationalist logics and totalitarianisms, be it fascist or Stalinist.

Despite having attained only 7% more votes than the LCC PDC, the CDU had an absolute parliamentary majority in drafting the constitution that would base the new Croatian democratic order, whose foundations have remained unchanged until today. This thesis has showed that in and through the foundations of the democratic constitutional order the nationalist party myth about the nature of social unity expanded into a collective democratic imaginary horizon. The effect that this expansion had on the political landscape in Croatia in 1990 can be read-off from the analysis of the discourse of the Serbian Democratic Party (SDP) presented in this thesis. In terms of logics, the SDP's myth and that of the CDU resembled one another remarkably although they pursued antagonistic objectives. Both parties understood nations as undivided political subjects and both parties disarticulated the link between the 'Serbian nation in Croatia' and 'SR Croatia' that was constitutive of the dying imaginary. Furthermore, both parties also produced the national subjects whose political interests they claimed to embody in and through the threat of an allegedly already consolidated nationalism of the other. As a result, they both represented the relationship between the Croatian and Serbian nation in Croatia as a relationship of power and, given the national composition of the republic, they both represented the Serbian nation in Croatia as a national minority inhabiting a state of the Croatian majority. In this sense, the expansion of the CDU's representation of the nature of social unity as being about the (Croatian) nation and its state into a collective democratic imaginary also gave credibility to the SDP's nation-centred project, and in doing so contributed to the out-break of the 'defensive' Homeland War.

The analysis presented in this thesis contributes to understanding how the exclusivist/essentialist representation of the Croatian nation, that underlies the present democratic order, actually came into being. It also contributes to understanding Yugoslavism as a discursive formation, the particular system of division that was instituted by it, how

this system was contested and how it failed as a hegemonic project. Socialist-national identities were not dismissed as a priori failed because of the collapse of communism and the break-up of Yugoslavia. Rather, how they operated as both subject positions and political subjectivities within the Yugoslavian imaginary has been examined in great detail, to draw out the limitations of the CDU's nationalist discourse.

In a theoretical sense, the analysis presented in this thesis contributes to understanding the operation of nationalist discourses because it has showed the extent to which national identities are weaved together through different strands of discourse that attempt to organize the field of meaning and that they are not alone in attempting to produce that national position. What is characteristic of nationalist discourses however is the identitary logic underpinning their particular representation of society. Irrespective of the difference in the particular elements through which nationalist discourses are articulated they share the conception that social unity and division are articulated through national nodal points and the empty signifiers that imbue them with a purpose. From the nationalist perspective, society, politics and conflicts are contracted to an essential national core and driven by alleged strategies for the core's preservation. The nationalist discourses examined in this thesis operated by masking the fact that the very signification of the nation, what it included/excluded, was always an act of political institution created primarily with the aim of critiquing/delegitimizing/transforming the existing structures that organized social life. In the Yugoslavian imaginary a similar process could be observed. The regime based its hegemony in binding together a set of differentiated national identities that were assumed to share an essential class core in and through which their political meaning was exhausted, their mutual relations de-antagonised and the national question resolved. However, that order was premised upon a class centred conceptualization of social unity.

This analysis, I believe, showed the limitations of interpretations that maintain that Croatian nationalism was a natural reaction to Serbian nationalism and that implicitly hold that it is 'legitimate'. Such interpretations overlook the fact that, in the Yugoslavian context, nationalist discourses profited from one another precisely because they drew on

the same logic of social unity and division and, in doing so, reinforced the credibility of each other's premises even when pursuing mutually exclusive objectives regarding the structures that organize social life. Thus, a nationalist discourse that claimed to combat another nationalist project that allegedly threatened the existence of 'its' particular nation, contributed to the credibility/reality of that in response to which it said it had emerged. In this sense, I believe that it is important to highlight the extent to which so-called reactive nationalisms, like Croatian nationalism, contributed in and of themselves to the expansion of nationalist discourses in Yugoslavia because they made the notion that social unity translates into national unity 'more real' and undermined the credibility of alternative non-national representations of democratic unity/division. This mechanism is visible in the comparative analysis of the CDU's and the SDP's electoral programmes in 1990.

Therefore, the analysis presented here contributes to the development of a conceptual infrastructure that can enable the examination of other nationalist discourses in the former-Yugoslavia and elsewhere, since they emerged in response to and at the expense of a similar discursive context. The strategy can be adapted to the particular contexts in the process of the application, depending on the particular contents of the nationalist party/movement at stake, like this analysis has done. The different discursive strategies that were used by different national movements to disarticulate the 'old' system of social division could be examined comparatively, to trace the trajectory of the Yugoslavia's dissolution in a more all-encompassing way than the one presented in this thesis.

The status of the 'old' Yugoslavian identitary logic in Bosnia and Herzegovina today can be examined so as to flesh out potential and context specific strategies that can help to overcome the sedimented national divisions that are currently paralyzing the multinational state and its society. In the Croatian case, it would be interesting to examine how the discursive terms of representing social unity shifted in the post-war period and uncover the new empty signifier that bases the right-wing discourse and embodies the fullness of the nation. Furthermore, the signifier 'Yugoslavian' has continued to circulate as negative label within the nationalist discourses a strategy of discrediting the positions

articulated by NGO's, historians, artists, and left-wing parties etc. The labelling strategy has intensified after November 2015 when a CDU-led right-wing coalition came to power. Ever since, the public discourse has been flooded by accusations of alleged plots against the Croatian national interest from something deemed to be a 'Yugoslavian' perspective. Since Yugoslavia as a state and subject position has ceased to exist 26 years ago, it would be interesting to examine how different articulations of the signifier 'Yugoslavia' continue to shape the present democratic context.

