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INTRODUCTION

UNWANTED LEGACY

Yugoslavia as a state lasted less than a hundred years. From the historical perspective (Bakić, 2011) comparing that lifetime even with short-lived countries, Yugoslavia did not last long. Even if we are considering both unities, so called First Yugoslavia (Kingdom of Yugoslavia), and The Second one (Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia), Yugoslavia would not reach a century. However, the impact that the unity of Yugoslavia imprinted in the countries on the Balkan peninsula and its neighbors, had its roots and beginnings before state (with Yugoslav idea and common cultural space), and lasted longer than a state – also through the Yugoslav idea and common cultural space, and even more – in favor to phenomenon idea was based on – common cultural space.

Further on, during the existence of the Yugoslav state, and in the post-Yugoslav period, a common cultural (and art) space was shaped by the similar language, culture, connection, mentality, territory, economic relations, (foreign) influences and art production (Denegri, 2011).

After the dissolution of Yugoslavia in bloody war conflicts that happened mainly in the territory of Bosnia and Hercegovina and Croatia, but also had wide and wild influence on all former Yugoslav countries and all of Europe, an immense economic and cultural crisis hit the entire Balkan region. Former Yugoslav countries became not just peripheral from the perspective of Europe and rest of the world, they could not reach not a similar impact that Yugoslavia had on the all of three worlds (Soviet Union, United States and countries of Non-Alignment Movement) (Kulić, 2014). The cruelty of Bosnia war, genocide, crimes, victims, and refugees, caused a cultural collective trauma in all former Yugoslav countries (Alexander, 2004).

Also, embargoes, economic crisis, severe inflation, protests against regime of Slobodan Milošević in Serbia, all caused of three traumatic responses as a phenomenon on a collective or individual level: fighting, escaping and avoiding (moving), freezing or collapse, that would occur.
in institutions likewise in any other structure. Cultural trauma brought confusion, disorientation, anxiety, and a crisis of identity, in society and fragmentations of narratives in all (cultural) institutions (Hirchberger, 2018). The crisis of identity is considered predominantly supranational, the Yugoslav identity that becomes an unbearable burden, and ‘sentenced to death’, after dissolution of a state. At the end, the youngest construction, Yugoslav identity of Socialist Yugoslavia, was first to fragmentize. Built last, in cruelty of the Second World War, it was broken first.

During the First Yugoslavia (Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes 1918–1929, Kingdom of Yugoslavia 1929–1941), with the attempt of imposing the unitarist model of culture South Slavic common cultural space appears as a matter of construction and institutionalization intertwined with the building of Yugoslav nation. Art and culture are implied to be important for spreading the Yugoslav idea and creating the Yugoslav identity since the very beginning of South Slavic Unity idea (Makuljević, 2017a).

Also, during socialist Yugoslavia, in the process of building an identity of Yugoslavs, on pillars different than in the Kingdom, modern and progressive, institutions still had a prevalent role. Yugoslav nationality should become supra-nationality respecting and encountering diversities. Part of that investment was also part of the investment in strengthening the state that was always in fluctuation, like the on-going revolution it emerged from (Kulić, 2014). The New Belgrade (Belgrade on the left side of rivers) as a ‘new’ center for Yugoslav institutions, still witnesses the importance of institutions for identity creation and the readiness of CPY (Communist Party of Yugoslavia) to create them.

My assumption was that the disintegration of the Yugoslav identity could also be obvious on example of institutions, not just during the dissolution of Yugoslavia, which was evident, but also as its aftermath in post-Yugoslav period and when the word is about the Yugoslav legacy. The fragmentation that occurred on every level of the socio-political life meant also breaking apart of main cultural institutions like Museum of Contemporary Art, Museum of Yugoslavia, Students Cultural Centre, and went until so severe consequences – from barely functioning with minor or without projects, towards closing down. The main excuse for institutions closing were completely devastated buildings – an external structure that reflected internal one.

After the dark period of the ‘90s, and with the fall of Slobodan Milošević’s regime (2000), Serbia dived into progressive democratic changes and unblocked t transition process, which would become a huge source of disappointment in Serbian society, due to unclarity of privatization process, maltreatment of social and cultural needs, and lasting economic crisis with no
comprehensible official strategy nor cultural policy and all accompanied with effects of cultural trauma (Bolčić, 2013). During all the changes and fluctuations, Yugoslavia (idea and a state) figured as a main culprit for a crisis and a large mistake in the newest history (Kuljić, 2006a; Bakić, 2011). The official narrative (omnipresent discourse) starting with the late ‘80s (until present 2020) was anti-Yugoslav, anti-socialistic, and anti-communistic. The historical revisionism has been a dynamic of changes, since the ‘90s, and main support for creation of a new identity, causing Yugoslavia and its legacy to be marginalized, suppressed, even erased, in the official and public discourse, in all former Yugoslav states (Markovina, 2018).

Individual memory and private space of citizens in Serbia were still crowded by the memories of previous period, objects, contacts, family connections, as it would continue for the second and third generation, due to transgenerational transmission, but translating into cultural memory became doubtful (Assman, 2011). For that kind of translation, and revitalization of the part of the culture, space for speech, discussion, search for meaning (Baumeister, 1991) should be essential, initiated and placed in institutions of culture.

In my research I was trying to investigate if and how Yugoslavia continued to exist in cultural institutions as a phenomenon, through values of its ideology and common and wide cultural space, as a notion, motif, and theme of the projects and events. What kind of speech and representation is desirable and present, and which one is suppressed and pushed into the shadows? My question was also how was the Yugoslav narrative transformed in order to fit into the new post-Yugoslav reality, and was it at all? Illustration of Yugoslav legacy which still does not have a consensual decision about its identity and emanation, could be given through the description of inherited values, images, narratives and placed in an event (like an exhibition in official institutions) or incident (like exhibition in alternative institution).

I intend to represent the importance of the Yugoslav legacy (as a symbolic heritage in the first place), from the perspective of creating continuity and finding (creating) a meaning about the past, as a way of overcoming cultural trauma. I have supposed that accepting the past, responsibility and loss, on the institutional level, can lead to the emerging of the new narratives. I also intend to show if an attempt of re-owning Yugoslavia exists in cultural institutions, following the assumption that core narratives and ideology of institutions practically emanate in cultural events they have organized together with information about the space where institutions are placed, its history and development.

I have been in search of significant projects that thematized Yugoslavia, illuminated, motivated, or inspired to discuss or problematize Yugoslav idea, state, identity or legacy.
Considering the fact that the process of overcoming trauma consequences, request speech about traumatic events and everything connected with it in the aim of meaning making (Heine, Proulx, Vohs, 2006), I intended to understand and illustrate how and if institutions represent Yugoslavia. Do they own or discard its inheritance? Is there a continuity in their narrative, or discontinuity? Do they still own Yugoslav space and how, in the first place? Then, do they intend to bring or carry a new perspective, openness, and freedom, or do they just follow the official narratives and authorities they are dependent on? Even though, the Yugoslav legacy is already described and defined, in academic circles, as ‘non-existing legacy of country that does not exist anymore’ (Gavrilović, 2012), I have assumed that cultural institutions somehow inherit the Yugoslav period, representing it in events, and its aim, spontaneous or rational, in search for conclusions, coherence and consensus about the past.

The period I have chosen as a time reference for my thesis – from 2003 (as a year of last Yugoslavia dissolution) until today, in 2020 – seems to be far enough from the traumatic events in the ‘90s, war conflict and dissolution of Yugoslavia, for new narratives, dynamics and identities to emerge. On the contrary, Aleida Assman states that post-conflict societies and the process of translating an individual to a collective memory as non-predictable dynamics, that cannot be slowed down nor forced further, but it could be stopped by cancelling and suppressing the occasions for talking about the past, witnessing, debating, discussing, until talking does not become speech and a story¹ (Assman, 2011).

Through that cancelling of the space for discussion, translating from personal memory and forming collective memory is interrupted. Based on those assumptions, I have been motivated to investigate if this process is (and how) developing in Serbian cultural institutions, does it have a spontaneous or a planned structure, does it lead to remembrance or forgetting Yugoslavia, how Yugoslavia exists, if it exists. Also, how does the Yugoslav legacy exist, what is the nature, definition and expression of that legacy? Do those institutions prefer owning the Yugoslav identity or disowning it?

Regaining the past’ syntagm, considers also the perspective on the phenomenon of disowning the past events (which precedes to regaining), first we must disown something on individual and collective level, if those events were somehow traumatic, in order to preserve certain structure, then, with the awareness that past could repeat if we do not own its meaning, the regaining of its legacy could begin (Volkan, 2001). Defense or coping mechanism of disowning

¹ Story as a way of organizing experience and transforming temporal fragmented memory into linear permanent one (Baumeister, 1991).
has its value (to prevent the collapse of whole identity, if that is possible), and its price. The discontinuity and fragmentation that trauma causes leads to blockade and dysfunction. Sometimes, it creates gaps between narratives, groups in society, splitting and eventually freezing in ‘either-or position’ (false dilemma).

Regaining the past, which is slightly a different notion than overcoming (Kuljić, 2002), means in the same time – owning again, in a sense of regaining the missing fragments of previous identity (the fragmentation is dangerous due to the fact that, with time, some important pieces are fading from our memory, causing fragmentation to occur in even higher level, and at the end causing the core narrative to collapse). Getting familiar with most of the aspects (pieces) of the traumatic event, brings different perspectives together, which is of crucial importance for post conflict societies. Talking about previous events leads to a creation of new narrative, and through that to coherent speech (and story) about traumatic events, as a way of overcoming a cultural trauma. In that process, inheritance, in its different forms, represents the elements, connectors, from the past, to the present and future (Boehnlein, 2001; Hirshberger, 2018).

For the aim of this work, and phenomenon I am trying to describe and analyze, I have chosen the term legacy, considering the notion heritage as a material inheritance in a first place, and legacy as a symbolic one – emanated in attitudes, mentality, ethic, aesthetic, artistic representation, language, and expressed in art and culture, through image, speech, idea, kept in conceptual and emotional individual and collective memory.

**THE MAIN CATEGORIES**

The main categories and points of view I have chosen as a methodology of the research, could be named as interdisciplinary cultural study approach, through content analysis and notions of representations (mainly in discourse), interpretation, discovering of symbolical or concrete presence/ absence (in an event, language, or image), search for meaning and cultural policy. Considering the knowledge about revealing of collective trauma and translating personal memory into collective one (with a coherent meaning and established continuity) which requires patience for the process, the aim of this research was to discover the dynamic of that process in Serbian society through the functioning of cultural institutions from both sectors (official and nonofficial one).
The material for my research were interpretations (academic literature, non-official interviews, newspapers articles, videos, comments on exhibitions, comments in program of institutions, personal interpretations of actors (artists, academics, curators, activists) expressed in informal interviews and meetings or audience, that could be then incorporated in my interpretation of exhibition/event. During my research, I have spoken with workers in institutions, activists and artists. Their interpretations, attitudes and affections had an important influence on my analysis and conclusions. Especially due to the methodical approach I have decided to apply hermeneutical analysis, as well as narrative and discursive analysis. I was using a corpus of socio-psychological theories and achievements (study of trauma), prominent achievements of museology, study of commons, visual anthropology, depending on the event and institution.

Taking as an important fact that in post conflict societies cultural trauma and economic crisis means not just crisis of identity, it actually signifies the collapse of one identity, I have accentuated the activities in the institutions and their collectives (especially in alternative ones), that could provide connection with the distanced and derelict past.

The appreciation of the common cultural space (former Yugoslav artistic space), multiculturalism, openness towards cooperation and connection (in region, on the first place), together with an activist approach and respecting commons (common resources and sharing), in alternative institutions, could be a frame of Yugoslav legacy and link from the past to the future.

Descriptions of events, exhibitions and projects would appear as a fragment without the strongest connection to the thesis, but in a wider context of collecting fragments in order to find out how does Yugoslavia exist in post-Yugoslav period in Serbia, every thematization of Yugoslavia, with plan and program, in official or nonofficial institutions, was important for my work. Due to the lack of space and time, and with intention to skip the trap of ‘finding a forest just to lose sight of a tree’, I have chosen the most prominent, evaluated and interpreted cultural events. For description and interpretation, I have used catalogues, articles in archives and magazines (the amount of material and literature that witnessed ‘importance’ of the project was one more criteria). Catalogues of exhibition after exhibition, sometimes with valuable comments about the intention of the exhibition, discovering the intentions and relation of the curator and artists towards the theme and artifacts, were valuable material for my work. For some conferences and projects I could not find more relevant resources nor articles in newspapers (archive or internet) on the portals where the information did not last long, often not more than fourteen days, as Aleida Assman stated (Assman, 2011).
STRUCTURE OF THE RESEARCH

In the first chapter State of Art, with an overview of books, articles and projects that relate to a theme of my work, I present different aspects of its formulation and content. Also, I intended to represent and to shape a space where I aimed to search for the conclusions: in the intersections of the studies about the past, studies about meaning, cultural memory and cultural policy. Since there are no monographs considering the legacy of Yugoslavia and its representations in official and nonofficial institutions, I have presented an overview of the literature that was an important source for my research and valuable guidance.

Considering the relation towards the Yugoslav legacy as one of the most important topic of my research, I have started with a description of prominent studies about Yugoslavia, its emerging and dissolution (Bakić, Kuljić, Dimitrijević, Buden) and about valorization of its legacy, aiming to show the possible positions toward the heritage of Yugoslavia in cultural institutions. Also, my attempt was to give an overview of the studies taken in a field of cultural policy, from the perspective of cultural memory and heritage assigned to show dynamics of the change in the cultural institution’s functioning at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century.

The second chapter titled Historical context is dedicated to the history of South Slavic unity with an overview of Yugoslav history. The idea of South Slavic Unity is closely connected to the idea of a common culture and art ground. The ‘Yugoslav Kulturnation’ (Yugoslavism), as the idea based on the cultural closeness among the South Slavic peoples was the core narrative of the South Slavic Union. Yugoslavism together with the Yugoslav state conception, emerged in the circles of intellectuals. It was the result of the various actions of intellectual and cultural elites, movements, organizations, and individuals during the 19th and early 20th centuries, and during the time, a place of common creation was developed. I have intended to shape the origin and development of the South Slavs Unity idea, then conceptualization of Yugoslavism as a project of elites, with the overview of Yugoslav history, both of First Yugoslavia and Second Yugoslavia.

Also, I intended to show the mutual influence between Yugoslavia as a cultural project and Yugoslavia as a political project – being completely intertwined ‘from the beginning until the end’. In this chapter my goal was to point out the significance and vital potential of the common cultural space as a basis for Yugoslavism and Yugoslavia but also as a space where Yugoslavia could ‘exist’ after its dissolution.
For the analytical part of my research I have chosen three official and three alternative institutions to describe and illustrate the place and role of the Yugoslav narrative and legacy in cultural institutions: among official those are the Serbian Pavilion in Venice (Paviljon Republike Srbije u Veneciji), Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade (Muzej savremene umetnosti u Beogradu), Museum of Yugoslavia (Muzej Jugoslavije), and among nonofficial (alternative) institutions those are Centre for Cultural Decontamination (Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju/ CZKD), squat Inex, and alternative cultural center Catch 22 (Kvaka 22). I assumed that by choosing different types of the institutions would help create a wider image, and form the basis for a more complete map of the institutions in Serbia in the post-Yugoslav period.

An analytical part dedicated to official institutions placed after *Historical context* contains three chapters describing three institutions.

The first chapter is this part is dedicated to the Pavilion of Republic Serbia in Venice, the former Pavilion of Yugoslavia in Venice (all of state emanations). I have decided to investigate Serbian (former Yugoslav) Pavilion in Venice as the only institution where Yugoslavia still exists in the frame of international art and culture manifestations (even just as an alive memory and context). In the time of the Yugoslav art constitution in the ‘50s and ‘60s, international manifestations and representations of the Yugoslav artists to the European and World audience (also introducing them to the artistic circles and wider professional publicity) had an important role and represented the accentuated moment in the cultural policy and program (Sretenović, 2016).

So, I have intended to show if Yugoslavia exists in its last home in the international art scene at most prominent art manifestations in Europe, not just as a large prescription on the edifice of the Pavilion, but as the content inside it – through representations of the Serbian artists. I have described representations of Serbian artists after the dissolution of Yugoslavia that were thematizing the former state. It was almost every edition since the breakup of Yugoslavia.

The next chapter is dedicated to The Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade, built in New Belgrade, opened in 1965 as the most prominent cultural institution representing the Yugoslav and Serbian Art of the 20th century (whole durance of Yugoslavia). The Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade appears to be the institution symbol of the Yugoslav art and culture creation. I have assumed that the Museum can also appear as a litmus paper test, following the fate of the Yugoslav narrative in Serbia, in post-Yugoslav period, detecting the treatment of the authorities towards the Yugoslav legacy (as towards Yugoslav legacy, the same as towards Museum).
I have presented the dynamic of the Museum as an institution, with historical context, through the exhibition and projects, since the breakup of Yugoslavia (its last emanation in 2003) with the overview of the Museum history. Part of my interest were projects (exhibitions) and the dynamic of changes (the Museum was closed for ten years due to restoration). I have noted attempts of anticipation and transformations of the Museum towards critical institution conception of Piotr Piotrowski (Piotrowski, 2013).

The third chosen institution is the Museum of Yugoslavia, the only institution in former Yugoslav space fully dedicated to the representation of Yugoslavia. The Institution showed the enormous capacity for transformation, communicating the possibility of the new modern institution, offering the wide range of the possibilities for Yugoslav legacy interpretation in the future. After the historical context I have represented the dynamic of the institution’s transformation through various projects following within the place and shape of Yugoslav legacy.

Choosing the particular cases for the description of alternative institutions, I have intended to represent different types or models of organizations in aim to investigate how past occurs in different places (as I was trying with official institution also, and that was one of the reasons why the Pavilion in Venice is incorporated in my research, aiming to show institution in wider spectrum of emanations, and as the only opportunity to show that somehow Yugoslavia still exists after its dissolution, even in its former exhibition places abroad).

The analytical part dedicated to alternative institutions also contains three chapters with the short introduction bringing the explanations and descriptions of alternative institutions as a phenomenon. I have chosen the notion of alternative institutions to describe nonofficial institutions, in order to accentuate the significance of the structure as replacing (alternative), parallel structure, to non-functional (closed, or asleep) official institutions.

The first chapter in this part is dedicated to the Centre for Cultural Decontamination (Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju / CZKD). Being one of the oldest nonofficial organizations in Serbia, emerged from a decisive protest against the regime of Slobodan Milošević in aim of Yugoslavia preservation and stopping of conflicts, in 1995, CZKD was my choice for the alternative institution of the older generation. I have intended to show the main attitudes of the organization when the word is about Yugoslavia and Yugoslav legacy, through the events, debates, and exhibitions. Also, I have intended to accentuate the characteristics of the alternative institutions that emerged in the ‘90s in comparison to the alternative space and organizations that emerged later.
In the second chapter of this part of research I have decided to describe the squat and cultural center Inex established in a building of the Inex Film Company (one of the largest Yugoslav). Inex was one of the rare cultural centers that emerged from a squatted building and especially in Serbia that does not have squatting tradition (when the word is about squatting in purpose of fulfilling cultural needs). I have shown the model of alternative institutions celebrating the ethics of commons in the first place (attitudes of togetherness as an inheritance of Yugoslav period). Part of my interest was, beside the events and values of community, a building, and the context it bears (in every chapter, on example of every institution's edifice). That was also one of the criteria for selecting the institutions/examples. Edifice needed to be a representation (symbol) of the Yugoslav legacy itself in one way or another.

In the third chapter of this part, Kvaka 22 as the youngest institution should represent the youngest generations of artists and cultural workers, activists and citizens, and their approach towards contemporary life, culture and art, and relation to the past. Part of my interest was also to investigate if and how Yugonostalgia occurred in projects of the young artists in the institutions that emerged after the dissolution of the last Yugoslavia state, and occupied the building which belonged to Yugoslav Army Orchestra (again interesting context of a site).

In the last chapter of my research titled Conclusions I have intended to present at once common denominators of the all described institutions from the perspective of the Yugoslav legacy, and a wider context as a common space for all of them. In addition, I have intended to accentuate the conclusion about the significance of cooperation between institutions, in the field of cultural memory but not just. I have accentuated the phenomenon of relatedness and interconnectedness that could be (re)gained and owned through the mutual project of dealing with the past in cooperation with official and nonofficial institutions.

Even after dedicated research, I have decided not to include National Museum of Serbia [Narodni muzej Srbije] in this argument for several reasons – due to the structure of giving three cases from the official institutions corpus, and three cases of the alternative ones, then because it appeared in my research that National Museum did not cross through the internal transformation during the time it was completely closed for the public (almost fifteen years), and the institution opened in renewed edifice but with the more or less as the old traditional internal structure.

Also, with no commentary on the collection, especially with no interpretation of the part of the collection that could somehow contribute to the Yugoslav legacy – questions and resolutions. Even though, I do think that the National Museum, being one of the most important institutions in Serbia (at least because it includes several prominent locations and collections),
should be the example for investigating place and space of Yugoslav legacy, and I hope to investigate it in the future from different perspectives and in context of this argument.

Also, when the word is about alternative institutions, I did not include Association Krokodil, even though it appears as another contribution to my thesis, especially in last couple of years, due to the various activities thematizing the sensitive socio-political situation connected with Yugoslav legacy in culture and art but not just. For example, projects: *Reading Balkans*, *Zajednička čitaonica* [Common library], *Ko je prvi počeo?* [Who started all this?], *Istoričari protiv revizionizma* [Historians against revisionism], *Jezici i nacionalizmi* [Languages and nationalisms], *Deklaracija o zajedničkom jeziku* [Declaration on common language]. Krokodil in the first place represents the center for research of contemporary literature and would be a relevant proposal for the continuation of the research considering the theme of Yugoslav legacy in alternative institutions of art and culture.

Encompassing all the mentioned chapters I have represented the key notions shaping the Yugoslav legacy and Yugoslav idea in cultural institutions, through the projects and interpretations of institutional teams, artists and audience. The most prominent emanations of the Yugoslav legacy are, in the first place a common cultural space, being the most prominent phenomenon in research of Yugoslav legacy, then an emanation and inheritance of the People Liberation Army / Narodnooslobodilačka borba in attitude and values, also ‘brotherhood and unity’ with the sense of togetherness. Yugonostalgia and the cult of Josip Broz Tito could not be bypassed in this research. Nor it could be cultural trauma because of war conflicts, economic crisis and sanctions that occurred with the dissolution of Yugoslavia.

**FROM YUGOSLAV CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS TO CULTURE IN CRISIS**

Due to the fact that federal (Yugoslav) institutions were on the territory of Serbia, in spite of diminishing Yugoslav narrative and legacy since the ‘90s, Serbian institutions – sometimes in the same edifices like federal – inherited Yugoslavia. Considering the fact that in Croatia and Croatian institutions the culture narrative regarding Yugoslavia was completely transformed in narratives about socialism or even communism while the notion Yugoslavia remained forbidden or left unspoken, interest of my work was not to represent the musealization of a socialist period or communistic one in Serbia. The goal of my thesis is to find out if there is an attempt to preserve Yugoslavia in cultural memory in spite of all circumstances, and if there is such an attempt, how,
where, and why does the remembrance of Yugoslavia survive, among the fragmentation of narratives and the challenging process of overcoming cultural trauma in permanent crisis without any coherent strategy to succeed in.

Further during my research, probably with the awareness of the on-going process of revealing collective trauma and post traumatic syndrome, on a collective and individual level, together with permanent traumatic circumstances (repression, economic crisis, corruption, devastating local and city policies, poverty), I have become motivated to discover the potential of making new discussions. That presence in a dialog space becomes a way of creating new narratives, answers, solutions – in the first place – connection as the only way of escaping from the freezing reality of a traumatic world. That potential is revealed in bottom up institutions, NGO (non-governmental) organizations, under one umbrella – of alternative institutions, mainly those of the youngest generation and space that occurs in their cooperation with official institutions.

EDITORIAL REMARKS

The theme of my thesis is rooted in contemporaneity and some of the publications I have used as materials could be found in both versions (Serbian or Croatian and English). All the quotations in the text are written in English and in the original language (if the source was not in English language already).

The sources in Serbian are in Latin alphabet and I have decided to keep it consequently in the whole work. The translations of the quotations are all mine and marked. If the quotation is placed in the text, then the original is placed in a footnote and sometimes both the quotation and translation are placed in the footnote. Titles of the projects, exhibitions, books, are translated by me and placed in the brackets (original is in Italic). If they have been already translated, then in that case, I wrote them down in Italic also, and again – in brackets. Some projects are better known by their translated title, title in English (all depends on which occasion and under what circumstances the project/exhibition/manifestation was produced).

I have tried, in a first place, to give original title and translate it in brackets or just to write down a translation if it already exists – and then to use the name in its common form, always shorter than the full name (project Moderna for example) as it was known and accepted among producers (authors) and audience. That is especially important when the word is about the name of the institutions. I have decided to use the original name in the case of alternative institutions,
for example Kvaka 22 (Catch 22) stays Kvaka 22, despite the context that its translation could provide to the reader. In Serbia, among the collective of Kvaka 22 and their audience only the original name is in use. Same as CZKD (Center for Cultural Decontamination) or Inex.

When the word is in regards to official institutions, if it was necessary for understanding (after original and translated names in pair) I have used the entire name, but more often just ‘the Museum’, or ‘the Pavilion’, if the institutions in the text appears in its common or symbolical, but everyday role in aim of better understanding and easier reading. The names of the institutions, when they appear for the first time in text, I provide in the English language first with the original in brackets.

The illustrations are an integral part of the work and I have provided them in particular place in every chapter next to information they refer to. The whole list of illustrations could be found at the last pages of the argument together with the Bibliography.
I STATE OF ART

During more than half of the 20th century, on a large part of the Balkan Peninsula there existed Yugoslavia – a state union created to gather Southern Slavs into a common political, social, cultural and artistic space, under a common name and common denominators. The Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia² fell apart in the bloody conflicts of the 1990s, and although Yugoslavia was preserved for several more years in the name of the union of Serbia and Montenegro, from the early 2000s onwards we can discuss the fate of Yugoslav legacy in post-Yugoslav areas and states.

This chapter dedicated to previous research of (post)Yugoslav period and Yugoslav legacy in institutions of culture and art in Serbia represents the overview with the following procedure, since the representation of Yugoslav legacy in culture and art, i.e. cultural and art institutions both official and alternative ones, is essential for my work and there are no specific monographs on the subject, I will mention those monographs and articles that are strongly connected with some aspects of my thesis. First accentuated aspect is relation towards Yugoslav past in former Yugoslav countries and in institutions of art and culture. Also, an important aspect is defining the Yugoslav legacy and cultural policy in the post Yugoslav period. The theme of my research – Yugoslav legacy in official and alternative cultural institutions in Serbia after the breakup of Yugoslavia (its last emanation in 2003) – is tangentially mentioned by articles and studies from various areas, I will describe in this chapter.

As I shall note further on, the scientific texts devoted to culture and art in the Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav period are mainly written in the form of articles, exhibition catalogues, or with the aim of an evaluation from the perspective of cultural politics. We lack monographs devoted to the post-Yugoslav identity and legacy in official and alternative cultural institutions. Also, there are no monographs about the common art ground and destiny of the Yugoslav artistic space in the post-Yugoslav period, and the research of this topic is staying in the space of exhibitions, catalogues, panel discussions, and conferences.

2 The Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia, also informally known as the Second Yugoslavia or Tito’s Yugoslavia, was a socialist federation that comprised the present states of Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo and Macedonia (1943–1992).
As stated at the beginning of the supplementary publication of the Museum of Yugoslavia’s project Jugoslavija od početka do kraja [Yugoslavia From Beginning to the End]³, from the collapse of SFRY (Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) ‘there was no institutional framework for the development of long-term regional projects’ which were, on the other hand, necessary ‘for a critical re-examination of our common past and the development of an awareness of the positive and negative common heritage and its influence on contemporary identities of new states and unions’ (Panić, 2013, 3).

First part of this chapter is dedicated to the publication thematizing the relation towards the past (in Serbia and after dissolution of Yugoslavia in 2003), sometimes closing Yugoslav narrative into the (closed) past. After those publications follows the overview of literature centering on Yugoslavia after Yugoslavia, i.e. as the still existing and active narrative of post-Yugoslav societies, and finally the post-Yugoslav and Yugoslav artistic space today and cultural policy – as a ‘presence in absence’ in studies and articles devoted to Serbian culture and art after 2003. Since the position of Yugoslav heritage in cultural institutions and their narratives is a consequence of the relationship with and the understanding of the past, I shall attempt to centralize the hermeneutic research of this phenomenon on a concrete example, in the manner delineated in the title.

Considering that an integral and essential part of the thesis is Yugoslav legacy in existing research and institutions within the space of former Yugoslav republics (specifically, as shown on the example of the cultural and artistic space in Serbia), the outline of existing research encompasses primarily projects, articles and evaluations by regional scientists, written in regional languages and in English, published both in local and foreign publications, as well as regional and international project reports. Since the subject is pertinent, deeply determined by the past and the present moment when new studies and projects emerge, this overview has but one ambition – to list and map the positions of the most important research and information sources.

The research papers of post-Yugoslav space and post-Yugoslav legacy in Serbia after final dissolution of Yugoslavia include political, sociological and psychological studies, conference

---

³Jugoslavija od početka do kraja [Yugoslavia From Beginning to End] is a research project and exposition in the Belgrade Museum of Yugoslavia, present a regional and long-term project of overcoming the post-conflict problems, which makes it necessary to understand and critically re-examine the shared past and to develop an awareness of the positive and negative shared heritage and its influence on the contemporary identities of the new states and communities. The project Novi stari muzej [New Old Museum] which gathers relevant scientists and experts for social history, museology, history of art, sociology, communication and media, anthropology and cultural studies, aims to develop a new permanent exhibition of the Museum, in a project containing several phases and in cooperation with regional and foreign partners. On the occasion of an exhibition (December 1st 2012 – March 17th 2013) the Museum of Yugoslavia’s History, which in the meantime changed its name to Museum of Yugoslavia, published the publication – catalogue.
articles, exhibition programs and catalogues, project plans and evaluations. It involves both those situated in the present and looking to the past and those envisioning the future from the present moment.

The main subject in published research papers, for more than 20 years after the breakup of Yugoslavia was the break up itself. Also, its causes and effects, together with the causes and effects of wars among Yugoslav republics during the 1990s and the relations both between the former republics and towards the European Union, while the field of culture and art was marginalized severely. In the second decade of the 21st century, after 2010, researchers from different areas are getting more involved into areas of Yugoslav heritage and legacy, culture, narratives and change.4

In his book Prevladavanje prošlosti [Mastering the Past], devoted to the deconstruction of the great European narratives and the transformative periods and processes in Europe, especially after 1989, Todor Kuljić anticipates and points out the importance of dealing with the Yugoslav past in a manner that affirms it and turns it into a source of new narratives and future constructive choices – which makes the book very important for the following study, primarily because of the tendency to centralize and all-encompassing research the phenomenon of the past (and the narrative) as a constitutive and essential denominator of our present (Kuljić, 2002).

The author firstly concerns himself with the notion of large narratives from various perspectives5. He speaks of the complicated relation that countries in transition have with the heritage of the past periods, of the demythologization and dethroning of the narratives of the past, the imperative of mastering and, as the title suggests, overcoming them.6 The problems hidden in

---

4 By the term post-Yugoslav, in this research, I am considering the successor state’s space (both psychical ad symbolical) after the breakup of SFRY (Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) and after the last Yugoslav emanation state dissolution in 2003. The prefix ‘post’ represents sociopolitical and cultural change of the Yugoslav identity and it’s institutional and alternative representations, after the state diminishing and in period of sociopolitical transition, especially after 2000 (period of unblocked transition (Lazić, Cvejić, 2006).

5 ‘The subject of this book is the ideological side of overcoming the past, which cannot, however, be conclusively isolated from the others. Although every history appears to be particular and incomparable, at the close of the 20th century, a series of more than local themes and contents appear in overcoming the past, resistance to Nazism and collaboration with it, settling of old scores in the name of justice, creation of integrative myths in order to re-establish national identities and reconcile a society torn apart after the breakdown of the Cold War and socialism. This, as T. Judt notes, are universal problems that unintentionally and gradually level the writing of European history’ (Kuljić, 2002, 21). Translation Tijana Vuković, further TV

6 ‘The very notion ‘overcoming the past’ suggests that the past is not over. We are speaking of renouncing the entire past or its part, but of the responsibility for the past as well. In a narrower sense, the same notion is used to determine the ideological transition from socialism to capitalism. Politics with history (Geschichtspolitik) is an additional analytical category researching ‘the disputes over history as a political fact and, in that regard, devoting
the expressions ‘mastering the past’ and ‘overcoming the past’, are contained in the fact that the past should not be overcome as such, and the transitioning entities do not have the imperative to overcome it, because that would mean to leave the past behind, marginalize it, exclude it, even to forget it (Kuljić, 2002). In his book, Todor Kuljić stresses the polysemy and inadequacy of the syntagm ‘overcoming the past’ as a directive and imperative, i.e. a program to overcome the past as a pledge for the future. But also he stresses its adequacy and illuminating potential for a description of how political and social elites relate to the past in periods of crisis. The process of overcoming the past instead of accepting it thus turns into a self-defeating dynamic. Actually, the

particular attention to the interests of the political agents’. Therefore, politics with history is always present in a pluralist society, since the political elites ground their own identity in different historical ways. Overcoming the past, identity shift and the reworking of history are themes linked by their syndromes and denoting a turn in thinking about society after the downfall of European socialism. We are not speaking merely of the change of the socio-economic system or the demolition of ideology or epoch-awareness, but of a shifted vision of the essence of one’s own being in broad social groups’ (Kuljić, 2002, 22). Translation TV


7 ‘The chosen past or cultural memory is always marked by its epoch, and thus the past is always new (I. Svevo). It always changes, and present determines the past. Each generation is carried by its own particular memory. It is dependent on the depth of time reached by those memories. The history of France is dominated by a pattern of strong continuity, rising above historical eventness. The history of Britain and USA contain an even stronger continuity. In German history, the collective consciousness focuses on breaks, not continuities (Krass, 1999). That is the ‘burden of memory’ of fascism and divided Germany from 1945 to 1990. In the USSR and the Balkans, breaks also dominate the continuities; this is the so-called ‘Dictatorship of the Zero Hour’ that each new regime starts from, radically shifting the historical memory of the previous regime. Where the breaks truly surpass the continuities, an artificial continuity is created by omitting or deleting certain phases of history, between 1941 and 1945, Serbian quislings deleted from the national continuity the period between 1918 and 1941, because of the national idea’s downfall, and for the same reason, the contemporary Yugoslav regime creates a continuity with 1941, skipping over the following sixty years. Something similar is happening in Russia. Everywhere where the breaks dominate in memory, overcoming the past becomes more dramatic and more conflicted. This study traces the overcoming of the past mainly through the ideological conflict of countries faced with the continuous shifts of a new beginning (FR Germany, Yugoslavia). And yet, the spaces of memory are not identical in all countries’ (Kuljić, 2002, 436). Translation TV

scientific research of Yugoslav destiny and legacy started with the last decade, when the last emanation of Yugoslavia became the past (in 2006, Montenegro declared independence, and state unity of Serbia and Montenegro, as the last state entity connected to Yugoslavia – disappeared).

The first concrete definition and description of common art and culture (ground) in successor states without marginalization of Yugoslav period achievements is the article of Jerko Denegri from 2011 dedicated to the phenomenon of Yugoslav common art and culture space (Denegri, 2011).

From the 2011 until now, Yugoslavia becomes the important topic and theme of several monographs and projects – sociological studies treat the subject of Yugoslavia and its downfall as a common past with particular consequences in each successor state, usually from a socio-historical and socio-political perspective, with still rare overviews of the cultural and artistic life in the post-Yugoslav period. Sociologist Jovo Bakić deals with the problem of Yugoslavia’s breakup from a socio-historical perspective and at length in his voluminous monograph Jugoslavija, razaranje i njegovi tumači [Yugoslavia, destruction and its interpreters] (Bakić, 2011), starting from the theoretic-interpretative framework and following through with an explanation of Yugoslavia’s creation process and the act of its breakup.

Subsequently, Bakić also follows the wars for Yugoslav heritage and ideological hegemony, including various factors and several parallel strands of cause and effect. Through discourse analysis, he finds a complex narrative of the current situation in the Balkans regarding Yugoslavia’s breakup, the end of Yugoslavia, despite the numerous predictions, was not inevitable. The main cause of Yugoslav state dissolution probably lays in the upraise of the nationalism in all republics, mainly in Croatia and Serbia, and among elite circles, in a first place (Bakić, 2011).

Describing the possible reasons and effects of downfall, Bakić delineates various perspectives and hypotheses, but what is the most important – he shapes the significance of Yugoslavia and its heritage, for Serbia, and other successor states. Author’s main interest in this research is the impact of world power states on minor ones, also the purpose and significance of the gathering and unity on Balkans, the danger of emerging nationalism. Author points out the analysis of different discourse considering Yugoslavia as a topic, mainly in world press and media. When the word is about lance on the valorization of Yugoslav period in mentioned study – author is not advocating the Yugoslav legacy, even though he is bringing the argument of its significance, heritage and achievement, marked at the conclusion of the study and with the touch of personal
experience (Bakić, 2011). The scientific attempt of regaining the right on the Yugoslav past is yet to come.

Important, the studies about dissolution of Yugoslavia represent the huge research step into a direction that could be marked by the watchword Jugoslavija od početka do kraja [Yugoslavia, from beginning to end]⁸ and represents an all-encompassing overview of Yugoslav history in various spheres of socio-political life. Simultaneously, that is the title of the aforementioned regional and international project carried primarily by the Museum of Yugoslavia. This flight represents the attempt to explain the phenomenon of Yugoslavia and Yugoslavism by means of an all-encompassing overview, necessarily positioning it into the past. Even when that is not the intention, the very act of closure turns Yugoslavia, its narrative and legacy, into a closed and past structure in all its forms.

That research presents Yugoslavia from a historical perspective, starting with the very inception of the Yugoslavism idea, through its different realizations over time, to its downfall and end. The self-evidence (or the given fact) of the Yugoslav idea’s end is part of a continuum thematized from a socio-historical perspective by scientific papers that observe and interpret Yugoslavia’s development from the period of the early Illyrian movement onwards, with a particular focus on the period of communist Yugoslavia from 1945 to 1990. The period after 1990 became a subject of the Yugonostalgic or anti-Yugoslav narratives (Kovačević, 2012).

The Slovenian culturologist Mitja Velikonja answers the questions related to Yugonostalgia and Titostalgia in his book Titostalgija: študija nostalgije po Josipu Brozu [Titostalgia: a study of nostalgia for Josip Broz] (Velikonja, 2008) the first scientific study in the Balkan area devoted to nostalgia, whether or not they are part of a common trend, a mania for living in the past, the European longing for socialism, or a socio-political and economic crisis. Nostalgia is always marked by a sentimental narrative created by a new interpretation of the past, depending on its attitude towards the current situation, i.e. the present and even more important – an eternal present characteristic for the period of late capitalism. Nostalgia is the utopian story and

---

⁸ Jugoslavija od početka do kraja, ‘a research project and exposition in the Belgrade Museum of Yugoslavia, present a regional and long-term project of overcoming the post-conflict problems, which makes it necessary to understand and critically re-examine the shared past and to develop an awareness of the positive and negative shared heritage and its influence on the contemporary identities of the new states and communities.’ The project ‘New Old Museum’, which gathers relevant scientists and experts for social history, museology, history of art, sociology, communication and media, anthropology and cultural studies, aims to develop a new permanent exhibition of the Museum, in a project containing several phases and in cooperation with regional and foreign partners. On the occasion of an exhibition (December 1st 2012 – March 17th 2013) the Museum of Yugoslavia’s History, which in the meantime changed its name to Museum of Yugoslavia, published the publication – catalogue Jugoslavija od početka do kraja.
according to Velikonja’s opinion can represent a quest for meaning, escapist conformism or, if one steps into the past – an activist approach to the present and its critical rethinking.

Together with publications of other Slovenian theorists (Slavoj Žižek, Aleš Debeljak, Tanja Petrović), among the first in the region to deal with the subject of Yugonostalgia, Velikonja concerned himself with the countries of the post-Yugoslav space in transition (Velikonja, 2005). The questions and answers related to the phenomenon of nostalgia, besides other insufficiently explained and illuminated themes linked to the post-Yugoslav period, are important because Yugoslav narrative is usually reduced to Yugonostalgia in public and official discourse.

The idea of Yugoslavism in the post-Yugoslav period is often not merely reduced to Yugonostalgia, but to a single historical fact, and in some cases it is even deleted from that axis (Petrović, 2012). In her book *Yuropa - jugoslovensko naslede i politike budućnosti u postjugoslovenskim društvima* [Yuropa, Yugoslav Heritage and Politics of Future in Post-Yugoslav Societies] Tanja Petrović deals with social, cultural and linguistic identities and practices of memory in the area of former Yugoslavia during ‘Europeanization’, demonstrating how fatal the negation of a socialist (Yugoslav) past was for the regions of former Yugoslavia, mirroring in war crimes and outstanding ethnicization. The end of socialism was at the same time the breakup of the state and period of violent conflicts and war coloring all the aspects of social life and changing cultural memory (Petrović, 2012, 14).

The author considers as especially malign the idea that the Yugoslav past should be left behind and erased from national narratives for being an inappropriate and problematic segment of national history, accentuating the role of the political elites in forming the cultural memory (Petrović, 2012, 25). Such ‘overcoming of the past’ leads to a quick and efficient Europeanization, but also to the loss of a rich heritage descending from a country that lasted over 70 years. By pointing out the importance of Yugoslav heritage, Tanja Petrović insists not on a nostalgic and petrifying view of the past but on including the image, narration, experience of former Yugoslavia, immanently existing in the present, into the plans, the projection, and eventually the realization of the (European) future.

Boris Buden directs our attention to a Yugoslavia existing in the present in his book *Uvod u prošlost* [Introduction to the Past], based on the conversations he led in Novi Sad in 2009 with Želimir Žilnik, a well-known film director of the former Yugoslav Black Wave.9

---

9 Apart from Buden’s monographs another example of critically examining Yugoslavia until its story is returned to the structure of the present moment, interpreted as a past fraught with values we should not renounce, is the collection of papers titled Welcome to the Desert of Post-
The collection of papers *Jugoslavija u istorijskoj perspektivi [Yugoslavia from a Historical Perspective]* (Perović, et al. 2017) sheds light on Yugoslav periods and identities from multiple angles, comprising the problems created in the prolonged transition process and the consequences of Yugoslavia’s breakup. Project involved almost fifty scholars from all successor states. As the previously mentioned monograph and projects, *Jugoslavija u istorijskoj perspektivi* contains only a chapter devoted to culture and art in Yugoslavia, and none about Yugoslav art and culture in post-Yugoslav period. Although nearly all articles dealing with Yugoslavia and its breakup touch on, or deal at length with the subject of its breakup consequences and the effects of transition, and (time permitting) enter into the post-Yugoslav period, the subjects linked to the field of culture and art are neglected or completely passed over.

There is the conclusion shape which can be identified as the common conclusion if the authors – Yugoslavia project still waits for its evaluation, despite its great value for the cultural and political ground of the successor states. ‘The fact that the past is being misused on a daily basis in all the post-Yugoslav states, without exception’ (Biserko, 2017, 11), was the initial point for the project *Jugoslavija u istorijskoj perspektivi*.

On the centenary of the Yugoslavia’s formation in 2018 (hundred years from the first unity Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, Slovenes in 1918) the interest in Yugoslav heritage is growing, research projects are being formed and their results gain audience both in expert circles and in the broader public. As an illustration, in Belgrade Youth Centre, a cultural institution established in 1964, there was a panel *Stvaranje Jugoslovena [The Creation of Yugoslavs]* (2018), as the first in a series of

---

*Socialism* (2015), edited by Igor Štiks and Srećko Horvat. Dealing with subjects such as an imaginary post-socialist Balkan, twenty years after Yugoslavia’s breakup, the bitter fruits of transition and new political subjects, the authors represented in the collection offer a critical overview of the post-Yugoslav period, mainly from a socio-political and anthropological perspective. New tendencies and currents of socio-political thought and action are discussed while postulating the existence of a new left (Štiks, Horvat, 2015). As in the aforementioned monographs of the post-socialist period, the subjects of culture and art are only mentioned in passing, and the examples chosen from these areas are illustrative and incidental.

10 ‘The purpose of this project is to interpret and describe objectively key historical processes that are vital to an understanding of Yugoslavia and its brutal disintegration. Yugoslavia played a crucial historical role, it functioned as a framework for the emancipation of all the Yugoslav peoples and the constitution of their republics – states’ (Biserko, 2017, 11).

11 ‘We make no claim to present a definitive picture of Yugoslavia’s disintegration as that will be certainly the focus of research of future scholars. The truth about its break-up is not simple or one-sided; on the contrary, it is extremely complex and calls for a multi-disciplinary approach. Our ambition, however, is to provide enough information and analysis to younger generations that will give them a deeper insight into the context other than the one they are being offered. Our ambition is not only to assist them in overcoming the historical narratives that have been imposed on them, but also to encourage their constructive and deeper reasoning about their future in the countries in which they live’ (Biserko, 2017, 12).

12 The fact that the collection of papers *Jugoslavija u istorijskoj perspektivi [Yugoslavia from a Historical Perspective]* (Belgrade, 2017) was published and financed by the Helsinki committee for human rights in Serbia, testifies of the existence of new projects that aim to create an overview of the Yugoslav period and a synthesis.
debates *Sto godina od osnivanja Jugoslavije* [Hundred years of Yugoslavia establishment] dedicated to the Yugoslav period from its inception till today. Researchers were looking for answers to questions related to the creation of the Yugoslav nation, the processes of creating Yugoslavs top-down as well as bottom-up, the shifts in official ideology from the time of World War I and the Unification in 1918 to the period of the Yugoslav state as a kingdom and finally – a socialist republic. Such research, gathering more and more scientists and a constantly broadening audience, sheds light on the importance of Yugoslavism for today’s culture, primarily in establishing a continuity.

**RESEARCH DEDICATED TO CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS AND CULTURAL POLICY AFTER BREAKUP OF YUGOSLAVIA**

Studies from the area of cultural politics and cultural management, as I attempt to show further on, deal with the unenviable *status quo* of the culture in transition, although to this subject as a whole has been devoted only one entire publication in Serbia – the anniversary edition of the journal *Kultura*, with its main theme – *Kultura u tranziciji. Slučaj Srbije* [Culture in Transition; case of Serbia] (from 2013). A group of authors aimed to answer the questions related to the change of cultural patterns and the formation of cultural politics, as well as the context of transitive cultural changes – the relationship between state and culture and the influence of the shifting social patterns on culture. The articles represent a map of the most important cultural processes in the period of transition, a critical review of some of its results and the description of those processes’ essence and the current state of Serbian culture, rightly understood as a state of crisis.

Although the idea of Yugoslav legacy and its importance in relation to culture and art, primarily their structuralized and institutionalized emanations, did not receive adequate attention

---

13 The first in a series of talks was dedicated to the centenary of Yugoslavia’s unification (2018), and organized by the Centre for Yugoslav Studies (CEJUS) and the Belgrade Youth Centre. The participants were dr Stanislava Barać, Institute for Literature and Art; dr Lada Stevanović, the Ethnographic Institute SASA/Cejus; prof. dr Ildiko Erdei, Philosophic Faculty of the Belgrade University; dr Sanja Petrović Todosijević, Institute for Recent Serbian History/Cejus. Moderator, dr Srđan Atanasovski, Musicological Institute of SASA, coordinator of the Centre for Yugoslav Studies, formed in 2016. With aim of creating common ground for researchers dedicated to the topic, from different perspectives and fields. Centre is main organisation of numerous events (mainly panel discussions and debates), which gathered the scholars from all successor countries around the themes (for example, Creating of Yugoslavs, Delusion of Yugoslavia, Memory on Yugoslavia, etc).

14 The journal *Kultura* exists since 1968, publishing by the Belgrade Institute for the Research of Cultural Development. All issues are accessible on line.

15 The period between one old model of culture worn out and a new one yet not created defines crisis in the broadest sense (Koković, 2013, 296).
until Yugoslavia’s centenary, certain tendencies leaning in that direction do appear – in the form of single monograph studies and collections of papers. The subject of post-Yugoslavism in the context of cultural and art institutions is the key narrative and common denominator of the studies published in the collection dedicated to the Museum of Contemporary Arts in Belgrade, *Prilozi za istorizaciju Muzeja savremene umetnosti* [Contributions to the Historization of the Museum of Contemporary Arts] (Sretenović, 2016), spinning around the notions of Yugoslav and Serbian art as a constitutive institution narrative of Museum, and via the phenomenon of Yugoslav artistic space and common cultural space as explained by Jerko Denegri in the already mentioned article from 2011 *Ideologija postavke Muzeja savremene umetnosti – Jugoslovenski umetnički prostor* [Ideology of permanent exhibition in Museum of Contemporary Art – Yugoslav Artistic Space]. Jerko Denegri unambiguously points out how important it is to accept the Yugoslav artistic space, not as a phenomenon of a specific past period, but in the present, and probably in the future as well (Denegri, 2011). Denegri stresses:

/… that this term is not a political construction with allegedly centralist, unitarist or Yugo-nostalgic connotations, but a real historical fact based on the awareness that during the nearly entire 20th century several consecutive generations of visual artists from the area of this at first (around the turn of the century) non-existing country, and subsequently during the ‘first’ and the ‘second’ Yugoslavia, acted in close mutual cooperation, often based on intimate personal relations, gathered in shared organizations, groups and associations, the best among them appearing abroad as representatives of their own state, and therefore we can conclude that during that entire period they took part in the very intense artistic life of a simultaneously decentralized and united artistic space that can justifiably be called Yugoslav.

In addition, the aforementioned collection of papers (Sretenović, 2016) puts Yugoslavia’s duration in the sphere of culture and art before its socio-political duration and does not consider it demarcated or final. Thus, for the first time, their collection creates an image of the Yugoslav narrative’s importance in cultural institutions, by conjoining fragments related to the post-Yugoslav identity in general. The Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade, the former Museum of Contemporary Yugoslav Art, appears as a symbol of Yugoslav art and the symbolic representation of all cultural institutions in former Yugoslavia and the post-Yugoslav period.
First as the Museum of Contemporary Yugoslav Art and later as Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade, it suffers because of the idea and the process of marginalization (up to and including complete negation) of the Yugoslav period, and because of the abolishing of the Yugoslav space as a culturological and artistic community, which therefore marginalizes the existence of a Yugoslav artistic period after Yugoslavia. At least as a constitutive principle of cultural institutions such as the MoCAB (Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade) (Dimitrijević, 2016):

Finally, the Museum still relied on its original Yugoslav identity in the institutional meaning as well. On the level of securing such an identity, in a political context of the national segmentation of Yugoslav art, after 2001 the MCA resisted dividing its collection according to the national identity of the artists and the initiatives to return and exchange the works of art with similar institutions in Slovenia and Croatia17

The shifts in cultural politics, the tasks and structures of cultural institutions, are themes of the project Culturlink18. The project represents ‘a network of networks’ dealing with the development of culture, cultural institutions and change of cultural politics in various countries, and with management in culture as well as the shifting of cultural identity in transition (in some former SFRY countries that situation continues after transition). The projects marked the importance of networking, creating the common field between various institutions, significance of cooperation, mutual projects and dialog. Particular publications were devoted to the subject of transformation in institutions after breakup of Yugoslavia from the perspective of cultural politics and strategies, Redefining Cultural Identities, Southeastern Europe (Švob Đokić, 2001), Cultural Transitions in Southeastern Europe, (Švob Đokić, 2004), Cultural Identity Politics in the (Post-) Transitional Societies (Švob Đokić, 2011). They depict transitive processes and results in different sectors of cultural activity, evaluations of achievements and projections for the foreseeable period. The most important events were mapped and their significance illustrated, while some possible
trajectories of future socio-psychological and socio-political analyses of the described processes and (un)achieved results were drawn.

Depending on the period they evaluate (some belong to the early years of the transition period, immediately after Yugoslavia’s breakup, and some were written more than ten years later), those studies approach definitions of the reasons for fragmentations and discontinuities shaped in cultural institutions, or merely describe their consequences, such as the gap between official (state-owned) and alternative cultural institutions, and the lack of an appropriate cultural strategy and the support of governing political structures and institutions.

In her article *Transition of Cultural Policies in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia Between Nationalistic and Opportunistic Tendencies*’ (Čopić, 2011, 2020) underlines the polarization of two cultural sectors, the state-owned and the private one, and the marginalization of the third, civil sector as an aftermath of Yugoslavia breakup and transformations processes that follow its dissolution. The aforesaid polarization is not value-driven as much as interest-driven, while governmental institutions, in accordance with their program and directives, insist on national interests and nationalist programs and the private institutions insist on production and their production, material and pecuniary interest, the civil sector remains completely neglected as a field of creativity and freedom:

In this situation, the cultural institutions, established under the socialist regime, have taken a conservative position over the past twenty years of transition and have been presenting their existence as a matter of national interest (Katunarić, 2004, 24). This reactionary standpoint has resulted in a professional, technological and infrastructural standstill (Švob-Dokić, 40) a kind of institutional fatigue (Klaić, 2012, 123). On the one hand, these institutions are overstaffed, and on the other their staffs lack modern professional competencies and skills in PR, marketing, fundraising, human resources management, strategic planning, etc (Čopić, 2020, 36).

This author states that in Slovenia there was almost no shift within the internal structure of cultural institutions, and that therefore it is difficult to speak of a true transformation after the breakup of Yugoslavia, transition and identity shift in culture and art. The reasons for that condition are mainly the broader EU politics that do not foresee a strategy for transitioning cultural institutions which would consider their nature (also Yugoslav identity and narrative) and immanent structure or offer them space to find their own acceptable solution in the general change and crisis. Transitive laws impose a mandatory observation of general directives anticipated in other spheres of socio-political life.19 An important thesis of this study, touched on by nearly all evaluations of

---

19 As the result, the cultural sector is included in the process of EU integration mainly through the carrying out of other policies that deal with these four freedoms, such as the tax policy with the harmonisation of VAT, labour
transitive cultural processes (at the territory of former SFRY republics this is simultaneously the post-Yugoslav period), is based on the fact that former Yugoslav countries faced greater challenges, since their situation during socialism differed from the positions of other European socialist countries. In the area of former Yugoslavia, the people did not gain much by the very ‘liberation’ from the socialist system, as in other countries (those under repressive Stalinist regimes, behind the Iron Curtain, whose transformative and transition process was completely different – the acquisition of autonomy itself, from the first moment of ‘exiting’ the period of communism, realizes the most important task of transition).

In the countries of former Yugoslavia, not only do the transition processes differ from those in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the former federation members are different from each other as well. And while the status quo is reflected in a singular lack of transformation in the Slovenian cultural sector, in Serbia there was a collapse of cultural institutions – as I shall demonstrate in this part mainly because of the marginalization of the Yugoslav narrative and the creation of discontinuities and fragmentations in the internal structures of leading official cultural institutions. In individual studies centering on former Yugoslav republics the authors dealing with cultural politics, management in culture and transition changes, such as Milena Dragićević Šešić, Dragan Klaić and Predrag Cvetičanin, evaluate the cultural processes up to the present, mainly up to 2014, when the comprehensive retrospections ceased and tentative anticipations started. The analyses of the current state in culture, such as those by Milena Dragićević Šešić (in the collection of papers Culture and Sustainable Development at Times of Crisis (2014) or the article How Theatres Remember, Cultures of Memory in Institutionalized System (Šešić, Stefanović, 2014a), underline the importance of the perspective shift and the re-evaluation of existing and emerging narratives, the overcoming of old patterns and the acceptance of heritage in so-called turbulent times.20

In other words, it is necessary to establish a central value narrative, an additional value to material culture which, thus, becomes a meaningful whole and fertile ground – a creative field:

---

20 ‘To be really functional, cultural memory has to surpass its ‘storage for artefacts’ status. Memory - storage has an interest in everything, and archives everything, without taking into account values, norms, etc. In times of value changes, without certainty, many institutions have opted for this fact based and objective approach. However, real cultural memory is created today, for tomorrow, by selecting the facts to be collected, and then explaining them in big narrative ways. Without storage – memory accumulation, they run the risk of becoming illegible or being thrown away as information of no use in/ for the future’ (Dragićević Šešić, Stefanović, 2014, 15).
Functional memory is the result of memory politics based on institutional values and norms, attempting to forge links between past, present, and even future developments. Certain things from the institutional past might be temporarily forgotten or re-read according to current institutional values (Dragićević Šešić, Stefanović 2014, 15b).

The journal *Manek*, edited by Asocijacija Nezavisna kulturna scena Srbije [Association of Serbia’s Independent Cultural Scene], focuses on these problems by gathering experts from various spheres of culture and art. Official institutions show dysfunctionality in all dimensions of their activity and existence, and their space is taken over by alternative institutions, no longer in the opposition, as the words alternative and alternative art suggested in the previous 20th century period. The relations between official and alternative institutions during transition in Serbia, their internal structures and historical discontinuity created by marginalizing Yugoslav heritage, also the mutual attempts of creating continuity, establish dialog space needed for gaining consensual conclusions about the past, have not been adequately described neither in scientific nor in popular literature.

Collection of papers *Okviri konstrusanja jugoslovenskog kulturnog nasleđa* [Frames for the Yugoslav cultural heritage construction] (Kovačević, 2012) brought the first conclusions of the project named ‘Definisanje jugoslovenskog kulturnog nasleđa’ [Defining of Yugoslav cultural legacy] and marked the possible interpretations and notions that could shape Yugoslav legacy, „brotherhood and unity”, non-alignment movement, cult of Josip Broz Tito, revolutionary attitude and glorification of working class. Contained from 11 contributions, collection of papers strongly accentuated several attitudes from paper to paper, Yugoslavia, the non-existing country, with its non-existing legacy (at least not consensually shaped and defined) could count on the future presence in space of Yugonostalgia, or through the authentic like Non/alignment movement that cannot be connected with anything other from the past except Socialist Yugoslavia (which then implicates that it cannot be strongly related to any phenomenon in the future). Studies from the field of cultural policy and cultural management in years to follow are changing the perspective about uncertainty of the Yugoslav legacy and its influence for the future.

In her book from 2013 titled *Governing Heritage Dissonance, Promises and Realities of Selected Cultural Policies* Višnja Kisić connects heritage studies and cultural policies pointing out notions of conflict and reconciliation, placing the phenomena of different cultures, nations and generations in a dialog space in order to make conclusions about Yugoslav heritage on the four

---

21 This journal is, in its entirety, issue to issue, devoted to the deplorable working conditions in the independent cultural scene, the lack of support from competent institutions and the resulting challenges. The authors also stress the evident importance of independent culture in Serbia, taking over the function of official institutions.
examples, Stećci Medieval Tombstones Graveyards, located in Bosnia and Herzegovina, western Serbia, western Montenegro and central and southern Croatia as a good example of the joint interpretation of the common heritage (Kisić, 2016). The last case study is dedicated to an online museum in the Croatian Memories Archive and significance of personal memory in creating the consensual and collective approach towards Yugoslav legacy.

While the place of Yugoslav heritage in official institutions, together with (possible) cultural policy, got its shape in mentioned case studies and articles, the field of non-official (alternative institutions) still waits for the proper research. In a book titled *Umetnost i kultura otpora* [Art and culture of resistance] from the 2018, Milena Dragićević Šešić defines the role of the alternative movements and organizations in 90s, from war conflicts the perspective of the resistance towards regime of Slobodan Milošević in period of war conflicts and breakup of Yugoslavia. Author points out the causes and consequences of the activities in alternative art field, their significance and influence on socio political reality in Serbia, and suggests the possibility of space for the new movements (and studies) to appear on a basis of the culture of bunt and resistance from 90s (more about it in the chapter dedicated to alternative institutions).

**YUGOSLAVIA WITHOUT A FINAL STOP. CONCLUSION**

Apart from mentioned monographs dealing with Yugoslavia in different historical periods (Bakić, 2011), a significant number of scientific texts (articles, studies, lectures) is centered around the importance of Yugoslavia and its cultural influence. Insisting on cultural memory and the perseverance of the idea of Yugoslavia and Yugoslavism, as well as the significance of profounder and more diverse research, devoid of political influences and pressures, Yugoslavia appears not merely as a closed past-tense narrative, i.e. a phenomenon of the past, but as an active principle as well, lasting until today. Since Yugoslavia and its heritage are identified with communism, and communism itself becomes a ‘waste container term’ that includes all things unwanted and a super-category deprived of any defined content, the insistence on continuity and the positioning of the Yugoslav period on maps and in stories is often declared to be Yugonostalgia, a phenomenon similar to sentimentalism.

Thus we arrive at the importance of memory and the narrative that re-conquered the past and therefore a completeness and the right to the future of the structure whose core it represents, in culturological studies and analyses evaluating the existing results of cultural institutions in the
transition process. However, the internal structure of cultural institutions in the post-Yugoslav period should be examined by approaching its central narrative, its essential core, containing, naturally, the near past and, accordingly, Yugoslavia after Yugoslavia, i.e. more or less the transformed Yugoslav artistic space. The analysis of the status quo in cultural institutions, their inability to transform and prolonged transition as the subject of my thesis were presented in existing research by creating transverse and longitudinal sections of their achievements, meaning achieved and expected results, and hinting in which direction one should search for the causes of certain phenomena and their dynamics. That means that there are only a few hints within evaluation studies from the perspective of cultural politics regarding Yugoslavia after Yugoslavia, i.e. the Yugoslav artistic space after SFRY’s breakup in the context of cultural and artistic institutions (Kisić, 2016). Significantly, those statements are dispersed across texts by various authors, in articles dedicated to the events in official and nonofficial institutions.

The enumerated reasons for the transitive pause in the listed studies can be traced to the political views seeping into the sphere of cultural and artistic activity – whereby an entire period of Yugoslavia, marginalized because it does not correspond with official politics and the sphere of national interest, can be forced outside the field of culture and art. ‘The Second Yugoslavia’, created in 1945, is today, in official discourse, often identified with Yugoslavia in general (by governing authorities and wide publicity), and the fact that Yugoslavia fell apart during bloody conflicts between its constituent republics is still the most important point in cultural memory and individual remembrance. By means of the particular interest in the Yugoslavia created in 1945, the Yugoslavism is equated with socialism and communism, which leads to an additional intervention of political structures in the process of marginalizing its paradigm in the socio-psychological sphere of life in the region of former Yugoslavia (Kuljić, 2011).

The attitude towards Yugoslavism, Yugoslav legacy and successorship in Serbia (and other former members of the SFRY, especially cultural legacy) is controversial, fluid and still has not become the object of a unifying publication (monograph). This statement is particularly pertinent for the area of culture and art, which lacks systematic research, especially from the perspective of identity and legacy as a symbolic heritage (of the post-Yugoslav period) creating a cultural continuity through the prism of humanities. Research connected with culture and art is mostly conducted from the perspective of cultural politics (Šešić, Tomka, 2014) and represents primarily evaluations and programs (Čopić, 2014).

A reflection of the complex and ambivalent relationship with Yugoslav heritage and Yugoslav narrative principally as developed by official structures and political elites, and
subsequently by the official strategies and cultural politics with regard to the institutions of culture and art, has yet to become the object of in-depth analyses and discussions, or even an all-encompassing written overview. Yugoslav legacy still does not have a stable and clearly defined position in the governing narrative circles, the most important and central storyline of the official institutions’ internal structures – primarily those of culture and art. Researchers and workers in the field of culture and art have advised on the importance of accepting the Yugoslav past in order to preserve the internal structure of institutions and their functionality (Branislav Dimitrijević, Jerko Denegri, Dejan Sretenović) and the fatality of a lingering fragmentation and discontinuity in the narrative by circumventing the Yugoslav past.

However, serious scientific and artistic projects still do not focus on the subject of Yugoslav legacy (Yugoslav identity) and its importance for cultural institutions, and the creation of an identity crisis and confusion by ‘overcoming’ i.e. ‘circumventing’ the Yugoslav historical period, spanning some 70 years, is not the object of a significant monographic analysis and evaluation. The reasons could be found in the ambivalent relationship with the Yugoslav heritage in general and the lack of understanding for the importance of a whole and functional narrative for cultural institutions and cultural activity. Authoritative structures and institutions do not act responsibly towards their tasks and questions in the field of culture and art, from the beginning of transitive processes till today (2020) and act by marginalizing the needs of cultural-artistic institutions and individuals, so that field is considered neglected and unsupported (Šešić, Tomka, 2014). As Dragan Markovina stresses in his book Jugoslavenstvo poslije svega [Yugoslavism after all], from 2016, common cultural ground and art space has survived the breakup of Yugoslavia, as it was present long before its establishment (Markovina, 2016).

The phenomenon of Yugoslav legacy contains the creative potentials of the past. My argument should describe the place, the role, and the impact of the Yugoslav legacy and its narrative in the internal structure of both formal and informal cultural institutions at the end of 20th and the beginning of the 21st century until 2020. Yugoslavism was for so long a very significant part of Serbian identity, and it should be investigated from the contemporary perspective.
II HISTORICAL CONTEXT

After the Barbarian invasion and during the massive Migration in the 4th century, the Old Slavs were displaced from their territory in Eastern Europe, on three sides of the world, so they have divided into three tribes (East, West and South). For South Slavs (which include the Serbs, Croats, Bosnians, Slovenes, Macedonians, Montenegrins and Bulgarians), there exists only a few documents prior to the 5th century and before their migrations and settlement in the territory on which they have stayed until present (the tribes inhabited the whole region in the Balkan Peninsula and some territories of the eastern Alps region).

The Slavs, known as the Sklavenoi, migrated successively, in small numbers that might have moved down as early as the 3rd century, however the massive migration did not occur until the 6th century (Skowronek, Tanty, Wasilewski 2005). The Balkan Peninsula was already inhabited by the tribes, Illyrians, Avars, Dardanes, Thracians, Celts, which inherited the Greek language and culture as dominant, as it was by the end of the 4th century BC in whole Eastern Mediterranean (Felczak, Wasilewski, 1985).

In spite of the various influences of different cultures on the Balkan peninsula, most still remained subjects of the Roman Empire, so the Balkans remained the meeting space of the different peoples, cultures and influences since the early period of tribe migrations. The popular name for every tribe living in the Balkans and the Adriatic area among Romans, was Illyrians, even though, in the period of the huge migration, the Illyrian tribes were situated in the area corresponding to today's Adriatic coast and the name Illyrian was originally used to refer to a people occupying an area centered on Lake Skadar, situated between Albania and Montenegro (Illyrians proper).

However, the Greeks and Romans subsequently used the term as a generic name for the different peoples (most of the time including Slavs) within a well-defined but much greater area. The area was influenced by at least two huge Empires from the earliest periods, so the Balkan Peninsula, as a chosen settlement space for South Slavs, was at the same time, a space of various cultural influences, and the interest of the various conquistadors (Felczak, Wasilewski, 1985). In
the early Middle Ages, the Greek speaking Eastern Roman Empire (Byzantium) controlled the provinces in the Balkans and Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{22}

The idea of unity among Slavs raised at first was the awareness of the common denominator and cultural similarities among all Slavs then among South Slavs, and also as a way of empowering and gaining independence (Jezernik, 2018). Cultural resemblance became the foundation of the unity idea, emerged in the late 17th century and gained prominence through the Illyrian movement in the 19th century – a South-Slavic cultural and political initiative with roots in the early modern period, developed and widened by a group of young Croatian intellectuals.\textsuperscript{23}

The concept of unity among Slavs, then idea of unity among South Slavs (Ilyrism), the idea of the common state (Yugoslav idea), became apparent among intellectuals firstly in Croatia, then in Slovenia and Serbia (Rapacka 1997, 74–81, 93–98). It has been depicted by Croatian Illyrists, as a Serbo-Croat linguistic and cultural unity in the attempt to defend national and cultural identity from the magyarizing policies of the Magyar elites. The Serbs that lived in the territory of the Habsburgs Empire (and on its border) together with Croatians that used to live on that territory (Pannonian) long before migrations occurred, had an opportunity to get involved with the heritage of territory and its influence on the creation of double identity.

Yugoslavism (jugoslovenstvo) was ‘invented’ by Habsburg South Slavs intellectuals, and in 19th century took shape of the political movement highly accepted in Serbia, spreading on the Slovenia on north and Bulgaria on the east, mostly flourishing in intellectual circles but having wide influence (Trgovčević, 2005). So, the political representation of the South Slavic unity idea (emanated in Yugoslavism) was the common state, based on the common cultural ground and other interconnectedness. Yugoslavism was inspired ‘by the concept of Kulturnation\textsuperscript{24}, the model of

\textsuperscript{22} From the 14th century, Venice controlled most of the maritime commerce of the Balkans with important colonial possessions on the Adriatic and Aegean coasts. But much of the Balkans was under Ottoman Empire through the Early modern period. Ottoman rule was long, and complex, lasting from the 14th century up until the early 20th, tolerant to the culture and religion of Balkan people, having enormous impact to their social, administrative, and military structures. The new cultural circle, created by the influence from both societies and culture, is often mentioned as the Ottoman cultural influence and heritage in the Balkans (Fine, 1991).

\textsuperscript{23} The Illyrian Movement (1835–1848) strove to establish a broad national identity among the South Slavs, who were subjects of two empires, Austro-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire. The Illyrian Movement by creating a single language for the people who today identify themselves as Slovenes, Croats, Bosnians, Bosniaks (Muslims of Bosnia), Serbs, Montenegrins, and Macedonians. At first the political movement tried to create a ‘spiritual brotherhood’ among Slavs by developing their language and promoting literacy in it. Its main proponents were Croats and as it developed, it moved away from broad South Slavic, focusing increasingly on Croatian political concerns, having failed to attract many followers outside of Croatia. By 1848 the Movement had succeeded in creating a Croatian national identity from the provinces of Civil Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia (The Triune Kingdom), Istria, and much of the Military Frontier, but by then Slovenes and Serbs had already developed their own national languages and identities that were incompatible with the Croatian one‘(Greenberg, 2011).

\textsuperscript{24} Kulturnation was a concept developed by Johan Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), it represents the concept of a language-based cultural nation and has in its core Herder’s idea of the connection between thought and language.
thinking about nationhood in terms of philological-literary concepts (e.g. ‘national rebirth’), which is unavoidable in any attempt to understand the process of the national integration of the majority of (south) Slavic nations’ (Roksandić, 2017, 29). Probably the best conditions for creating the Slavic unity as a common state, were on the Balkan peninsula, where the South Slavic countries were divided and unified at the same time.25

INTEGRATION PROCESS AND SPACE OF CULTURE (AS A REFLECTING SPACE OF DECISION-MAKING)

Idea of the Kulturnation, Slavophil idea26, Illyrism and Yugoslavism, was, at first, a representation of tendency for unification, among small European countries, which was present mostly because of the dividedness and the fragmentation of the small territory in comparison with the other continents. The Balkan peninsula was a space of the gathering and mixture of the different cultures and influences, which was one of the main characteristics of the Balkans from the earliest ages, and as a result of being between the western region (the Roman empire) and the eastern region (‘New Rome’ or the Eastern Roman empire, predominantly Hellenized).27 The most

as a ground for the Romantic concept of the nation in 19th century. Herder valued the future of Slavdom, the cultural unity of South Slavic people (which emanation seems to be the phenomenon and fact of existence of Yugoslavia, a federation based on the cultural and language similarity). His philosophy and approach to heritage and the possibility of unity by the principle of cultural similarities was the inspiration and anticipation of the Slavic Idea and Jan Kollar’s (1793–1852) development of “Kulturnation principles”.

25 ‘However, nations, understood primarily as a sovereign people, had in the „long 19th century”, already after the French Revolution of 1789, become historical subjects that had appropriated the experience of the national past, the national present and future, so that (Yugo)Slavism, too, originally a phenomenon of South Slavic interconnectedness, had conceptually changed its meanings dramatically in different national traditions. From that standpoint, (Yugo)Slavism cannot be an analytical concept, but nevertheless can be the subject of analysis, including in all its distinct, particular historical manifestations, meaning also as an ideologeme’ (Roksandić, 2017, 30).

26 ‘One of the responses to the assertion of German and Hungarian and the loss of neutral Latin in the Empire was the emergence of a thin layer of Slavic intellectuals promoting Pan Slavic ideology. The Slovak pastor and Pan-Slavist Ján Kollár (1793–1852) envisioned a literary and spiritual (apolitical) brotherhood of Slavs through his concept of ‘reciprocity’, entailing the creation and promotion of Slavic literary languages, literature written in those languages, Slavic libraries and reading rooms, and the active reading of others’ literatures in their original Slavic languages.’ (Greenberg, 2011, 367) But, idea of Slavic Unity was brought in a first place by Stanisław Staszic, Polish catholic priest, philosopher, writer and poet (1815, Myśli o równowadze politycznej Europy), and then by Jan Kolar (Borzym, Floryńska, Skarga, Walicki, 1983).

27 ‘… it was the only European region where, side by side, ‘Greeks’ and ‘Barbarians’, and ‘Romans’ and ‘Barbarians’ endured simultaneously. It was also unique by the fact that Christianization began very early and ended very late, with numerous juridictional, ritual, confessional and ecclesiastical controversies characterizing the shifting borders of the Christian West and the Christian East, which was also marked by deeply rooted paganism, heresy and, from the 15th century onward, its own autochthonic version of Islam. There is in fact no European monotheistic religion that did not become autochthonic in this region. This was a unique European region that spawned and maintained Glagolitic, Cyrillic, Roman and even Arabic Slavic literacy, parallel with Greek and Latin language culture’ (Roksandić, 2017, 32).
realistic option was the concept of the Slavic unity on the Balkans based on German (Herder’s) idea of Kulturnation.

Those efforts were mostly guided by Herder’s idea of Kulturnation, which was the model to the conceptualization of common linguistic ground and common language of the South Slavic people. Josip Sipus pointed out in his work from 1796 (Basis of the Wheat Trade), that the Croatian language needed standardization, as it was already done by the scholars for the German language (example of the German linguistic situation and culture, and its standardization, led the Slavic scholars to the German concept of Kulturnation and to the unification of the South Slavic nations, based on cultural similarity). So, in the middle of the 19th century, Serbian and Croatian writers and linguistics proposed the standardization of the common language based on the Shtokavian dialect.

Every language of the South Slavic territory has its own development path and by it – standardization, and the whole and separated processes were the part of the joining and creating the common language. The standardization of the Serbian language was marked by the Serbian Cyrillic alphabet and established by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, the Croatian Language with the Croatian Latin alphabet, established by Ljudevit Gaj.

Among Vienna scholars, the origin Croatians or Serbians, the idea of the unification of the South Slavic peoples eventually became a question of the program. To the Vienna agreement led the effort of Ljudevit Gaj, and the launching of the magazines Novine horvatske (Croatian News) and the Danicu horvatchu, slavonzku y dalmatinzku (Croatian, Slavonic and Dalmatian Morning Star), which, the following year, he had already renamed as Ilirske narodne novine (Illyrian National News) and the Danicu ilirsku (Illyrian Morning Star) – the process of Croatian national integration explicitly shifted to a program of South Slavic (Roksandić, 2017).

The Illyrian movement and its emanation in Yugoslavism were based not just on the common cultural ground, but also on the common interest and political aspirations of the Slavic nations. It was also rooted, as a common cultural space from which basis it was built, on personal connections and cooperations. Further, the very emerging idea of the South Slavic unity had numerous interpretations containing the emotional potential of subjective expectations, and a certain ambivalence held and expressed by its creators (Rapacka, 1995, 26). Eventually, the mutual influence between ‘cultural’ and ‘political’ would become completely intertwined in emanation of the South Slavic Unity idea (at first Illyrism, then Yugoslavism and Yugoslav state(s)).
The political effects became visible in the spring of 1848, with the clarity that the vision of the Austro-Slavism and unity between Slavic people and/under Habsburg Monarchy, which was based on constitutional reform of Habsburg Monarchy, remained closed inside small national elite circles, while Illyrism (soon to become Yugoslavism) took place and its legitimacy among wider circles. Even if it was the vision of elites, Yugoslavism was much closer to people, and conceptually to South Slavic integration, especially in Croatia (Roksandić, 2017).

Croatian elites were declaring acceptance of Yugoslavism, constantly and by emerging numerous institutions of culture and art, for example the Yugoslav Academy of Science and Arts (Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti) established by the initiative and foundation of bishop Josip Juraj Strossmayer28, The Society for Yugoslav History (Družtva za jugoslavensku povijestnicu, 1850), the Archive of Yugoslav history (Arkiv za povijestnicu jugoslavensku, 1851), and the Yugoslav Committee (Jugoslavenski odbor, 1915–1919)29.

28 Josip Juraj Strossmayer (1815–1905) was a Croatian politician, Roman Catholic bishop, and benefactor. In 1860 he became the leader of the People's Party and remained at its head until 1873. In 1861, Strossmayer supported the relations of Croatia and Hungary, where he stated federalization as a goal. Strossmayer was the one to support the founding of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts in 1866, as well as the re-establishment of the University of Zagreb in 1874. Strossmayer aided the creation of the printing house in Cetinje, helped found the Matica slovenska and actively supported Matica srpska, the national culture societies of the Slovenes and the Serbs, respectively. Strossmayer supported the union of all south Slavic peoples, and promoted religious unification through (Stančić, 2018).