# Bibliography

# Academic Books and Articles

Adizes, Ichak. *Industrial Democracy: Yugoslav Style*. New York: Free Press, 1971.

Allcock, John B. *Explaining Yugoslavia*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Bellamy, Alex J. *The Formation of Croatian National Identity: A Centuries-old Dream?* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.

Bennett, Christopher. *Yugoslavia's Bloody Collapse: Causes, Course and Consequences*. Washington Square: New York University Press, 1995.

Benson, Leslie. *Yugoslavia: A Concise History*. 2nd. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Bertsch, Gary K. and Obradovic, Josip. "Participation and Influence in Yugoslav Self-Management". In: *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* 18.3 (1979), pp. 322–329.

Bieber, Florian, Galijaš, Armina, and Archer, Rory, eds. *Debating the End of Yugoslavia*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2014.

Bijelić, Biljana. "Women on the Edge of Gender Equality". In: *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet and Davorka Matić. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007, pp. 276–299.

Bilandžić, Dušan. *Hrvatska moderna povijest [The Modern History of Croatia]*. Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 1999.

Bowman, Glenn. "Constitutive Violence and the Nationalist Imaginary. Antagonism and Defensive Solidarity in 'Palestine' and 'former Yugoslavia'". In: *Social Anthropology* 11.3 (2003), pp. 319–340.

Bowman, Glenn. “Constitutive Violence and the Nationalist Imaginary. Antagonism and Defensive Solidarity in ‘Palestine’ and ‘former Yugoslavia’”. In: *Populism and the Mirror of Democracy*. Ed. by Francisco Panizza. London: Verso, 2005, pp. 118–143.

Broekmeyer, Marius J. “Self-Management in Yugoslavia”. In: *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 431.1 (1977), pp. 133–140.

Budding, Audrey Helfant. “Nation/People/Republic: Self-Determination in Socialist Yugoslavia”. In: *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia’s Disintegration*. Ed. by Leonard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragović-Soso. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2008, pp. 91–30.

Bunce, Valerie. *Subversive Institutions: the Design and the Destruction of Socialism and the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Burg, Steven L. “Political Structures”. In: *Yugoslavia: a Fractured Federalism*. Ed. by Dennison I. Rusinow. Washington: The Wilson Center Press, 1988, pp. 9–22.

Carter, April. *Democratic Reform in Yugoslavia: the Changing Role of the Party*. London: Frances Pinter, 1982.

Cohen, Lenard J. *Broken Bonds: Yugoslavia’s Disintegration and Balkan Politics in Transition*. 2nd. Boulder: Westview Press, 1995.

Cohen, Lenard J. and Dragović-Soso, Jasna, eds. *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia’s Disintegration*. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2008.

Comisso, Ellen T. “The Logic of Worker (Non) Participation in Yugoslav Self-management”. In: *Review of Radical Political Economics* 13.2 (1981), pp. 11–22.

Čular, Goran. “Political Development in Croatia 1990-2000: Fast Transition-Postponed Consolidation”. In: *Politička misao* 37.5 (2001), pp. 30–46.

Denitch, Bogdan. “Notes on the Relevance of Yugoslav Self-management”. In: *Politics and Society* 3.4 (1973), pp. 473–489.

Dimitrijević, Vojin. “Sukobi oko ustava 1974 [The Conflicts arround the 1974 Constitution]”. In: *Srpska strana rata: trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju [The Serb Side*

*of the War: Trauma and Catharsis in Historical Memory]*. Ed. by Nebojša Popov. Beograd: Republika, 1996, pp. 447–471.

Djokić, Dejan and Ker-Lindsay, James, eds. *New Perspectives on Yugoslavia: Key Issues and Controversies*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Doder, Milenko. *Jugoslavenska neprijateljska emigracija [Yugoslavia's Enemy Emigration]*. Zagreb: Centar za informacija i publicitet, 1989.

Dragović-Soso, Jasna. *Saviours of the Nation: Serbia's Intellectual Opposition and the Revival of Nationalism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2002.

— "Why did Yugoslavia Disintegrate? An Overview of Contending Explanations". In: *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia's disintegration*. Ed. by Leonard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragović-Soso. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2008, pp. 1–39.

Drulović, Milojko. *Self-Management on Trial*. Nottingham: Spokesman Books for the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, 1978.

Estrin, Saul. *Self-management: Economic Theory and Yugoslav Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

— "Yugoslavia: The Case of Self-Managing Market Socialism". In: *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5.4 (1991), pp. 187–194.

Finlayson, Alan. "Ideology, Discourse and Nationalism". In: *Journal of Political Ideologies* 3.1 (1998), pp. 99–118.

Fischer, Sharon. *Political Change in post-Communist Slovakia and Croatia: from Nationalist to Europeanist*. New York: : Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Flaherty, Diane. "Self-Management and the Future of Socialism: Lessons from Yugoslavia". In: *Science and Society* 56.1 (1992), pp. 92–108.

Freeden, Michael. *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Godina, Vesna. "The Outbreak of Nationalism on Former Yugoslav Territory: A Historical Perspective on the Problem of Supranational Identity". In: *Nations and Nationalism* 4.3 (1998), pp. 409–422.

Goldstein, Ivo. *Dvadeset godina samostalne Hrvatske [Twenty Years of Independent Croatia]*. Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2010.

— *Hrvatska 1918-2008 [Croatia 1918-2008]*. Zagreb: Europa Pressholding, 2008.

Gow, James. *Triumph of the Lack of Will: International Diplomacy and the Yugoslav War*. London: Hurst, 1997.

Hayden, Robert M. *Blueprints for a House Divided: the Constitutional Logic of the Yugoslav Conflicts*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Höpken, Wolfgang. "Party Monopoly and Political Change: The Lague of Communists since Tito's Death". In: *Yugoslavia in the 1980s*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet. Boulder: Westview Press, 1985, pp. 29–51.

Howarth, David. *Discourse*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2000.

Howarth, David and Stavrakakis, Yannis. "Introducing Discourse Theory and Political Analysis". In: *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: Identities, Hegemonies and Social Change*. Ed. by David Howarth, Aletta J. Norval, and Yannis Stavrakakis. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000, pp. 1–23.

Hudson, Kate. *Breaking the South Slav Dream: The Rise and Fall of Yugoslavia*. London: Pluto Press, 2003.

— *Breaking the South Slav Dream: the Rise and Fall of Yugoslavia*. London: Pluto Press, 2003.

Ingrao, Charles W. and Emmert, Thomas A., eds. *Confronting the Yugoslav Controversies: A Scholars' Initiative*. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2012.

Jović, Dejan. "The Constitutional Debate 1967-1974: Why did Serbia Accept the Kardelj Concept and the 1974 Constitution?" In: *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2009. Chap. 5, pp. 95–140.

— *Yugoslavia: a State that Withered Away*. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2009.

Kardelj, Edvard. *Pravci razvoja političkog sistema socijalističkog samoupravljanja [Self-management and the Political System]*. 3rd ed. Beograd: Komunist, 1980.

— *The Nation and Socialism*. Belgrade: Socialist Tought and Practice, 1981.

Kasapović, Mirjana. “Electoral Politics in Croatia 1990-2000”. In: *Politička misao* 37.5 (2000), pp. 3–20.

Knežević, Đurđa. “Affective Nationalism”. In: *Transitions, Enviorments, Translations: Feminisms in International Politics*. Ed. by Joan W. Scott, Cora Kaplan, and Debra Keates. New York: Routledge, 1997, pp. 65–71.

Kolaja, Jiri Thomas. *Workers' Councils: the Yugoslav Experience*. London: Tavistock Publications, 1965.

Kursar, Tonči. “Prijeporni pluralizam 1971 [Disputable pluralism 1971]”. In: *Politikča misao* 43.4 (2007), pp. 143–55.

Laclau, Ernesto. *Emancipations(s)*. London: Verso, 1996.

— *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time*. London: Verso, 1990.

— *The Making of Political Identities*. London: Verso, 1994.

Laclau, Ernesto and Mouffe, Chantal. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso, 2001.

Lampe, John R. *Yugoslavia as History: Twice there was a Country*. Cambrdige: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Lendvai, Paul. “Yugoslavia without Yugoslavs: The Roots of the Crisis”. In: *International Affairs* 67.2 (1991), pp. 251–261.

Lydall, Harold. *Yugoslavia in Crisis*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Lynn, Monty L., Mulej, Matjaz, and Jurse, Karin. “Democracy without Empowerment: the Grand Vision and Demise of Yugoslav Self-management”. In: *Management Decision* 40.8 (2002), pp. 797–806.

Magaš, Branka. *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*. London: Verso, 1993.

Martin, Chris and Tyson, Laura D'Andrea. “Can Titoism Survive Tito? Economic Problems and Policy Choices Confronting Tito's Successors”. In: *Yugoslavia in the 1980s*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet. Boulder: Westview Press, 1985, pp. 184–200.

Massey, Garth, Hodson, Randy, and Sekulić, Duško. “Nationalism, Liberalism and Liberal Nationalism in Post-war Croatia”. In: *Nations and Nationalism* 9.1 (2003), pp. 55–82.

Matić, Davorka. “Is Nationalism Really that Bad? The Case of Croatia”. In: *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet and Davorka Matić. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007, pp. 326–353.

Meister, Albert. “Où va l’Autogestion Yougoslave? [Where is Yugoslavian Self-management going?]” In: *L Homme et la Société* 17.1 (1970), pp. 91–96.

— *Socialisme et Autogestion; l’Expérience Yougoslave [Socialism and Self-management: the Yugoslavian experience]*. Éditions du Seuil, 1964.

Mencinger, Jože. “From a Capitalist to a Capitalist Economy?” In: *Yugoslavia in Turmoil: after Self-managemenet?* Ed. by James Simmie and Jože Dekleva. London: Piner Publishers, 1991, pp. 71–86.

Mertus, Julie. *Kosovo: How Myths and Truths Started a War*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Miller, Nick. “Return Engagement: Intellectuals and Nationalism in Tito’s Yugoslavia”. In: *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia’s disintegration*. Ed. by Leonard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragović-Soso. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2008, pp. 179–200.

Milosavljević, Olivera. “Zloupotreba autoriteta nauke [The abuse of the authority of science]”. In: *Srpska strana rata: trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju Srpska strana rata: trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju [The Serb Side of the War: Trauma and Catharsis in Historical Memory]*. Ed. by Nebojša Popov. Beograd: Republika, 1996, pp. 305–338.

Mostov, Julie. “Sexing the Nation/Desexing the Body: Politics of National Identity in the Former Yugoslavia”. In: *Gender Ironies of Nationalism: Sexing the Nation*. Ed. by Tamar Mayer. London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 89–110.

Norval, Aletta J. *Deconstructing Apartheid Discourse*. London: Verso, 1996.

— “Frontiers in Question”. In: *Filozofski Vesnik* 18.2 (1997), pp. 51–75.

— “Pictures of Democratic Engagement: Claim-making, Citizenization and the Ethos of Democracy”. In: (Forthcoming).

Norval, Aletta J. “Review Article: The Things We Do with Words-Contemporary Approaches to the Analysis of Ideology”. In: *British Journal of Political Science* 30.2 (2000), pp. 313–346.

— “Theorising Hegemony: between Deconstruction and Psychoanalysis”. In: *Radical Democracy: Politics Between Abundance and Lack*. Ed. by Lars Tønder and Lasse Thomassen. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005, pp. 86–102.