29 Yugoslav Committee (Jugoslavenski odbor) was a political interest group formed by South Slavs from Austria-Hungary during World War I aimed at joining the existing south Slavic nations in an independent state. Founding members were Franjo Supilo, Ante Trumbić, Ivan Meštrović, Hinko Hinković, Franko Potočnjak, Nikola Stojanović, Dušan Vasiljević. First three members were Croats from Kingdom of Dalmatia, next two members were Croats from the Kingdom of Croatia - Slavonia, while the last two were Serbs from Bosnia and Herzegovina. Their initial gathering happened in 1914 while the committee was officially formed on 30 April 1915 in the Parisian Hotel Madisson. As Britain was the leader of the Entente, London was chosen as the headquarters of the Committee. The president was Ante Trumbić. In 1915, there were 17 members in the Committee, of which 11 from the Croatian and Dalmatian littoral regions. During that year, the Committee formed branches in Paris, Geneva, St. Petersburg, Cleveland, Valparaiso and Washington. Their liaisons in the homeland were the United Yugoslav Youth, an illegal youth organization formed in 1914 in Vienna (within Austria-Hungary), and the Government of the Kingdom of Serbia. Their relationship with the Serbian official politics was seen by the Committee members as necessary, but strained because of their occasionally conflicting political stances The Committee reacted negatively to Nikola Pašić's government open courting of Italy in 1916, which had said that Serbia recognized the Italian hegemony over the Adriatic and particularly the naval bases. Later the same year, they learnt of a memorandum by the Serbian government to the British where they explicitly staked a claim on various territories of Austria-Hungary where there were Serb Orthodox monasteries. However, they could not come to an agreement on that issue, and Franjo Supilo left the Yugoslav Committee on 5 June 1916. He died the following year. The committee signed the Corfu Declaration with the Kingdom of Serbia in 1917. It was a compromise declaration, advocating a parliamentary monarchy, with three nations and two alphabets equal before the law, religious freedom and universal suffrage. It received political sponsorship from Great Britain and France. In October 1918, the State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs was declared from the liberated lands from the Austro-Hungarian Empire in what would become the first incarnation of a Yugoslav state. This did not achieve recognition. In December, the State united with the Kingdom of Serbia (which had just expanded its borders after World War I to incorporate the Vojvodina region, Macedonia, and previously independent Montenegro) to form the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. The Committee's task was accomplished. Ante Trumbić later became an opponent of the June 1921 Vidovdan Constitution and the new Kingdom of Yugoslavia (January 1929) (Miladinić Norka, 2007, 138-139).
Bishop Josip Juraj Strossmayer continued for some time to make connections between Croatian and Serbian elite members. In 1860 Vuk Karadžić, and in 1870 Ante Starčević stated the plan of the national assimilation, but in the opposite direction – Karadžić was advocating the assimilation into the Serbian nation, and Starčević into Croatian. Both were unacceptable. But the agreement was succeeded within the field of the language battle, so called Agreement in Vienna, in 1850, and made important conclusions, the literary language was based on Shtokavian dialect, and called Serbian and Croatian as the variants of the same language Serbo-Croatian. In this achievement Đuro Daničić and Vuk Karadžić were linguists from Serbia to take part, Croatians, Dimitrije Demeter, Ivan Mažuranić and Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, and the Slovenian linguist Franjo Miklošič (Greenberg, 2011, 375).

According to Božidar Jezernik, the name ‘Yugoslavia’ appeared for the first time in one Slovenian newspaper, in an article published on October 19th, 1849 in Lublana. That could represent how Yugoslavia as a conception emerged together with Yugoslavism. The article is dedicated to the linguistic issue arguing that the Yugoslav language was needed to connect the Yugoslavs in Habsburg monarchy. The author of the article, signed as Bukovšek, wrote that Slovenes also should accept the one Yugoslav language in order to join one ‘Slavic tree’ (Jezernik, 2018, 13).

On the Habsburg Monarchy border, in the part of the Military Frontier (Vojna Krajina) buffer regions, shaped like an earth string along the Sava river with Belgrade on one and Zagreb on the other side (until the 1878 and the occupation of Bosnia and Hercegovina)
30, both on the Sava, connected with the mutual recognition of the languages and customs, and through that with numerous different contacts among people, alternative institutions, rudiment, secret and alternative organizations, written and spoken word, and at the end – accompanying similarities, were space for unity, culturally and geographically, creating the unique mentality and among its representatives mental maps as representations of mutual and shared time and space (Sujecka, 2015).

But, geographically, more than culturally, unification of South Slavs (despite other numerous problems and political factors), seemed to be complicated and sometimes an unsolvable

---

30 Ljudevit Gaj was the first who programmatically, linguistically and culturally integrated the area from the Julian Alps to the Black Sea, from the west to the east, endowing the Croatian national renewal (i.e. Illyrian Movement) with a Yugoslav meaning (1835-1848).
Besides the importance of agrarian and economic perspectives towards Yugoslavism, taking all circumstances together, the Illyrian (Yugoslav) movement was the matter of the intellectual elites and based on cultural values.

CULTURE AND POLITICS INTERTWINED

According to Dennison Rusinow’s conclusion, mentioning and applying Miroslav Hroch’s theory from 1968 about the three stages of the movement developing and spreading in small countries, Yugoslavism took just two:

First a group of awakened intellectuals (like the Ilyrianists) starts studying their language, culture, and history, as an evidence of their historic credentials and worth as a distinct nation. Then these ideas are transmitted and propagated by ‘patriots’ (carriers of national ideologies) and the national movements and parties they create. In the third stage these last become mass movements and parties. As Ivo Banac notes, Hroch’s sequence aptly sums up the course of national revivals among the South Slavs. This is certainly true of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. However, Yugoslavism in its pure form—what I have called ‘the core idea’, from Illyrianism through and beyond its revival and elaboration by Josip Juraj Strossmayer and Franjo Rački—never progressed beyond a feeble approximation of the second stage. Yugoslavism active proponents, at least until the early twentieth century, were few in number and almost entirely Croats drawn from a very small social stratum. The Illyrianists of the 1830s and 1840s were exclusively members of ‘the intellectual class’ (clergy, officials, soldiers, artists, and students), wealthier merchants, a members of the lower nobility’ (Rusinow, 2003, 13).

Yugoslavism was owned by the elites in the first place, but under various circumstances – different for the Slovenes and Croats, and the Serbs in Habsburg Monarchy, Serbians had autonomy, independence, and later a Kingdom, in the second quarter of the 19th century, so the

31 However, it was only in the latter part of the 19th century that the conservative national élites, confronted with the great challenges of European-wide modernization, would begin to realize that less than a third of the mostly northern South Slavic territories were agriculturally fertile flatlands, while two thirds consisted of mountainous terrain, significantly less agriculturally productive, with limited lines of communication and very few natural throughways from the plains to the Adriatic Sea, and without waterways that led into this sea. In these areas, there was not enough drinking water to sustain concentrated populations and larger livestock funds (Roksandić, 2017).

32 The ideologues of South Slavic/Yugoslav cooperation sought the economic basis of Yugoslavism primarily in agrarian economics. Agrarian economics and rural culture were dominant in South Slavic societies up until the socialist modernization and industrialization in the second half of the 20th century, but the types of the agrarian economics were so different that any attempt of the projecting kind of common solutions was completely unstable (on the other side Habsburg Lands, on the other Ottoman Empire, and in the middle Serbian village with the culture of free family and domestic agriculture). If there was a geographic basis to the South Slavic/Yugoslav issue, it could only be concerned with the longitudinal networking of territories to the north and south of the Middle-European-Adriatic basins, between the sub-Danubian and Adriatic regions, predominantly in the mountainous areas of the Balkan Peninsula.
fear for the state and freedom was not omnipresent like in other parts of a future union (Djokić, Rusinow, 2003, 17). Serbian politicians, and prominent figures from art and culture, because of the domination from the middle of 19th century the idea of old Serbia, were predominately more interested in unity of all Serbs, in comparison with the Yugoslavism as a unity of South. Slavs (Trifunović, 2015).

A different perception of Yugoslavism, in the 19th century, based in different political situation of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenians, were the reason for todays particular interpretations of the Serbian perspective towards the realization of Yugoslav idea – that Serbian elites were apologist of the Great Serbia, instead of the Yugoslavia, and the fact that they did not approach Illyrism with as much euphoria like Croats (which project that originally was) lays in their assumption that Yugoslavia is just a cover for Great Serbia aspirations (or a cover for the Great Croatia aspirations from the other side)\textsuperscript{33}. Considering the fact that Croatia was still in great danger of an Italian invasion, while under Habsburg Monarchy, this assumption was one more variant, and it followed rare interpretations of Strossmayer’s work and motivation, which declared that his aspirations weren’t the pointed one (unity based on cultural closeness, among all), so South Slavs in Unity, even the heads of Illyrism, had seen the opportunity for realization of national and nationalistic goals through the idea of Yugoslavia (Jezernik, 2018).

The period of the 19th century was the period of Serbs and Croats getting closer through the idea of South Slavic Unity, and that was from the different points of view, a different historical continuity, influences and circumstances, from one point of view Yugoslavism emerged from a cultural closeness, from another it was motivated by political and economic interest.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{33} Every national project is built on the (common) tradition. If we take as a fact that the notion ‘origin’ which is often in a center of the national identity contains, in its nature, turning to the past, and substitute for the future (Kuljić, 2018, 50), then the building of the supranational identity, even progressive by its intention and definition, could be withdrawal from the insecurity of the unknown (future).

\textsuperscript{34} The significant moment in construction of the Yugoslav idea as the political and economic agreement on the first place in contemporary historiography, was the meeting of the Serbian minister Ilija Garašanin and bishop Juraj Strossmayer in 1860. The ocasion for the meeting was the plan of the Miloš Obrenović, Prince of Serbia, to make coalition against Ottoman Empire. Garašanin and Strossmayer agreed ‘to work for a Yugoslav state independent from both Austria and Ottoman Empire’ (Djokić, Rusinow, 2003, 17), but agreement lasted just two years after assassination of Prince Obrenović, Ilija Garašanin and Juraj Strossmayer where politicians with different approach to Slavic Unity – Garašanin’s writings \textit{Načertanije} (1844), was influenced by the lively contact with Polish emigration gathered in Hotel Lambert in Paris, and represented the variant of Yugoslavism with Serbian state in its core (Polish prince Adam Czartorysky vision) what become Unity under Serbian predomination in Garašanin’s \textit{Načertanije} (Skowronek 1976). The Polish prince Czartorysky with an idea of one strong Slavic state in the Balkans as a help for Polish recovery, was sending agents in Serbia, so there is the context of their influence on Serbian politics in ’40s (Skowronek, 1976) Croatia was not strong enough for that kind of temptations, being under Habsburgs Empire and confronting with the fact that possibility of Austro- Slavic federation is lost. The fact that all the Slavic “countries” in the Balkans where geographically dispersed, meant then one more strong argument for gathering, in political and economical way since they were connected by languages and ethnogenesis.
In order to build and maintain the Unity, even based just on the political interest, Serbs, Slovenians andCroats were drawn to create a common identity, but also drawn towards a constitution of their own modern national identity (together with supranational identity). Among elites or just prominent figures who were not in the same time apologists of Yugoslavism, there were attempts of valorization and adaptation of the Yugoslav idea taking so called national interest in focus (for example already mentioned \textit{Načertanije} (Sketch) of Ilija Garašanin) and in the middle of that process there was, again, the question of a language\textsuperscript{35}. In the 19th century, the understanding and interpretation of the language and culture was connected with forming of mental maps in collective and individual level as sort of the creation of national identity and mentality, with the orientation in time and space (Sujecka, 2015). At least, that was the case among elites, and the Yugoslav idea which emanated in cultural project could not be separated from the Yugoslav state project / Yugoslavia. The phenomenon of culturalization of politics (Kuljić, 2018), or politicization of culture, could describe the fact that there is no Yugoslav culture (project) without a Yugoslav state, as the Yugoslav state was conceptualized on the basis of cultural similarity.\textsuperscript{36}

\section*{First Yugoslavia – One Nation, One Culture}

Due to the new circumstances in early 20th century and the disintegration of the old European empires, Yugoslavism as a concept of South Slavic unity appeared to be more than just an idea of the ‘Slavic interconnectedness’ (Roksandić, 2017). In this period, the Yugoslav idea

\textsuperscript{35} Slovenians had different (but similar) language in comparison with Serbs and Croats which were speaking (almost) the same language and naming it differently – in Serbia it was Serbian, in Croatia – Croatian (Jezernik, 2018): The issue was complicated by the fact that those who felt as a Croats spoke and wrote in three quite distinct dialects: Čakavian, Kajkavian, and Štokavian, the last of which was also spoken by almost all Serbs. National ideologues could deal with this problem in one of two ways: if ‘language(s)’ these people spoke was in fact or could be developed into a single language, they were or should be one nation, or - if they (or their nationally conscious elites) ‘knew’ they were separate nations, then they must be speaking separate languages. (Rusinow, 2003, 19). The different perspective towards language issue had its roots in opinion of both Serbs from Vojvodina and Principality of Serbia, that the Illyrian name, despite recalling the ancient language and culture closeness, marginalized the importance of their national identity. The fact that Serbian language movement was very successful in theoretical and practical way, and was already lasting since 1815, when Vuk Karadžić (1787–1864) established standard language based on the Štokavian dialect and spoken language: ‘Karadžić’s proposed standardization broke with the Slaveno-Serbian standard language, a secularized variety of Church Slavic heavily influenced by Russian that only a small educated elite within Serbia could understand. Karadžić also advanced his view that all speakers of the Štokavian dialect (on which Illyrian was also based) were Serbs. Not only did this view clash with the aims of the Pan-Slavic ideology of the Illyrian Movement, but it also conflicted with the beliefs of those Illyrians who understood the Movement as a primarily Croatian national endeavor. Karadžić’s view, just as the Illyrians’, assumed that language defines the community, but he opposed the supranational character of the Illyrian endeavor, taking ancient dialect divisions as historical indicators of ethnicity. By this definition he expanded the notion of the Serbian to include Catholic and Muslims.’ (Greenberg, 2011, 375).

\textsuperscript{36} Conceptualization and accentuatization of the cultural similarity among elites in the 19th century is already a political construct. And it did not take a long time for that political concept to materialize in the form of state unity.
grounded and all the South Slavic countries inhabited the territory of the Balkan peninsula, except Bulgaria, united in one single state, state of Yugoslavia (lit. ‘South Slavia’). After the Balkan Wars of 1912–13, and World War I, the unification was possible, even though it was not completely foreseen and analyzed, so the different interpretations and variants of Yugoslavism and common state were present (Trgovčević, 2003, 223).

On the eve of 1914, Jovan Skerlić, one of the Serbian ideologues of integral Yugoslavism as the South Slavic response to the challenges of the ‘age of empires’, but also as the guarantee of successful Westernization, advocated a compromise in linguistic unification (neo-Shtokavian Ekavian plus Roman script). As the known authority in Serbian culture, he was also a leading influence on the political beliefs of many, especially the young generation.

The first South Slavic state was proclaimed on December 1st 1918 – as the union of the Slovenes, and Croats with the Kingdom of Serbia (which already included the Kingdom of Montenegro, by the Assembly which took place in Podgorica from the 24th to 29th of November in 1918). The new state was crowned as a Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Almost every nation who entered the unity was deeply divided, and the outcome of World War I was such that the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes became a problem the moment it was established (Perović, 2015).

Among the constitutive nations of the Slovenes, Croats and Serbs, the union included Montenegrins, Macedonians, Bosnians, Albanians, and other national entities as the minorities German, Greeks and Turks. The fact that all nations were at least once in history engaged in a war with each other, caused mistrust and fragmentation in the core of every participating nation. After the great victory in World War I, Serbian history and culture took the large role in the unification narrative, and a huge part of story started to circle around Serbian myths like Kosovo37, victory in Balkan wars, and World War I. The problem was that Slovenes, Croats and also Serbs from Vojvodina were on the Austrian side during the big war, so they could not participate equally in the victory celebration, memory politics, building monuments, or choosing Memorial Days and the way of its celebrations (Jezernik, 2018).

Although every nation held its position among others in Europe and already being known as an old European people, constituted as modern nations at the time of Yugoslavia’s establishment to a particular degree, on the other hand the awareness of the peripheral position in modernization

37 Kosovo myth with its huge narrative and imaginary potential influenced strongly on forming Yugoslav narrative (Jezernik, 2018).
process was ever present, a new state and new horizon open a new perspective – perspective of overcoming peripheral position (Roksandić, 2017, 33).

In addition, the Serbian great victory in World War I made from the Serbian ethos and mythology, by default, a narrative core of the new state, supported by prominent figures in Croatia and Slovenia (Ivan Meštrović, for example), but not from all. Further on, the new state as the new entity needed the new narrative (Yugoslavism already had its variations). What was the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes? What was the Kingdom of Yugoslavia? What was Yugoslavia itself and who are the people of Yugoslavia?

Part of the Kingdom (north and west) was previously under the Habsburg Monarchy and was marked by the strong and severe attempt of the cultural assimilation by the Habsburg Empire regime, and the other part was under the Ottoman Empire for the five centuries (south). Those economic connections and cultural influences were very strong even in the period of the constitution of the common state and Yugoslavian identity, which could form the polarization in the territory and orientation of the new state. All nations of the Kingdom were used to have the centers of the culture on some other place – not in their own core (Jezernik, 2018).

The Kingdom of Yugoslavia existed from 1929 to 1941, at the onset of Second World II, and the state was ruled by the Serbian dynasty of Karadorđević. Alexandar I, regent of his father Petar I, known as ‘Alexander the Unifier’, was assassinated in Marseille in France, by a member of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (IMRO). The crown passed to his under-aged son Peter. Alexander's cousin Pavle ruled as Prince regent until 1941. The same year the country was being invaded by the Axis powers, and the royal family flew to London.

As Dejan Djokić (Djokić, 2003) stresses almost hundred years after emerging of South Slavic unity idea in the frame of Illyrian movement, to the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in 1919, several narratives and perspectives towards Yugoslavism caused two strands, ‘integral Yugoslavism’ which did not recognize or just suppressed the differences between Slavic – Serbs, Croats and Slovens, and Yugoslavism which endured a nationhood with differences and similarities in one multi-ethnics state created from related Slavic nations. The South Slavic unification among the name of Yugoslavia, in October of 1929, came with a surprise, considering the fact that the common assumption was proclamation would not happen so soon after the end of World War I, so the circumstances for emerging of Yugoslavia were set. Yugoslavia emerged from the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (Djokić, 2003, 7) in 1929.
Different narratives emerged as different interpretational ideas of Yugoslavism where state’s characteristic during the whole of its existence, and it differed from the structure to structure. For example, the governments were looking forward to the national interest while the most of the prominent cultural elite figures were advocating a complete unity based on cultural values more than economic and political reasons, besides that the first motivation and relation toward idea of South Slavic unity was not the same from the perspectives of the all nations (Markovina, 2016). Every entity of the new unity had its own understanding of its nature in Serbia’s predominant interest in 19th century (despite of the prominent people who were the apologists of the Slavic Unity) was the liberation, national awakening and unity with Montenegro.

The Illyrian movement as the nest of the Slavic Unity was, by its origin, the Croatian movement, Slovenians where culturally and by religion close to the Serbs and Croats, while Muslims in Bosnia became the supporters, once when the idea emerged, even though they were able to notice that Christianity was the common ground for the Yugoslavism, considering the fact that Serbs, Croatians and Slovenes where constitutive ethnicity (Djokić, 2003).

**Still First Yugoslavia – Possibility of New Culture**

Different types and understandings of Yugoslavism with all its adaptations, rooted in different traditions, customs and religion, destined the both Yugoslavia. When the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenians was created, right after World War I (in 1918) even the most prominent Yugoslavs needed to admit that there is no Yugoslav nation yet, and that establishing one, requested an effort of the elites. The apostles of an integral Yugoslav nation, and Yugoslav culture, so called integral Yugoslavism, were dominant in the First Yugoslavia, delineating its character in comparison with the second Yugoslavia (created after World War II).

As Andrew Wachtel stated they were three groups, models of the Yugoslav culture, which coexisted in the inter-war period (Wachtel, 1998). But, according to that conclusion, it seemed that there were – three models in the plan of elites to create cultural unification and by that Yugoslav culture.

---

38 Petar Petrović Njegoš (1813–1851), bishop, ruler and poet of Montenegro, was one of the arguers of Slavic Unity, but still, interest of Montenegro and Serbia was their one unity, and after that unity among all Slavic people from the Balkan.
Those were, (1) existing culture (most likely Serbian as Serbs were the largest and most politically powerful group in the country) and by that chosen as the standard; (2) a new culture could be created that would combine elements of the existing (i.e. Serbian, Croatian, Slovene, and possibly Bosnian Muslim as well), which emanated the best in Croatian sculptor Ivan Meštrović and Serbian writer Ivo Andrić) and (3) possibilities of a new culture creation (Wachtel, 2003, 238).

The First model was characteristic for the 19th century Yugoslav apologists (for example – adaptation of the Stokavian dialect by the Croatian Illyrians who were mainly Kaikavian, and the fact that famous Croatian poet Ivan Mažuranić took the motive from the Serbian history for his eponymous poem Smrt Smail-age Čengića [Death of Smail-aga Čengić]. The second (potential) cultural model described as ‘Yugoslav national culture that would ignore existing affiliations and create a supranational Yugoslav culture to supersede them’ (Wachtel, 1998, 240), laid on the effort of the writers like Tin Ujević, Miloš Crnjanski, Branko Šimić, Marko Ristić and Oto Župančić, in creating modernist literature on Serbo-Croatian or Slovenian language and aligning Yugoslav culture with Western European culture.

But in the first decade after the World War I, and for the artists and Yugoslav thinkers from the inter-war period, only the model of the synthetic Yugoslav culture was acceptable – ‘culture that would join the existing tribal cultures into a new and dynamic national culture suitable for the new state’ (Wachtel, 1998, 240). The most prominent figures advocating this model were, as mentioned, Ivo Andrić and Ivan Meštrović (Makuljević, 2017a). An illustrative attempt of creating the Yugoslav culture was Meštrović’s famous ‘Kosovo Temple’ project. In the inter-war period, both Andrić and Meštrović were affiliated with the royal family and King Alexander. Ivo Andrić was a member of the four-man editorial board of the journal Književni jug (Literally South) which gave the exact statement of its goal to create synthetic Yugoslav culture already in its first issue (Perović, 2015).

Meštrović and Andrić stayed devoted to this interpretation of the Yugoslav culture, while that model was pretty much abounded in the ‘20s and 30s, and the synthetic Yugoslav culture was substituted by the model of supranational Yugoslav culture or by a separate Croatian or Slovenian

39 Meštrović became famous after exhibition in Rome in 1911, where he exhibited fragments from his work dedicated to Kosovo battle in 1389, in Serbian, and Vitus Day (28th of June) as the Serbian national and religious holiday. Meštrović should exhibit his work in Habsburg pavilion, but after his refusal to do it unless there is separated space for the South Slavic artist, his exhibition was held in Serbian pavilion. His Kosovo Temple was inspired by the Ortodox and the Catholics elements, with the figures inspired by the epic poetry inside, which were for the many Yugoslavs of those days, symbols of the Yugoslav awakening. Meštrović himself stated about his intention to provide a single synthesis of the popular folk ideals and to show how deeply rooted are some moments and symbols from the past (Makuljević, 2010).
culture (Wachtel, 1998, 246). Staying with synthetic Yugoslavism for Andrić and Meštrović was also the matter of the carrier interest, financial moment was playing a role also, and among them – the close friendship with King Alexander (Meštrović), which was the good argument for the supporters of different model of Yugoslav culture, after the World War II, and against Meštrović and Andrić. But, with time and distance, the synthetic cultural model provided more stability than the nationalist model which argued Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian culture as separate. The effort of the unitarist was not valued in a proper manner (Makuljević, 2017).

In conclusion, the unitary model of the Yugoslav identity and culture was characteristic for the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and shattered facing the World War II. Character of the post war Yugoslavism, and Socialistic Yugoslavia, was completely different. Clearly, after World War II and the revolutionary changes it made, a Second Yugoslavia had totally different character and was based on the completely different foundations, which meant leaving the unitary idea, at first practically and at the end even formally (Jezernik, 2018).

SECOND YUGOSLAVIA. NEVER RETURN TO THE OLD! SPACE FOR NEW INSTITUTIONS

The Yugoslav communists, after the capitulation of the Yugoslav Royal Army in April 1941, were the only ones to declare a will to: ‘universally lead the resistance against occupation and collaboration and for the renewal of Yugoslavia as a community of nations. Namely, they were banned and literally outlawed in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in 1920/1921, subject to state terror and prescribed in dominantly anti-communist public opinion, including the opposition’ (Roksandić, 2017).40

40 ‘Never a return to the old! was the message to all who were invited to join them. This was ultimately a message to all those who in the previous Yugoslavia felt deceived and betrayed and who did not rule out the possibility of a better, more just world. The second message, ‘brotherhood and unity’, was directed at all who, for whatever reason, felt marginalized and denied in their human, civic and national rights and who did not exclude the same rights for others. This alternative was so radical that the national-liberation resistance to occupation and collaboration could not avoid being burdened on its margins by civil war. However inclusive this communist-inspired, national-front mobilization, it had to be selective in order not to lose its credibility. The brakes failed seriously for the first time at the moment of ‘victory’. Revanchism against the vanquished, however limited, had far-reaching consequences, as did every other repressive campaign, with loss of human life or without it, which ensued all the way up to the dissolution of the SFR Yugoslavia in war. Even though in terms of modernization and level of civilization, socialist Yugoslavia did achieve results and values that were without precedent in the history of South Slavic nations, it did not manage to create a political culture and a political system capable of withstanding the pressures of internal and external crisis’ (Roksandić, 2017).
Belgrade was liberated on October 20, 1944 by the joint forces of the Soviet Red Army and the People’s Liberation Army (PLA/NOVJ, Narodnooslobodilačka vojska Jugoslavije). PLA, even not quite partisan, was organized by the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and its leader Josip Broz Tito who promised democratic elections after the ending of the War - to decide the future of the state. The monarchy (First Yugoslavia) was officially dissolved with the election in November 1945, while Josip Broz Tito was already a year in a White Palace in Belgrade, one of the buildings in the royal complex in Dedine (an elite neighborhood in Belgrade), as in his official residence. The state that emerged in 1945, was a Stalinist state, ruled by one party and its leader (Kulić, 2013, 37).

The new state also requested new narratives, a new culture and new institutions. For all that to be achieved, the new center, capital, was also planned. Milovan Đilas, one of the most prominent politicians of Communist Party, suggested Sarajevo, a city in Bosnia and Hercegovina, for the new capital of the new state. The site would be central, and Bosnia and Hercegovina was the multiethnic par excellence, representing a mixture of different nationalities, and intersection of different cultural influences and religions of Yugoslavia, in a pill.

The suggestion was denied, and for the capital of the new state new planes emerged – for the erection of the New Belgrade, on the left side of the Sava and Danube, north from the (Old) City of Belgrade. New Belgrade should represent the first socialist city with a concrete and symbolic value – emerged on the pillars of national equality guaranteed for the federation of six republics (each had their own capital), ‘constructing New Belgrade was, therefore, more than just colonizing an empty field, it was an act of socialist cosmogony, marking the foundation of new society’ (Kulić, 2013, 39).

The new society was oriented towards cooperation with Soviets (and Stalin) until the change in 1947, and conflict between Tito and Stalin, when Yugoslavia turned to the West (USA) gaining the support in the distancing from the Soviets Communist Party and regime of Josif Stalin. It was the end of socialist realism rule in Yugoslav Art and Culture, which would become official in exhibition of USA Abstract Art. The emerging of the new Belgrade with its plan Yugoslav character (not just that the new city was claimed to be the new capital and center for all Yugoslav and of all republics, it emerged in voluntarily labor, and with architects from throughout the all country somehow involved (on the selection of the architectural solution all experts could submit their projects) (Blagojević, 2007).
Besides the federal institutions (Central Committee, for example), Museums and Galleries, New Belgrade would represent a modern, healthy and a green place for living. In 1965, after establishing as a Modern Gallery in 1958, the Museum of Contemporary Art was erected on the representative place of the new Belgrade map, as a masterpiece of modernist architecture bearing the same symbolic meaning as the city itself. The Museum of Contemporary Art represented the symbol of planned Yugoslav artistic and cultural project, a project of unification and building of a new model in art and culture (see more in chapter dedicated to official institutions) (Sretenović, 2016). Institutions played a major role in political and cultural intersection of projects (Makuljević, 2017).

Also, simultaneously with the emerging of Yugoslav institutions in Belgrade and plans for unification and empowering a new Yugoslav identity, the dissolution process started in already created Yugoslav organizations. It was at the time of serious debates among prominent figures of the cultural and political sphere in the same time, proving the fact that political and cultural project of Yugoslavia where intertwined since the first steps into Yugoslavism until the dissolution of the Second Yugoslavia in the ‘90s.

The debate between Dobrica Ćosić (Serbian writer and politician) and Dušan Pirjevec (Slovenian literary critic and politician) took place in 1961 concerning literature as a subject, covering the focus on the relationship between the republics and the federation, relations in Party, and integration or disintegration. Dušan Pirjevec was among those intellectuals who aimed towards pluralization of the perspectives in the Party, while his opponent was trying to preserve the traditional perspective of unification. The field that debate was mainly placed in, literary magazines in Ljubljana and Belgrade could not hide the political background of the debate (Perović, 2015).

The prominent example of the culture and politics overlapping was also the Serbo-Croat ‘language debate’ in 1967 - which culminated during the Croatian spring (1971) in ‘Declaration Concerning the Name and Position of the Croatian Literary Language’. The document, signed by one hundred and forty intellectuals representing nineteen Croatian institutions, affirmed ‘the right of each nation to protect the attributes of its national identity’, making Croatian the official language in Croatia, while the Serbs from Croatia had the guarantee of the official institutions for the use of Serbian language 41 (Dragović Soso, 2003).

41 ‘Whereas for Croatian intellectuals the ’Declaration’ represented an affirmation of their nations sovereignty, for their Serbian counter-parts, it threatened to reverse their own nation’s traditional goal of ‘liberation and unification’. While Serbian writers saw their ’Proposal’ as simply a call for the extension of equal rights to the
Meanwhile in Belgrade, the Museum of Contemporary Art was officially opened, as an institution representing Yugoslav art and contemporary culture, oriented towards creating the Yugoslav identity in culture and art and representing it in all republics of federation and abroad. The Museum was one of the many planned Yugoslav cultural institutions in the new capital of New Belgrade.

**DISINTEGRATION PROCESS AND SPACE OF CULTURE (AS A REFLECTING SPACE OF DECISION-MAKING)**

The language of debate was more than a linguistic question, it was a political object – a debate about state and nation. In the early 1970s, the Party took more surveillance under the current happenings in order to regain more control under the cultural sphere (which ended in imprisoning numerous intellectuals, preventing them to participate in cultural and social activities), aimed to prevent the anticommmunist activities. Under enormous pressures, critical intellectuals left official institutions, as well as the Yugoslav Writers Union (Savez književnika Jugoslavije) \(^{42}\), to gain other activities and alternative ways for work and to earn living and no official meeting of the writer's union was held for ten years.

Considering that Yugoslavism was born and raised in literary circles, among writers, linguists, who were politicians also created in idea of the interconnectedness between culture and nation, I will describe the example of the last meetings in the institution of Yugoslav Writers Union, to show the anticipating event(s) – dissolution of one institution that foresaw the breakup of federation.\(^ {43}\)

But, in the 1980s, with Tito’s death and serious economic crisis, alternative politics and intellectual activism had a support in existing cultural institutions in Serbia and Slovenia. In

---

\(^ {42}\) ‘The Union was created in 1945. to promote communist’s values in culture; art and social life. Following 1948. break with Soviets politics and poetics, Union declared in October 1952, withdrawal from the current politics about cultural sphere, and beginning of the new and free literary creation and cooperation. But despite the changes in the 1950s and 1960s and gaining more freedom in discourse and production, ‘Yugoslav cultural sphere continued to reflect contemporary political debates and problems’ (Dragović Soso, 2003, 269).

\(^ {43}\) ‘During the Tito era, cultural institutions including the Yugoslav Writer’s Union essentially reflected political differences and disputes in the Party leadership, but they never went so far as to openly challenge official policy. Although intellectuals at times overstepped the limits of publicly acceptable discourse, genuine dissident activities, which contested single party rule and aimed at a transformation of the system, were few and had no institutional base’ (Dragović Soso, 2003, 270).
Slovenia, in order to gain more awareness and a wider critical perspective toward society, politics and culture, the most active were Slovenian Writers Society and magazine *Nova revija* (with its constant effort to mark the Slovenian Central Europe position and affiliation). While in Slovenia the alternative institutions and critical intellectuals were fighting to maintain and raise national awareness, the same structures were struggling for civil rights in Serbia. Serbian poet Gojko Djogo was arrested in 1982 because of publishing a collection of poems with the critical elements motivated by the governing of the ceased president Tito. The way that writer’s community stood for the poet and writers freedom and freedom of creation, witnessed that there was unity despite all ideological differences (Dragović Soso, 2003).

In April 1985, ten years later, the Ninth Congress of the Yugoslav Writers Union was gathered its members again, with the idea and awareness of a common purpose (freedom of creation, influence on entire state and region), but also under the shadow of the already rising nationalism in every states and conflict between the two Writers Societies – Slovenian and Serbian. The conflict had its escalation in moment of the declaring the candidate for the president of Unity, the Serbian society candidate (controversial writer Miodrag Bulatović), which could not be accepted by the Slovenian Society (members labeled the famous writer as the nationalist) (Repe, 2017).

This was not the first conflict based on the ideological attitude of a particular member and his opponents. The Serbian Society of Writers was already in permanent conflict with the Kosovo Writers Society (with the rare periods of peace and tolerance) assuming that the human, civil, and culture workers’ rights of the Serbian writers were diminished.\(^4^4\) The Slovenian Writers Unity succeeded in collecting the support from the Croatian, Kosovo and Montenegro Unity, so the election of the Miodrag Bulatović was suspended, and the function of the Union blocked for a couple of years. The conflict resonated throughout all institutions and in the entire country.

The Yugoslav Writers Union mirrored the situation in federation and political life in Serbia. It was a symbol for the destiny of the state, and a good example of a pattern for breaking down of the federal institutions. The conflict became even more serious when the Slovenian society invited the writers organization from Kosovo and Croatia to present their national literature in Ljubljana.\(^4^5\)

\(^4^4\) The Serbian- Albanian argue came to the top in the 1985, when forty Kosovo writers, non-Albanian, claimed that they were victims of discrimination in process of the president selection.

\(^4^5\) Whereas in the Albanian case, the Slovenes could argue that they merely wanted to become better acquainted with the literature written in a language not used by the other members of the organization, the Croatian case could not be justified on the same grounds. In fact, some of the Croatian participants of the literary evening expressed their discomfort at the Slovenes invitation, noting that Croatia, unlike Slovenia, was not an ethnically
The invitation was based on points already made during the Croatian spring and linguistic debate in 1971 – Croatian and Serbian are separate languages. The standpoints differed between writers’ societies, about language and literature, was the difference in standpoints about a common state, which became clear in February 1987 when the Presidency of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia called for a public debate on its draft ‘Proposal for Change of SFRY Constitution’. In that moment also by the start of the following year, the writers from both communities participated in making and collecting the papers which represented and reflected the interest of nations in the new Yugoslav arrangement, therefore the Slovenian writers took the opportunity to leave all what represented the Yugoslav nation, insisting on the Slovenian national interests. The Serbian intellectuals, on contrary, kept insisting on the Yugoslav frame.46

Slobodan Selenić, a Serbian writer, was last to follow the disintegration of the Union as its president. The Serbian and Montenegrin writers resigned from the Kosovo association due to constant marginalizations. They were supported by the Serbian Society and Montenegrin society with the newly selected Serbian writers on the head, which caused the Croatian and Slovenian societies to support the Kosovo organization, seeing no reason for Serbian and Montenegrin writers to withdraw from their positions. In 1988 the debate among members of intellectual organizations lost its logical sense, the national question went into the red zone and for every representative the nation, republic and federation together with the notion of equality meant something else.47

In February 1989, the Slovenian society broke the relation with Serbian society, which caused the Serbian society to end the cooperation with the Kosovo association. The long-lasting conflict transformed the final meeting of the Yugoslav Writers Union Presidency into a big homogenous republic and that Croatian literature encompassed many distinguished writers who were Serbs’ (Dragović Soso, 2015, 280).

46 ‘Yet, their proposal was tailored to fit Serbian needs and thus contained the inherent contradiction. On the other hand, it advocated the reintegration of the federation to ensure ‘the establishment of total national, spiritual and cultural integrity of each Yugoslav people, ’regardless of republic or province’ -which went against the ’confederate’ arrangement of the country. On the other, it called for the constitution of the Republic of Serbia as a state, with powers over its whole territory, including the autonomous provinces – implying the maintenance of the same confederate structure, but merely applying it equally to Serbia.’ (Dragovic Soso, 2003, 283).

47 By 1988 the intellectuals' debate on Yugoslavia had arrived at a dead end. Uncompromising national claims left no room for agreement on the common state or its organizations. For Slovenes, who represented a small nation even by Yugoslav standards, 'equality' implied total national sovereignty and the right to veto any decision they disagreed with, regardless of the majority will in the federation. For Serbs, who were both the most dispersed throughout Yugoslavia, and the only ones whose republic had two autonomous provinces, 'equality' meant both statehood for Serbia and national unity in a reintegrated Yugoslavia, For Albanians, it denoted republican status for Kosovo and independence from Serbia. For Croats, it implied the right to Croatian statehood, a separate language, and culture. For too many Yugoslav writers, Yugoslavia no longer represented the ideal worth striving for, outside the satisfaction of their own, narrowly defined, national interests. Considering their total lack of empathy for each other’s needs and concerns, it is not surprising that the Yugoslav Writers Union could not survive (Dragović Soso, 2015, 284).
argument, and at the end complete failure without any conclusion. The Slovenian members were insisting on the vote in order to solve some problematic situations but other members simply refused to participate. After that meeting, Slovenian and Croatian writers were first to announce, in joint letter, that Yugoslav Writers Union ceased to exist, for most Serbian writers, the Slovenes and Croats exit from the Writers Union was merely a rehearsal of something much more serious (Dragović Soso, 2003, 285).

The dissolution of the Writers Union became paradigmatic for the destiny of other federal institutions and the federation itself. Not only that intellectuals, as the founders of the Yugoslav idea, failed to transform the communistic society in a way to make a new, democratic society, they failed to preserve Yugoslavia, and even more- to find a peaceful solution for all the federal states.

The culture and politics in communist Yugoslavia were closely connected and influenced each other strongly. The importance of the institutions for the common state’s constitution was equal to the importance of the institutions in its dissolution, The Yugoslav Writers Union, never a purely literary organization, was first to disintegrate, in the spring of 1989 (Dragović Soso, 2003, 268). The Yugoslav Writers Union with its fate represents the cultural institution- an illustration of the (communist) Yugoslavia.

Yugoslavism had an intellectual character – the idea about Yugoslavia came from the elites, and it was put down by intellectual elites (Djokić, 2003b). It was the first endeavor for giving the proper name and status to the idea of gathering and to this cultural and historical mixture among South Slavic nations at the Balkan peninsula. It was a political plan for creation of a new entity, state, identity, in an attempt to create more possibilities for the South Slavs independence in relations with Europe and the world. The South Slavic union also served to secure more opportunities for the development and escaping the status of the internal periphery. The additional (common) identity, space of the union in every sense, and common ground of the new state (Roksandić, 2017).

So called romantic national renewal in the Balkans during the 19th century is actually the beginning of the modern statehood, independence, owning cultural space, gathering people and building institutions, and through those attempts – gaining authenticity, identity and creating cultural and historical continuity as a fertile ground for the new (Yugoslav) tradition to appear. The interpretation of Yugoslavism and within Yugoslavia, as a ‘failed idea’ because of its ‘false character’ and damage which caused to national(istic) identity of Slavic nations, was a popular interpretation after the break up in the ‘90s, and main narrative in description of the past. But, the
fact is, that in 19th century and after, in order to create a Yugoslav state and additional Yugoslav supranational identity, or in order to protect from its domination, a tribal identity gained own national identity in one faster and more focused way (Djokić, 2003).

From the ‘never get back to the old’ as omnipresent partisans motto, countries from the region, actually post Yugoslav countries went back to the old common cultural and art space that existed before any institutionalization. Due to the fact that ‘every rational or scientific planning has always been a central part of a larger hegemonic project’ to rewrite history and to formulate new ground rules of how to perceive reality, complete with new models of the person and the social (Brandstädter, 2007) dissolution of Yugoslavia could be perceived as a result of the interests conflicts and power games among the elites. After its dissolution, common cultural space is spontaneously renewing, since 19th century and officially rooted in intimate and stable interpersonal connections, based on the simple unity of space, time, and by it cultural similarities, that form unique chronotope and authentic shared mentality as the only continuity in omnipresent discontinuity (Sujecka, 2015).

Yugoslavia’s break up already started in the ’80s. Until the early ‘90s, as a result of the political crisis and conflicts that led to the war between states, from 1991 to 2001, causing complete dissolution of the federation. Slovenia was first to declare independence (Jun, 1991), causing ten days of army conflict, while war conflict took the most severe form in Bosnia and Herzegovina and partially in Croatia from 1992 to 2001. Serbia and Montenegro formed a rump state known as a Federal State of Yugoslavia, with successor’s aspirations, but the state dissolved in 2003, first to a last Slavic unity – Serbia and Montenegro, and by Montenegro declaration of independence in 2006, completely.

Some of the theories about breaking up of Yugoslavia (also various types of Yugoslavism, and various periods of Yugoslavia) are shaping, so called, period of the Fourth Yugoslavia, as the one which already contained disintegration in its concept (Jović, 2003). Despite of all the theories and assumptions regarding the last decades of the Second Yugoslavia, the breaking year and its consequences, ‘the fact is that disintegration factors were stronger then integration ones’ (Markovina, 2016, 42) for a long time, which eventually led to dissolving of the federation.

Taking into account the three versions of post 1980s Yugoslavism – federalist and integrative versions, both articulated in the late 1980s and a regionalist version which appeared only after the collapse of the Yugoslav federation in 1992, the main discourse in the 1980s was
dominantly anti-Yugoslav, with rare true attempts of preserving the Yugoslav idea, which was already, by the communist ideology of zajedništvo\textsuperscript{48}, ‘reduced to the bare minimum’.\textsuperscript{49}

While the disintegrative tendencies were growing, as Dragan Markovina (2016) argues, there were rare but important integrative projects, which were kept in shadow in the moment they were active and are not often acknowledged even in contemporary historiography, for example Association for Yugoslav Democratic Initiative (Ujedinjena jugoslovenska demokratska inicijativa/ UJDI) and the attempts of the prime minister Ante Marković. The Association for Yugoslav Democratic Initiative was a political party in Yugoslavia, founded in Zagreb in 1988 by a group of left-leaning intellectuals, and was unique by insisting on the Yugoslav narrative in a new modern frame (while the anti-Yugoslav narrative was the core one of the dominant parties in all states).

The Serbian Academy of Arts and Science with a selected committee of the sixteen intellectuals, as a reaction on the crisis, proclaimed the Memorandum (created in the period between 1985 and 1986), known by addressing the causes of the crises and proposal of solutions. It was somehow published in one tabloid before the verification of the Academy. The memorandum contained the assumption that the Constitution from 1974, by which Yugoslavia started to exist as a confederation and no longer a federation was to blame for every developmental problem in the state.

As was claimed in the memorandum, the Constitution abounded the foundational principles of the Yugoslav state – those that were constituted by the AVNOJ (Anti-Fascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia) in 1943. The memorandum did not mention which one, assuming that Yugoslavia was proclaimed as a federation by the AVNOJ, hence solution proposed by Memorandum, for Serbia, and other republics, was to return to the AVNOJ principles, which was the clearest expression of its ‘unspecified’ Yugoslavism (Pavković, 2003, 256).

\textsuperscript{48} ‘By 1980 ‘brotherhood and unity’ had been replaced by an even vaguer concept of ‘togetherness’ (zajedništvo). Yugoslavia was, according to this concept, a state in which different nations and nationalities only lived together but, apart from this, they had no other ties, except their alleged participation in and commitment to the system of socialist self – management, which then distinguished Yugoslavia from the Soviet model of ‘real socialism’. In contrast to the countries of ‘real socialism’, political power in Yugoslavia had by then been developed to the leadership of the Communist Party of each of the six federal units (republics) and two federal units (provinces). Unlike the ideology of ‘brotherhood and unity’ the ideology of zajedništvo denied the existence of any common national or supranational identity to the citizens of Yugoslavia- all citizens were assumed to belong to a recognized national group. It was an accident of history, as it were, that this state came to be called Yugoslavia- the name of the state was no relevance to the bonds that allegedly tied its citizens together’ (Pavković, 2003, 252).

\textsuperscript{49} The Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, enacted in the 1974 by the Federal Yugoslav Assembly, controlled by the Communist Party leadership, transferred all federal powers to the republics and provinces and their representatives.
Dobrica Ćosić, the leading Serbian writer and former dissident, took part in creating and promoting the Memorandum, advocating for the Yugoslav federation as the most rational choice for all nations. Ćosić believed that in the 19th century both Serbs and Croats took part in Yugoslav project to protect their national interest and sovereignty from the interest of foreign powers, and not because of the love among the Slavic people (Pavković, 2003, 260), together with Slobodan Milošević was a follower of an idea that confederation would negate the historical goal of the Serb people, the unification of all Serbs into a single state.

In 1988, Ćosić proposed a radical reform of the Yugoslav state and community, contained in the sizable referendum in all the states, second the abolition of the Communist Party monopoly, and introduction of various types of ownership, the respect for all autochthonous values and only with those reforms there was a reason to maintain the unity of Yugoslavia.

In 1995, after the NATO bombing of Serbian territories in Bosnia, Ćosić proclaimed Yugoslavia as a matter of the past, with no healthy reason or possibility to emerge again. While Ćosić declined any supranational or national Yugoslav nation or nationality, arguing unity as a deal among nationalities for dealing with the economic problems and foreign traits, Milorad Ekmečić, prominent Serbian historic, have seen the Yugoslav unity based on cultural and language similarities, Yugoslavism according to which the South Slavs are a single nation with a three names, speaking three variants of the same language, even in late 20th century (Dragović Soso, 2004).

YUGOSLAVIA AFTER THE BREAKUP. CONCLUSION

During the ’90s, and at the beginning of the 21st century, the perspective towards Yugoslavia and its legacy was extremely negative among elites in successor states (Kuljić, 2017). This was the period when formal institutions began to change the discourse of the Yugoslavian past which was marked as the dark age of every successor state, and also changing the way history was taught in schools, names of the public squares and streets.51

50 Slobodan Milošević, was the President of the Socialist Republic of Serbia, a constituent republic from 1989 to 1997 and President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia from 1997 to 2000. He got his prominence as a politician mostly in the period of proclamation of the need to reform the 1974 Constitution of Yugoslavia due to both the marginalization of Serbia and raising of the Albanian separatist unrest in the Serbian province of Kosovo (Jović, 2003).

51 ‘The more that Titoism is getting dark past, the criticism towards present is getting lower, and the hope in European future is raising. In other words, if Yugoslavia is prison for Croatia, or illusion for Serbia, then, logically, its delusion is new liberation. Every Yugoslavia in maddy Marica (river, TV), its repetitive saying of Serbian conservatives, and in Croatia, for a long time already, is bigger risk to be Yugoslav than Serb. It’s easy to notice that
In the same time, especially after the war conflict, in discourse and narrative of the ordinary citizen, Yugoslavia appears as the object of nostalgia: ‘Shifting the trauma and crisis in the period of transition spontaneously creates extreme interpretations and memories, demonization equally as a nostalgia.’ (Kuljić, 2011, 219). The previous fact can be assumed as a cause of immense polarization in perception of the previous state, especially in the 2000s. Before that, Yugoslavia was a catastrophic project which naturally ended up in catastrophic events like civil war during the’90s, economic sanctions, and bombing of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) in ‘99. Through the devaluation of Yugoslavia, the memory of socialism was also transformed. More than in other successor states, that happened in Croatia – the communistic and socialistic past was decreased, and brought under the question.

The newest zero hour for the Croatian history became the War of Independence (1991–1995) instead of the antifascist battle of communists during World War II (Kuljić, 2011). In the history textbooks for the school children in Serbia, during the Slobodan Milošević’s regime (from 1989 to 2000), the positive approach toward Yugoslavia, was kept. On the contrary, in Croatian textbooks, during these same years, perspective and interpretations were extremely negative. From the books in the 90s in Serbia, some of the main concepts of Yugoslavia, like ‘brotherhood and unity’ popular slogan of Yugoslav communists, were erased, but Yugoslav context, aside from the national one, was present. Also, the valorization of socialism was positive, especially through its concept of modernization, and that point of view still exists in nowadays textbooks (Jezernik, 2018).

In Slovenia, the memory of communism and Yugoslavia as a period of modernization, was alive the entire time, and in this successor state the narrative about ‘the good old days’ and ‘Yunostalgia’ was first to appear. But, with the emerging of the new states, the most appropriate narrative was the one which contained the negative perspective towards the previous state (Yugoslavia), diminishing of the Yugoslav identity, and affirmation of the national identity, and that discourse is kept until now (in 2020) (Markovina, 2018). The part of the planning and new and official frame of memory is making easier demonization of Titoism, cause euphoric feelings and expectation from new national harmonic state raising and getting closer to European abundance, are suggested and spread everywhere.’ (Kuljić, 2011, 208). („Što je titoizam mračnija prošlost, to opada kritičnost prema sadašnjici, a rastu nade u evropsku budućnost. Drugim rečima, ako je Jugoslavija hrvatska tannica, ili je srpska iluzija, onda je po logici stvari, njen raspad novo odlučenje. „Svaku Jugoslaviju u mutnu Maricu” ponavljali su srpski konzervativci, a u Hrvatskoj je već dugo rizičnije biti Jugosloven nego Srbin. Lako je uvideti da novi službeni okviri sećanja olakšavaju demonizaciju titoizma, zato što svuda sugeriraju ekstatična očekivanja od harmonične nacionalne države koja će se pridružiti stabilnom obilju EU’) (Kuljić, 2011, 218). Translation TV
constitution of the new states, after Yugoslavia, is the diminishing of the Yugoslav past and its importance (Kuljić, 2017).

Against historical revisionism and the diminishing of Yugoslav legacy, in Dragan Markovina’s book *Jugoslavija u Hrvatskoj od euforije do tabua 1918-2018* [Yugoslavia in Croatia from 1918-2018, from euphoria to taboo 1918-2018] (Markovina, 2018) the author marks the history of Yugoslavism as an idea, comparing the beginning of Yugoslavia as an idea with its contemporary status, confronting the achievement of modern Yugoslav state with the nationalistic revisionism of nowadays successor states, representing new attempts among scholars – attempt to suppress dramatic consequences of historical revisionism and to comply with the Yugoslav heritage.
III YUGOSLAVIA IN OFFICIAL INSTITUTIONS

3.1 PAVILION YUGOSLAVIA – ABSENCE IN PRESENCE. YUGOSLAV PAVILION IN GIARDINI PARK, VENICE BIENNALE OF ART (1938–2003)

The Venice Biennale, with its long tradition as a major art and cultural international event, represents a place where contemporary artistic, culturological, social and political currents meet and intersect.

The Biennale Art Exhibition is placed mainly in the Giardini Park which is situated in the eastern edge of Venice, the traditional site of The Biennale Art Exhibitions (La Biennale di Venezia) since the first edition in 1895. Due to the great success and large number of visitors in the first couple of years, the City of Venice started building (national) foreign pavilions since 1907. The Giardini now hosts 29 pavilions of foreign countries, with the Arsenal site as the place of many national pavilions with many of others locations all around the city.  

At the beginning of the 19th century, the Giardini Park ‘royal gardens for public walks’, held an ‘idealized image of the world’ in a reality covered with the shadow of authorities of that time, so the Giardini Park and Venice Biennale formed and kept one fictive world of national representatives and identities with fictive geography (Topalović, 2012).

The Yugoslav pavilion, built in 1938, lies between the pavilions of Egypt and Austrian pavilions in Giardini. Emerged during the Mussolini regime, the architecture of the pavilion (and other pavilions built at that time, among which is the Polish pavilion) is witness of the time and political circumstances (the exhibition in 1942 colored the event and whole period in Biennale history with fascism, bringing politics into the core of the manifestation). The whole edifice where

---

52 ‘The traditional site of La Biennale Art Exhibitions since the first edition in 1895, the Giardini rise to the eastern edge of Venice and were made by Napoleon at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It was the success of the first editions (more than 200,000 visitors in 1895, more than 300,000 in 1899) to trigger the building of foreign pavilions since 1907, which were added to the already built Central Pavilion. The Giardini now host 29 pavilions of foreign countries, some of them designed by famous architects such as Josef Hoffmann’s Austria Pavilion, Gerrit Thomas Rietveld’s Dutch pavilion or the Finnish pavilion, a pre-fabricated with a trapezoidal plan designed by Alvar Aalto’ (La Biennale in Venice, on line source).

53 ‘Since then it has hosted a number of states and statelets which have continually faced the problem of representing an undefined now also non existent nation constantly trapped in an unbelievable position somewhere between the rock and the hard place in the gap of opposing geopolitical interests’ (Mitrović, 2003, 39).
the Jugoslavia pavilion is placed is straightforward and has a clear architecture to the point of banality (Blagojević, 2003, 32).

While the inscription ‘Jugoslavia’ (Yugoslavia) in stone, stands among the entrance ‘marking the building as probably the last remaining place where Yugoslavia is still present in an international institutional context’ (Topalović, 2012, 1) the smaller, title Serbia, is added on the side. With other pavilions of the same architecture (Poland, Egypt) in the neighborhood, the building faces the grassy area in the front and the canal with a small bridge:

In this spatial situation, where the pavilion with its public front and the obscure back resembles a theatre with a stage and a backstage, the designers and artists meet the visitors of the show, as if in a set for a play whose title, Jugoslavia, is already suspended above the scene. There is no doubt that the notion of Yugoslavia creates the limits of a symbolic territory, within which any event in the pavilion is positioned and interpreted (Topalović, 2012, 1).

The participation of Yugoslavia in the Biennale exhibition took place in the period between 1938 and 1990, from the year in which the pavilion was built to the beginning of Yugoslav dissolution and war. During all those years, the Yugoslav selection and participating artists were trying to answer the Manifestation requests in order to show the best artist from the main artistic centers in Yugoslavia in answer to the ‘waves’ on the international art and culture scene, eventually to show something new, to gain approval and acceptance, and even to reward. No one particular cultural policy in order to build a Yugoslav identity in front of the eyes of the world could be proved. Actually, more than ever, Yugoslavia appeared in its Pavilion, after its dissolution.


As Ana Bogdanović stated, further on, with Yugoslav exhibitions and institutions behind it, they aimed to implement and promote Yugoslav culture and art, and through that to (re)establish a Yugoslav cultural identity in an international context. It was, at the same time, a place for creating, establishing and promoting Yugoslav art and culture, together with discovering and

54 The inscription in stone is ‘Jugoslavia’ (Italian) meaning Yugoslavia.
exploring its new tendencies in international dynamics (Bogdanović, 2017, 2). After the break-up of Yugoslavia, with the Vienna agreement in 2001, which concluded the process of inheritance of Yugoslav property (also those abroad) seemed that the Yugoslav Pavilion came under the ownership of the Republic of Serbia, the time when the Pavilion got one smaller inscription, ‘Serbia,’ on the right wall, walking from the entrance.\footnote{During my research, in spite of the effort and contacts with authorities, I could not manage to find or get valid information about ownership of the Pavilion in Venice, nor any document as a proof. The most frequent comment or unofficial information was about ‘unsolved problem’.
}

Being a representative of Yugoslavia (until 1990, then 2003) the name carved into the façade is now (in 2020) the only residue of Yugoslavia existence, in international frame (Stojanović, 2003) (fig. 1).

Figure 1. Serbian Pavilion in Giardini, photo, Tijana Vuković, Venice, 2019

In its history, the Giardini changed from a public garden of the early 19th century, to an international art exhibition and a certain museum of art history of the 20th century, nowadays in the same time not prioritizing the national portrayal, but with the great sense that ‘the concepts and roles of nations and states generally, is still strong and compelling’ with the pavilions as the ‘tools to rethink questions of identity’ (Topalović, 2012).
All the exhibitions in the Yugoslav Pavilion were organized by official institutions. This mirrored official cultural strategies and perspectives not only towards a representation of the Yugoslav art and culture abroad, but also a reflection of cultural policy inside of the borders. As the Biennale took the leading role in exhibiting contemporary art in Europe, the national pavilions (also Yugoslav) aimed to represent the best of its dominant tendencies in art and culture, also as the meeting spot of different influences (social, political, cultural) (Merenik, 2014). The representative art and artists in the pavilion Yugoslavia should have created, established, and sustained the notion of Yugoslav art in the context of the European and the World contemporary art scene, from edition to edition (Bogdanović, 2017).

The reason why the research and overview of the Yugoslav participation at Venice Biennale exhibition is important is its description and understanding of the Yugoslav art dynamics, prior to its conceptualization and constitution (forming) both spontaneous and by authorities, especially in the period after World War II.

For the history of Biennale itself, a few periods are important, among which, the most – the period from its establishment in 1895 to the beginning of the First World War in 1914, which was dominated by academism, realism and impressionism. Secondly, the period between the First World War and The Second World War (1920-1942) which marked the fascism regime in Italy and changing course after 1926 in the direction of national promotions and ending domination by the Parisian school. With the autonomy of the Biennale in 1930s, the international character of the exhibition gained its prominence (even before the assembly of the pavilion, Yugoslav artists were present at Biennale exhibition, for example Ivan Meštrović, Milo Milunović, as one of the most prominent world artists at the beginning of the 20th century) (Bogdanović, 2017, 15).

Then, the period after World War II (first postwar edition was in 1948) and the last one after the big transformation in the ‘70s, when the whole concept of the manifestation changed due to the revolutionary circumstances in 1968. A new statute had been proclaimed (1972) and rewarding policy had been changed (Grand Prize, from 1969, was abounded until ‘80s). The International Art Exhibition had not been held (until it was resumed in 1976) and the role of thematic exhibitions, after the transformation period, was highly enlarged. The transformation assumed also enlarging the exhibition space, and in 1980 the Corderie dell’Arsenale as the second main Biennale site, was opened to the public for the first time (also in Venice).

Following the mentioned dynamics, for the pavilion of Yugoslavia and presentation of the art and culture in this space, in continuity, with the structure of certain institution and representing other national institutions, one more periodization must be marked as important, until the 1990,
the building was dedicated to the Yugoslav art and artist, after that to a successor state Yugoslavia (formed by Serbia and Montenegro) that transformed into mentioned state Serbia and Montenegro. From 2007 until now (in 2020) when Serbia has taken over most of the mutual cultural institutions as the legal successor of the previous owner, ‘Serbia’ is assigned with the smaller letters, on the right side from the entrance, and it became a national pavilion of the Republic of Serbia.

As Ana Bogdanović stated about the importance of the presence in Giardini, thinking about the exhibition is thinking about the social and political context, especially in the connection with the exploring and representing integral Yugoslavism in art and culture. Observing the exhibition also noticed the juncture of the art, culture narratives, political and social situation and moment, while also considering conclusions about relations, meeting of an artist and curator with the institutions, and their joint action. It is significant in discovering the tendency and importance of the Yugoslav presence in Biennale, from the perspective of the cultural institutions in Serbia, the Biennale concept of the national representations, in the international context, for the Yugoslav institutions - was the way of constitution, establishing and representing of the new cultural and national identity - Yugoslav identity, and by that important occasion and priority among international manifestations. 56

Due to that perspective and understanding of modern tendencies, Yugoslav authorities (among which cultural institutions) used the occasion of making politics a different way by considering the importance of the big international exhibitions in Europe of the 19th and 20th centuries. They, participate in the Biennale fair since 1938 to display ‘the best’ of Yugoslav art (Denegri, 1989). The national pavilion, opened in the same year, was in the ownership of Yugoslavia, and the first interest for the erecting of the pavilion was dated in 1931. The first plan was abandoned by the Yugoslav institution due to financial reasons and prioritization of the museum buildings in the country were on the top of the list.

56 ‘Exhibitions had, as a cultural frame emanated from museum praxis, their expansion during 19th century and became one of the emblem for the society and state in Europe- new ritual for reception of art which is strongly related to market character of the west democratic society structure, and which took visitors into the time and space happening, organized and managed in accordance with the values of the modern European society, for example, in accordance with an idea of linearity and progress of time and history, importance of an individual (actually – affirmation of an individual in modern society) also – importance of production (art) objects and their circulation on the market...’ Translation TV

'Izložbe su, naime, kao kulturni format proistekao iz muzejske prakse, doživele ekspanziju tokom 19.veka i postale jedan od ambala modernog gradanskog društva i države u Evropi – novi ritual za recepciju umetnosti koji je usko vezan za tržišni karakter zapadnih demokratskih društvenih uređenja, a koji je posetioce uvodio u prostorno-vremenski dogadaj organizovan i uređen prema vrednostima na kojima su se zasnivala moderna evropska društva, poput ideje o linearnom i progresivnom protoku vremena i istorije, značaju pojedinca (odnosno afirmaciji individualnih vrednosti u modernom društvu) kao i važnosti produkcije (umetničkih) objekata i njihove cikulacije na tržištu.’ (Bogdanović, 2017, 12).
Even though The Kingdom of Yugoslavia already took part in several international exhibitions, the Ministry of the Culture and Education stated the erection of the pavilion in Giardini, before the building of the national museums, as a luxury, due to the limited budget (Bogdanović, 2017, 27). Authorities were prioritizing the emerging of the national institutions in the country, in comparison with representations and manifestations abroad. With the assembly of the Museum of the Duke Paul (Muzej kneza Pavla) in 1935, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia received the modern museum as the representative institution for the Yugoslav national art and culture.

Part of its concept and regent Paul’s intentions was the representation of the Yugoslav art and culture in the European context, and as a part of the wider art space, European and the World one. In connection with the activity and aims of the Museum structures, and in response to improved relations between Kingdom of Yugoslavia and Italia, particularly with the start of the new political dialogs in 1936 and 1937, were also beneficial for the sphere of art and culture of the both side (Stojanović, 2018).

During 1938, 18 countries participated in the Biennale, which was the highest turnout than ever before, and Yugoslavia was one of the countries that signed the agreement regarding the erection of the pavilion in Giardini Park. Prince Paul of Yugoslavia gave the official statement about the plans for the pavilion on January 5th,1938 and the work began in February of the same year. On the island of the St. Helena, next to the Giardini Park, Biennale already had the buildings for the Venezia Pavilion with two more exhibitions for the applied arts given to the Switzerland and Poland exhibits, spreading into the two-exhibition area brought Romania and Yugoslavia. The building was finished April 1938 (fig.2) and the next two editions, in 1938 and 1940, in the Pavilion of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, two collective exhibitions were showed (both containing the artwork of the six artist)57:

On the meeting of the Art section in Yugoslav Academy of Art and Science in Zagreb, on March 26th in 1938, authorities took the rule 2,2,1, as model for selection representatives for Biennale and for choosing the number of the artists from the Lublana, Belgrade and Zagreb circle.58

---

57 The form of the exhibition, collective, six artists, was partly the result of the meeting and consultations between Giuseppe Volpi, the main curator of the biennale, and Milan Kašanin, Yugoslav commissaire. The advice was that every artist has ‘its wall’ if not the whole space, and that sculptor Toma Rosandić was a good choice due to similarities with Ivan Meštrović. Ivan Meštrović was already known in Venice, by successful participation in collective exhibitions in Rome (1911) and solo participance in Biennale 1917 (Bogdanović, 2017,34).

58 At the meeting of Yugoslav Academy of Art and Science in Zagreb in 1938 (26th of March) it was decided about a model for selecting artists and representative artworks for Venice Biennale. Accepted Model was 2,2,1 (two artists from Belgrade circle, two from Zagreb and one from Ljubljana (Bogdanović, 2017,41).
So the model for choosing the representative artists was – two artists from the Zagreb’s art scene, two from the Belgrade’s, and one from the Lublana (it was not by national criteria – Serbian, Croatian or Slovenian, due to the fact that international exhibitions should serve to the creation of supra-national Yugoslav identity. Milan Kašanin, commissioner, strongly argued that his criteria for selecting Yugoslav artists was mainly for keeping and showing the continuity of progress in modern Yugoslav art and its dynamics. Also, he was trying to mark the shape of the main contemporary art tendencies. The plan for the next Biennale, 22th in a row, was to advance the trend of representing Yugoslav art as an integral phenomenon and integral part of the European art scene.

However, in 1940, the shadow of the future events in World War II was already dominated in almost every public event. Even though the organizers of Biennale tried to separate the exhibition from the political situation in Italy and wider, France, Great Britain and Denmark cancelled their participation, and the exhibitions in the national pavilions of USA, Belgium, Germany, Greece, Netherlands, Yugoslavia, Romania, Switzerland, Hungary, were closed (due to the officially proclaimed war conflict between Italy, France and Great Britain). The idea of the
exhibition in the Yugoslav pavilion took the same exhibition narrative and concept as the previous year. That was five painters from different countries and one sculptor.

The artists were chosen to fulfill the concept of displaying the artwork of three generations of the painters. They were all representative for the tendencies in Yugoslav art, known by their work in the country and abroad, and also most important for the area of sculpture, represented of the accepted and appreciated continuity (Ivan Meštrović, Toma Rosandić, and in 1940, Frano Kršinić). In Kašanin’s perspective, Yugoslav art was at the same time synthetic, but with strong individuals and individual expressions giving it a character of the heterogeneity and a special quality.

The first Biennale exhibition held after World War II was in 1948. Yugoslavia, as the rest of the suffering world in war years, was walking through huge changes of every structure. The Regime had already changed, and in 1948 Yugoslavia was a state governed by Communist Party, going through one more difficult transition - leaving the alliance with the Eastern bloc, heading towards independence, and turning to the West (Merenik, 2010).

This was the period of social realism established as a new paradigm and expression mainly in 1948 and 1949. So when the invitation and proposition for taking part in reestablishing the Biennale significance and two annual meetings arrived in Yugoslavia institutions, the new state

---

There was not clear distinction of national type inside of the Kašanin’s invention of Yugoslav modern art (were belongs model of the representation at Biennale manifestation in Venice) the synthetic historical and art narrative was offered, which was then, in historical sense, close to political ambition – to gather different ethnic, social, historical and cultural experiences in one monolith state unity, which should constitute Yugoslav contemporary reality. This synthetic intention towards Yugoslav art was inseparsable from Kašanin’s activity on position of the director of The Duke Paul’s Museum Duke Paul’s Museum and strategy of the exhibition policy of this institution which reflected and realized ideas of jugoslavism via parallel process of ‘constitution of european identity' and cohesion of south slavic people in one cultural environment’. On the concept of jugoslavism as a main frame of musealization of art in activities of Duke Paul’s Museum, it was already pointed out in the scientific field. European orientation was one of the main characteristics of the modern Yugoslav art and culture which was realized and marked through activities in museums, numerous exhibitions of jugoslav art abroad and guesting of the international exhibitions in Belgrade. That's the way for establishing the new paradigm of Yugoslav identity. (Bogdanović, 2017, 53).


Fall of the fascistic regime in 1944, and change again from 1946 to 1948, and finally the time of First Republic and stabilization (from 1948 until 1992) (Gningsborg, 2003).
still could not answer to the expectation to the one of the (still) most prominent international exhibitions. The final decision regarding Yugoslav art exhibiting abroad was brought by the Committee for the Culture and Art (Komitet za kulturu i umetnost, 1947–1948).

Despite the effort of collecting propositions in all the states, Yugoslavia did not send representatives for the 24th Biennale. The reason was probably due to a lack of institutional structures and frameworks, to prepare the biennale presentation, but also due to the period of transformation of Yugoslav culture and art after war. Therefore, still in constitution, the new state with new narratives was not able to prepare for the international exhibition of modern Yugoslav art. Yugoslavia cancelled the participation in the 24th Biennale due to the ‘technical problems’.

The following two years were turning points for abandoning the social realism concept, and in 1950, Yugoslavia appeared in Venice with the collective exhibition of artists and their works in a manner of social realism. In the catalogue, commissioner of the exhibition Petar Šegedin, spoke about the social realism paradigm in Yugoslav art, with the struggle for freedom, resistance to fascistic occupation, a fight for the renewal of the country after war, a devotion to ideals of the socialism in Yugoslavia, but also about freedom of the art, artist, and individual expression (Milkić, 2015).

The way of Yugoslav modern art interpretation in the context of the 25th Biennale witnessed the need of Yugoslav artists to find their own way in new tendencies, narratives and expressions, in the field of culture and art, as in the social and political life in ‘50s. Yugoslavia had established an already declared decision and devotion to independent socialism, free of the influence of other socialist countries.61

Yugoslav cultural diplomacy was oriented in the direction of getting closer to the Western art scene, especially immediately after breaking up with Soviet concepts of socialism (in 1948) when the change of the course, in art and culture also, requested validation in Europe and wider. The official break-up with the ideology of social realism, as with the cultural paradigm, happened in 1954, on the Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ) when the course of the Yugoslav culture development officials took the direction of liberalization.

---

61 Important role was one of the Petar Šegedin, in deconstruction of the social realism narrative, and change of the perspective towards social reality and art, which became obvious in 1949, on the Second Congress of the Yugoslav Writers (II Kongres Saveza književnika Jugoslavije, 1949). Šegedin was speaking about literature, but with the accent on the part about the artist’s individualism, and individual freedom in expression and creation, with or despite the reality role, and rule of realism. That approach took place in the concept of the art exhibition in Giardini, also in the catalogue of the 25th Biennale in Venice, and become valuable description of the Yugoslav art tendencies in ‘50s (Koščević, 1988).
After that, the main aim of the Yugoslav cultural institutions was to, through international exhibitions, create a new image and perspective toward a new conception of modern Yugoslav culture and art. In order to position and reposition Yugoslav culture, on the basis of the new modern (western) tendencies, in European context, cultural institutions in Serbia were making precise plans and structures, with enlarged budgets for exhibiting abroad, especially at Venice Biennale as the most prominent space for international art meetings (Denegri, 1998).

For the next decade, from about 1956 to 1966 at the time of the Yugoslav Committee for Foreign Cultural Relations activity (Savezna komisija za kulturne veze sa inostranstvom) Venice Biennale was still the most prominent place for international affirmation and exhibitions. Those years represented the structured cultural policy and functional cultural institutions in Yugoslavia. The model requested a modern art with the great appreciation of the national and local in a new and wider context. In the ‘60s, the idea of making a thematic exhibition which would show the development, logic and dynamic of Yugoslav art, was illustrative for the period and Yugoslav cultural diplomacy.

Despite the precise plans and more time for organization, Yugoslavian institutions did not always have good assumptions about which artists would be the best representatives and candidates for the prizes even though the ambition for winning one of the Biennale Prizes was present in Yugoslav institutions.

---

62 For the next, 26th Biennale (1952) choice of Yugoslav institutions were artists (Antun Motika, Emanuel Vidović) with intimate personal expression in exploring the world of feelings and imagination through their paintings, sculpture should be small and in balance with paintings. Next one, in aiming to create and represent Yugoslav art, Biennale in 1954. was important, mostly due to the graphic part of the exhibition, which was perceived as modern and open to contemporary tendencies (in comparison with the exhibition of other socialistic states, USSR for example). The sculpture was perceived as more traditional. The exhibitions in 1952, and 1954, were decisive in promotion of the Yugoslav art as modern and open to contemporary tendencies in international (and Western) context. Their concept shaped the model present in Yugoslav art in those years- making continuity with the local tradition and placing it in a wider, European context (Merenik, 2010).

63 The institution was formed with a function to manage the cooperation in the field of culture and art among Yugoslavia and foreign countries, to make the space for artist to show their work abroad, bringing the inspiration from contacts and cooperation to Yugoslav art and culture.

64 Authorities were choosing the Biennale representatives in a way characterized by the late reaction in comparison with European trends. For example, Petar Lubarda’s work was part of the exhibition, several years after the invitation, so his work was displayed several years after the declared interest. The postponing of the new artists and tendencies, which should find their way to Biennale according to the quality and accomplishes, was present in the decision process of the Biennale selecting. Yugoslav participation in the 70s and 80s was marked by the important changes in the Constitution (1974). The decentralization, which started with the political and social changes in the direction of decentralization (1968) was finished and became legit by Constitution from 1974, which gave to the republics full independence in making decisions in the frame of the Federation (SFRJ) and everything started to be the question of the emotionally intense negotiation (Bogdanović, 2017, 122).
The year 1968 was also decisive for the Venice manifestation. Huge crisis connected with student protests in Europe and reflected on every segment of cultural life and also had its consequences on the Biennale exhibition. Due to the protests on St. Marco’s Square, some of the pavilions were closed, and at the end – even Giardini gate. The Biennale with its tradition and conception, maybe even by resisting transformation in the ‘70s, was a symbol of the bourgeois politics in art and culture that was the object of protests (Denegri, 1998).

In that decisive year, The Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade was an authority institution for the Yugoslav selection and the Biennale program, and some changes were noticeable – the artistic expressions contained different and new tendencies, but artists were still prominent and accepted in international frames. Since 1972, the concept of Biennale has changed. A thematic concept was marked as the most important and was brought to the first place, which made national selection less important. Yugoslav selection was more dependent on the curator’s decision due to the decentralization (Republic based choice was a matter of the past, and promotion of the integral Yugoslav culture could not stay a priority).

Those were the last years (1972, 1974) of Biennale transformation, when an activist, problematic and thematic conception of exhibitions took domination and was reflected in the main theme of the Biennale. The crisis that took part in Biennale’s manifestation for years was obvious also in Yugoslav institutions during the preparation of selection. The national selection and building of the Yugoslav identity could not be the criteria for selection nor participation to represent at Biennale. Also, since the building in Giardini needed restoration and was the cause of all the difficulties, Yugoslavia’s cultural institution authorities announced that Yugoslavia would not participate in the 37th edition of Biennale.65

The participation in 1980 was first to be framed by a retrospective theme, The Presence of the Past [La presenza del passato]. That was the first year in which Biennale opened one more exhibiting area Arsenale [La Cordiere dell’Arsenale] with the concept of Aperto ‘80 – and the aim to present the work of young artists who did not get enough space at regular exhibitions (this frame lasted until 1993). The following years were shaped by a similar concept – at the same time with the look back on the’70s, and consider the new post modernist tendencies as representable.

---

65 After the letter that Biennale curator Carlo Ripa di Meana, sent to president Josip Broz Tito (19th June 1976, month before grand opening) where he asked for his intervention in case of Yugoslavia resignation, Yugoslavia was back on the preparation 37th Biennale Edition. The eventual non participation of Yugoslav selection at Biennale could ruin the good relation between Yugoslavia and Italia.
The Yugoslav pavilion at the beginning of the ‘80s made a step forward showing the work of young artists. This was an opportunity for the Yugoslav institutions to mark the continuity in Yugoslav art again by significantly moving toward a recognizable narrative. As already mentioned, it was a rare occasion before Aperto that the Yugoslav selection contained works of the young artists.

In the ‘80s, the Yugoslav selection considered the concept of representing new art tendencies in the Yugoslav space, but with an obligation marking the continuity with the previous decade. Yugoslavia on Biennale in 1986 was, for the example, post modernistic, representing the turning point in Yugoslav contemporary art and also very intimate expression in artworks, at the same time pointing out on their interpretation of the very specific ‘national picture’, combined with the influence of Italian, German and American art schools (Bogdanović, 2017, 161).

As the contrast for exploring and representing new tendencies, two last participation of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia were dedicated to the solo exhibition of the prominent artists from the ‘50s and ‘60s (Janez Bernik, Brano Filipović Filo). The overview of Yugoslavian exhibitions at Venice Biennale (1938-1990) shows the rare continuity in Yugoslav art space of the XX century, in a sense of presence.

Yugoslav Pavilion was the home for Yugoslav artists for more than 50 years. Even though it cannot form the image of Yugoslav art (where the assumption of its existence/nonexistence can rise) it can describe the attempt of the Yugoslav cultural institutions to be part of the international art and cultural scene. It also gives us the perspective on the institutional structure and support for presenting Yugoslav art abroad. Additionally, this was a part of the cultural institution’s constitution - through preparation of the selection and its explanation. Some of the institutions, like the Commission for International Cooperation, were created to display projects for the prominent international exhibitions among which in the first place – Venice Biennale.

The case of the Biennale is a good example of political influence on the area of culture and art – the pavilion was made in a period when Italian and Yugoslav relations became better, problems were solved, and a conclusion was needed. Also, during the whole Yugoslav experience at Biennale manifestation, a socio-political factor was present and influential – the fate of Biennale

---

66 In 1984, the work of Boris Bučan (poster) was presented. Due to the ‘republic key’, representation of the one, single author, was not possible before. The criteria, and decision of authorities, due to the Biennale as a prestige manifestation and collision of interest stayed unclear, edition after edition. The fluctuations, changes, regressions, and unexplained decisions are part of the Biennale Manifestation and its nature.
is the fate of every national Pavilion too (the history of art shows in Venice is marked by huge social and political events, conflicts, wars, protests.