— “Trajectories of Future Research in Discurse Theory”. In: *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: Identities, Hegemonies and Social Change*. Ed. by David Howarth, Aletta J. Norval, and Yannis Stavrakakis. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000, pp. 119–236.

Offe, Claus and Adler, Pierre. “Capitalism by Democratic Design? Democratic Theory Facing the Triple Transition in East Central Europe”. In: *Social Research* 58.4 (1991), pp. 865–892.

Özkırımlı, Umut. *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.

Palairet, Michael. “The Inter-Regional Struggle for Resources and the Fall of Yugoslavia”. In: *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia’s Disintegration*. Ed. by Leonard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragović-Soso. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2008, pp. 221–248.

Pauković, Davor. “Politička tranzicija u Hrvatskoj 1989-1991”. PhD thesis. University of Zagreb, 2010.

— “Posljednji kongres Saveza komunista Jugoslavije: uzroci, tijek i posljedice raspada”. In: *Suvremene teme* 1.1 (2008), pp. 21–33.

Pavković, Aleksandar. *The Fragmentation of Yugoslavia: Nationalism in a Multinational State*. London: Macmillan, 1997.

Perić, Ivan. *Ideje "masovnog pokreta" u Hrvatskoj*. Zagreb: Centar za aktualni politicki studij, 1974.

Perica, Vjekoslav. *Balkan Idols: Religion and Nationalism in Yugoslav States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Pešić, Vesna. “Serbian Nationalism and the Origins of the Yugoslav crisis”. In: *Peaceworks* 8 (1996).

Pleština, Dijana. *Regional Development in Communist Yugoslavia: Success, Failure, and Consequences*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1992.

Ponoš, Tihomir. *Na rubu revolucije: studenti ’71 [On the Verge of a Revolution: the Students ’71]*. Zagreb: Profil, 2007.

Pusić, Vesna. “Korijeni hrvatskog političkog identiteta [The roots of Croatan political identity]”. In: *Erasmus-Časopis za kulturu demokracije* 15 (1996), pp. 3–8.

Radić, Radmila. “Crkva i "srpsko pitanje" [The church and the serbian question]”. In: *Srpska strana rata: trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju Srpska strana rata: trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju [The Serb Side of the War: Trauma and Catharsis in Historical Memory]*. Ed. by Nebojša Popov. Beograd: Republika, 1996, pp. 267–304.

Ragazzi, Francesco. “The Croatian “Diaspora Politics” of the 1990s: Nationalism Unbound?” In: *Transnational Societies, Transterritorial Politics: Migrations in the (Post-)Yugoslavian region 19th–20th Century*. Ed. by Ulf Brunnbauer. Munich: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2009, pp. 143–166.

Ramet, Sabrina P. “Apocalypse Culture and Social Change in Yugoslavia”. In: *Yugoslavia in the 1980s*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet. Boulder: Westview Press, 1985, pp. 3–26.

— *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962-1991*. 2nd. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1992.

— *Thinking about Yugoslavia: Scholarly Debates about the Yugoslav Breakup and the Wars in Bosnia and Kosovo*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

— “What’s Love (of Country) got to do with it? Civic Values in Democratic Transition”. In: *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet and Davorka Matić. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007, pp. 1–27.

Ramet, Sabrina P. and Matić, Davorka, eds. *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007.

Rusinow, Dennison I. “Facilis Decensus Averno [September 1972]”. In: *Yugoslavia: Oblique Insights and Observations*. Ed. by Gale Stokes. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2008, pp. 137–162.

— “Introduction”. In: *Yugoslavia: a Fractured Federalism*. Ed. by Dennison I. Rusinow. Washington: The Wilson Center Press, 1988, pp. 1–8.

— “Nationalities Policy and the "National Question"”. In: *Yugoslavia in the 1980s*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet. Boulder: Westview Press, 1985, pp. 131–165.

— “Post-Mortems of the crisis in Croatia [June 1972]”. In: *Yugoslavia: Oblique Insights and Observations*. Ed. by Gale Stokes. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2008, pp. 105–136.

— “The Road to Karadjordjevo [September 1972]”. In: *Yugoslavia: Oblique Insights and Observations*. Ed. by Gale Stokes. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2008, pp. 163–198.

— *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Salecl, Renata. “The Crisis of Identity and the Struggle for New Hegemony in the Former Yugoslavia”. In: *The Making of Political Identities*. Ed. by Ernesto Laclau. London: Verso, 1994, pp. 205–232.

Schöpflin, George. “Political Decay in One-Party Systems in Eastern Europe: Yugoslav Patterns”. In: *Yugoslavia in the 1980s*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet. Boulder: Westview Press, 1985, pp. 307–321.

Sekulić, Duško. “Civic and Ethnic Identity: the Case of Croatia”. In: *Politička misao* 40.2 (2004), pp. 140–166.

Sell, Louis. *Slobodan Milošević and the Destruction of Yugoslavia*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

Simmie, James and Dekleva, Jože, eds. *Yugoslavia in Turmoil: after Self-management?* London: Piner Publishers, 1991.

Sitton, James F. “On the Political Limitations of Self-Management Socialism”. In: *Social Theory and Practice* 12.2 (1986), pp. 201–221.

Slapšak, Svetlana. “Nationalist and Women’s Discourse in Post-Yugoslavia”. In: *Transitions, Enviorments, Translations: Feminisms in International Politics*. Ed. by Joan W. Scott, Cora Kaplan, and Debra Keates. New York: Routledge, 1997, pp. 72–78.

Søberg, Marius. “Croatia Since 1989: The HDZ and the Politics of Transition”. In: *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media*. Ed. by Sabrina P. Ramet and Davorka Matić. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007, pp. 31–62.

Sokol, Smiljko. “Ostvarivanje ustavnog koncepta društveno-političkih zajednica u svjetlu ‘Kritičke analize’ [Realizing the constitutional concept of the socio-political community in the light of the ‘Critical Analysis’]”. In: *Politička misao* 23.2 (1986), pp. 55–58.

Staničić, Nikša. *Hrvatska nacija i nacionalizam u 19. i 20. stoljeću [The Croatian Nation and Natonalism in the 19th and 20th Century]*. Zagreb: Barbat, 2002.

Staten, Henry. *Wittgenstein and Derrida*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.

Stokes, Gale. *Three Eras of Political Change in Eastern Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Šušak, Ivica. “Hrvatsko proljeće-početci političkog interesnog pluralizma [The Croatian Spring-the inception of political pluralism]”. In: *Hrvatska i Komparativna javna Uprava* 8.3 (2008), pp. 767–783.

Thomassen, Lasse. “In/Exclusions: Towards a Radical Democratic Approach to Exclusions”. In: *Radical Democracy: Politics Between Abundance and Lack*. Ed. by Lars Tønder and Lasse Thomassen. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005, pp. 103–119.

Tully, James. *Public Philosophy in a New Key*. Vol. Volume I: Democracy and Civic Freedom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Tuđman, Franjo. *Nationalism in Contemporary Europe*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.

Vesterdal, Knut. “Conclusion: Building Liberal Democracy in Croatia”. In: *Democratic Transition in Croatia: Value Transformation, Education, and Media*. Ed. by Sabrina

P. Ramet and Davorka Matić. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007, pp. 354–378.

Vladisavljević, Nebojša. *Serbia's Antibureaucratic Revolution: Milošević, the Fall of Communism and Nationalist Mobilization*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Vujević, Miroslav. "Nacionalna identifikacija u Hrvatskoj". In: *Društvena istraživanja-časopis za opća društvena pitanja* 16.3 (2007), pp. 379–404.

Wachtel, Andrew. *Making a Nation, Breaking a Nation: Literature and Cultural Politics in Yugoslavia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Wachtel, Andrew and Bennett, Christopher. "The Dissolution of Yugoslavia". In: *Confronting the Yugoslav Controversies: A Scholars' Initiative*. Ed. by Charles W. Ingrao and Thomas A. Emmert. West Laffayet: Purdue University Press, 2012, pp. 13–47.

Whitehorn, Alan. "Alienation and Workers' Self-Management". In: *Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 16.2 (1974), pp. 160–186.

— "Yugoslav Workers' Self-Management: A Blueprint for Industrial Democracy?" In: *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 20.3 (1978), pp. 421–428.

Woodward, Susan L. *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution After the Cold War*. Washington: Brookings, 1995.

— *Socialist Unemployment: the Political Economy of Yugoslavia, 1945-1990*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Žagar, Mitija. "The collapse of the Yugoslav federation and the viability of asymetrical federalism". In: *The Changing Faces of Federalism: Institutional Reconfiguration in Europe from East to West*. Ed. by Sergio Ortino, Mitija Žagar, and Vojtech Mastny. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005, pp. 107–133.

Zakošek, Nenad and Čular, Goran. "Croatia". In: *The Handbook of Political Change in Eastern Europe*. Ed. by Sten Berglund, Joakim Ekman, and Frank J. Aarebrot. 2nd. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2004, pp. 451–492.

Zubak, Marko. "The Croatian Spring: Interpreting the Communist Heritage in Post-communist Croatia". In: *East Central Europe* 32.1-2 (2005), pp. 191–225.

Zukin, Sharon. “The Representation of Working-Class Interests in Socialist Society: Yugoslav Labor Unions”. In: *Politics & Society* 10.3 (1981), pp. 281–316.

Županov, Josip. “Self-Managing Socialism: the End of a Utopia”. In: *Politička misao* 26.4 (1989), pp. 21–36.

# Official and Party Sources

"Zaključci X sjednice CK SKH [The conclusions from the X Assembly of the CC LCC]". In: *Deseta sjenica Centralnog komiteta Saveza komunista Hrvatske [The Tenth Assembly of the CC LCC]*. Ed. by Milovan Baletić and Zdravko Židović. Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1970, p. 104.

Dabčević-Kučan, Savka. "Bratstvo i jedinstvi na elementima onoga što nas spaja u samouprvnom socijalizmu". In: *Deseta sjenica Centralnog komiteta Saveza komunista Hrvatske [Zagreb 15,16 i 17. siječnja 1970]*. Ed. by Milovan Baletić and Zdravko Židović. Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1970, pp. 5–20.

Despot, Zvonimir, ed. *Bijela knjiga Stipe Šuvara: originalni dokument Centra CK SKH za informiranje i propagandu [Stipe Šuvar's White Book: the Original Documents of CC LCC's Propaganda and Information Centre]*. Zagreb: Večernji edicija, 2010.

Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica. "Prednacrt programske osnove [A Preliminary Draft of the Party Program]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, pp. 59–62.

— "Proglas građanima i Saboru SRH i cijelome hrvatskom [A Declaration to SRC's Citizens, its Assembly and to all Croatian people]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, pp. 70–71.

— "Programska deklaracija osnivačke skupštine HDZ-a [The Declaration of the CDU's Constitutive Assembly]". In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990.

Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica. “Programske zasade i ciljevi [The Program’s Foundations and Objectives]”. In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, pp. 73–77.

Jurica, Neven. “Ciklus tribina: izbori u Hrvatskoj-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990 [The Cycle of Discussions: Elections in Croatia-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990]”. In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, pp. 83–85.

*Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije [The Programe of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia]*. Beograd: Kultura, 1958.

Račan, Ivica. “Veliki javni razgovor [A big public talk]”. In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj [Parties in Croatia]*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, pp. 297–300.