This is also the case with Yugoslav Pavilion). Lastly, but probably the most importantly, the concept of national pavilions and national representation was in accordance with the Yugoslav institution’s goal to establish and promote Yugoslavism and the Yugoslav identity in and through art and culture, even though it cannot be shaped through analysis of exhibitions – they were conceptualized to follow the currents of art (international) world and dictate of manifestation itself (as I have already mentioned, Yugoslavia appears as a theme in its Pavilion, after dissolution of a state).

After its manifestation in 1990, the governing structure of the Biennale decided to pause for a three-year period (instead of a two due to the plan for the anniversary of hundred years that would be in 1995). In 1993, Serbia did not participate due to the embargo (Srbljanović, 2007). In Yugoslav Pavilion in Giardini, at the start of the '90s, the first selection after war conflict was the exhibition of Miloš Šobajić (commissar Radislav Trkulja i Vesna Milić) which took place in 1995, the year when Biennale itself was celebrating a hundred years, as mentioned. Those were the decisive years for the Yugoslav Pavilion. Yugoslavia as a state and a nation was living its Pavilion.

The last emanation of the Yugoslav state, Serbia and Montenegro occupied the Pavilion in 2001, with the artwork of participants of the 49th Biennale (Platou of the Mankind) artists from Montenegro Milija Pavićević and Russian artist Oleg Kulik. The artists presented their project Kuće i prozori [House and Windows] (with comissaur Petar Šuković from the Museum of

---

67 During the Yugoslavia Dissolution and War in the 1990s, international sanctions were imposed against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Yugoslav republics of Serbia and Montenegro). In the first wave, sanctions lasted from April 1992 to October 1995, Yugoslavia was placed under a United Nations (UN) embargo. The embargo was lifted following the signing of the Dayton Agreement, which ended the conflict in Bosnia, as a main reason for international embargo. Second wave was after the Kosovo War of 1998–1999, and the embargo was imposed again on Yugoslavia by the UN, European Union (EU) and the United States. Following the overthrow of Yugoslav President Slobodan Milošević in October 2000, the sanctions against Yugoslavia started to be withdrawn. It had the hardest impact on the Serbian economy and society, causing devastation of the economy, cultural trauma and poverty (Šuković, Jovanović, 2001).

68 In 1997, Serbia represents Vojo Stanić (commissar Branislav Sekulić) and Marina Abramović, who won Golden Lion together with Gerard Richter. The year 1999 with the Biennale theme Opening after all, in Yugoslav Pavilion, was dedicated to work of artists Milorad Damnjanović, Marijana Gvozdenović, Slobodan Katić, Mladen Marinov, Borislava Nedeljković-Prodanović and Todor Stevanović (with comissar Radislav Trkulja i Vesna Milić) with the two young artist from Belgrade, chosen by the curator of the Biennale, but not for the Pavillion (in one article about Biennale, those young artists were called Yugoslavs, which was already rare) ‘Two more Yugoslav will participate at Biennale in Venice, Tanja Ristovski i Vesna Vesić, but not in our pavilion. They have been called by Harold Zeman, art director of Biennale, to show their artwork in main, Central pavilion, among 99 artists from the whole world Zeman saw their artwork while he was visiting Belgrade due to the lecture in Student’s Cultural Center. ‘Bijenalu u Veneciji predstavije se još dve Jugoslovenske, Tanja Ristovski i Vesna Vesić, ali ne u našem paviljonu. Pozvao ih je Harold Zeman, umetnički direktor Bijenala, da izlažu u glavnom, Centralnom paviljonu među 99 umetnika iz sveta. Zeman je video njihove radove dok je boravio u Beogradu zbog predavanja u Studentskom kulturnom centru.’ (Ćirić, 1999).
Contemporary Art in Cetinje, Montenegro). The exhibition left almost no trace in a historical row of the Yugoslav Pavilion exhibitions. Also, it left no trace in online or other archives, and relevant information is hard to find. The simple description of the artworks or biography of the artists, or (non)official information about selection process that could be reached, do not contribute to the theme of my thesis. The exhibition is important as a ‘shift point’ or ‘point zero’, where the large period in history of Yugoslav pavilion ends, and instead of Yugoslavia, between its walls arise Serbian art and culture representation. With the edition from 2003, Pavilion with the inscription ‘Yugoslavia’ became a Serbian Pavilion.


In this part of the chapter dedicated to Yugoslavia at Biennale after its dissolution my aim is to show that, and how, Yugoslavia existed in every single exhibition (representation) since 2003 when the Yugoslav Pavilion became a Serbian Pavilion. Even more than before (during state existence) Yugoslavia is present as a theme, in a dialogical space, in a metaphorical space, in narratives of and about exhibitions. Even in those representations at Biennale where Yugoslavia is not explicitly brought as a theme or motif - it appears as a context, not just due to the edifice that being Yugoslav legacy itself, buried by meanings, creating an inevitable frame (Newhouse, 1999).

For example, *Nema ničega između nas* [*Nothing between us*], at the 55th Venice Biennale, in the 2013 exhibition which had no connection with Yugoslav legacy, on a first glance, brings complex narratives about the past and present, both personal and collective experiences in video interviews with the artists and curator where they discover the motivation for their artworks, cultural policy in Serbia after dissolution of Yugoslavia, and how the theme of the exhibition actually discovers the urge for distancing from the past, which could not be fulfilled. Artworks represented the ever present personal and collective memory in a subtle and metaphorical way.

Another example is the exhibition *Tama i svetlost simbola* [*The Lightness and Darkness of the Symbols*] of author Raša Teodosijević (commissioner Živko Grozdanić, curator Sanja Kojić Mladenov, production Museum of Contemporary Art Vojvodina) in 2011, for the central theme of

---

69 The need for representation and discussing of the Yugoslav past in front of the world art publicity could be the consequence of cultural trauma caused by Yugoslav dissolution. The mentioned cultural trauma is also Yugoslav (state) legacy.

70 Artists, Vladimir Perić i Miloš Tomić, Nothing Between Us, Serbian Pavilion at the 55th Venice Biennale, Project, Guidance /Vodjenje, production, SEEcult.org, 2013. Link in Online Sources in Bibliography.
54th Biennale, *Illuminations*. The exhibition has been mentioned briefly here, due to the fact that exhibitions like *National Pavilion*, and *Regaining the memory Loss* where more important for my thesis. The Exhibition catalogue *The Lightness and Darkness of the Symbols* brought the interesting narrative about Yugoslavia being an ever present symbol, frame, context in representations placed in Serbian pavilion, imposing the perspective, choosing a light (see more, page 27). The phenomenon of Yugoslavia contains all the meanings of the certain exhibition, imposing the additional supra meaning and evoking the relation between Yugoslav and Serbian art and culture.

A paradox of Yugoslavia in Yugoslav Pavilion lies in a phenomenon that Yugoslavia (as an existence, idea, state, past and present) has been presented, discussed (and through that constituted) after its dissolution. While the period of representations in the Pavilion until 1990 was dedicated to the work of Yugoslav artists, the period after 2003 seems to be dedicated to the memory of Yugoslavia and its legacy. It emanates in themes and motifs such as personal memory, dissolution of Yugoslavia, national identity.

In 2003, a ramp state formed in 1992 by Serbia and Montenegro, known as a Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, or last Yugoslavia, ceased to exist. Serbian and Montenegro created a new state union under the mentioned name (Serbian and Montenegro) and only three years after, in 2006, Montenegro declared independence. As Živko Grozdanić stated (Grozdanić, 2011) the Pavilion in Venice could also exist as a paradigm of unforgettable Yugoslav history, and a sign that is emptied and then fulfilled with every particular exhibition, as well as just a physical space. It was always a space of fulfilled or unfulfilled (even suppressed) desires of all Yugoslavs (and its nationalities) since its emerging in 1938.

Yugoslav Pavilion in Venice appears as a state that it used to represent – a place of Utopia. With its transformation in a Pavilion of Serbia, it is also, place of nostalgia (and nostalgia is often

---

71 Exhibition catalogue brought the interesting narrative about Yugoslavia being an ever present symbol, frame, context in representations placed in Serbian pavilion, imposing the perspective, choosing a light. (See more, page 27.)

72 ‘The Serbian Pavilion, a physical place, or a paradigm of an unforgettable history? The forming of any kind of judgement or opinion, beforehand, regarding these two positions for the gallery space at the Giardini of Venice, something not yet sufficiently known, which still awaits its thorough and critical examination, represents a serious and difficult task for the commissioner. The history of the Pavilion, since its construction in 1938, and the exhibition of art at the Venice Biennale, had always been a point of repressed desires - national, religious, class related, as well as sincere art career aspirations, primarily, in the former Yugoslavia, to nations (Serbs, Croats, Slovenians, Macedonians) that, as Yugoslavs, presented their artists at the Biennale. Today, Yugoslavia is a semantic remnant, based on unprovable claims and false authorities of those that created it, guarded it, and, ultimately, dismembered it. The Pavilion belongs to the Republic of Serbia now and functions as an inherited sign that obliges the commissioner, as well as the artist, ‘to fill it up, empty it, improve on it, add to it, and make it comprehensible’ (Grozdanić, 2011, 7).
perceived as a backwards looking stance (Pickering, Keightley, 2006, 920). Year 2003 was a farewell year for Yugoslavia as a legal, existing state at international art manifestations, including Biennale. Serbia and Montenegro for the first time, participated in Giardini Pavilion on the 50th manifestation (main theme *Dreams and Conflicts - The Viewer's Dictatorship*) with the exhibition *Pavilion Yugoslavia*, accentuating the fact that in spite of the main theme, exhibitions in the national pavilions could never be pulled out from the sociopolitical context of the state (nation) that they represent (Kojić-Mladenov, 2011, 12). As Pavilion of Yugoslavia existed as a paradigm of Yugoslavia itself, exhibitions that occurred after 2003, represented a space for ‘dealing with the past’ and Yugoslav legacy in front of the international audience.

*Figure 3. National Pavilion, instalation Milica Tomić, photo MoCAB, 2003*

*Paviljon Jugoslavija [Pavilion Yugoslavia]* contained two separated projects. One project was titled *Internacionalna izložba moderne umetnosti [International exhibition of modern art]* of non-specified author, and a second one *Nacionalni paviljon [National Pavilion]* installation on the facade, artist Milica Tomić (fig. 3). It was the project that brought together insights into the contemporary art scene in Serbia and the context of World Contemporary Art (part of the project
named *International exhibition of modern art*) original perspective, and the interpretation of relation between Yugoslavia, and Serbia, past and present, pavilion now and then.\(^{73}\)

For the *National Pavilion*, Milica Tomić, author of the project, attached 400 flashbulbs to the facade of the building, prepared to strobe at regular intervals, during the day and at night. As it stated in a catalogue of exhibition, the effect of flashlights was, to withdraw the attention of the visitor to the surface of the building which would then at once ‘disappear’ before his eyes because of the shock that flashlights cause to the human eye. The historical context appears in connection between the fascist architecture and ‘non-existing country’:

> ‘These flashes at once dematerialise the surface of the building, reducing the fascist architecture to a fading memory of a non-existing country... (Geers, 2003, 21).

That evokes National Liberation Combat (*Nacionalnooslobodilačka borba/ NOB*) anti-fascist struggle in Second World War, as a main pillar of the state of Yugoslavia. So, the non-existing country already appears with its legacy:

> The object of the building that was fixed in terms of memory and in terms of history, suddenly ceases to exist in the physical world and is transformed into a scar against the back of the viewer’s retina, a space very close to memory. How many times has this same building been looked at by the same viewer at previous Venice Biennales without the context and history being considered? (Geers, 2003, 21).

This project brought the historical context and phenomenon of (re)interpretation, the flashlights could indicate the overwhelming interest of (international) media to investigate and show the war and dissolution of Yugoslavia in a manner that is often blinding. Under the spotlights and flashlight of world publicity, some of the countries (not just Yugoslavia) ceased to exist. The question about name of the pavilion Jugoslavia [Yugoslavia], a name that now belongs to a non-existing country, evokes the impossibility of naming other phenomena connected with its disappearance – for example to name XX century, with its revolutions, wars, changing borders, extreme violence (Stojanović, 2003).

In the project *National pavilion*, the name (of the pavilion) disappears together with the image of Pavilion (in burst of the flashlights) just in order to appear again. The strongest impression is the aggression of the flashlights which are haunting, repetitive, violent, oppressive

---

\(^{73}\) ‘Imagine you wake up one morning and your country has disappeared. Your bed and the house are the same and your neighborhood is, almost, the same, but your neighbors seem to have changed and the city is changing even as you get out of bed. On the news a man that you do not recognize is making an inaugural presidential speech, introducing a flag and national anthem you do not recognize and he is speaking about your country, yours, that you don’t know.’ (Tomić, 2003) (Commissar of the selected project was Branislava Andjelković, and Museum of Modern Art in Belgrade)
(imposing the fact of human intervention being often aggressive, dangerous and frightening). Also, the effect of 400 hundred flashlights signaled that something important (and devastating) happened (disappearance of one country, as the disappearance of the whole world).

It was an introduction for interpretation of entire modern art concept (exhibition inside of the pavilion) as a call for reinterpretation of modern art and history, in context of history of the 20th century itself (again- in its wholeness, marked by wars, revolutions, bloody conflicts, manipulative and violent regimes, and concentration camps as places for systematic killing, for the first time in history).

Also, it was an attempt of bringing together art and revolutions that changed the world in the 20th century, through the notion of Yugoslavia, a state that emerged from War (wars)\(^\text{74}\) and ended up in war (Stojanović, 2003).\(^\text{75}\) Installation of Milica Tomić, by accentuating the façade (emerged during the fascism regime in Italy) and the name Jugoslavia (which disappears in flashlights just to appear more visible than ever) evoked the political context, being ever present at Biennale Manifestation from its beginning (Blagojević, 2003). That is on the first place People’s Liberation Struggle (Narodna oslobodilačka borba – NOB). As Siniša Mitrović stated in his contribution to Catalogue dedicated to 50th edition of Biennale and Pavilion of Yugoslavia:

> ‘the sight of a Yugoslav national pavilion was fundamentally always the scene of an imperialist seizure. The flash intervening in this scene irrevocably evokes the Event that changed that particular order of things. Undoubtedly, this was the conception of the Peoples Liberation Struggle (Narodna oslobodilačka borba, PLS/NOB) a liberatory anti-fascist movement which gave an opportunity to people of the then Kingdom of Yugoslavia to reject the role imposed upon them by the scenario of this imperialist historical force.’ (Mitrović, 2003, 40).

Through the notion of PLS/NOB, the shaping of Yugoslav legacy started in the Yugoslav Pavilion almost immediately after its last emanation ceased to exist. Excessive effects that followed the flashlights was pointing out the excessive existence of the country that changed its name and structure several times in less than hundred years, being as a creator of nonalignment movement, and liberal communism, ‘a social anomaly in the eyes of the West and capitalist defect in the eyes of the East’ (Mitrović, 2003, 41).

\(^{74}\) At the beginning of the century as an idea, after the First World War as First Yugoslavia (unity of Serbs, Croats, Slovenians), after Second World War as a Social Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, becoming a metaphor of the fragmented history of 20th century.

\(^{75}\) ‘That flash which made the pavilion of non-existing state to disappear becomes a refuge for that which falls down from history’ (Stojanović, 2003, 28). Even more, it made Yugoslav pavilion to become the meeting place for history and art. Also, with the memory culture that occurred in every exhibition, it became memorial space.
The flashlights with its effect are calling the audience to look again. The entrance of the pavilion which stay visible represents the gate into the world of art, actually reproductions of the famous artworks of modern art representing the Pavilion Yugoslavia as a project using the metaphor of a disappearing world (National Pavilion – Atlantis) as well as metaphor of disappearing world - Noel Arc bearing the most prominent artworks (Exhibition of the modern art, inside of the pavilion).

With the project from 2003, Pavilion Yugoslavia, culture of memory and remembrance, the Yugoslav legacy and identity became one of the main themes of the Serbian participation in Pavilion Yugoslavia. Probably the first explicit reflection about Yugoslavia appeared in its pavilion, shaping the post Yugoslav identity not just as an inheritance and influence of the Yugoslav past in culture and art, but also as a trauma of Yugoslavia disappearing. With the title of the project Yugoslav pavilion, and its parts (exhibition that represented the history of art itself as a space of constant interpretation and reinterpretation, creation and destruction) together with the National Pavilion exhibition of Milica Tomić, a dominant theme regarding the identity and place of post Yugoslav art in post Yugoslav space – has been open.76

Considering the fact that, officially, the unity of Serbia and Montenegro still represents Yugoslavia, The National pavilion was anticipating the end of the last Yugoslav unity, and a post Yugoslav space, confusion in identity, and an urge for shaping new narratives and communicating the Yugoslav legacy in its wholeness (together with the consequences of its dissolution).

The 51th Biennale in Venice in 2005 (The experience of art, always a little further), curated by the two professionals for the first time, had two participants from the former Yugoslavia state – Croatia in separate pavilions outside of Giardini, and Montenegro in the Yugoslav Pavilion, due to the agreement with Serbia which considered the change between two countries every two years. The separation of Serbia and Montenegro union was anticipated.

In 2006, Montenegro officially announced independence, and the next year, 2007, Serbia became the main and only inhabitant of the Yugoslav Pavilion (until now, 58th Biennale in 2019). That was the year in which the last emanation of Yugoslavia, embodied in Serbia and Montenegro state, ceased to exist. The Pavilion of Yugoslavia, in a way and once again, became a matter of the past, and joined other ‘non-existing countries’ which still had its space in Biennale Garden (that

was the main theme of Ivan Grubanov project twelve years after\textsuperscript{77} described further in this text on page 26).

The presentation of Serbian contemporary art and culture began from the project \textit{Reset} on 52nd manifestation in 2007 (\textit{Think with the Senses – Feel with the Mind}) where Serbia had its first independent exhibition, housed in the Pavilion (with inscription) Jugoslavia in Giardini. Project \textit{Reset} by sculptor Mrđan Bajić (born in 1957, lives and works in Paris) and commissioned by painter Vladimir Veličković. \textit{Project Reset} consisted of the three parts \textit{Yugomuseum, Backup, and Reset.}\textsuperscript{78}

As it is already marked in a title, the project refers to the past, more precisely – to the sociopolitical past of Serbia, in the context of Yugoslavia, and in memory of the previous state. The exhibition was marked by metaphorical elements in sculptures that recalled the socialist Yugoslavia. As Maja Ćirić, art historian and critic stated in her contribution to exhibition catalogue, Bajić was using collective references with the intimate expression:

With his work Bajić proposes to provide an answer to the challenge of creating art while interpretatively dealing with political, structural, cultural, and esthetic criteria. His YUGOMUSEUM links great, problematic historical narratives with idiosyncratic needs of the individual. BACKUP reminds us that the studio is still a frame and a subject matter. RESET indicates a gap between the abstract concept of the nation and a world irrevocably transformed by everyday experiences of real men and women. His sculptures form an imprint of complex mindsets coming to terms with universal contradictions, while attempting to comprehend the complexities, and the turbulence of his native country’s current situation (Ćirić, 2007).\textsuperscript{79}

\textit{Yugomuseum} is a project that took several years starting from 1998. As the author Mrđan Bajić stated in presentation of the project\textsuperscript{80}, he was sharing the first attempts with friends rather than with the colleagues, and that is the way that \textit{Yugomuseum} used to grow during the years – adding new memories, new comments and new material. It is a multimedia project, a collection of

\textsuperscript{77} At 56th edition of Venice Biennale, Igor Grubanov represented \textit{The United Dead Nations/ Ujedinjene mrtve nacije} displaying the installation of flags of countries that does not exist anymore.

\textsuperscript{78} As Biljana Srbiljanović (Serbian theatre writer) stated about the artist and exhibition, his critical approach towards past, mixed with subjective and intimate experience, Serbian participation in Biennale was one more turn to the Yugoslavia theme, ‘Mrđan Bajić has now been selected to exhibit at the national pavilion for the second time. And this little house in Venice has in fact gone through a process very similar to the artist’s, a search for identity, positioning itself in contradictory historical circumstances that changed many times over, changing its name four times, it’s citizenship the same number of times, and all of it of course (and fortunately) not moving from the Venetian garden. The pavilion that carried the name of communist Yugoslavia, then the smaller, wartime Yugoslavia, and then yet smaller, nervous union of Serbia and Montenegro, now becomes a national pavilion of a small state called Serbia. The name that for years was a symbol of war and devastation in the simplified views of public opinion, now resumes its right to be something other than that.’ (Srbiljanović, 2007).

\textsuperscript{79} Video from vernissage can be found on the link Vernissage TV (online sources in bibliography).

\textsuperscript{80} Description and explanation of the project on the page MrdjanBajic.net (online sources in Bibliography)
collage drawings, photos, and comments – even following lectures – a narrative that explains the concept of the imaginary or real institution of *Yugomuseum*. For the author and its first audience, *Yugomuseum* was a real institution – as real as everything that happened during Yugoslavia’s existence and after its dissolution.

It is a collection of intimate memories (perspective) of all the merchant places, characters, figures, atmosphere, people, events, that can invoke the former Yugoslavia and placed it into the Museum. With the ironic and critical approach of accumulating a large amount of material and information about every single ‘artifact’ (collage) the author shows the weak side of contemporary cultural institutions such as the museum and tries to place past events in a space that is no longer present now, or in the future. The author points out that the past is ever present and cannot be cut off from the present, but can be (re)owned and used to gain rights (collective and individual) for the future.

Placing its museum in the center of Belgrade (Slavija Square) the author spoke about its project from the perspective of the Speaker, taking the role of Lecturer to represent the ‘reality’ of *Yugomuseum*. Slavija Square with its surroundings (hotel from the period of social modernism, then one from the period of social postmodernism, square and monument dedicated to Dimitrije Tucović, as a pioneer in defending the worker’s rights before First World War, where he died, all together with the crowd and rush of everyday life). Presenting the project of *Yugomuseum* as a real institution that actually exists, in every sense (material also) the author intended to use the ‘lying’ as an artistic attempt to point out the false reality that takes place if we would try to leave the past behind and cut off memories from our personal and collective consciousness.

Attempting to forget the past creates false narratives which are placed in the institutions making them untrue (just like *Yugomuseum*). *Yugomuseum* is a radical critic of official institutions (museums) that are trying to marginalize and falsify the Yugoslav legacy. In addition, the incredible amount of images, symbols, names, and places in just one ‘artifact’ shows how serious

---

81 *Yugomuseum* also bears a moment of allusion on the institution The Museum of the Revolution of Yugoslav Nations and Ethnic Minorities created in 1959, then in 1996 - Museum of Yugoslav History was founded by merging the collections of the Memorial Center ‘Josip Broz Tito’ and the Museum of the Revolution of Yugoslav Nations and Ethnic Minorities, just to change a name in Museum of Yugoslavia in 2016 (more in chapter dedicated to this institution, page 92).

82 I will give just one small sequence as an example part of the collection of colages.
For example:
00026, Shoes; 140x60x120cm, 1999. Shoes that Slobodan Milošević wore during the meeting for signing the Dayton Agreement. Shoes that Bill Clinton wore during the claping to Dayton Agreement signers. Bogumil grave stone from the Middle Age with the quation from Bible and Kuran – wrote in cyrilic, latinic and arabian letters. Donations, SFOR. (translation TV).
00026, Cipele; 140x60x120cm, 1999.
the ‘project’ should be when dealing with the Yugoslav past for all institutions and points out the significance of personal memory as a part of the process (the author was collecting the material from his friends and colleagues that were witnessing the growth of the project by participating with the comments and their one experience documented with photos). As part of the project at Biennale, *Yugomuseum* was presented inside of the main pavilion as a multimedia installation. (fig. 4).

![Figure 4. Map of the Yugomuseum artefacts constellation](http://www.arte.rs/sr/umetnici/mrdjan_bajic-4/opus/yugomuseum-16/)

While *Yugomuseum* referred to important historical narratives, *Backup* was a collection of drawings that was a reminder of the intimate world of artists (and every other ‘participant’ of this ‘reality’) (fig. 5).

---

*Cipele koje je nosio Slobodan Milošević prilikom potpisivanja Dejtonskog sporazuma; cipele koje je nosio Bil Klinton prilikom aplaudiranja potpisnicima Dejtonskog sporazuma; srednjovekovni bogumiški stećak sa citatima iz Biblije i Kurana – pisani čiriličnim, latiničnim i arapskim pismom, presečen na dva dela. Donator, SFOR.*
Figure 5. Backup, collection of drawings, part of the exhibition Reset, Mrdjan Bajić, Source: http://www.galleriaverrengia.it/en/backup-stories-mrdjan-bajic/

All together it would make Reset point out the abstract meaning of a nation that arouses in a collision of historical and personal experience. The whole project is colored by the intention of the author to accentuate the need of a new perspective in contemporary Serbian society (visible in the name of the project – ‘reset’ in the meaning of ‘set again or anew’). The central position of the pavilion was reserved for sculptures, a monumental part of the exhibition – their weight could reach four tons, made from steel, aluminum, wood, onyx, working uniforms, blankets, ropes, polyester, printed material, optic glass and other materials, a wearing a concept of politically engaged art.

For example, the remarkable part of the exhibition sculpture Andeo [Angel] (fig. 83) as the author stated about the sculpture in his work, sculpture is quitly depended from the context, and when the word is about Yumuseum, the place where it was displayed for the first time. Pavilion Veljković ia an amphitheatr of the Center for Cultural Decontamination, described in the first example of alternative cultural nstitutions, ‘A sculpture or ‘an object with artistic pretensions’, viewed within the scope of contemporary comprehension of art gets confirmation in the context in which it is shown and created. On the parking space, between cars. It does not lose anything of its original meaning. Koons in an antique shop, between other relics, loses a great deal of its provocative character and meaning. There is nothing to regret. Some new semantic categories have been established and we must count that also in today. Therefore, ‘YU Museum’ promotion took place on Slavija Square in 1999. The Pavilion ‘Veljković’ was chosen for the first promotion of ‘YU Museum’ for the same reason. Isolated, with its own prehistory which is parallel to the political situation in Yugoslavia, an unsolved ownership status, and at the same time so flexible and easily adjustable cocoon-like space. That is why it is taken a great care regarding to display, atmosphere, lights, dimensions - all these things make and unit with a sculpture. As far as single pieces are concerned, a lot of attention
6) brought allusions on recent Serbian history, including NATO bombing in 1999 (it refers on the deep symbolic meaning in orthodox religion and Serbian culture) and on the name of the NATO’s operation in 1999, the *Angel of Mercy* [*Milosrdni anđeo*] (name is still under the question, for being uncertain if it was official or nonofficial, or even being just part of the urban language and manipulative construction by the regime in Yugoslavia).

![Figure 6. Angel /Anđeo, Mrđan Bajić, Sculpture from Biennale in 2007](image)


In his sculptures, Mrđan Bajić is inspired by the past[^84], and ‘resetting’ means for him - back to the previous in order to gain new possibility with an old experience, holding ambivalent

[^84]: "Mrđan Bajić relays his work on the past (Yugomuseum) without being closed into his own logic (Backup) letting it go to the fatality of changes (Reset). Reset is for him taking a right position which considers experience of a culture as complete displacing characterized by the impossibility of catching what is outside of his sculptures"
topology of now and then, here and now, without polarization and binary perspective, with the radical gesture of deconstruction, and power of creation (Bogdanović, 2013). The opposition present/past, now/then, inside/outside, here/there, was thematized and present in Pavilion, particularly after 2003 (since the exhibition Pavilion Yugoslavia). That was the way of artistic response, both on the theme of the Biennale and at the same time – the theme of the Pavilion itself, always related to the Yugoslav history, culture and art of the past, and Serbian contemporary art and society, of the present.

Figure 7. Sequence from the Yugomuseum collage, part of the project Reset, photo from the Catalogue, 2007, capture from catalogue, Photo: Tijana Vuković (2019)

(’enfermer le dehors). He suggests non-binary and non hierarchial material and symbolical practice based on the deconstructive gesture. Paradoxically, authenticity of author’s discourse is self-managable due to the interplay and tension between what is from the inside and outside, past, present, political, aesthetical...’ (translation Tijana Vuković).

’Mrđan Bajić se oslanja na prošlost (Yugomuseum) ali nije zatvoren u sopstvenu logiku (Backup) već dozvoljava da bude izložen fatalnosti promena (Reset). Resetovati za njega znači zauzeti ispravnu poziciju koja podrazumeva doživljaj kulture kao neprestanog izmeštanja i koju odlikuje nemogućnost zatvaranja onog što je izvan njegovih skulptura (enfermer le dehors). On predlaže nebinaranu i nehierarhijsku materijalnu i simboličku praksu, koja se zasniva na dekonstruktivističkom gestu. Paradoksno, autentičnost autorskog diskursa je samoodrživa upravo zato što se Bajić poigrava sa ambivalentnom topologijom u kojoj je svako ovde u tenziji sa onim tamo, unutrašnjost, spoljašnjost, prošlost, sadašnjost, političko, estetsko... ‘ (Ćirić, 2007).

http://www.arte.rs/sr/umetnici/Mrđan_bajic-4/tekstovi/reset_Mrđan_bajic-1621/
Mrđan Bajić created an alternative space for Yugoslavia to exist through its project Reset (fig. 7) accentuating how the past is always present. Pavilion Jugoslavia in Venice, the only space that still wears the name of the non-existing country in international frames, was the logical choice from Yugomuseum/Backup/Reset home.

The interplay of the present/past, now/then, inside/out, here/there, and individual experience at a time of huge changes of the XX century in subtle way was also a theme in 2009 during 53th edition of Venice Biennale (Making Worlds) where Serbia entered with the two projects, Toplina [Warmth] of author Zoran Todorović (fig. 8) and Ako mi uzmeš glas šta će mi ostati? [But if you take my voice, what will be left to me?] by author Katarina Zdjelar.

![Figure 8. Zoran Todorović, Warmth installation view, Serbian Pavilion at the 53rd Venice Biennial](https://www.zorantodorovic.com/portfolio_page/warmth/)

Curator Branislav Dimitrijević stated in one of the interviews about the exhibition that the national pavilion should represent certain aspects of contemporary art of the country but also its emotion, atmosphere, or that what happens. The dialog that these two projects created represents
a certain pessimism and maybe fatalism in Serbian society. Project *Warmth* by Zoran Todorović showed blankets made of the human hair, while Katarina Zdjelar’s theme was learning the other language in special circumstances (living in the foreign country) in her audiovisual installations. The exhibition on first sight does not refer to the political situation nor does it have concrete allusions about recent events (final dissolution of Yugoslavia in a split of Serbia and Montenegro in 2006) but both artists have the subtle allusions to the consequences of the ‘interesting times’ of the ordinary life and people. Two artists, coming from different generations share a common point in arguing that an artist with its sensibility should mediate common interest and critical approach to reality. The collection of hair in *Warmth* of Zoran Todorović (fig. 9) actually an artifact that presents blankets of human hair in a subtle way invokes the (miss)use of the human body (and soul) in the 20th century - even the monstrous legacy of the 20th century such as concentration camps.

Figure 9. Collection of hair, Zoran Todorović, Warmth, Serbian Pavilion at the 53rd Venice Biennial, 2009

Source: https://www.zorantodorovic.com/portfolio_page/warmth/

---

Katarina Zdjelar also, by practicing languages on audio and visual documentations represents the migration of people from their one country to another and invoking the generations that had left former Yugoslav countries during the 90s, but not just them.

Living in the other phonetic surroundings dictates the huge sacrifice. Part of the identity should be suppressed in order to accept another one, or to build the new one. In Katarina Zdjelar work with multimedia and audiovisual materials testifies to the complicity of living abroad, common for generations born in Yugoslavia, grew up in some of their emanations, but decided to work and live somewhere else. Traumatizing potential of that migration is reflected in a part of Katarina Zdjelar’s work where dissociation and splitting as a coping mechanism is represented in an artistic, subjective and effective way in opposition native language and the one that the subject (needs to) learn. Zoran Todorović’s two tone of human hair for blankets, transformed in an installation, was collected for months from hairdressing salons (fig.10) as well as in military barracks accentuating a hair-cutting as a norm of discipline, adaptation and also a form of control or social care. The conditions in which this process is carried out have been thoroughly documented (fig. 11).

Figure 10. Collecting of hair, Zoran Todorović, Warmth, Serbian Pavilion at the 53rd Venice Biennial, 2009
Source: https://www.zorantodorovic.com/portfolio_page/warmth/

Figure 12. Katarina Zdjelar, Still image from the video *The Perfect Sound, But if you take my voice, what will be left to me?* At the 53rd Biennale di Venezia, 2009 
The whole process invoked the chauvinistic perspective toward the body and body products, dehumanization and utilization, an atmosphere of concentration camps in the context of modern contemporary ‘humanistic’ capitalistic society. With the human hair in the blankets (Todorović) and linguistic practice of the worker in foreign country (Zdjelar, for the people from Yugoslavia and ex-Yugoslav countries, the main destination for working and leaving was Germany, video installation fig. 2). The exhibition shows a pessimistic image of the contemporaneity after the huge combat for human life, freedom and equality in the Second World War. In the context of the former Yugoslav Pavilion as an ever-present frame, the exhibition recalls the People's Liberation Army (NOB) maintaining the continuity of Yugoslav legacy themes or at least their allusions.

Through the artwork of Raša Teodosijević, and exhibition in 2011, for the central theme of 54th Biennale (Illuminations) Yugoslav Pavilion was once again occupied by the Yugoslav Past. Serbia presented the exhibition Svetlost i tama simbola [The Lightness and Darkness of the Symbols] (fig. 13) of author Raša Teodosijević (commissioner Živko Grozdanić, curator Sanja Kojić Mladenov, production Museum of Contemporary Art Vojvodina). Yugoslavia is settled as a frame for artist to fill it up:

Today, Yugoslavia is a semantic remnant, based on unprovable claims and false authorities of those that created it, guarded it, and, ultimately, dismembered it. The Pavilion belongs to the Republic of Serbia now and functions as an inherited sign that obliges the commissioner, as well as the artist, ‘to fill it up, empty it, improve on it, add to it, and make it comprehensible’ (The Lightness and The Darkness of the Symbol/ Svetlost i tama simbola, catalogue, 2011).

86 ‘The central theme of the 54th Biennial is ‘Illuminations’, developed by artistic director Bice Kuriger. The topic has historical references to Italian painter Tintoretto, whose work with light can be seen as important for the work of many contemporary artists. Bearing in mind the theme of this year’s event, Todosijević’s presentation consists of three interrelated segments. The first is the ‘Diary’ – the artist’s reminder and testimony, which consists of 120 small-scale works of different concepts, techniques and dimensions. The second segment consists of installations made of photographs, newspaper clippings and other material covering a wall, through which Todosijević examines the changed relation and perception of content and the form, especially in sculptural forms in connection with the present, petrified ideas and, he says, ‘above all, suspicious strongholds in the history of ideas.’ (Barlovac, 2011).
Two years after, in 2013 on the 55th edition of Biennale, *The Encyclopedic Palace*, authors Miloš Tomić and Vladimir Perić displayed *Nema ničega između nas, [Nothing between us]* a project that explored ‘the relationships between objects, history and knowledge through the use of video, sound and found or replicated objects’ (Spencer, 2017). The artists represented an intimate voyage through the past (the exhibited artwork of Miloš Tomić were short movies titled, *Muzički dnevnici/Musical diaries*) where Yugoslavia appeared in blurry sequences of memory, then known objects (dolls) multiplied in installations of Vladimir Perić, the personal and subjective perspective, transformed and liberated from all socio political narratives – but just on the first glance. Multiplied dolls were manufactured in Yugoslavia.

In the video guiding dedicated to the exhibition, commmeasure of the exhibition Maja Ćirić commented the symbolic meaning of the title making a connection with the Yugoslav past and
accentuated the fact that exhibition was placed in Yugoslav pavilion, but without further explanation – what kind of obvious connection was that? 87

So, according to the statement of the curator and artists even in the frame of the Nothing between us project, there are connections with the Yugoslav past – for example, authors stated in video guidance about the circumstances in Serbia after dissolution of Yugoslavia and influence they have on national pavilion, accentuating the absence of the real criteria for selecting the representative artwork for Venice Biennale.

In 2015 on 56th edition of Biennale, All the World’s future, the Pavilion was a place for the project of Ivan Grubanov Ujedinjene mrtve nacije [United Dead Nations]88, ‘an installation that continues Grubanov’s interest in collective memory and what he calls dead countries, or states like Yugoslavia and the German Democratic Republic. These nations were split up or dissolved during the second half of the 20th century, when Eastern European nations’ borders were constantly shifting’ (Greenberger, 2015).

Artist used the flags of Yugoslavia, the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and also the Ottoman Empire, Austria-Hungary and other vanished states (100 hundred flags of disappeared countries for 120-year history of the Venice Biennale) for installation on the floor of the pavilion. The three-dimensional names of all these countries were installed on the walls together with the duration of their existence (in years). United Dead Nations came after Ivan Grubanov’s Mrtve zastave [Dead Flags] in 2013, a collection of flags of republics and organizations that no longer existed, his first work thematizing the cultural memory using the strong symbolic meaning of flags. Flags would represent the fate of the states as a cultural destiny and also the influence of institutions, organizations and states on the individual.

Eventually, the installation in the pavilion looked like battlefield (fig. 14) artist mixed liquid and colors, pouring the color on the flags left on the canvas on the floor, moving them and stepping on them, until they left their own color on the canvas, creating traces, losing their own qualities and absorbing the colors from other flags. The coat of arms on the flags became unrecognizable, or hardly recognizable.

87 Obviously, there is always additional contextual meaning that Yugoslav pavilion imposes on exhibited artwork. Short film containing interviews with authors and material from the site is available on the following link, http://www.seecult.org/vest/vodenje-nema-nicega-izmedu-nas
88 Artist in creation process, preparation of the installation in pavilion on Vimeo, link in online sources in Bibliography.
Instead of their ‘dignity’, the large amount of fabric appeared in the Serbian pavilion, and the flags were ‘united in death’. The installation evoked the periods of violence in former Yugoslavia during its dissolution, and all the conflicts that occurred in connection with the disappearing of the other states.

Along with provoking a strong emotional reaction, the exhibition opened the discussion field and fate of the disappeared nations and countries of the past and became the question of the present, and a treat for the future. The influence was accentuated with the meaningful site of Yugoslav pavilion and the context it bears. Ivan Grubanov used to live in several countries that all emerged as a phase of Yugoslavia dying, implicating the conclusion that no nation dies easily, coloring the atmosphere of the war (fig. 15).
Fig 15 Sequence 2 from exhibition *United Death Nations* at Serbian Pavilion in Venice, 2015.