Rašković, Jovan. “Ciklus tribina: izbori u Hrvatskoj-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990 [The Cycle of Discussions: Elections in Croatia-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990]”. In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj [Parties in Croatia]*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, pp. 339–340.

Savez Komunista Hrvatske; Centralni Komitet. *Hrvatsko proljeće: presuda Partije [The Croatian Spring: the Verdict of the Party]*. Zagreb: Dom i svijet, 2003.

Savez Komunista Hrvatske-Stranka Demokratskih Promijena. “Izborni program [The Electoral Program]”. In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, pp. 273–294.

Šeks, Vladimir. “Ciklus tribina: Izbori u Hrvatskoj-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990 [The Cycle of Discussions: Elections in Croatia-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990]”. In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj [Parties in Croatia]*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, pp. 83–86.

Šiber, Ivan. “Ciklus tribina: izbori u Hrvatskoj-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990 [The Cycle of Discussions: Elections in Croatia-KIC, Zagreb, 27.2.1990]”. In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj [Parties in Croatia]*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, pp. 294–297.

Srpska Demokratska Stranka. “Osnovna načela [Basic Principles]”. In: *Stranke u Hrvatskoj [Parties in Croatia]*. Ed. by Dragan Đurić, Bojan Munjin, and Srđan Španović. Zagreb: Niro Radničke Novine, 1990, pp. 335–338.

*The Constitution of the Republic of Croatia*. Zagreb: Novi informator, 2010.

*The Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*. Beograd: Secretariat for Information of the Federal Executive Council, 1963.

*The Constitution the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*. Ljubljana: Dopisna Delavska Univerza, 1974.

The Federal Commission on Economic Stabilization Problems. *The Concluding Party of the Long-Term Programme of Economic Stabilization*. Belgrade: Jugoslavenski Pregled, 1983.

The League of Communists of Yugoslavia. *Tweelfth Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia*. Belgrade: Socialist Thought and Practice, 1983.

Tito, Josip Broz. “Closing statement at the 21st LCY Presidency Session”. In: *The National Question*. Beograd: Socialist Thought and Practice, 1983, pp. 161–177.

— “Korijeni, uzroci i klasna suština nacionalizma [The roots, cases, and class essence of nationalism]”. In: *Nacionalno pitanje u djelima klasika marksizma u dokumentima i praksi KPJ-SKJ [The National Question in Marxists Classi and in LCY’s Theory and Practice]*. Ed. by Leopold Kobsa, Ines Šaškor, and Vjekoslav Koprivnjak. Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1978, pp. 524–528.

— “Report to the Eight LCY Congress held in Belgrade from December 7 to 13, 1964”. In: *The National Question*. Beograd: Socialist Thought and Practice, 1983, pp. 110–122.

— “Yugoslav Sovereignty-the Sovereignty of all Republics”. In: *The National Question*. Beograd: Socialist Thought and Practice, 1983, pp. 163–177.

Todorivić, Mijalko. “Report on the Final Draft of the S.F.R.Y. Constitution by Mijalko Todorović”. In: *The Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*. Ljubljana: Dopisna Delavska Univerza, 1974, pp. 11–52.

Tripalo, Mirko. *Hrvatsko Proljeće [The Croatian Spring]*. Zagreb: Globus, 1990.

Tripalo, Mirko. “Klasni princip i nacionalno pitanje [The class principle and the national question]”. In: *S Poprišta [From the Struggle]*. Zagreb: Centar za aktualni politički studij, 1971, pp. 176–191.

— “Novi osnovi i problemi našeg razvitka [The New Bases and Problams of our Development]”. In: *S Poprišta [From the Struggle]*. Zagreb: Centar za aktualni politički studij, 1971, pp. 100–119.

— “Osnovi novog jedinstva [The basis for a new form of unity]”. In: *S Poprišta [From the Struggle]*. Zagreb: Centar za aktualni politički studij, 1971, pp. 243–255.

— “Samoupravljanje i avangarda [Self-managemen and the vanguard party]”. In: *S Poprišta [From the Struggle]*. Zagreb: Centar za aktualni politički studij, 1971, pp. 142–166.

— “Suvremeni razvitak našeg društva i reforma SK [The contemporary development of our society and the LC’s Reform]”. In: *S Poprišta [From the Struggle]*. Zagreb: Centar za aktualni politički studij, 1971, pp. 120–141.

*Ustav Republike Hrvatske [The Constitution of the Republic of Croatia]*. Narodne Novine, 56/1990. [Electronic record]. URL: `http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/1990_12_56_1092.html` (visited on 05/12/2016).

*Ustav Socijalističke Republike Hrvatske [The Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Croatia]*. Nardodne Novine, 08/1974. [Electronic record]. URL: `https://www.pravo.unizg.hr/_download/repository/Ustav_Socijalisticke_RH_1974.pdf` (visited on 05/12/2016).

Vrhovec, Josip. “Uvodno izlaganje [Introduction]”. In: *Kritička analiza funkcionisanja političkog sistema socijalističkog samoupravljanja [A Critical Analysis of the Functioning of the Political System of Socialist Self-management]*. 24. Sednica CKSKJ. Beograd: Izdavački centar Komunist, 1986, pp. 21–49.

# RFE/RL Research Institute Archive

*A Separate Kosovo Republic in Yugoslavia, 16 June 1981*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11875; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:4b831271-e2cd-4664-95e4-74590f8f6288 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Crisis and Dissent in Yugoslavia, 23 October 1984*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12218; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:115a5462-bcca-4ad8-a780-437c91a6eea3 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Debate Continues on Reforming the System in Yugoslavia, 1 June 1983*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12043; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:b186ee66-dd0a-4585-b893-5c7ccc7719f0 (visited on 02/06/2016).