After the *Pavilion Yugoslavia* in 2003, this was the first project that explicitly returned Yugoslavia in Serbian Pavilion. Described as a ‘dead nation’, among others, Yugoslavia existed one more time as a ‘presence in absence’. The certain ‘comeback’ of a national memory as a theme points out that dominant tendency in contemporary culture in Serbia could be (re)thinking of the past and creating new, more beneficial narratives considering Yugoslavia, and making context of similar stories of European states while also regaining the continuity.

The installation *United Dead Nations* aims to establish a dialogue on what does the notion of the nation represent in our post-global times by putting in focus the nations that no longer exist as such, but whose ghosts are still conditioning the geo-spheres they had occupied (Austro-Hungarian Empire, Ottoman Empire, Soviet Union, German Democratic Republic, Yugoslavia, etc.). By doing so, the multifaceted spectrum of desires and conflicts, which the notion of nation embodies, is considered and the questions of nature and permanence of today’s nations are being imposed. *United Dead Nations* recreate an absent political and enable its alternative life in the aesthetic regime of art by opening new

---

89 ‘The pavilion of Serbia makes for a significant example within the debate surrounding Venice’s nation-based system. Housed in what once was the Yugoslavian pavilion, the exhibition space is, in the words of artist Ivan Grubanov, still inhabited ‘by the ghost of [the] nation,’ whose name remains engraved on the building’s façade. Grubanov represented Serbia at the 56th Venice Biennale, where he participated with an installation ominously titled United Dead Nations, which was ‘a mirror held at the very concept of the Venice Biennale’ (Gvero, 2017)."
representational relations within the field of the visual - the space where social reality is translated into forms and images (Merenik, 2015a).

In 2017, the project Enklavia – Slikarstvo, posledica ovakvog života [Enklavia - Painting, a Consequence of This Kind of Life] 90 brought works of three Serbian painters to Biennale, by its title recalling non-existing state, also containing allusion to that state being something separated and isolated by its nature, always surrounded by the (different) Other. Three painters (Vladislav Šćepanović, Milena Dragićević, and Dragan Zdravković) were selected by the commissar Nikola Šuica, to explore and represent a phenomenon of painting through perspective of the exhibition motto ‘Painting, a Consequence of This Kind of Life’ and distorted presence of cultural memory in contemporary art and life.

In a fact that Biennale theme for the year 2017 was Viva Arte Viva and that choice of Serbian institutions looks like a bypassing the main task, decision to dedicate the participation to descriptive concept and metaphor of non-existing space (state) which could be illustrative for the status of the Serbian contemporary art and artist, in Serbia and abroad, and in geopolitical context. The permanent state of transformation and transition in Yugoslav art of the 20th century, has its continuation in the transitive process of the successor states and their art.

Almost every exhibition presented in the Pavilion of Yugoslavia, but also in pavilions of other former Yugoslav states, after the dissolution of Yugoslavia in the ‘90s had become a remembrance space in which Yugoslavia still exists. For example, during the last Biennale manifestation in the 2019 Serbian Pavilion presented the art-work of the artist Đorđe Ozbolt, a Serbian painter, living in London, known more in international artistic circles than in Serbia. The exhibition Povratak gubitka memorije [Regaining Memory Loss] 91 brought murals, paintings, and sculptures by the same artist (fig. 16).

90 ‘The exhibition is purposefully entitled Enclavia, since it is a continuation of the tension of general geopolitical standpoints, and it is situated at the original pavilion, founded by the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, the place which has decades long history of presenting selected art from the Yugoslav socialist federation. The paintings by these authors transform the rectangular space of the Pavilion of the Republic of Serbia, as a structural exposition of political, situational and existential circumstances of our time.’ (Ober, 2017).

91 ‘Regaining Memory Loss. Đorđe Ozbolt presents new paintings and sculptures that address personal and collective memory. The pavilion is transformed by a new wall painting by the artist, which serves as an imaginary landscape on top of which more paintings are hung. Ozbolt views these works as windows, or portals, open onto symbolic and illusory visions of the past. Through the artist’s signature use of bright, saturated colour, the canvases and wall paintings clash and fight against each other, for a sort of performed, unreliable history. The sculptures and paintings are configured to face each other, each reflecting to the other the layering of selective fragments of memory. The works in themselves are interpretations, a subjective view of the past from the perspective of the present moment. Ozbolt questions the role of the artwork in distilling the truth, in its imagined unreality, the works reveal their memory...’
The regaining of the memory loss, represents the impression and interpretation of an artist, intimate and individual with slight allusion on collective memory (of people in post Yugoslav countries) and with, at the first glance, insignificant symbols of the socio political situation in 20th and 21th century on Balkan.

Đorđe Ozbolt’s selection of works under the title Povratak gubitka memorije [Regaining Memory Loss] consists of a mural/wall painting (that brought unity between sculptures and paintings) presenting an abstracted landscape, which is actually a metaphor of a landscape from the artist’s youth and space of a country that does not exist anymore (Yugoslavia in Regaining the memory loss showed itself as a still blurry space between personal and collective memory).

The mural as a landscape represented a space where paintings were hung on, as an accentuated and self-defying fragments of memories, together with two-meter high sculptures to be false, however as artistic representation, they are true.’ (official representation of the national pavilions, link in online sources in Bibliography).
that were standing against the opposite wall, facing the paintings and the mural, that represent the real, material, monumental present of the past in everyday reality. The effect of the sculptures coming out of the mural and paintings remember the haunting influence of the suppressed past on the present and the future.

It is a dialogue between painting and sculpture, inspired by memories of the same epoch, and of the same cultural-economic sensibility. Human figures, celebrated in past times – worn out today, disfigured and manipulated by time. What remains is a mixed sentiment and a contradictory experience.

Nevertheless, even for those who would not recognize the monuments from the period of Socialist Yugoslavia as a motif in Ozbolt’s paintings, the name of the exhibition will automatically lead to the past and, for example, to a country that owned the Pavilion before it became Serbian. Also the title is associated with the traumatic experiences, knowing that memory loss is often a consequence of some violent, unexpected, harming or unpleasant experience or event. From the other side, Ozbolt’s paintings are colorful, vivid, and expressive, dynamic and with a sparkle of comic effect due to the exotic motifs and grotesque effects.

The portraits of the massive monuments from the period of FSRY (Federal Socialistic Republic of Yugoslavia) are immersed into deep exotic woods and surreal surroundings, with the suggestive presence of animals, or human figures. Through the images of Tjentište, Kosmaj, Nikšić monuments that were built in the ‘60s and ‘70s in Yugoslavia, to represent a victory in anti-fascism combat as well as the power of the socialist Yugoslavia and its president Tito, Ozbolt evoked a whole spectrum of meanings connected with Yugoslavia.

The monuments from this socialist period of Yugoslavia where the main theme of the project *Towards concrete utopia, Architecture in Yugoslavia (1948-1980)* in Museum of Modern Art in New York, from July 15th, 2018 to January 13, 2019⁹² (fig. 17) that could inspire the work of Djordje Ozbolt for Venice Biennale.

---

⁹² Situated between the capitalist West and the socialist East, Yugoslavia’s architects responded to contradictory demands and influences, developing a postwar architecture both in line with and distinct from the design approaches seen elsewhere in Europe and beyond. The architecture that emerged—from International Style skyscrapers to Brutalist ‘social condensers’—is a manifestation of the radical diversity, hybridity, and idealism that characterized the Yugoslav state itself. Toward a Concrete Utopia, Architecture in Yugoslavia, 1948–1980 introduces the exceptional work of socialist Yugoslavia’s leading architects to an international audience for the first time, highlighting a significant yet thus-far understudied body of modernist architecture, whose forward-thinking contributions still resonate today. Toward a Concrete Utopia explores themes of large-scale urbanization, technology in everyday life, consumerism, monuments and memorialization, and the global reach of Yugoslav architecture. The exhibition includes more than 400 drawings, models, photographs, and film reels from an array of municipal archives, family-held collections, and museums across the region, and features work by important architects including Bogdan Bogdanović, Juraj Neidhardt, Svetlana Kana Radević, Edvard Ravnikar, Vjenceslav Richter, and Milica Šterić. From the sculptural interior of the White Mosque in rural Bosnia, to the post-earthquake reconstruction of the city of Skopje.
The mentioned exhibition in New York gained an unexpected prominence, and brought in effect a large scale of the following events in Europe and America, such a panels, articles and another exhibitions or projects, for example the International forum, *Creating a Concrete Utopia – Architecture in Yugoslavia 1948-1980* and the additional program, organized by *Architectuuul*, based on Kenzo Tange’s Metabolist design, to the new town of New Belgrade, with its expressive large-scale housing blocks and civic buildings, the exhibition examines the unique range of forms and modes of production in Yugoslav architecture and its distinct yet multifaceted character’ (Kulić, 2018).
online platform from Berlin and the Faculty of Architecture, University in Belgrade together with CZKD (Center for cultural decontamination, more on the page).

The expression, architecture form and symbolic meaning of the Yugoslav socialist monuments were already recalled on the artistic scene, which made their visual identity and narrative easily recognizable in the period of Biennale and among the artistic world(s). The exhibition, with a mixture of motifs related to the personal and collective memory, could also allude to the phenomenon of Yugonostalgia – a personal and emotional remembrance of Yugoslavia, often present in former Yugoslavia countries, and mostly among people of the generations which used to live in its ‘best period’.

Also among researchers (Velikonja, 2009) making it an interesting phenomenon of today being, naturally rooted in the past and sometimes strongly expressed in the present. Yugonostalgia is also the way of an internal presence of Yugoslavia in the Venice Pavilion brings this (non)existing country to life, by making from her absence – expressive presence (Fuchs, 2017).

STILL YUGOSLAV

The crisis in Serbian institutions, caused by discontinuity and transformational and sociopolitical changes during the 2003–2019 period, reflected on the Biennale manifestation, even though the Pavilion, Biennale and Serbian representations are showing together continuity and coherence that is rare on the Serbian cultural scene and among official institutions and representations. Artists were trying to find a new interpretation and a new understanding of the past to emerge out of the crisis:

In her project for the facade of the ‘Yugoslavia’ Pavilion, Milica Tomić seeks to rethink the previous existence of Yugoslavia and to confirm one of its emancipatory political projects, the anti-fascists People’s Liberation Struggle. However, she seeks to abandon its worn-out iconography. The artists’ utopian desire for unmediated human connection discards iconography that romanticizes the Role of

---

93 The event took place in the Center for Cultural Decontamination, from the 12th to the 15th of November 2018, in Belgrade.

94 ‘The exhibition in MOMA in New York, ‘Toward a Concrete Utopia, Architecture in Yugoslavia, 1948 – 1980’ marks a turning point in the interest for the architectural and urbanistic production of socialist Yugoslavia. The exhibition of Yugoslav architecture in an institution of world-wide renown is a direct motive, or call, for our dealing with our own heritage. The exhibition is a result of a long standing teamwork of experts from the region, who will talk at the Center for Cultural Decontamination, during a four-day-long international forum, joined by protagonists and creators from that period. The modernization processes of former Yugoslavia enabled intense development and urbanization, creating an infrastructure which is still a basis for the functioning of cities and the region, as well as a unique architectural, artistic and cultural heritage. The relationship toward that heritage has been embedded in the transitional transformations, both physical and social, and it is of key importance not just for understanding the contemporary development of cities, but their future as well’ (Slavković, 2019).
Nation and Nations and conceptualizes an abstract statement that romanticizes human desire to emancipate and be emancipated. When throwing some Light upon the existence of this country of ‘Enlightened Socialism’, we notice/imply an observer who sees more when looking aside. (The work of art in the state of exile, Serbia and Montenegro, Project, National Pavilion, catalogue, 2003).

The Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade was mostly the authoritative institution for selecting the project representing Serbia at Biennale although sometimes not the leading one, from the time of the Duke Paul’s Museum. The main national cultural institutions shared the narrative with the representation on Biennale. Due to that relation, Biennale and Pavilion Yugoslavia, was always kind of a litmus paper test for the change in structures, either internal or external, of the cultural institutions in Serbia, and also for cultural policy change.

All participation, since 2003, were related in a way with the Yugoslav past by dealing with the symbolic meaning of the Yugoslav Pavilion renamed in Serbian. If not by the exhibition itself, then by side or core narrative of accompanying texts, with the common denominator in a motto - dealing with the past:

By titling the exhibition Light and Darkness of Symbols, through which he examines the transformed relationship and perception of content and form, as well as history, which, in itself, becomes form, Dragoljub Todosijević, particularly in his sculptural objects, draws attention to the highly suspect mainstays in the history of ideas. The widespread presence of particular ideas, and their firm stand in the globalized world, obliges the commissioner and the artist to deconstruct all historical and national symbols at the exhibition space of the Serbian Pavilion. Hence, the inherited ‘utopia Yugoslavia’, as something which was forsaken, ensures its hidden presence at the Serbian Pavilion- and Dragoljub Todosijević reminds us of the twofold reading and understanding of the Pavilion, as well as the term Yugoslav Pavilion, itself, in the same way that the notion of the Greek word ‘utopia’ can be ‘Eutopia’, i.e., ‘good place’ or, alternatively, ‘ou-topia’ or ‘no place’. Utopia never became a reality, it descended into darkness, as did countless other political ideas (Grozdanić, 2011).

The Institution of the Yugoslav Pavilion created its identity in an international context through exhibitions, through different conceptions and tasks, and at the same time by what is the most important, maintaining a continuity between Yugoslav and Serbian art which was often interrupted and marginalized. If we consider the Pavilion in Venice as the certain institution (reasons lie in the internal and external structures functions, aims and results) then the Yugoslav Pavilion was (is) the example par excellence for the (dis)continuity in the narrative of the contemporary Serbian art and culture institutions.

The dissolution of Yugoslavia (1991) brought the Yugoslav Pavilion under the successor process. Despite the fact that after dissolution of the Social Federal Republic of Yugoslavia the
pavilion became a heritage for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (composed of Serbia and Montenegro) and Yugoslavia became Serbia and Montenegro in 2003, and process of the dissolution at the end led to erasing the name Yugoslavia from the list of existing states. Despite the Yugoslav Agreement on Succession Issues (2001) almost twenty years after - the status of the Yugoslav Pavilion is not completely solved to date.

The authorities of Serbia (as users of the pavilion since splitting of the Serbia and Montenegro and which the name is written on the right side of the facade) declared at the beginning of the 2017, that the status of the Pavilion is not solved yet, not even by Agreement from 2001, cause there is no concrete place in agreement dedicated to this property. That was, at the same time, an answer to the speculations regarding the sale of the Serbian Pavilion.

In permanent crisis and constant transformational process, the ‘transition’ became a notion in the core narrative of the cultural institutions in Serbia (and Serbian institutions, abroad). From the perspective of the cultural institutions and dynamic of Serbian culture and art in the 21th century, with the context of the Yugoslav Art, the transition process seems like the only continuity. The best reference point is the Pavilion in Venice, as one of the rare institutions and cultural space that has its continuity, also discovering and proving continuity in art and culture of the both Yugoslavia, its emanations (last Yugoslavia, and Serbia and Montenegro) and contemporary art and culture in Serbia.

In addition, the connections of the Biennale and Italian institutions with the Yugoslav and Serbian ones, relations and cooperation, are witnesses for a cultural policy in Yugoslavia and Serbia. For this example, in the case study of the Biennale exhibitions, it is possible to discover a development of the contemporary culture and art narrative, partly raised from the international presentation and from a need of discovering a national identity in context of the large international manifestations. The significant element of the cultural policy in socialist Yugoslavia were representations abroad as a way of creating and representing the identity of Yugoslav Art.

Pavilion in Venice still stands for the space where nation and culture intertwined should express itself through art representation and in context of the European and World Contemporary Art. Transformation process, forming the new identity, after which discovering and establishing its features and learning about the narrative structures of the new identity, dynamics and tendencies

95 During my research, I could not manage to get the proper answer from authorities about the ownership under the Pavilion. After several months of waiting and numerous addresses (mail, phones) I have reached a couple of journalists who were investigating the Yugoslav Pavilion case, and found that the solution has not been found yet. Until then, the Yugoslav Pavilion is in ownership of Serbia.
it creates, are the most prominent and productive characteristics of Yugoslav and then post Yugoslav Serbian culture.

Pavilion was the place of meeting and occasion for the mentioned ‘new’ art and culture to check and prove itself through relation with Others (other national pavilions, other artistic scenes, artists, contexts). Pavilion figure as the certain house for international display. Through exhibitions and their preparation – Pavilion, along with the Biennale participation projects, was the main institution for creating and establishing contemporary art in an international context.96

The context of the exhibited artworks during the period from 1990 until 2019, even if the primary concept was based on the main theme but through the subjective, intimate impression of the artists, shaped every representation. This context, connected with the geopolitical situation, took the prominence together with the history of the Pavilion and made the main accent in the exhibition narrative. What could be the most important, it marked the need for making (discovering) continuity, by regaining the awareness about the past, and right to its legacy, in Serbian culture and art scene.

The continuity that is missing in other institutions of culture and art is still present in Biennale and its space. Yugoslavia does not leave its Pavilion, being present as a theme or a motif, reminder or just intimate memory, in every representation of Serbian artists since the breakup of the state (fig. 18).

96 ‘In a country recovered from war and conflicts and in economic, political and social transition on its way to become a member of the EU, the crisis of today’s world comes to the fore in a more direct manner’ according to Maja Kolarić, curator of the 2017 Pančevo biennial. For artists from Serbia and its diaspora, the notion of ‘transition’ seems to be inextricable from their production and the Serbian pavilion remains informed by this aspect. Beyond the difficult development of the country’s art scene, the ghost of a dead nation and its history of civil war, artists from Serbia are reclaiming their right to be more than merely the representatives of a nation, both in Venice and elsewhere’ (Gvero, 2017).
Figure 18. Capture as an illustration for collecting missing pieces in personal memory to translate it to collective (interpretation TV).
Raša Todosijević, Light and Darkness of Symbols – Serbian Pavilion,
The 54th International Art Exhibition of the Venice Biennale
3.2 MUSEUM OF CONTEMPORARY ART IN BELGRADE – PRESENCE IN ABSENCE

In 2006, during the conference in Rome dedicated to museums – their perspectives, roles and functions\(^\text{97}\) – Hans Belting stated relations between contemporary art and institutions ‘par excellence’ for its representations - the museums of contemporary art. He spoke about the transformation process that occupied museums in the 20th century, having them change and adapt to new social and political circumstances in order to become more dynamic, approachable, discerning, and creative to greater resonate with the audience.

He argued that emerging new galleries, particularly museums of contemporary art, in most cases meant that institutions had won the battle and right for existence (overcoming the huge crisis expressed in the question, ‘Does the contemporary art need museums anymore’\(^\text{98}\) ) and these institutions are becoming ready for the new challenges\(^\text{99}\).

During the same period in Belgrade, both the Museum of Contemporary Art (MoCAB) and the National Museum were closed for restoration (expected to last up to fifteen years) and unable to continue functioning in the devastated buildings. The Museum of Yugoslavia was going through the challenging process of changing the core narrative as well as the whole internal structure to focus on searching for a new identity more than on their audience (Pintar, Ignjatović, 2011).

After changes in the ‘90s when Yugoslavia was forced to abandon its institutions and institutions were forced by the new elites to shift cultural policies to anti-communistic, anti-Yugoslav and nationalistic foundations, institutions faded into an identity crises and become unable to function. Fragmentation that occurred as a consequence of discontinuity was highly damaging (Šuber, 2006).

\(^{97}\) Lecture given at the conference *Idea of the Museum, Identity, Role, Perspective* (L’Idea del Museo, Identità, Ruoli, Prospettive) from December 13-15, 2006, which was organized by the Vatican Museum in the context of the festivities of 500 years of the Vatican Museums.

\(^{98}\) Title of the lecture held by Marina Gržinić Muhler on The International Council of Museums of Modern Art conference, at Ludwig Museum Budapest, 22-25 September 2000 (Grzinic Muhler, 2000).

\(^{99}\) ‘Museums play a critical role, especially in the realm of contemporary art, a role different than that of representing world heritage. It is presently not possible to predict what this role will be. In a positive case, it would lead to the orchestration of roles that are different but still compatible. Such roles are closely linked to the contested claim of personal creativity, including freedom of expression, which was guaranteed as an accepted ideal of aesthetic competence in the sense of a distinct quality of ‘art.’ At the same time, such a concept of art was the condition for creating an off territory that we call a museum, a zone protected from the grip of political power. In the latter case, such a zone remains a hope in those parts of the world where political freedom appears to be in danger. To conclude, art museums have to integrate the double role of remaining (or becoming) an independent institution and, at the same time, serving as a new political forum’(Belting, 2006).
All significant cultural institutions, which should play a crucial role in the network of official institutions, were absent for years. The research represented in analytical chapters aims to show how the narrative of Yugoslavia and the Yugoslavian legacy existed (or did not exist) in different projects (mainly exhibitions) of official institutions at the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st century. This is particularly true after 2000, which was a breaking point for social and political life in Serbia. This was a change of the regime and caused the beginning of the second phase of the transition (argued also as the first real one) (Tomić, 2011).

**ATTEMPT OF CREATING YUGOSLAV IDENTITY IN ART AND CULTURE**

At the beginning of the 20th century, with success of the first Yugoslav Art Exhibition in Belgrade (1904) and the Yugoslav Art Colony (1905) in village Sićevo (near Pirot, Serbia) elites in Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia, decided to establish the Yugoslav Art Gallery with great approval of authorities at first but actually lacking financial support. After World War I, the initiative had been realized through the newly established Museum of Contemporary Art (1929) that was fused with the Museum of History and Arts in 1934 to form the Prince Paul Museum (Muzej kneza Pavla). As Irina Subotić stated about its significance:

The Prince Paul Museum in Belgrade grew out of a fusion of the National Museum, established on 10 May 1844 (called the Museum of History and Art in the 1920s and early 1930s) and the young Museum of Contemporary Art, opened to the public in July 1929. By decision of the Council of Ministers of 29 March 1935 the new institution was named Prince Paul Museum, and was known as such until 26 December 1944 when the post-war authorities reverted to the title Museum of Art. Later on, its original name was restored. The Prince Paul Museum made its contribution to what Germain Bazin called the museum era. In the memory of older citizens of Belgrade it is still a symbol of the period that brought the local culture closer to Europe. It was a micro cosmos – the keeper of the official memory of a national culture which facilitated a controlled transfer of the desired image of a society, a state and their ideals. Every museum is, primarily, a novel, highly aestheticized institution, but also an ideological, cultural, historiographic, social and political instrument of authority. (Subotić 2011, 15).

During World War II, institutions of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia vanished with the kingdom itself. Together with the establishment of the new state at the end of the Second World War, with new intentions and conceptualization of new core narratives, the new institutions (of Socialist Yugoslavia) also emerged. During that process, a huge gap was made by marginalization of the monarchy character of the First Yugoslavian legacy and its institutions, for example the case of Muzej kneza Pavla [Prince Paul Museum] (Sretenović, 2016).
The awareness of cultural institution’s importance for creating a new (Yugoslav) identity was present, and was expressed by the permanent display of Yugoslav art in galleries of painting and sculptures. In 1947, at the conclusion of an Agitprop meeting (‘departments’ for agitation and propaganda in communist countries) the decision to form one state body together with the Art Committee which would collect the best works of art for the modern gallery was made and soon approved by authorities. The initiative also took into consideration the new space required for the collection; the modern gallery; and the promotion of the Yugoslavian art and culture which were valued topics in the policies of Communist Yugoslavia (Gnjatović, 2014).

In 1948, the competition for the project of Moderna galerija [Modern Gallery] building began with the plan to relocate to New Belgrade, on the left side of the river(s) not unintentionally. New Belgrade was planned to be the center of the new Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia. The new capital city would be a modern center and the center of modernism, with the Yugoslav institutions emerging on its territory, symbolically divided by the rivers from the old town (representing past times, including the First Yugoslavia)(Blagojević, 2007):

Almost two decades later, in October 1965, the Committee of the Modern Gallery took the new name for an already long time planned institution, Museum of Contemporary Art. New building in New Belgrade made after the project of architects Ivan Antić and Ivanka Raspopović was officially opened. This modernistic building made for the purposes of the museum still represents an outrageous architectural and cultural monument, it is a sign itself, but it also contains a priceless collection of Serbian and Yugoslav works of art of the twentieth century, which makes it unique and different from other museums of modern art in the region. With its distinct interior connected to the outdoors it is an original structure and an interesting world-class example of museum architecture design. The main feature of the building is a polymorphic crystal composed of six cubes with truncated corners. The walls are covered with white marble panels and glass, and the sloped roofs are glazed. The interior is functional and dissected. A unique and very authentic interior is divided into five exhibition levels connected with staircases, with no vertical partitions and corridors. With those levels, which almost flow one into the other, the spaces of different heights are successfully integrated into a single structure. This is why from the upper levels it is possible to see, from different angles, the displays on lower levels, and a visitor is able to reach the uppermost levels easily (Gnjatović, 2014, 50).

According to William Whyte’s theory (White, 2006) that every building contains history of meaning (not only history of form) the building of MoCAB (fig. 19) represented the intention of

---

100 Area of New Belgrade, part of the Yugoslav capital, planned and emerged in 60s as a new center of Yugoslavia, where all the ‘new’ institutions should be placed, Museum of Revolution, Museum of Natural History, Ethnographic Museum, and Museum of Contemporary Art (Blagojević, 2007). Only one of all planned museums was built on the territory of the new Belgrade as the new center – the Museum of Contemporary Art, representing in a way, the whole paradigm of making a new Yugoslav cultural, art and science center.
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authorities to build modern institutions to convey the new narratives and form a Yugoslav identity in culture and art as represented to the world.


The building was unique itself and was first promoted as a work of art. It would also demonstrate the readiness of the government to invest in this kind of project—building new institutions and creating new narratives. In addition, it represented the ability to engage the architects who could create the remarkable piece of modernist architecture. The demonstration of ability, resources and possibilities was part of creating the Yugoslav cultural image (especially abroad).

The transparency of the building implies the clarity of a meaning behind it. The sharpness of its walls communicates a straightforward strength of a story the creators intend to own. The building in its wholeness communicates masculinity and a penetrative principle, although neither radical nor aggressive. The glass enables rays of light to circle through the building, while cupolas and the patterns on the floors and other designs project an impression of wholeness, harmony and calmness. The possibility of seeing the lower levels from the upper ones and vice versa, accentuates the relatedness among the part of the collection (or exhibition) accentuating continuity and unity. Described impression (characteristically for this building to leave impressions) appears
to be influential not just when the matter was about creating the Yugoslav identity in ‘60s and ‘70s, it had a crucial role in composition of the exhibition *Sequences/Sekvence*, that should represent the comeback of the Museum as institution to its main edifice together with Yugoslav narrative (further in this chapter). The configuration of the building implies integration as a way of displaying and interpreting.

The Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade opened on 20th of October, 1965. This is the same day when, in 1944, the Alliance Forces along with the National Yugoslav Army liberated Belgrade from the occupation in World War II, as one of the first museums of contemporary art in Europe. It was not a long before the museum building was well known and became the representative institution for Yugoslav and Serbian art. This was mainly due to the creative work of its first director and idealist, Miodrag B. Protić, who initiated establishing the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade.

The Museum was a modern institution which followed world standards, and was influenced with concepts and solutions brought from the Museum of Modern Art (MOMA) in New York where Protić used to study during the preparation of the Museum project (Čubrilo, 2012). Before the opening of the Museum in 1958 and the establishment of the Modern Gallery, the practice of following and studying the tendencies of Yugoslavian art had already started. 101 Prior to announcing the name change (from the Modern Gallery to Museum of Contemporary Art, following the trend among world institutions) this institution had its own, well-prepared core narrative dedicated to Yugoslavian art (Čubrilo, 2012).

The renaming was required due to the changing the location 102 and aim to develop an institutional policy. The new name was more suitable for the institution in which Modern Gallery was transforming. An exhibition policy in the new Museum concerned the most important art and culture moments and artist on the Yugoslav and international scene 103.

Miodrag B. Protić stated, in a lengthy interview (Matić Panić, 2002) describing the idea of the museum forming as the old one idea and that the realization of the Museum in Belgrade project

---

101 Even though, Yugoslav art always appeared (during the state existence and after) as a multilayered, polyphonic phenomenon more than coherent paradigm (Šretenović, 2006).

102 From the Street of the Duke Milan in Old City of Belgrade to the New area of New Belgrade dedicated to the building of Yugoslav institutions (Kulić, 2013).

103 The Museum pretends to be more than just one ‘special museum’ in the history of Museums in Yugoslavia, dedicated to one subject or a theme (Šulc, 1984). According to Miodrag B. Protić (Protić, 1965) it should represent (and create) contemporary Yugoslav art and culture in a way based on the world museology criteria like no other institution in Yugoslavia.
would take time.\textsuperscript{104} The project itself took 15 years to complete after the first plan was drafted in the ‘70s. The core narrative of the institution aimed to represent the national (Serbian) and Yugoslavian contemporary art\textsuperscript{105}, first as the integral part of the second (Matić-Panić, 1986). The Museum should present, by its collection at the start, developing contemporary art, capturing both the historical moments and important work of individual artists. The aesthetic criteria had been privileged, in comparison with the historical one (Sretenović, 2016, 14).

The Museum was focused mainly on the (Yugoslav) painting of XX century, because of the affiliation of the director, but also considering the prominence and popularity of the painting. As Dejan Sretenović stated, analyzing the speech on the Opening Ceremony of the Museum (Sretenović, 2016)\textsuperscript{106}, the influence of the elites was obvious, also influencing political structures and regimes of the Museum’s policy.

Also to include important ideas within the Museum narratives like the idea of the ‘brotherhood and unity’ which was the most prominent. The opening speech was a proof of the wider significance that the event had in a sociopolitical sense, and the proof of the conformability of the Museum’s narrative with the aims of the state authorities, proving also the importance that the event had over culture and art (Sretenović, 2016, 18). From the beginning, the Museum narrative was to legitimize the governing ideology. Its core narrative was to highlight the common cultures and artworks of the Yugoslavs, their common artistic space and unique Yugoslavian art and culture (Denegri, 2011).

On that common ground, the sociopolitical situation would be a great influence.\textsuperscript{107} The museums and other cultural institutions in Yugoslavia, from its very beginning, interfered with the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[104] Significant period in creating the foundation for new institutions was after 1948. The term refers to the Cominform Resolution of June 28, 1948 (resulting from the Tito–Stalin Split) that accused the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ) among other things, of departing from Marxism-Leninism, and expressing an anti-Soviet attitude. Following these allegations, the resolution expelled the Yugoslav Communist Party from Cominform. As a result, Yugoslavia fell outside of the Soviet sphere of influence, gaining its independence from the Soviet line, steered an independent course, opening towards the West and constantly experiencing tensions with the Soviet Union. Independence and new influences created conditions for new institutions to arise, new expressions in art and culture, and authentic Yugoslav artistic discourse which emanated in social modernism (Čubrilo, 2015)

\item[105] The Museum of Contemporary Art was not a Federal Institution. It was established by Serbia, to promote Yugoslav and Serbian art as a part of Yugoslav art (Sretenović, 2016).

\item[106] The significance of the Miodrag Protić’s speech, also Branko Pešić’s speech, major of the City of Belgrade, during the Opening Ceremony in 1965, lies in defining the core narrative and by that ideology of the institution. The key words were Yugoslav art, common state, culture, interest, Yugoslav identity. In those speeches, the importance of the new circumstances that helped realization of the project (socialism) were emphasized, while the existence and significance of the Prince Paul Museum (1929-1939) was silently skipped, generating discontinuity (Sretenović, 2016, 18) and fertile ground for more discontinuity in the narrative in the future.

\item[107] Complicated in the following years, and even more challenging as we approach 21st century, political situations are reflected in often change of museum management, mainly on the position of director (Dimitrijević, 2016, 317).
\end{footnotes}
society, being mutually influenced. Cultural institutions should create, support and represent the Yugoslav nation and society (Šulc, 1984).

In the period after 1948, distancing from the Soviet model of the cultural policy and turning in the direction of the Western Countries, caused a separation from social realistic aesthetics and opening to the new styles and waves. The main artistic expression of Yugoslavia at that time could be defined as a path between modernism and social realism, described as a social modernism (Denegri, 2012) specific for liberal cultural policy (abstract art was allowed and incorporated in main discourse). Artistic freedom was more present in Yugoslavia, in comparison with other communistic countries.

Paradoxically, governing political structures were also authorities of the narrative in cultural institutions, so the ‘freedom’ was part of official identity construction (top down). Cultural institutions and their management, in spite of the strong connection between politics, society, culture and art, still had their sovereignty. In ‘50s, the new institutions had been established, the network of the galleries had been created, also the matrix of cooperation with the foreign institutions, manifestations and artists had been made, due to the creation and presentation of the Yugoslav identity in culture and art (Denegri, 2016).

The certain sovereignty of the cultural institutions and freedom of artistic impressions was not just partial, but could only be achieved by constantly rebalancing and adjusting with the existing political structures (fig. 20). This used to be achieved with great effort particularly in the ‘50s and ‘60s (Dimitrijević, 2016).

---

108 The concept of MoCAB that Miodrag B. Protić implemented something emanating completely from his own experience from abroad (New York, Paris) and the government gave all the trust to his expertise. He admitted the influence of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, but the result in MoCAB was authentic collection and the way of displaying – it was obvious that author(s) attempt to show as much of Yugoslav Art as it is possible (in order to gain stronger expression and cohesion of its identity) (Sretenović 2016, 42).
In the ‘60s, it became obvious that, in the cultural policy of the Federation started the process of differentiation and separation, one by one, of state cultural policy from federal policy, increasing the level of state institution policy together with independence in comparison with the common institutions. The agenda of the Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, Montenegrin, Bosnian and Macedonian gained priority upon Yugoslavian one. In those circumstances opening the Museum meant not just final conceptualization and manifestation of the Yugoslav artistic space, it also meant institutionalization of Yugoslav art and its space (Sretenović 2016, 20).

With the establishment of the Museum, Yugoslav art, culture and its identity would be shaped and presented and at the first signs of the disintegration process, preserved. The Museum orientation towards Yugoslav supra-identity, in mentioned circumstances, in spite of the fact that institutions intended to be in a first place Yugoslav firstly, appeared to be oriented towards the Serbian national group:
The official programmatic statement of the museum declared that, ‘Serbian art is going to be displayed in a wider specter that that of the other Yugoslav nationalities,’ in spite of the fact that ‘the museum tends to be Yugoslav in terms of the values shared by non-Serbs alike’ (Protić 1965b, 8). If the values that Serbian art reflected were those shared by others, then such a narrative could be established and even elevated to a position of dominance of one national group in Yugoslavia. Here one can find testimony of a clandestine ideology of Serbian nationalism that has been constantly rising since the opening of the museum in 1965 (Pintar, Ignjatović 2011, 797).

Due to the Miodrag Protić, involvement for the first two decades, the Museum was a pioneer of modernism in Yugoslavia (Matić Panić 2016). By certain dynamics and narratives and from the same beginning – it was an anticipation of the Piotr Piotrowski’s conception of critical museum from 2010, which concept of the museum forum with the different events, debating, appears as a descriptive for the period after 2000 and before closing in 2007 (Sretenović, 2016). Protić considered the Museum as a generator of a change in culture and art, place for dialog and exploring creative solutions (Protić, 1965, 6).

It anticipated the attitude considering the new museology and new theories, influences and significance (Newhouse, O’Doherty, Bennet, Belting, Duncan). The Museum altered towards its educational role except being shattered to a just representative one (Goodman, 1985). Its early concept anticipated the concept of institutions that should participate in education, dialog and

---

109 Piotr Piotrowski (born 1952, died 2015) was Professor Ordinarius and Chair of Modern Art History at Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań in Poland where he was Director of the Institute of Art History from 1999 to 2008. Since August 2009, he has been Director of the National Museum in Warsaw. From 1992 till 1997, Piotrowski was a Senior Curator of Contemporary Art at the National Museum, Poznań. His conception of the Critical Museum became influential in modern museology and humanistic science suggesting the transformation of the official institutions towards a more engaged site in an attempt to create a contemporary humanistic society.

Piotr Piotrowski conception of critical museum lies on assumption that the museum, and especially the art museum, could absorb and benefit from the critique manner of traditional museum (accused also of power knowledge, both for commercialism and elitism, patriarchalism, and masculinism) turning into a critical museum, into the space of resistance and revolution rather than ritual? The concept of critical museums emerges from the experience of turning the National Museum in Warsaw, the major museum institution in Poland, into a critical museum. Conception of critical museum aims to provoke the change in traditional museum towards engaged art institution, searching for ways in which the museum could use its cultural authority, human resources, art collections, space, audience, network to create a discussion space for social, political and cultural controversies about the fundamental issues of contemporary world(s) (Murawska Mauthesius, 2015).
support of the society. The interference between society and its cultural institutions was also a product of time and a main task of cultural (Yugoslav) institutions (Petrović 2013).

In 60s, building up of the Yugoslav identity through institutions and manifestations reached its highest point (for example – by creating Yugoslav Triennale of Fine Arts in Belgrade). But, with the new rule of ‘republic keys’ in the selection of the institutional managing structures, the first signs of the disintegration process occurred already in the ‘70s. Increased independence of the Republics in decision-making, considered both cultural policy on republic and federal levels, connecting and unifying the field of culture and art, was still very strong and functional in dynamic common space. Polyphonic and multilayered fields of Yugoslavian art as supra-identity was present still in every segment of representation (in country and abroad) but the national art and cultural paradigms (even policies) occurred more often.

The numerous Yugoslav art exhibitions in smaller cities in the country were held trying to prove the stability of the common cultural and art spaces and common cultural policy. The last Yugoslav manifestations were held in Sarajevo in ‘80s. Sarajevo was often taken as the most representative city for the Yugoslav identity among all (for example, First and Second Yugoslav Documenta, in 1987. and 1989, while Third one will not be held) and held a certain metaphor for Yugoslavia. After dissolution of FSRY (Federal Socialistic Republic of Yugoslavia) Yugoslavia was still present on the international art scene via, through exhibitions and projects of Yugoslav selection of artists (Denegri 2011) for example at Biennale of Art in Venice (often in organization of MoCAB) where Yugoslavia proceeded to exist long after its dissolution. With the Museum’s

---

110 'Primary mission of Museum was to convert the totality of artistic praxis emerged on Yugoslav territory from the beginning of the century, into the symbolic legitimization (Pierre Bourdieu) of modernism as international artistic paradigm in the function of socialist vision of culture and rhetorics of Yugoslavism.' Translation TV

111 Mision of the Museum, and main focus was establishing of Yugoslav art. First exhibition, right after the opening of MoCAB, was dedicated to Yugoslav graphic arts of the 20th century, and permanent collection to paintings and sculpture. Two years after the MoCAB’s opening, Miodrag B. Protić selected serial of works and texts in serial edition Yugoslav Art of the 20th century /Jugoslovenska umetnost XX veka (seven books, in the period 1967 to 1986, followed seven exhibitions focused on systematization of modern Art in Yugoslavia). In the mentioned series of studies, the beginning of the Yugoslav art was set in 1900, and described again in the Miodrag Protić’s book from 1973 titled Yugoslav painting 1900-1950/ Jugoslovensko slikarstvo 1900-1950. Together with the colleagues from Yugoslav cultural centers (Zagreb, Ljubljana, Sarajevo, Skoplje, Priština) following the cultural policy of equal representation of each Yugoslav Republic, but also professional criteria and urge for gaining the best result, the edition brought the valuable contribution to designate of notion of Yugoslav modern art. Systematization was based on a timeline structured by decade, best works arranged in poetic sequences, then into chronological succession, structuring the master-narrative of the history of Yugoslav modern art (Čubrilo, 2012).