*Desecration of Serbian Graves in Kosovo, 21 May 1981*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11885; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:53f675ee-28ff-4113-bb8c-4af6ba639d2a (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Differences over Yugoslavia's Five-Year Social Plan, 24 November 1980*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11770; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Insti-

tute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:d5ae1ffc-654d-4fd4-92b2-4d903ce1bb54 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Discussion of Internal Situation in Yugoslavia Continues, 5 February 1981*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11836; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:631f973a-feca-4d69-ad7b-26f9adb18ac9 (visited on 02/20/2016).

*Discussions in Yugoslavia of Changes in the Political System, 6 December 1982*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11980; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:80026a32-1180-4c6f-bf4e-513a392c68a0 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Exodus of Serbs from Kosovo, 18 May 1981*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11890; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:100212b5-23c9-4013-8c35-ff8a5c7438f3 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*First Radical Changes Inaugurated in Yugoslavia's Economy, 13 July 1983*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12160; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:9d206522-287b-4e66-bec9-b9b3e837a757 (visited on 02/15/2016).

*Ideological Struggle Intensifying, 1 March 1983*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12080; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:0aaf30cc-b7ff-4a9d-ac6d-ace7a4c2ffbe (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Kardelj's Death and the Consequences, 14 February 1979*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11517; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:59a9265e-4af5-4e28-97f7-92f8c158ebca (visited on 02/20/2016).

*Kosovo: One Year after the Riots, 17 March 1982*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-298; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:53f675ee-28ff-4113-bb8c-4af6ba639d2a (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Oil Supply Problems in Yugoslavia, 15 March 1982*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11953; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:0b3cc454-5941-44b5-955d-950a92ff6cba (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Precongress Struggle in Yugoslavia over Party Statutes, 27 January 1982*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11970; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:e460e9b9-a655-47da-ac50-6ce4317f05c4 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Rise of Tension in Kosovo Due to Migration, 28 June 1983*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12166; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:97db0e37-5591-41ba-ab43-77a65e5c4b42 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 1 March 1985*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-215-3; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University,

Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:2614d69b-554f-4925-a63b-a5823124a7f7 (visited on 02/27/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 10 December 1985*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-215-10; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:54b0debe-2689-4acd-9351-6eb896d98764 (visited on 02/21/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 11 November 1988*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-218-10; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:528468b7-1a60-4dbe-b424-36ad9dc6b91f (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 11 October 1988*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-218-9; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:dfa06996-70df-4ef3-b6b2-0f2c551d0786 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 12 August 1985*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-215-8; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:b4a00b2c-d15f-4039-b4c3-8f82c7ab13d2 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 15 December 1986*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-216-12; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:77148eca-41a6-45c8-92bc-76ebc7c9f984 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 16 September 1987*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-217-8; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications

Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:c1f118ed-9a22-46ef-971c-de7cf59f9c98 (visited on 02/15/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 17 August 1989*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-219-10; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:73380124-a7e8-42ef-9368-7ba40ecad85c (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 17 January 1989*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-219-1; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:58ca551e-0fa2-4cc9-a77d-834bb1f43781 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 17 July 1986*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-216-7; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:3c05ac96-dfc7-4091-bb7a-84c90f0d4b7b (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 18 December 1987*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-217-12; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:880d5db0-59e4-489a-8125-d8d97af54b0f (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 20 December 1984*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-214-2; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:88282ad7-ace8-4fed-a266-6ae1954e5fc5 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 20 November 1986*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-216-11; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:78f759fc-a4ae-45a4-9f33-532de5d78006 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 22 October 1987*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-217-10; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:6102a925-344b-4015-933b-0d355f239c91 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 23 September 1988*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-218-8; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:9acfd12b-8aa2-4f1c-addc-0751c67811de (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 26 May 1989*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-219-7; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:f6e36c90-37bd-4365-ad57-3ce8294862c5 (visited on 02/15/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 26 May 1989*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-219-7; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:f6e36c90-37bd-4365-ad57-3ce8294862c5 (visited on 04/14/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 27 June 1989*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-219-8; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University,

Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:81d42585-44c6-4403-a023-104bf46ff232 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 27 March 1986*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-216-4; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:786a52b0-4ad4-48f4-bc11-7e99562e9ff5 (visited on 02/06/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 30 November 1984*. [Electronic record].HU OSA 300-8-47-214-1; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:418ca94d-3420-4bba-8bba-ac38e0bf1ed1 (visited on 02/27/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 4 May 1987*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-217-3; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:b78fccf4-fad4-46a4-b290-b00c7181fe8a (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Situation Report: Yugoslavia, 8 March 1989*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-47-219-4; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Situation Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:768e38c7-8b39-4eee-98e0-e8b566461d4d (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Solutions Sought to the Kosovar Problem, 19 April 1984*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12172; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:1db78e36-39a3-490b-b6a1-26044ad449dd (visited on 02/16/2016).

*The Aftermath of the Slovenian Party Congress, 28 April 1982*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11935; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute:

Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:33067039-ced5-40ec-8113-aab2032c907d (visited on 02/16/2016).

*The Aftermath of the Yugoslav Central Committee Plenum, 28 June 1984*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12241; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:e6fc40b6-1f8c-4711-9ed9-ee972674045c (visited on 02/16/2016).

*The Aftermath of the Yugoslav Party Congress, 20 July 1982*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12017; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:d38e8012-488e-49d9-a6f3-7c400cb9bca7 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*The Fourth Anniversary of Tito's Death, 17 May 1984*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12254; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:690f2697-a163-4f29-abb9-df47aae027e3 (visited on 02/21/2016).

*The Kosovo Events in Perspective, 28 April 1981*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11799; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:5fe7713f-b32a-434e-aa38-c6d4288fe60f (visited on 02/16/2016).

*The Kosovo Unrest - The Causes and the Consequenes, 7 April 1981*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11798; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:29b463a2-6d2c-40cc-9341-6be4b2f02d35 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*The Problems of Contemporary Yugoslavia, 1971.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-10625; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:0f6ef817-95f3-4941-a744-879109cdb81d (visited on 02/06/2016).

*The Serbian Question - One of Yugoslavia's Major Internal Problems, 26 January 1982.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11972; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:7c8184f0-63c8-4dfc-8c42-f0dfc2af11d7 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*The Tito Era in Yugoslavia, 5 May 1980.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11669; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:2b11a530-9551-48e8-a307-b4d2b8d05b3c (visited on 02/20/2016).

*The Yugoslav Central Committee's 11th Plenum, 16 June 1980.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11746; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:f36af2f8-b9c9-4a36-9978-0cc9d6595e1e (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Three More Regional Party Congresses, 24 May 1982.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12026; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:c0036ce5-7bb9-4644-9ce5-163fa1dfff34 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Two Groups in Yugoslav Party Fighting over "Ideological Purity", 13 February 1981.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11832; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society

Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:bf3eb554-ce05-4703-9cdb-926cd201585f (visited on 02/20/2016).

*Vojvodina: A "Paradise" for National Minorities?, 30 December 1983*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12101; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:60f3f633-50ab-4ca6-ad40-9ea58a36e2d7 (visited on 03/29/2016).

*What's Wrong with Yugoslavia's Economic System, 10 November 1982*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11983; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:45e19006-d297-42d5-a562-35a17f3b7146 (visited on 02/12/2016).

*Who Actually Rules in Post-Tito Yugoslavia, 18 May 1983*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12049; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:c77c5074-19fa-48fe-a22b-219eca0057db (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Why Are so Many Serbs Leaving Kosovo?, 16 November 1982*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-15197; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:a46d2d71-fffc-4adc-9c39-fb3a369138b0 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Yugoslav CC Plenum Deals with Economic Crisis, 10 December 1980*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11761; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:3273af84-edef-4bcb-a819-ef8c2cc218dd (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Yugoslav Central Committee Demands Discipline, 3 September 1985*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12262; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Insti-

tute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:53191264-2359-471e-a160-d6b99324c536 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Yugoslav Dissidents Accused of Demeaning Tito's Memory, 22 June 1984*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12246; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:1ff4e326-1182-4d1c-acce-f70bdf5ff6c4 (visited on 02/21/2016).

*Yugoslav Government Concerned about Internal Security, 15 November 1983*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12114; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:3ff07804-dd7c-4c53-9f1f-7f31239ae6a1 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Yugoslav Government Introduces Drastic Austerity Program, 20 October 1982*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11989; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:9e3d988b-14d7-45ee-9376-c172f0813879 (visited on 02/15/2016).

*Yugoslav Leaders Disagree about Reforming the System, 22 April 1983*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12059; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:0d5ef8c2-cd14-48c5-a41d-5f02c02520dd (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Yugoslavia Devalues the Dinar, 13 June 1980*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11749; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:df27763d-65b1-4bcb-b829-87da16547aaa (visited on 02/15/2016).

*Yugoslavia's Economic Difficulties, 14 August 1980.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11717; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:daba2835-6d84-4a64-8e4a-42d55fdba6a3 (visited on 02/15/2016).

*Yugoslavia's Economic Situation Discussed, 7 July 1980.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11737; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:da44302f-190a-4941-831a-6361e80d7eee (visited on 02/12/2016).

*Yugoslavia's Finance Minister Resigns, 29 December 1983.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12104; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:cf4d40f1-1294-4f02-80a5-559304d774ea (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Yugoslavia's Five-Year Plan Suggests Sociopolitical Continuity, 19 December 1980.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11757; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:e8a67072-3236-43a6-931f-4480f98087e7 (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Yugoslavia's Last Two Regional Party Congresses, 16 June 1982.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12020; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:d7231b3f-8892-4371-acaf-aae9c08c638c (visited on 02/16/2016).

*Yugoslavia's Parliamentary Style, 14 December 1981.* [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-11900; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European Uni-

versity, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:8328edcf-0591-4183-8f88-2792bdf68b2c (visited on 02/15/2016).

*Yugoslavia's "Serbian Question", 22 July 1988*. [Electronic record]. HU OSA 300-8-3-12271; Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute: Publications Department: Background Reports; Open Society Archives at Central European University, Budapest. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/10891/osa:3963aa13-db55-44bf-bc19-7cf6a139bedd (visited on 02/16/2016).

# Declarations and Newspaper Articles

Babić, Jasna. "Ustavne brane: Ustav SFRJ ne zabranjuje saveze, nego političke stranke [Constitutional obstacles: SFRY's constitution doesn't prohibit alliances, but political parties]". In: *Danas* (7 March 1989), p. 23.

Bukovčan, Miljenko. "Episode 7: MASPOK". In: *Hrvatsko Proljeće*. (Documentary). Hrvatska Radio Televizija, 2010.

"Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika [The declaration regarding the name and position of the Croatian language]". In: *Telegram* (17 March 1967), p. 31.

Jajčinović, Milan. "Ulazak u višepartijski sistem: što znači osnivanje odbora, saveza i udruženja koja se deklariraju kao demokratska [Introducing mutlipartism: the meaning of committes, leagues and associations that idenfity as democratic]". In: *Danas* (24 January 1989), pp. 18–19.

"Petition by Belgrade Intellectuals". In: *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracking the Break-up [1980-92]*. London: Verso, 1993, pp. 49–52.

The Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences. *The Memorandum (a draft)*. Autumn 1986. [Electronic Record]. URL: `http://pescanik.net/wp-content/PDF/memorandum_sanu.pdf` (visited on 04/02/2016).