112 The huge number of cultural manifestations organized in early 60s were focused on representing contemporary art practice from all over Yugoslavia, implying the existence of Yugoslav art scene (for example Visual Autumn in Sombor, Triennale of Yugoslav Art in Belgrade, Biennale of Yugoslav Graphic Arts in Zagreb) (Čubrilo, 2012, 290).
mediation, Yugoslav art was presented in the world’s largest cultural centers (among them Munich, Paris, Prague, Vienna, Krakow, Tokyo, Sao Paolo). As the most prominent contemporary art institution, the Museum was the important link between Yugoslavian and foreign artists, by placing the Yugoslav art in a larger context. For Miodrag B. Protić, internationalism was an important element of the Yugoslav cultural policy (together with the orientation towards new, now, and progress). In the center of the institution, building its internal structure, from the same beginning was a concept of common and unique Yugoslav Art that would be transformed to the notion of Yugoslav Artistic Space (Denegri, 2011).

In the context of the Museum adjective Yugoslav refers also to the Yugoslav idea (at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century) as well as on state (political unity) emerged first in the 1918 (Kingdom of SHS/ Yugoslavia) then in 1945 (Second Yugoslavia) and also on ‘its ideological-political constructs that produced identity positions and a cultural and artistic space’ (Čubrilo, 2012). The common cultural space along with an mindset of progress, focus on newness and experimental, with international cooperation was required to survive dissolution of Yugoslavia and transform into a Yugoslav legacy (for Miodrag B. Protić, internationalism and progressiveness were synonyms for Yugoslav cultural policy).

MUSEUM DEDICATED TO YUGOSLAV ART, AFTER YUGOSLAVIA

At the end of ’80s, cultural institutions in Yugoslavia were influenced on a certain level by an already obvious process of federation dissolution (decisions were made on a republic level, cultural policy and program also, due to the fact that financial reports could be made on a lower level than federal state). In comparison with the National Museum which followed the emerging of the nationalistic narratives that helped their construction, the Museum of Contemporary Art was more strongly linked to the space of Yugoslav art and culture, there formed as a Yugoslav Artistic Space (Denegri, 2011). Cultural and art space was (and is) the most vital area of Yugoslav unity, based on natural but traditional, spontaneous but structured, close contacts and cooperation, among institutions and artists, in the country and abroad (Denegri, 2011).

Popularization of the ethnocentric narratives and activities of the nationalistic oriented elites (with the destruction of supra-national identity as an aim and consequence) in the ‘90s could

---

113 Conflicts on the cultural scene in the late 80s were present in literature, but also noticeable in visual arts. The national interests came on the top of priorities, upon interest of supranational Yugoslav identity in Art, and conflicts in the culture anticipating the war conflicts in the 90s (Dimitrijević, 2016, 318).
not easily destroy the stability of the common Yugoslav cultural space, mainly because it was strongly rooted in personal and common experience, so as in closeness of mentality and sensibility among artists from every ex-Yugoslav country.

But, during the country’s dissolution, with the increased tensions emanated in bloody shades of the civil war most of the official (top-down) cultural activities were shut down, while non official (bottom-up) were leading to the change of narratives and cultural policy. The situation in cultural institutions was dictating the urge for concrete decisions. Unfortunately, every structure was strongly influenced by the political situation, which was obvious in the constant change of the employee and management structures of these institutions. Provoked instability was causing shifts in discourse and narratives, turning to the direction of ‘already legalized policy of cultural deregulation based on anti-Yugoslav, anti-communist, and anti-modernist ethno-nationalism’.114 (Sretenović, 2016, 27).

The ethno-nationalist ideology led to the marginalization of the Yugoslav narrative which was in the core of Museums’ identity. It would be replaced with a more nationally oriented and ethno-centric focus of Serbian artists and conceptions of national culture and art. Category of supra-national, the Yugoslav identity was not welcomed in the internal structure of institutions. As a reflection of huge socio political changes, devaluation of the ‘brotherhood and unity’, was partly a consequence of the dissolution of Yugoslavia and its’ transformation from socialism to capitalism.

Museum maintained its Yugoslav narrative until the early ‘90s, in spite of the tensions and conflicts from the political scene that were reflecting upon the cultural reality of the late ‘80s). Managing structures were devoted to the conception of Miodrag B. Protić which supposed the Serbian art and culture as integrative part of Yugoslav one lasting until the inauguration of the painter Radisav Trkulja as director of the Museum and legitimizing of the national Steering committee in 1993.

The change meant complete transformation of narratives in a direction of a revisionist process that started almost immediately with the erasing the notion Yugoslav from institutional narratives by cutting of the contribution in display of the ‘foreign’ (non-Serbian) artists; declaring the whole (Yugoslav) conception as a product of the perverted cultural policy; and a pseudo culture of the previous sociopolitical period. In the context of the Museum, that attitude (and measures)

114 Original version, ‘ozvaničenom politikom kulturne deregulacije na osnovama antijugoslovenskog, antikomunističkog i antimodernističkog etnonacionalizma.’ Translation TV
of the managing structures meant complete disqualification of collection and core narratives, and during years with a complete collapse of institution. Miodrag B. Protić’s conception appears to be an unwanted legacy (together with the Yugoslav inheritance) while a new applicable structure was not offered. In the years following, Museum was barely surviving, vegetating as an instrument of nationalistic and anti-Yugoslav ideology (Sretenović, 2016, 27–28).

Being ‘between two worlds’ (built on the concept of Yugoslav art, placing the Serbian culture and art under the Yugoslav roof) Museum was also struggling in the space between life and death, both in an economic and a material sense (Pintar, Ignjatović, 2011, 784). Staying in ‘either/or’ position (when one is abandoned past, and second uncertain future) culture and art institutions in difficult times, have been convicted on the status quo, which seems to be the only possible present.115 The period is marked by nonfunctioning in hard circumstances, low budget, forbidden old narratives, unknown new ones, almost without an audience, and completely without space for international presentation and cooperation.

The period of disintegration, started officially with conflicts in ’91. The conflict did not appear just among states, it was ever present, the silent riot due to the cutting of the budget and interfering of the regime in the institution policy in Museum, took place in 1992, and resulted with the change of director that I have already mentioned. Ten years later the transformation process entered the second phase (unblocked transition). At the same time it was the beginning of the huge and long-lasting (permanent) crises116.

With anti-Yugoslav discourse and in crisis, the Museum survived the period just barely functioning and following a shift of narrative paradigm, the Museum ‘has been constantly producing supra-national and pro-European narratives since simultaneously opening in 1965 with

115 In the case of MoCAB the years to come will be perfect materialization of devastated internal structure (Museum will be closed for years).

116 The crisis of culture reflects in the crisis of cultural values, together with the cultural institutions and the foundations on which it rests. More specifically, the culture crisis is driven by, a serious lack of funds which prevents the cultural institutions from better responding to the demands that have been placed upon them; inertia found in the very institutions, resulting in extreme slowness with which they adapt their internal structures to the needs, even if they are not too affected by lack of funds; and inertia of the social system, bounded by traditions, beliefs and values, which has proven to be incapable of making the best use of culture and cultural institutions in the interest of national development. The gap between cultural institutions and social environment is caused by relative autonomy of these institutions. They tend to remain what they are in order to protect their own interests and values. In order to overcome the crisis, it is quite obvious that the culture and the society must agree on the need for mutual adjustment and adaptation. Planning of cultural needs means development of various social activities, in particular the development and financial aspects of the economy. The development of certain activities over others should be replaced by a balanced and coordinated planning of all activities. The state has set up the necessary infrastructure and established various cultural institutions. However, bureaucratic attitude towards culture and bureaucratic culture has often neglected the activities of people in dealing with social affairs. The culture has become a guided activity, where the possibilities of manipulation are large (Koković, 2014, 296).
the National museum’ (Pintar, Ignjatović, 2011, 784). It was also occupied by extreme nationalistic and ethnocentric (cultural) policy of governing structures. The dissolution period of Yugoslavia made a huge impact on the narrative in institutions oriented on ‘an ideological formula that legitimized the federalist concept of the state and a vision of a pan-national Yugoslav identity’ (Pintar, Ignjatović, 2011, 797).

Due to the complex core narrative a transformation of the internal structure after the blocked transition in ‘90s was not easy. Progressivism and constant change was one of the Museums constitutive points since emerging and strongly connected with the social modernism of Yugoslavia, giving through the art discourse, the legitimization to the ‘brotherhood and unity’ – all the forbidden notions since the ‘90s.

In order to support the creation of the supranational Yugoslav identity in culture and art, Serbian art and culture had been taken as a part of a broader Yugoslav identity without giving the proper explanation or definition of the Serbian art and without mapping its position in context of the art and culture of the federal states. They also lacked a deep enough description of the Serbian/Yugoslav culture and art relation. Taking a new path in a period of unblocked transition, they supposed that the creation of Serbian Art as the Yugoslav was created for decades, regaining or shaping the continuity, creating the narrative, building the identity (Preziosi, 2004).

After 2000 (with the change of regime, beginning of the democracy period and second phase of transition process) with the change of governing structures, also in the state as in the Museum, the internal transformation started in a more productive way, ending the anti-Yugoslav discourse, regaining the idea of the common Yugoslav Artistic Space and the Yugoslav narrative. The Yugoslav narrative was in the core of internal structure from the very beginning.

The period between 2000 until its closing for restoration in 2007 was a transformative period for the Museum. Opening towards new concepts (for example exhibitions I will describe further on, Recycle Bin, Yugoslav Artistic Space from 1900 until 1991, project About Normality, controversial and discussed) and regaining the continuity and stable narratives and concepts of Yugoslav art. Holding various events and debates and co-operating with institutions from other countries, critical approach to political and social circumstances, were accomplishments of the period from 2001 until closing in 2007 (director of the Museum in that time was Branislava Andjelković). Two decades after Miodrag Protić’s retirement, in 2002, the Museum received a new permanent exhibition. For (re)making of continuum, changing of the perspective, paradigm and discourse, the permanent exhibition Yugoslav Artistic Space since 1900 until 1991, was crucial, already with signification in its title.
Author was curator Jerko Denegri, together with director of the Museum Branislava Andjelković, curators Branko Dimitrijević, and Dejan Sretenović. The exhibition represented an important glance back, aiming to deal with the Yugoslav orientation of Museum in a way of circling one period (narrative) and (re)owning Yugoslav identity of the collection, in aim to reach the Yugoslav legacy. The exhibition’s concept was based on escaping the traditional chronological linear perspective, which was at the same time liberation of the simple and closed narratives, and a sign of fragmentation and inability of storytelling caused by traumatic events in ‘90s. In a certain way, the content of the exhibition meant giving back Yugoslav narrative to the core structure of the Museum that was suppressed during the ‘90s.

Display represented the space of the common cultural ground of the region (marginalized and neglected) insisting on the common denominators, identity and Yugoslav legacy. The exhibition represented the new permanent display, opened on April 13th 2002, showing the new reading of the old collection, giving to it the new context, making the new narrative, as a beneficial legacy. Denegri chose to give the new reading through specific conception; making the structure on the thematic criteria (Sretenović, 2016). He participated in creating the identity and main narrative(s) of the Museum since its establishment, besides Miodrag Protić and Kosta Bogdanović. With this experience, he was the best choice for curating the new permanent exhibition (Šuvaković, 2002).

The exhibition has been dedicated to the art of the 20th century in the period of its formation and period of both Yugoslavias observing the complex network of the historic, theoretic, art problems, which are something more than assembly of the art periods and styles, schools, moves, and art works of the famous artists, in the same time, closing one period in history but opening up the themes of that period for rethinking, discussing, and inheriting (Dimitrijević, 2016). The new conception represented the several sections, park, self-portrait, women, house and landscape, body, day and night combat, hilarious marbles (urnebesni kliker/i) dada nope (dada jok) steel banders, backyard, phone booth, terra incognita, big ritual, imaginary landscape, dispersal, color-space-time, warunga, positive/negative, was ist kunst?):

Every mentioned whole is either grouped around some problem or it was in a way construction of the certain micro history. With this display history of an art in the 20th century is represented as a complex paradigm of different, gathered under different criteria, constructed histories or historical punctuations. For the careful observer this display will be, in a certain way, a good indicator for the contemporary battle between historical and non-historical perspective or historical and non-historical approach to the reading of 20th century art. On the contrary, created like this, conception moves the accent from the modernist conception of the Museum as a collection of art-works, or masterpieces of
big masters, maybe pieces of leading local author/artists (ethical identity, national culture) to the
conception of museum of contemporary art as an institution which maps and constructs possible
histories or presentations of culture and problems through which profiles artistic authenticity.117
(Šuvaković, 2002)

The structure of the exhibition associated with the collage technique, an assembly of
different forms, used to create a new whole, communicating the need of free and creative
presentation of the collection in order of the making the new dialog space. After the period of the
domination of the ethno-centric and nationalistic narratives (from 1991 to 2000) the exhibition was
a chance for the Yugoslav Artistic Space to come again to center of the research which was core
narrative of the Museum and to serve in making the new continuity and fertile ground for the new
narratives.

The result was decisive break up with the linear historic narratives and opened space for new
interpretation of Yugoslav modernism, at a time when ‘constructions of national art-historical
narratives in newly formed states were already fully at work’ (Sretenović, 2017, 9). Struggling
with the sentimentalism of Yugoslavostalgia from the one side and nationalism revisionism from the
other side, both as a way of neutralization and suppression of the Yugoslav narrative, the exhibition
was an occasion for (re)establishing the new relation towards Yugoslav heritage.118 Also,
Denegri used the site of Museum (and a building) as a context and frame (Newhouse, 1999) for
introducing the notion Yugoslav Artistic Space as an inheritance of Yugoslav Art (Protić, 1965,
5) taking it for the ‘intersection of national, supranational, and international discursive formations’

In the same time with the presentation of the permanent exhibition, the first temporary
exhibition Recycle Bin, curated by Dejan Sretenović, accentuated the meaning of the permanent
display and new narrative of the Museum. The exhibition was open in September 2001, bringing

117 ‘Svaka od navedenih celina je ili grupisana oko jednog problema ili je bila na neki način konstrukcija
djedne mikroistorije. Ovakvom postavkom istorija umetnosti XX veka prikazana je kao složeni skup različito,
po različitim kriterijumima, konstruisanih istorija ili istorijskih punktuacija. Za pažljivog posmatrača, ova postavka će
biti na neki način uzoran pokazatelj savremenih borbi između istorijskog i aistorijskog pogleda na umetnost, odnosno
istorizujućeg i deistorizujućeg pristupa čitanju umetnosti XX veka. S druge strane, ovako data postavka pomera pažnju
sa modernističke koncepcije modernog muzeja kao zbirke remek-dela, ili dela velikih majstora ili vodećih lokalnih
autora/umetnika (etničkih identiteta, nacionalnih kultura) ka koncepciji muzeja savremene umetnosti kao institucije
koja mapira i konstruiše moguće istorije ili prezentacije kultura i problema kroz koje se profilisu umetničke
individualnosti.’ Translation TV
118 The reason why avoiding linearization meant more than manner already known from avant-garde
narration. Skipping the closed stories (from the beginning until the end) gives the space for new themes to arise, new
readings and space for dialog. That should be the first phase of dealing with the past, waiting the time for the
consensual truth and coherent narratives to arise (Assman, 2011).
the old and broken objects from the basement of the Museum, referencing the devastated infrastructure, and years of nonfunctioning as a cultural institution of highest rank.119

The displayed ‘artworks’ were vacuum cleaners, broken monitors, boxes, archives, books, documents, catalogues, forgotten objects like masks and first aid kits ultimately to show the Museum from the other side, bringing the specific context of Museum functioning in a sacred hole of the gallery. The Recycle Bin indicated the place where all unwanted things went, but also where they could be taken from again, which was a completely different message than previously. Originally, the exhibition was a metaphor for the Museum itself, being a museum inside of the Museum, affirming the urge for dealing with the past, and things (objects, stories) that were useful before and abandoned now.120

The Exhibition announced a new phase in the work of the institution by creating space for provocative displays and sociopolitical contexts and opening towards a new conception of the museum that does not leave the sociopolitical reality out of its walls (O’Doherty, 1986). The accumulation of (un)necessary forgotten and abandoned objects in *site-specific* manner brought the symbolic dimension of the exhibition under the spotlight. While the exhibition was pioneering for the MoCAB praxis in the *site-specific* representation, the poetic of the found object in *ready-made* practice was revealed.121 With the broken equipment as a symbolic representation of a devastated building, abandoned archives as symbol of a neglected past, accumulations as denials and suppressions, new constellations of an old objects as a remembrance on the importance of connection between things, times, spaces and people - *Recycle Bin* was a first step towards critical museum (Murawska Muthesius, Piotrowski, 2015).

It was an exhibition – statement, not just for opening and presenting new permanent display and new politics towards permanent exhibition, it was an opening of the new dialog space. The critical approach towards art, culture and society, came from the *Recycle Bin* right in the main

119 From the change of management in 1993, until the new change in 2000, Museum fell into the specific dormant phase, marginalizing its one functions, due to the animosity of curators and management, then official discourse which was in opposition with the Museum’s core narrative (Dimitrijević, 2016).

120 The exhibition has certain similarities with the concept of Museum in alternative space of Kvaka 22 I will describe in the chapter dedicated to this alternative institution. The artworks are things that were meant to be thrown away and until that moment – completely forgotten. In new constellation and a new site they have completely different meanings.

121 A term coined by Marcel Duchamp in 1916 to describe prefabricated, often mass-produced objects isolated from their intended use and elevated to the status of art by the artist choosing and designating them as such. The term ‘assisted Readymade’ refers to works of this type whose components have been combined or modified by the artist.

122 Both *site specific* and *ready made* praxis will be often chosen in cultural events ‘dealing’ with the Yugoslav legacy (both official and nonofficial, like exhibitions in Museum of Yugoslavia, Inex, Kvaka 22 (see the next subchapter and chapter dedicated to this alternative institutions).
gallery of the MoCAB opening ‘an intimate dialogue between container and contents ideal for exhibition of art’ (Newhouse, 1999, 324).

The period after 2000, after the NATO bombings (in which the Museum building, already devastated, was seriously damaged) and massive political changes (end of Slobodan Milošević’s regime) was marked by the (re)institualization process, revitalization of international connections and cooperation, creating new educational programs and specialist clubs, establishing new sections, like the Section for design and multimedia, and reinventing the Museum as an educational institution ready for new readings of an old collection (Goodman, 1985) emanated in permanent exhibition Jugoslovenski umetnički prostor od 1900 do 1991 [Yugoslav Artistic Space since 1900 until 1991]. Together with the new functions, and opening for the new activities, the Museum did not abandon the exhibition studies or overviews.

In a manner of the huge retrospective exhibitions, praxis, suppressed during the ‘90s, the exhibition O normalnosti, srpska umetnost od 1989 do 2001 [On Normality, Serbian Art from the 1989 until 2001], had been opened in 2005, as a last big project before closing the main building. The project (exhibition and publication containing the images and articles) thematizing the art of the ‘90s drew huge attention. Representing works of art from 80 artists, choosing the culture of protest as an artistic response on the events in ‘90s (war, regime of Slobodan Milošević, dissolution of Yugoslavia, embargo) the exhibition provoked different reactions, opinions and critics.

Part of the audience (together with artists, critics, scholars, etc.) were satisfied with the overview of the period that was still problematic in culture of memory, considering the fact that every remembrance was resurfacing a traumatic experience and its consequences. On the other hand, part of the publicity expressed disappointment with the choice of curators (Branislav Dimitrijević and Branislava Andjelković) accusing them for their one sided look and doubtful criteria in their selection of artists and articles for the book-catalogue (with the same title as exhibition).

The ambivalence that occurred in contact with the theme and form of the exhibition, revealed the urge of opening the space for dialog. The context of displayed artifacts also uncovered unanswered questions, waiting for attention in search for consensus and coherent conclusions about the traumatic period of the ‘90s. Just two years after this exhibition that opened many questions, the Museum was closed for more than ten years.

123 The first conception of Museum in interpretation of the Miodrag B. Protić brought the educational program as important part of the Museum activities, together with comparative studies as a way of framing the Serbian and Yugoslav art in context of World culture and Art (Matić Panić, 2016, 75).
Between 2000 and 2007, the significant period, the exhibition policy was changed (with the pioneer attempts, site-specific and ready-made exhibitions like *Recycle Bin*) some of the technical equipment renewed and improved, and acknowledged at the same time that the building was seriously damaged, so the collection could be endangered. In 2006, Montenegro declared independence, and the last emanation of the federal Yugoslavia, state unity of Serbia and Montenegro, fell apart. The Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade, in ownership of the Republic of Serbia, was closed for the restoration in 2007. In 2007, due to the restoration work (but not just) period of transformation in the Museum was stopped (fig. 21).

Figure 21. Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade, under reconstruction, photo Saša Reljić, 2015
Source: https://msub.org.rs/saopstenje-za-javnost-povodom-pedesete-godisnjice-muzeja-savremene-umetnosti

**WHAT HAPPENED TO THE MUSEUM OF CONTEMPORARY ART? – THE PRESENCE IN PROTEST**

The Museum owns a big collection of Yugoslav modern Art (more than 8 000 pieces) which was kept in the National Bank’s treasury during the restoration of the Museum building. The long period of restoration and postponing caused an urgent closing up due to the damage of the air regulation system which could seriously harm the collection. The first phase was finished in 2010, after which status quo lasted until summer 2017, where only a few things were done, as contractors were changed several times as well as Museum management which happened a few times during this period therefore activities were very rare. The second phase began in the summer
of 2017, previously planned for 2008\textsuperscript{124} and completed in October in time for the opening on October 20th, 2017. The long period of absence in its residence (main edifice was completely closed for audience) by that limited presence on the art and culture scene in the country and outside its borders\textsuperscript{125}, caused the curators of the Museum to protest and then to develop alternative ways for the institution to follow its program.

All the characteristics of the ‘case of MoCaB’ (Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade in transition process) were common for the official institutions, which make the Museum, institution metaphor, not enough space and place for exhibiting and making creative projects, a low budget, and lack of support of authorities. Among all characteristics, ever present discontinuity in the core narrative made by a shift in governing structures and by the breakup of Yugoslavia almost a non-existent proper cultural policy. The status quo in the transformation of internal structures was a legacy of the dissolution of Yugoslavia and a traumatic experience that every institutional structure suffered (Edkins, 2006).

Alternative space for the Museum’s activities was made by NGO organizations, squats, and open public spaces. From 2001 until 2007, the Museum gained experience in cooperation with NGO organizations, and experts from the field of alternative and non-official institutions, for example then active / Centar za savremenu umetnost [Center for Contemporary Art] (Dimitrijević, 2016). Other opportunities came with the evident devastation process that occurred with a postponed restoration when, in 2012 a group of artists protested in 2012, tried to gain an answer on a frequently asked questions related to the destiny of the Museum building reconstruction (fig. 22).

\textsuperscript{124} At the same time, the National Museum was closed, the Museum of Yugoslavia was in the hard transformation process and searched for the identity and modus vivendi, some of the huge galleries were barely functional. The minor budget for culture and art, led the formal institutions into the big crisis causing the emergence of the alternative ones.

\textsuperscript{125} Museum on the move was an initiative to present part of the museum collection in different places in the country, but without the context of the site of the museum, the exhibition could not communicate fully with the audience, bearing only half of its message (Newhouse, 1999).
Their project was labeled as a non-exhibition representing a protest or appeal to make the Museum visible again. Authors named the project, by purpose, ‘non-exhibition’, alluding on the nonexistence of the exhibiting space in the Museum building, and situation of permanent restoration and crisis, by the title question Šta se dogodilo sa Muzejem savremene umjetnosti? [What happened to the Museum of Contemporary Art?] The Project was prepared and opened to the public from the 23th of June to the end of September in 2012, presented partly an alternative space to other parts of the city. It should investigate the destiny of the museum building, its interpretation of the current state of the Museum as an institution, and art and culture in Serbia in the period of transition.

The conception was prepared by curator Dejan Sretenović, Andrej Dolinka and Una Popović for the main building under the restoration, or in spite of the restoration. The non-exhibition was placed in the main building and main halls, generally closed for the audience, and inspired by it (Gnjatović, 2014, 55) (fig. 23). Beside the various artistic works, installation and

---

126 The main edifice was closed, with no trace of any functionality and it looked for the citizen as it was closed forever. The generations of students (even the ones that used to study Art, or History of Art) had never been in a Museum. The assumption of the building being completely ruined in NATO bombing became rooted among citizens that used to pass by. Others were forgetting about the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade. (Gnjatović, 2014).
interventions in space of the closed Museum building, projects also contained documentation, all
together generating the artistic representation about the Museum non-existence as an institution.

Bringing the edifice as the main theme of the artworks together with the Museum's
documentation, the project symbolically represented what happened with the Yugoslav legacy in
official institutions. The main theme became the Museum of Contemporary Art itself with its
unique site – New Belgrade built as a socialist capitol together with building as artwork of the
socialist modernism in architecture. The non-exhibition pointed out MoCAB as a non-museum
and was developed through the participation of artists and groups, NGO organizations and
individuals.127

The project contained three parts. First part dedicated to the representation of archival
documentation of the Museum building restoration process, from 2002 until 2012 (chronology,
press-clipping, photo and project documentation, comparative analysis cases of the same type
museums in the region). Second part was dedicated to the interventions of the artists and designers
from the perspective of the Museum state and condition of the Museum building, representing the
Artistic interpretation of the Museum activities as an institution, lowered to the status quo (fig.
24).

Third part was dedicated to the building itself as the metaphor for the Museum as an
institution, and a symbol of the authority’s attitude towards culture and art. At the same time with
the non-exhibition part placed in the Museum, part of the project was placed in the Street Gallery,
a non-official institution (alternative space, concept that I will describe in chapters dedicated to
alternative institutions) located in the city center. The exhibition was titled Reconstruction (author
photograph Ivan Petrović). The photographs were taken in 2008 during the first phase of Museum
building reconstruction for the magazine Forum.

In the meantime, Forum ceased to exist, and Reconstruction still was not finished, so
Petrović started to create one personal and artistic archive, with the focus on the daily routine of

127 It was a moment of the Museum's opening towards wider communication and cooperation with the
nonofficial institution, and through the direct question given already in the title of the exhibition, project
communicated with the audience asking for participation. The non-exhibition has been important step from the ‘hot’
representative museum to the ‘cold’ participative museum (Glusberg, 1983) with contribution of activists, artists,
cultural ‘workers’ Radoš Antonijević, Fabian Bechtle, Lazar Bodroža, Dušica Dražić, Ministry of Space (Marko
Aksentijević, Ivan Branisavljević, Iva Ćukić, Radomir Lazović, Dobrica Veselinović) Siniša Ilić, Irena Kelečević,
Karsten Konrad, Monika Lang, Jovan Mikonjić, Milorad Mladenović, Ivan Petrović, Darinka Pop-Mitić, Vahida
Ramujkić & Noa Treister, Mirjana Boba Stojadinović, Saša Tkačenko, Nenad Trifunović i Stefan Unković.
http://eng.msub.org.rs/sta-se-dogodilo-sa-muzejom-savremene-umetnosti  last opened 8/5/2019, 9.28 PM
the workers on the restoration, also their relation to the employees of the Museum and the ordinary life of the institution during extraordinary circumstances.

Figure 23. Non-exhibition What happened to the Museum of Contemporary Art?/ Šta se dogodilo sa Muzejem savremene umetnosti?, 2012, Source: http://eng.msub.org.rs/sta-se-dogodilo-sa-muzejom-savremene-umetnosti

Figure 24. Displayed documentation, non-exhibition What happened to the Museum of Contemporary Art?/ Šta se dogodilo sa Muzejem savremene umetnosti?, 2012, Source: http://eng.msub.org.rs/sta-se-dogodilo-sa-muzejom-savremene-umetnosti
Cooperation between Museum and the alternative institutions was one more way to emphasize the technical and space inadequacy of the formal institutions, becoming, step-by-step, non-places (Auge, 1992). The project was created to underline the need of ‘awakening’ of the formal institutions and to open the space for dialog and search for creative solutions. Also, to bring out once more the unanswered questions about delayed reconstruction and blocked internal transformations (artworks that represent the building in a form of psychical model or in metaphorical sense through documentation, paper and photography, fig. 24).

The artworks represented the model of the building (for example as an empty aquarium, fig. 23) or just its contour, suggesting the form without content (as installation of empty chairs presented absence of audience, fig. 25). Content was not just collection, displaced and closed, it was also narrative, in this particular case – narrative of Yugoslav and Serbian Art, and through those notions a narrative of Yugoslav legacy in culture and art. Non-exhibition should, through its aesthetics of the protest, examine the phenomenon of the blocked formal institution that could not answer the requests of the society.
Also, the non-exhibition questioned the sociopolitical and economical context of that blockage, and its relation with the authorities. It contained video-installation interpreting the working day of reconstruction, large archives of the documents accentuating many years of reconstruction. One more theme of the exhibition art works was its relation with the audience (fig. 26).

Figure 26. Installation inspired by absence of audience, non-exhibition What happened to the Museum of Contemporary Art? / Šta se dogodilo sa Muzejem savremenе umetnosti, 2012
Source: http://eng.msub.org.rs/sta-se-dogodilo-sa-muzejom-savremene-umetnosti


Belgrade was the only capital city in Europe with a closed National and Contemporary Art museum for more than a decade. The reason for the prolonged absence could be attributed partly to the economic situation and lack of the finances but even more due to the discontinuity and fragmentation of an official narrative as a core structure of official institutions that was caused by the breakup of Yugoslavia and generation of an anti-Yugoslav narrative. A sociopolitical situation influenced the core narrative of the institutions and an intervention in the internal structures, and the cultural policy and narratives by authorities (in changing management, lowering budget, dictating program). Altogether, a crisis was created due to the prolonged transition process and led
to the institution ‘shutting down’, and alternative institution ‘raising up’. The system was trying to fill the void.

Instead of a main exhibition space, the Museum building and two galleries were permanently on disposal, with their limited and insufficient capacities to replace the main gallery in Museum building, The Salon of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade, and Gallery-Legacy of Milica Zorić & Rodoljub Čolaković. Due to the limited exhibition space, and openness of the NGO organizations and initiatives for cooperation with the Museum (which already happened before, starting with the change in the Museum policy in 2000) two big projects marked the period of restoration, cooperation between Museum and Street Gallery, and Museum and Inex film expedition initiative.\textsuperscript{128}

Inex film Expedition, better known as Inex Squat, gathered the artists, cultural workers and independent (NGO) organizations in the name of reviving the devastated building in Karaburma, a district in Belgrade located in an industrial zone, and creative use of its space for cultural, art, and social activities. Due to a symbolic value that the space represented, Inex film Expedition functioned for a several years as a specific cultural center bringing the sphere of common space again to the cultural and art scene and rethinking the possibilities of the new space and new narratives in the context of Yugoslav legacy and cultural institutions, after its’ transition. With the excellent exhibition capacities, the Inex film building was a good host for the exhibition that emerged from the project \textit{Od dionizijskog socijalizma do predatorskog kapitalizma} [\textit{From the Dionysian Socialism to the Predatory Capitalism}].\textsuperscript{129}

The main aim of the project was to bring the subject of the Yugoslav legacy in contemporary institutions and cultural (art) life into the dialog space, to (re) question and rethink old narratives, and make space for the new ones. The third workshop, named \textit{Istorijski okvir sećanja} [\textit{The Historical Framework of Memory}] was conceptualized as an ambient setting for

\textsuperscript{128} See the chapter dedicated to alternative institutions.

\textsuperscript{129} The project was conceived as a series of workshops with young professionals and mentors focusing on the analysis and new reading of the social history and art production in Serbia and Yugoslavia after 1949. The project’s primary objective was to help the workshops’ participants develop an actively critical relationship vis-a-vis the way the history is written through continual discussions and subsequent practical work, so as to put this attitude to practice in the creative process within their respective media, drawing upon the archival film and audio materials made available for that purpose. In terms of its structure, the project is composed of three parts, a film workshop, led by Želimir Žilnik an audio workshop, led by Miodrag Miša Savić, and a workshop where the ambiental setting to accommodate the produced audio works was designed and executed, which was led by Milorad Mladenović. The local authors active in the visual arts scene, experts also in other fields were invited to act as mentors in this project. Their experience in transmitting contents and working procedures from one field into another, coupled with the specific pedagogical work, were the methodological challenge in this project. (Official site of the Museum, Bibliography).
listening to the voices of the past. The young musicians began working with the audio archival footages of Radio Belgrade, bringing the voices of the past into the present.

Broadcasts represented prominent figures of politicians, historians, critics and artists. The criterion for a certain voice to become the part of exhibition was its influence on socio political or cultural situation of that time. Those audio fragments then were incorporated into musical pieces reinterpreting the narratives from the past and enabling new ones to surface.

In a workshop led by Milorad Mladenović with students and graduates of the Faculty of Architecture, the installations made during the audio workshop were created by a composer and a participant of the workshop, in spatial modeling especially for the former building of Inex film. The building and the initiative, organizations and artists that gathered around Inex were already found to be a symbol of a transition process in the cultural institutions in Serbia, and also paradigmatic for the self-organization, alternative institutions, bottom-up cultural structures and solidarity. An adaptation of the space was part of the project.

The audio sequences had been taken from Radio Belgrade. The fragments of speech as a voices from the past of prominent figures in cultural scene of socialist Yugoslavia (politicians, artists, art critics, among them the most prominent figures such as Josip Broz Tito, Edvard Kardelj, Mića Popović, Miodrag Protić, and other ‘voices’) were shaped by context of the building ruined in privatization process and alternative institution that emerged inside of its walls.

Those voices were mixed in musical compositions, transforming the usual form of the historical narratives, and then intertwined with spatial solution (fig. 27). The exhibition thematized the meeting of the present and past, the legacy of the former republic (Yugoslavia), representing the cooperation between official and nonofficial institutions while also the fluid borders between them caused by the lack of the state support, proper cultural policy and sufficient budget, were accentuated. The baseline of a project was an assumption that history is not just given, it is constructed, which means that it can be (re) constructed or deconstructed. It can also be ‘suppressed’ by the sudden change of the space.
The whole project *Od dionizijskog socijalizma do predatorskog kapitalizma* From the Dionysian Socialism to the Predatory Capitalism] was an expression of the situation in Serbian society and culture, arts and cultural institutions in the 21st century and transition, so the cooperation between Museum and Inex was not accidental – it was the meeting of official cultural institution without space and a nonofficial, alternative institution as a space of culture.¹³⁰

**SEQUENCES. (RE) OPENING OF THE MUSEUM. CONTINUITY IN DISCONTINUITY**

At the end of 20th century, in contemporary museology, the question about the relation between contemporary art and museums (as in traditional institutions) was often debated. The transformation of the traditional museum became necessary at the end of the 20th century,

The museum is traditionally perceived as a ‘natural’ site and was preserved in a locality of surroundings and continuity, but with the new projects and media-oriented artworks that integrate the public

---

¹³⁰ More about the project from the perspective of Inex in chapter dedicated to alternative institution Inex.
as a fundamental element of the work, we can experience and recognize the artificial social construction of the site of art. The museum is an extension of art, but an artificial one (Gržinić-Muhler, 2000, 13)

Since the correlativeness between the governing structures and institutions of culture, national narrative and art museums, during the transition process (considering every transformation process as a certain type of crisis) museums should gain new narratives (fig. 28). Also, new critical points toward politics and social circumstances, towards art itself, and managing their capacity, internal and external structure, appeared as imperative in transformation of the institution into the place and space of a dialog (Beltinj, 2006). As Olga Pintar and Aleksandar Ignjatović stated in their study about national museums in Serbia:

/…/museum policies and narratives have been based on three general paradigms related to nation- and state-construction processes, each of them being heavily dependent upon interpretational discourse and firmly anchored to ideological and political context. The first one is the paradigm of exceptionalism and uniqueness; the second is the one that supports a rather mediatory concept of national identity, and the third paradigm establishes new interpretations of different historical processes (Pintar, Ignjatović, 2011, 779).

Figure 28. Museum of Contemporary Art, near entrance, logo of the exhibition Sequences/Sekvence, Photo: Tijana Vuković, 2017

Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade, after ten years of reconstruction was finally opened in 2017, 20th of October, with an exhibition titled Sekvence [Sequences] Art of Yugoslavia and Serbia from the Collection of the Museum of Contemporary Art, featuring over 300 artworks which marked the period from the beginning of the 20th century, taking up the museum’s five floors, structured as a row of 18 sequences. The author of the exhibit was Dejan Sretenović, with
curators Mišela Blanuša and Zoran Erić. As Dejan Sretenović stated in a catalogue of the exhibition, in the article titled *Uputstvo za čitanje* [The Reading manual] offering one of the possible ‘readings’ and giving the manual for creating new interpretations, the exhibition encompasses the period from the beginning of the 20th century to the present, showcasing art created in Yugoslavia and Serbia:

Sequences is with the primary aim historical exhibition that includes contemporary art, with the primary aim of reaffirming MoCA’s collection and offering a new framework by which to become acquainted with and understand the art made on these territories (Sretenović, 2017).

The authors emphasized a few postulations, as Sretenović marked in his manual, importance of the great shift, after 1989, especially the year 1991 ‘as a double historical marker, according to which the change in artistic geography on the regional level coincides with the change in the periodization of the contemporary art on the global level’ (Sretenović, 2017) then clearly visible traits of the (post)Yugoslav cultural space, also Yugoslav art heritage:

/in spite of the politics of the erasure and over-ranging from the past quarter of a century, survives as a common heritage (the MoCa collection is the best example) and historical reference, without which it is impossible to rethink contemporaneity (Sretenović, 2017).

The exhibition sequences are grouped around a ‘chronological axis’ following historical shifts of artistic currents, movements and tendencies. Sequences are spatial-temporal units, each organized in a synchronic pattern, while joined together they built a so-called diachronic pattern, giving the dimension of the historical periodization and a historical character to the exhibition:

Carefully curated and professionally documented, the show includes all of the major artists active in Yugoslavia and Serbia over a span of a decade, while masterly using the museum in a way that both accentuates and refines the spatial experience. The combination of the free plan and the Raumplan (major architectural innovations of high modernism) results in a permanent fluctuation between the floors, heights and various rooms situated at different levels, so that from each floor one can perceive the combination of spaces on the upper and lower levels, as well as catch glimpses of the other exhibition areas on the same level. This movement enables a very particular and dynamic experience, from one ‘sequence’ one can anticipate the following ones or recall the previous, while visually pendulating from one historical moment to another. A liquid motion through time and stylistic sequences is ensured by the central staircase, a unifying element that connects the floors and semi-floors, from the extrovert ground floor, panoramically opened towards the park (and exhibiting the first periods of the 20th century, foundations for what will succeed) gradually going up towards the first floors showcasing the historical avant-gardes and post-war experimentation, and finally towards the more introverted top floors (less connected with the exterior, thus more adapted for video art and the variety of contemporary mediums) that present the periods of the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and the art of today (Ghyka, 2017, 196).
The sequences were formed from five different narratives, not just a singular one, every distinct current on each floor of the Museum building. Every sequence had its autonomy-functioning as a fragment; part of the display, and as independent micro-exhibition. Also, by their nature, every one of them represents micro-narrative (Vasić, 2019). The second floor is, for example, almost entirely dedicated to the work of the professor Jerko Denegri, ‘probably the most influential writer dealing with the art of ‘the Yugoslav space’ being of exceptional importance’ (Dimitrijević, 2016).

As Sretenović (2017) emphasizes, the intention of the exhibition is not bringing one, comprehensive narrative about a certain period of Yugoslav and Serbian art, it isn’t about petrifying one core narrative and bringing it as imperative to the institution, is more about making the core narrative flexible, making the space and place open to different interpretations, readings and generating new narratives. New interpretation should emerge in a manner of new contemporaneity bringing a representative past into the present, creating dialectical space (Bishop, 2013). The Sequences presented new constellations, skipping chronological and linear narratives, aiming to represent the past from the perspective of the present moment within the context of socio-political circumstances (Barr, 2016).

Even the logo of the exhibition brings the constellation under the spotlight, putting the sequences into a certain map of constellations. Emphasizing the context of the exhibition – geopolitical mapping of the sequences, Sretenović describes new tendencies in the museum through an accentuation of the readings, interpretations, narrations, and critical about certain political contexts. Besides Piotr Piotrowski conception of critical museum (2015) which appeared as an anticipated possible orientation of the museum transformation at the beginning of the XXI century with director Branislava Andjelković, interrogative museum of Karp and Kratz (Karp, Kratz 2014) seems to appear in Sequences.

If not in the first visit, then certainly in repeated ones, the frequent questions about the Yugoslav legacy seems to appear more often, what kind of reading does the Museum offer? Is it

---


132 Using the word constellations, in his philosophy, Walter Benjamin (Benjamin, 1968) accentuates a difference between a history spoken in the name of power, and a history that identifies the problems of the present by scouring the past for the origins of this ‘present’ historical moment. Notion ‘constellation’ describes this project of bringing events together in new ways, suggesting new connections between ‘now’ and ‘then’. In the context of museology, that often means radical cancelling of the linear and chronological narratives and eternal choosing from the corpus of the past considering the need of the present and projected future (Barr, 2016).
possible to gain the real sense of wholeness? Is there any original connection between Yugoslav and Serbian Art? Is there any polyphony among many represented national poetics? The aim of the *Sequences* seems to be, by requesting the authentic reading and mapping of every single visitor, to show the present by exhibiting the past. As a result of the short research about the reception of the exhibition I have used to provide (on the 20 visitors) the *Sequence* dedicated to the ‘90s was the most discussed.

All the visitors were citizens from the former Yugoslav states, from Serbia, Croatia, and Montenegro. In the catalogue of the exhibition, Sretenović highlights the year 1991 ‘as a double historical marker, according to which the change in artistic geography on the regional level coincides with the change in the periodization of contemporary art on the global level’ Sretenović, 2017, 3). The collapse of Yugoslavia in the war of 1991 led to ‘dismembering the polycentric Yugoslav artistic space’ in new-formed states, and to the traumatic experience that caused fragmentation of high level and loss of the sense of the relatedness (Edkins, 2006).

*Sequences* with the creation of constellations, new maps and connections seemed to provide new possibilities to make connections and find a sense for relations (according to Denegri, Yugoslav Artistic space relies on interconnectedness between artists, currents, territories and times). Due to the transparent construction of the Museum’s interior, parts of the exhibition placed on the one floor were visible from the others.

Dejan Sretenović pointed out that *Sequences* is not permanent display (closed and petrified structure of an old museum) it is more of a big (mega) exhibition that does not intend to give finished and closed narratives nor interpretation of the Yugoslav art, Serbian art, and place of Yugoslav legacy. It should be an open space for different readings of an old collection. Even though he accentuated the continuity between Yugoslav and Serbian art in a way that Serbian art emanated from the Yugoslavs, the exhibition should be read in the mentioned key, in spite of the marginalization of the Yugoslav art in official institution and empowering of fragmentation process.133

Overall and through all of the mentioned, changing Museum from the traditional institution to a modern critical museum became obvious:

The continual production of narratives that rewrite art history *with names and events that appear, disappear, reappear, and disappear again* (Boris Groys) is the legacy of the dynamic development of

a scientific discipline, as well as the postmodern abandoning a static historical perspective (Sretenović, 2017, 9).

The previously mentioned exhibition, authored by Ješa Denegri, *Jugoslovenski umetnički prostor 1900-1991* [Yugoslav Artistic Space 1900-1991] made a huge impact on the conception of *Sequences*, mainly by its breaking up with the linear historical narratives and representing the organization based on the thematic principle. With all authors of the *Sequences* insisting on the accentuated points referring to the exhibition, by its title ‘from the collection’ instead of the ‘permanent display’134, they intended to ‘remove the aura of consecration and longevity that the term permanent display implies’ (Sretenović, 2006) and also establish a possible trajectory through the period of 20th century art and giving the opportunity for polyphony as a creative dialog space to show up.

Already on the first floor with the sequence *Gradanski modernizam* [Bourgeois Modernism]135 and sequence *Socijalna umetnost* [Social Art]136 a space for dialog was open. With *Primeri apstraktnog slikarstva* [The Examples of Abstract Painting] as an influence from a Parisian scene that announced *Apstraktno slikarstvo* [Abstract Painting] as an essential current in proving the freedom in artistic expression in Yugoslavia in comparison with the socialist realism in other communist countries.

With the sequences dedicated to *Zenitizam* [Zenitism] as an eclectic literary-artistic avant-garde derived from the magazine *Zenit* published in Zagreb and Belgrade from 1921 to 1926, and *Slovenački konstruktivizam* [Slovene Constructivism] as a major current in the international left avant-garde of the ‘20s, together with *Beogradski nadrealizam* [Belgrade Surrealism], Yugoslav Art appeared with the authentic expression that had influence on the currents of the World Art. The following sequences were dedicated to the neo-avant-garde tendencies made by historical

---

134 After the big shift in paradigm after the exhibition Yugoslav Artistic Space 1900-1991/ Jugoslovenski umetnički prostor (2002) Sretenović stated about current and permanent exhibitions in Museum in 2006, ‘The permanent display of the works from the collections of the Museum of Contemporary Art and changed every three to five years and is, as a rule, based on the author concepts of the reconstructions of historical periods, movements, tendencies, and individual phenomena in the Yugoslav art space (bolding T,V). The current display comprises 160 works of Yugoslav art originating from the 1900-1981 period, and is structured as a make up of a number of mini exhibitions, distributed in accord with the spatial units of the exhibition space. The structuring of the display by means of autonomous exhibition units has been governed by a twofold reason, an exhibition is a place of the immediate communication between a work of art and an audience and a strategic model of the acquisition of knowledge about art. For that reason, every mini exhibition simultaneously functions as a text which configures and interprets certain chapters of the 20th century history of Yugoslav Art, but also as a context for comparative understanding of the intrinsic meaning and historical position of every individual work of art.’ (Sretenović, 2006).

135 Mainstream of art in Yugoslavia in the period between the beginning of the 20th century, and beginning of the WWII, the art of moderate modernism, modern expression, aesthetically pleasing representing the world of bourgeois class.

136 Social Art was the engaged and political art of the left cultural front. Portraying the social reality in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, it transformed into social graphic art and partisan graphic art during the WWII.
avant-gardes (*Dada, Constructivism; Surrealism*) in Yugoslavia between 1951 and 1970 and then transformed into a *Nova umetnička praksa* [*New artistic practice*]. Neo-avant-garde represented an experimental approach to the language, ontology and traditional concept of art, as an alternative matrix. Abstract art emanated in two more sequences *Apstraktni predeo i vitalistička skulptura* [*Abstract Landscape and Vitalist Sculpture*] (9) as dominant tendencies of Socialist modernism in Yugoslavia (in ‘50s and ‘60s) and *Apstrakcija visokog modernizma* [*High Modernism Abstraction*] (11) as a pure abstraction in Yugoslav mainstream painting in the mid ‘50s, together with *Apstrakcija poznog modernizma* [*Late Modernism Abstraction*] (12).

Sequence dedicated to the *Figurativni egzistencijalizam* [*Figurative Existencialism*] (10) with the drama of modern man in interpretation of the drawings and sculpture (existential anguish, alienation, solitude, violence and death) invokes the sequences dedicated to the art of ‘90s *Umetnost devedesetih u Srbiji* [*The Art of 1990s in Serbia*] (17) as a historical stage of contemporary art in Serbia, which started with the war in 1991 and ended with the complete dissolution of Yugoslavia and fall of Slobodan Milošević’s regime in 2001 as a period where artistic scene, in spite of the violence, economic crisis and state repression, was dynamic and innovative, brave and diverse, and mostly it was critically engaged. The sequence number 18 refers to *Umetnost danas* [*The Art Today*]– as art after 2001, domestic art scene as well as the whole region and beyond.

THE MUSEUM OF TODAY – SEQUENCES AND TERROR OF NOW

Recalling the critical museum of Piotr Piotrowski, interrogative museum of Karp and Kratz, and contextual new reading and interpretation of O’Doherty137, *Sequences* was a transformative exhibition in the Museum of Contemporary Art, trying to shift from an old to the new in one integrative way, skipping linear traps together with either/or limitations. Even though the exhibitions mentioned already in this chapter were preparing the Museum for ‘new contemporary’ after ten years of absence.

The Museum would start a completely new period in renewed edifice. Sretenović accentuated that selection and curating was oriented to progressive ideas, artists and artworks.

---

137 In narrative dedicated to the exhibition, published in catalogue, or expressed during interview or guidance
Through the notion of new, now, and progressive that were key points of Yugoslav cultural policy orientation - another Yugoslav legacy emerges again.

The old contemporaneity, engaged with the Museum since the change of the name before its opening in 1965 (from Modern to Museum of Contemporary Art) dictated the presence in the here and now. The notion ‘contemporary’ meant orientation on a present, differencing its focus from the ‘modern’ being constantly oriented to the future through the notion of constant progress and change. The new contemporaneity meant an accentuated presence in the now and a chosen past brought to the present.

With the Yugoslav legacy always dictating progressiveness, and the ever present influence of avant-garde movements focused on the new, and contemporaneity demanding ‘now’, were building the terror of ‘nowness’ which will culminate with the traumatic ‘internal now’ of the ‘90s (Sieff, 2014). Besides modernism, contemporaneity and its ‘presence’, avant-garde imperative of new and experimental, and freedom of abstract expression, trauma of the ‘90s with its dynamic expression in art and culture was the most accentuated moment of the Yugoslav legacy in Sequences.

For example, through the installations and video works of Milica Tomić¹³⁸, to the video installation of Katarina Zdjelar, sequence The Art of the 90s in Serbia emanated in The Art Today Sequence. The themes and motifs of the last sequence were highly influenced by the previous one, as contemporary Serbian Art was and still is influenced by its traumatic experience of ‘90s.

The sequences showcase the works by local and international artists engaged in critical analysis of political, social, and cultural events, activities, and situations (Sretenović, 2017). Dominant themes were the politics of memory, transition, privatization, and cultural integration.

¹³⁸ Milica Tomić. engaged artists, participant of Venice Biennale with the installation National Pavillion, already mentioned in the previous chapter and Katarina Zdjelar, also participant of Venice Biennale.
LINKING THE PAST AND PRESENT

The exhibition would represent the Yugoslav art space as a plural, decentralized and multicultural space, open and compelling, and through the shift of accent from work to the context to give the multiple plans of reading:

/.../ every historical exhibition serves as a ‘linking structure’ between the past and the present, as an agent of actualizing the past with the present, and therefore it can be taken for a contemporary cultural artefact, composed of a material from the past (Sretenović, 2017, 10).

This shift from the one, complex but dominant linear narrative, to the possibilities of interpretations and constellations, brought also the responsibility to the authors of the exhibition. Even with the accent on the ‘exhibition’ notion, Sequences is at the same time more or less on permanent display. The exhibition occupied the space and place of the permanent display at least in the period of its opening, giving one flexible perspective, but still one (Vasić, 2019).

With the label of a mega-exhibition, Sequences actually were a semi-permanent display as an anti-display (Bishop, 2013, 7). The attempt to periodize contemporary art became dysfunctional and unable to accommodate global diversity, so the Sequences could be described as discursive, engaged and shifting, since ‘the constellation as the political rewriting of history is fundamentally curatorial’ (Bishop, 2013, 56).

The accent of the whole project was on (re)gaining continuity with socialist Yugoslavia, in art and culture, by describing the Yugoslav artistic space and insistence on the Yugoslav character of the presented conceptions and the Museum as an institution. Also, by owning Yugoslavs past through the overview of Yugoslav past with the direct emanation of the periods in Serbian art, and making the continuity, by and through the authority of the Museum as an institution.139

Erected in Socialist Yugoslavia in ‘50s and representing the Yugoslav and Serbian art in culture in the country and abroad, the Museum is a metaphor for a necessity of regaining the value of the Yugoslav legacy. Those emphasizing some of the critics see an attempt of the certain

139 Together with the space for multiple readings and interpretations came The five different narratives stayed without deeper connection, and at the end diachronic and historical perspective cut the possibility of vertical linking of the periods, which is also possible, due to their influences on each other. The overlapping of the movements and periods, also ‘cuts’, breaks between periods and movements, staying less visible, in the shadow, not accentuated, even of their potential to enlighten the transformation periods, process of change, social and political influences.

Also, some periods, among them artworks, like social realism, were almost skipped, and few, important for the subject, research projects of the 21st century, some of them even already represented in Museum, were not mentioned (Vasić, 2019).
managing structures to gain and keep authority in the institution and on the whole cultural scene (Vasić, 2019). The given interpretation being just one way of thinking and one conception of exhibiting the part of the Museum collection is still an important input and marked also with the traditional values of permanent display, searching for recognition and acceptance (Martinović, 2014).

It should be valued, discussed, and interpreted with a deep consideration for the cultural, social, artistic and political circumstances of the Yugoslav and post Yugoslav period, often named as the ‘permanent transition’ (Vasić, 2019). The emphasis of the Yugoslav identity and importance of the Yugoslav heritage represents the attempt of the authorities through *Sequences* as an opening exhibition to give the institution a chance to regain its influence and importance that it once had after opening in 1965, in international context:

Re-opening of the MoCAB challenges this very role of the museum as both a place of education and of research, one that, while re-accustoming the public to this museum, also actively contributes to re-writing the history of recent art, as a site for curatorial debate and public interaction (Ghyka, 2017).

*Sequences* was constructed for deconstruction – while created as the opening exhibition, just one path chose through the previous period of art in Yugoslavia and Serbia, authors already thought about its making over, moving, and leaving the place for new exhibition and projects (Sretenović, 2017). The exhibition was open until August 20th, 2018. From August 22nd the exhibition was dismantled on the third, fourth and fifth levels due to the preparation of the next exhibition. Still, its sequences from the first and second floor stayed available to the public.

After the period from 2000 until the closing up of the main edifice in 2007, when the policy of the Museum seemed to anticipate critical museum of Piotr Piotrowski (mentioned exhibitions *Recycle Bin*, non-exhibition *What happened with museum of contemporary Art?*) then with the shaping of the critical narrative in *Sequences*, the activities of the Museum turn back to the retrospective exhibitions with no critical rethinking of the present or the past.\(^{140}\)

Tony Bennet (Benett, 1995) recalls praxis of the 19th century museum as a complex of exhibits. With the exhibitions after opening of the museum with no narratives or debates that would follow, interpretation, or intention to problematize the exhibition, the Museum returns to the dynamics of a museum temple with the retrospective (didactical) exhibition *Refleksije našeg*...

---

\(^{140}\) After the huge spektakl made for, and of the exhibition of Marina Abramovic, Museum was closed again due to moving off the artworks and preparing the space for other activities to occur. It was the time of changing management and selecting the new director of the Museum which lasted, in a blurry process, full of speculations, for years.
vremena, Akvizicije Muzeja savremene umetnosti 1993–2019 [Reflections of our time, Acquisitions of the Museum of Contemporary Art 1993-2019] in 2020. Or it moves towards the entertainment museum with the spectacle that was organized and launched around the retrospective exhibition Čistač [Cleaner] of internationally known Serbian artist Marina Abramović (excluding from this comment exhibition itself that was overwhelmed with the other contents, for example gossips, provided by media and not just) (Ognjević, 2019).

Considering the last two years of the presence in sociopolitical and cultural life in contemporary Serbia (with two significant exhibitions, I have already mentioned, and almost two years of selecting the museum director) it seems that Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade provides again the process of self-marginalization like it was during ‘90s (Dimitrijević, 2016) promoting an attitude of complete absence in critical cultural life.

Carol Duncan (Duncan 1995) stated the importance that the social experience of a visitor when he visits the Museum must communicate the beliefs and values of the Museum. In an era where information and sensations are overwhelming and experiences overloaded, and in era of addictions to social networks, the Museum needed to offer a clear communication of its values and beliefs, critical attitudes and approaches and provide suggestive possibilities of interpretation(s) that are strongly rooted in the here and now of its audience, linking that past with the present in aim of the future projection(s).
3.3 Museum of Yugoslavia

The New Old Museum. Change of Perspective
From Yugonostalgia to Performativity and Popularization

As Višnja Kisić stated about the curious case of Museum of Yugoslavia:

This is a story of a museum that self-initiatively decided to cross some of the borders among states, professionals, sectors and generations in musealizing a country which no longer exists. This is a museum that has given itself a mandate to emphasize the role of culture in pioneering social, post-conflict integration and reconciliation processes among professionals and citizens of ex-Yugoslav republics by working on the interpretation of contested Yugoslav history (Kisić, 2016, 190).

The Museum of Yugoslavia [Muzej Jugoslavije], in the years after 2007, bearing in mind the innovations and that the Museum was one of the rare ones open to public, with his program and cultural policy since 2016 (new name) until today (in 2020) really represents ‘On-Going Revolution’\(^{141}\) among official institutions in Serbia. Considering the main dedication of Museum of Yugoslav History\(^{142}\) [Muzej istorije Jugoslavije], renamed in 2016 to Museum of Yugoslavia the institution could not easily become an example of those influenced by authorities and their official discourse related to Yugoslav legacy, during and after dissolution of a state in the ‘90s. But, at the same time as the Museum of Contemporary Art and National Museum, the Museum of Yugoslavia also went through the transformation process and change of the narratives by questioning the internal structure. Then, the Museum went through transformation of the permanent displays and exhibition concepts, all in context of the sociopolitical changes in the 90s, dissolution of Yugoslavia, and its aftermaths. The Museum of Yugoslavia, in comparison with the National Museum and the Museum of Contemporary Art, stands as an example of an opposite process, while the Yugoslav narrative in the mentioned institutions was marginalized and avoided, the Museum of Yugoslav History (MYH) was dedicated to preserve it.

The Museum was formed in 1996, by the merger of two institutions, Memorial Center ‘Josip Broz Tito’ [Memorijalni centar ‘Josip Broz Tito’] established in 1982 and the Museum of the Revolution of Yugoslav Nations and Ethnic Minorities [Muzej Revolucije naroda i narodnosti

\(^{141}\) Ongoing revolution - Motto of the Antifascist and National Liberation Revolution in WWII (Revolucija koja traje - moto antifašističke i nacionalnooslobodilačke revolucije u Drugom svetskom ratu). Translation TV

\(^{142}\) The name of the institution was given in 1996 for the complex, Memorial Center of Josip Broz Tito and complex of villas around the place he used to live.
Jugoslavije] established in 1959, as the only federal institution that was created to keep the memory of the revolution and represent the state and antifascist policy.\footnote{Today’s Museum of Yugoslavia was called the Museum of Yugoslav History until the end of 2016. The name was changed twenty years after the Museum of Yugoslav History was established (1996) by merging and simultaneously dissolution of the two institutions, the Memorial Center ‘Josip Broz Tito’ and the Museum of the Revolution of Yugoslav Nations and Ethnic Minorities. Due to the socio-historical circumstances, wars and the breakup of Yugoslavia in the 1990s, these museums became a burden, unwanted witnesses of the past, traces of which were being thoroughly erased from the present. The funds of these two institutions served as the basis on which, according to a political decision, the new museum was established. Even though this musealization of Yugoslavia was supposed to ‘put it on the shelf’ in accordance with the understanding of a museum as a storage place for ‘old and unnecessary things’, it turned out that the collections, histories, documentation and employees of these two institutions became the basis of a twenty years long search for ways of acknowledging Yugoslavia as a heritage.’ (official site representation, link in Bibliography).}

Today’s Museum of Yugoslavia (fig. 29) was named the Museum of Yugoslav History (MYH) until the end of 2016 (when the name of museum changed). It is placed in the complex of the edifices in the residential area Dedinje (Belgrade). The complex consists of the three buildings: Old Museum (fig. 30), Museum 25th of May, and House of Flowers\footnote{House of Flowers (Kuća cveća) is the resting place of Josip Broz Tito (1892–1980) the President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and his third wife Jovanka Broz (1924–2013). The name House of Flowers represents the memory of a winter garden during Tito’s life that was on a place of the grave built in 1975 as project} (fig. 31).
Figure 30. Inside of the Old Museum edifice, permanent exhibition New Old Museumside where are placed artefacts representing gifts to President Tito. Source: https://www.srbijadanas.com/kultura/vesti/muzej-istorije-jugoslavije-se-vise-ne-zove-tako-2017-03-10

by architect Stjepan Kralj, and memory on many flowers surrounded the tomb until it was closed to the public after the breakup of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. It consists of three parts, the central one - a flower garden, and two parallel wide corridors on the sides where the permanent exhibition is dedicated. On the opposite side of the entrance is an uncovered terrace with a view of Belgrade. In the central part, following his personal wish, Tito was buried in May 1980. Relays of Youth (from the period after 1957, from when 25 May was celebrated as Youth Day) written messages that Tito received with relays, photographs of people carrying and exchanging batons, tickets and programs of rallies, and other related material are displayed in the museum. The Memorial Museum with the resting place was closed to the public for almost a decade after the breakup of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. After 2000 (from 1997 to 2000 whole complex was blocked due to the decision of president Slobodan Milošević to move in the nearby villa’s as a part of the larger residential complex of Josip Broz Tito) the complex was open and until today have more visitors per day nor any other location in a city of Belgrade (more than 20 000 per year). House of Flowers (Kuća cveća) is the resting place of Josip Broz Tito that has been open for visitors since 1982 (Stevanović, 2006, 101).
As places of memory, those edifices could also metaphorically represent three conceptions of (new) museum I will mention in this chapter of my thesis, traditional museum, participatory and ‘popular’ or commercial museum, as a present model in transformation of Museum of Yugoslavia and within Yugoslav legacy. Also, Yugoslav legacy appears in the Museum, through three self-defying memory complexes (Singer, 2012): antifascist combat and revolution of National Liberation Army (Narodnooslobodilačka borba/ NOB), Josip Broz Tito, president of Socialistic Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (life and death, cult and myth) and popular culture (image of the Yugoslavia, visual and narrative, in popular culture).

![House of Flowers](https://www.photohound.co/image/josip-broz-titos-tomb-kuca-cveca-1000838)

**Figure 31.** House of Flowers, author Luka Esenko

From emerging in 1996, the Museum has been the most popular institution among tourists and domestic audience with the large number of visitors per year (more than 100 000, according to the official site) in spite of the Museums buildings being distant from the city center and not well marked. In comparison with the National Museum or Museum of Contemporary Art, Museum of Yugoslavia is an institution that does not have problems with exhibition space, due to the complex of buildings in its disposal.

In spite of spatial advantages, the sociopolitical circumstances, the dissolution of Yugoslavia and change of sociopolitical system, requested the internal transformation from the Museum of Yugoslavia, a new permanent display, program, and narrative. At the end also – the
reconstruction, in the same time as Museum of Contemporary Art, and National Museum, was beginning with the first decade of the 21st century.

I MUSEUM OF YUGOSLAV HISTORY (1996-2016)  
DIDACTIC AND NOSTALGIC APPROACH TO YUGOSLAV LEGACY

The mentioned institutions, the Memorial Center Josip Broz Tito (MC) and the Museum of the Revolution of Yugoslav Nations and Ethnic Minorities (MR) due to the socio-historical circumstances that resulted in violent war conflict between the Yugoslav states during the 1990s, ceased to exist by political decision. They represented the undesirable Yugoslav past. Also by political decision, the whole collection of those two ‘unwanted’ institutions had been placed as a collection of the new institution. The new institution needed the new narrative – which made the newly emerged Museum of Yugoslav History, the only official institution dedicated completely to research and the representation of Yugoslav past and heritage.

The Museum of Yugoslav History was founded by the decision of the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1996. It represented the first attempt of the authorities to deal with the legacy of both Yugoslavias \(^{145}\), and ten years later (2006) the last emanation of the Yugoslavia state, Serbia and Montenegro ceased to exist (Gnjatović, 2014, 61).

The Museum was dedicated to building and strengthening the narrative and identity of Communistic Party, to legitimize its ideology and give it the material shape through the museum collection, which contained documents, photographs, and other objects, gathered under ideological slogan Revolucija u toku [Ongoing Revolution] (Gnjatović, 2014, 64).

The Museum of Revolution, from today’s perspective, was significant by the fact that one dynamic, active, and fluent process was the main subject and object of the musealization process, which could be understood as the first step towards a new museum as an open and dynamic institution, in contrast with the traditional understanding of the museum, as the dark, cold, petrified, and closed up institutions (Belting, 2006).

After the death of Josip Broz Tito on May 4th, 1980, the main museum became the Memorial Center ‘Josip Broz Tito’, created two years later. It gathered, under ‘the same roof’, the

\(^{145}\) First Yugoslavia, Kingdom of Yugoslavia that existed from 1929 until the beginning of World War II, and second one, which existed since 1945 until beginning of 90s, in the frame of the cultural institution, and to articulate official position towards Yugoslav narratives.
May 25th Museum (the main exhibiting place, established in 1962) ‘House of Flowers’ as Tito’s burial place, and two residential palaces, close to the museum. The 25th of May, was a holiday date, introduced to celebrate the birthday of Josip Broz Tito, but also to build and maintain close relations of the people and its leaders, through various manifestations and symbolisms of different gifts, with the involvement of the whole society (starting with the celebration of the 1st of May as a socialist labor holiday)

The building of Museum 25th May, was a gift to president Tito, for his 70th birthday from the Belgrade municipality and emerged in order to save and preserve all the gifts that president Tito received (and was still receiving) from different countries, societies, unions, politicians, companies and individuals. The gifts were connecting, in a way, the whole museum complex and exhibiting space with the figure and personality of Josip Broz, from the moment of emerging the institution until today. Artefacts dedicated to and developed the cult of Josip Broz Tito, such as mentioned gifts, were sources of Yugonostalgic feelings. The president represented the whole state of solidarity, prosperity, progress and security connecting Yugonostalgia as a possible escapist strategy from present reality with ‘titostalgia’ as a possible way of idealistic remembrance of the Marshal Tito (Ziębińska-Witek, 2018, 212).

From the ‘60s onward, until the dissolution of Yugoslavia, the Museum (in space it occupied back then) tended to establish and strengthen Yugoslav identity. Through its core narrative, and in every segment of the complex display space – the figure of Josip Broz Tito, served to distance Yugoslavia from other Eastern Europe countries and communist regime they had in the 20th century, and to construct the Yugoslav identity. The Yugoslav identity should appear through the key notions of its ideology – the brotherhood and unity (srb. bratstvo i jedinstvo) or self-management, a specific Yugoslav form of economic practice (srb. samoupravljanje).  

The custom of gift-giving (which lasted through the whole year, with a climax in May) was, on a symbolic level, creation of the common space, a specific network of the gift-givers, spread through the whole region, insuring the connection among different parts of the Communist Yugoslavia society. Through the empathic feelings toward President, the unification was achieved and strengthen every year, by the numinous power of rituals (batons were the most recognizable symbolic gift, so at the end Museum fund owns 22 000 batons, accentuated strongly the nature of the institution, organized around the narrative constructed to support the cult of Tito’s personality).

In 2020, the Museum defines its mission and role as an ‘open institution that encourages different actors to actively perceive the present by modern interpretation of the past. Our mission is to be the place of open dialogue, to exchange knowledge and experiences on the social and cultural phenomena of the 20th century with all institutions, organizations and individuals interested in issues on Yugoslav heritage and Yugoslav history. Through our programs and activities, we encourage social memory and culture of remembrance related to development of the Yugoslav idea, since the creation of the Yugoslav state as a kingdom, until its breakup in the early 1990s. By the innovative approach to unique collections and preserved testimonies of Yugoslavia we offer authentic insights, knowledge and experiences through exhibition, educational and interactive programs to our visitors.’ Considering the official site as the source of Museum official attitude it recalls the museum forum type of institution (Belting, 2006) or critical museum (Piotrowski, 2011).
As in the case of Museum of Contemporary Art, the building was a first representation of the institutional narrative, carrying the symbolic meaning in its form and built as the example of modernist architecture, characteristic for modernism of Yugoslavia with clean and sharp edges. The building being symmetrical, spread around two axis and transparent (due to the glass, long and high windows, and glass doors at the end of the promenade) minimalistic in details situated on a wide open site with a massive fountain in the middle bordered by park and crowded with sculptures. As Olga Manojlović Pintar and Aleksandar Ignjatović stated about possible readings of the architectural representation of the mentioned institution, its form:

/…/ could be read as symbolic representations of Yugoslav politics and culture. The openness and lightness of the design corresponded directly to the very nature of Yugoslavia as seen as a liberal society. Its mediatory role in East-West cultural issues was totally opposed to orthodox, Soviet style communism. Furthermore, the urban setting of the museum simultaneously acted as an additional narrative that was at the front line of the same ideological agenda. Placed on the threshold of Tito's own residence — on the very border between a private realm of the state's leader and green space accessible to the whole community — the edifice stressed not only the idea of the mutual penetration of the museum exhibition and the surrounding open green spaces, but also of the realms of political authority and freedom of society (Manojlović Pintar, Ignjatović, 2011, 805).

After Tito’s death, the May 25th Museum transformed into the Memorial Center Josip Broz Tito, and with the Museum of the Revolution of the Yugoslav Nations and Ethnic Minorities, was marginalized during the ‘90s. The late 80s and 90s brought a huge ideological shift and sociopolitical change. In Yugoslavia the nationalistic tendencies became obvious, once dominant narratives were diminished and the institutions that were dedicated to preserve the memory on president of Josip Broz Tito, became unwanted (Stojanović, 2010, 13).

148 During the war in the 90s, and the huge economic and cultural crisis, almost all cultural institutions were barely functional. Especially those who had Yugoslav narrative in its core. Yugoslavia, as an idea and its materialization, was the main culprit for all the accidents that happened to its (ex) states. Visitors of the Museum’s complex were mostly foreigners, and during the embargo (borders were closed) the number of them was symbolic. People in Serbia, in severe trauma due to the sociopolitical circumstances, war, embargo and pressure of Slobodan Milošević’s regime, being unable to meet basic needs due to the deep economic crisis (inflation) could not afford museums surveys.

149 The May 25 Museum was created with a clear mission of musealization of socio-political activities and life of the president by collecting, studying and exhibiting gifts presented to Josip Broz Tito in Yugoslavia and abroad. Broz himself participated in decisions which peace from his collection will be shown for the first time. The objects were of different origin, size, shape and purpose. Among ‘givers’ were authorities of state and local government, organizations, collectives, citizens, artists, amateurs, immigrants, as well as presidents or politicians of foreign countries. The largest part consisted of relay batons and scale models. The Museum of the Revolution had a task to research and represent the continuous ‘ongoing revolution’, life and struggle of the working class. The exhibits were processed and cataloged by date, theme, subject and author. Four museum departments were formed to study the four historical periods, 1) the labor movement from 1870 to 1919, which also dealt with the Balkan wars, the First World War and the establishment of Yugoslavia; 2) the inter-war period from 1919 to 1941, with dominant topics of history of the Communist Party, political imprisonment, student demonstrations, and the Spanish civil War; 3) the Second World War in Yugoslavia; and 4) post-war reconstruction and building, and socio-political situation in socialist
From 1999 to 2000, the Museum was completely neglected. Serbian President Slobodan Milošević and his family used the residential complex as an unofficial private property (they moved in 1997) and two residential villas were divided from the Museum by a tall wall. The Old Residence was completely ruined by the NATO bombings in 1999, so the Milošević’s family moved to another one where they lived until he was arrested in March 2001. Since then and until 2007, the Museum was on the periphery of the city map, social and cultural life of the capitol, maintaining the limited offer of the cultural programs including several exhibitions. Combining the various narratives, after 2001, the Museum was ready for transformation (Pintar, Ignjatović 2011, 807).

Museum 25th May was dedicated to life while the Former Memorial Center (now House of the Flowers) with its dominant narrative, was dedicated to the death of Josip Broz Tito. Together with the Museum of the Revolution, often characterized as ‘the Museum of the Party’ and struggling to overcome that stereotype, were mixed into the story about Yugoslavia, as a core one of new institutions. Researchers and curators, from 1996, devoted their work to Yugoslav history, and significance of its heritage, as the main story of the Museum of Yugoslavia (Gnjatović, 2014).

The meaning of core narrative is pretty much defined by the origin of the Museum, as it is stated on the official site of the Museum intending to explain the significance of its history:

The vision of the Museum of Yugoslavia’s work includes safeguarding the two funds and their documentations, histories as well as memories of employees; dealing with topics related to the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and the socialist Yugoslavia as well as cultivating the memorial character of parts of the complex. Turbulent and layered histories of these units can be deciphered from the documentation, museum objects’ files, exhibition catalogs and documents. Connecting not only the two funds but these two institutions in 1996, which differed in nature, mission, work, documentation and personnel, into a new institution with a new mission of musealizing Yugoslavia, was a political decision, but also a challenge for their employees in defining and building the Yugoslav heritage and in challenging the deep-rooted opinions and prejudices about it.150 (Gnjatović 2014, 78).

The Museum of Yugoslav History’s first collection appeared as a symbiotic mixture of collections of two institutions – Memorial Center and Museum of Revolution, enlarged in next 20

---

150 The official site confirms Museum mission and orientation to the public through the simple and interesting interface full of information and possibilities for surveys through space and time (link in Bibliography).
years. The policy of renaming was an important part of the transformation process (Radović, 2013) as a signal of changing narratives so Museum as institution was renamed again in 2016. The previous name of the Museum of Yugoslav History seemed to be too rooted in a past, present and probably future. A new name did not allow Yugoslavia to leave the Museum and rejoin history again. Creating the Museum of Yugoslavia meant also that Yugoslavia could exist only in that one particular Museum (and probably nowhere else) together with the wholeness of its legacy (Petrović, 2013, 36).

Considering the 86 exhibition in the period from 2001 to 2008, the fact is that only 21 were conceptualized from the institution curators and the rest were contemporary art and guesting exhibition, also different students’ and authors’ programs, witnessing the evident lack of a plan, program or initiative in developing the new mission and narrative of the institution. In spite of the limited functioning, the mentioned period was important, due to the presence of institutions on the cultural map, while the other museums were closing (Museum of Contemporary Art, National Museum). The Museum of Yugoslavia started a serious transformation with a great investment of effort by researchers and curators.

In that period, the Museum with its 220,000 artefacts, was one of the institutions charged with creating new space and national identity, with a request for creating continuity and certain stable (linear) narrative about Yugoslavia, on a high demand. At the same time, the Museum practice was characterized with the absence of the permanent exhibition. In the focus of the new projects came an identity construction and official but interpretational narratives considering Yugoslav legacy. The lack of the official consensus about the past events affected the construction of museum narratives:

A complex Yugoslav heritage as well as confronting and often conflicting attitudes towards recent wars slowed down these processes, so the new historical paradigm is still lacking a broader social consensus. This seemingly odd situation is quite intriguing. The reluctance of museums in Serbia to deal with tangible and problematic issues of both Yugoslav historical legacy and the wars of the 1990s reflects dominant political discourse. Serbia still lacks social consensus, which affects the political status quo regarding its state borders. The representation of the Yugoslav Past is firmly linked with the perception of the Yugoslav wars of the 1990s and their aftermaths (Pintar, Ignjatović, 2011, 786).

The year 2007, with the change of management, brought a shift from one cultural policy and plan to another and work on the new collection could start. Before that ‘revolution’, the

---

151 The previous permanent exhibition was taken off in 1998. After NATO bombing, in 1999, the temporary exhibition *How to Kill a Country?* was opened, dealing with the current events, and anticipating the emerging of critical approach towards present and past that will take place in Museum after the transformation in 2007 (and eventually led to the Belting’s museum forum, dialog space for (re)thinking and influencing society (Belting, 2006).
Museum was functioning in a limited way with no permanent display or regular exhibitions, like the institution absent in its presence (Newhouse, 1999) on the opposite but in the same time similar way as the Museum of Contemporary Art and National Museum closed down for restoration and almost completely inactive.

A new team in the new old Museum of Yugoslav History (from 2007) consisted mainly of the experts with experience from the NGO sector. At the same beginning, it decided to find a new beneficial narrative, as a creative space of existence on which basis it was possible to make a productive continuity without petrifying the story of Yugoslavia into a closed and lifeless historical period. Those attempts of avoiding the set ups of fast and proved solutions like making the traditional linear narrative, by collecting the facts, officially accepted, and simplified, was not easy and for sure – not linear nor a straight forwarded project.

Due to the fact that the last historical conclusion about Yugoslavia belongs to the late ‘90s, it was still too early for historical and official conclusions. That period was a period of opening towards new conceptions of institution, museum which could hold a space for dialog, criticism, discussions, and participation (Simon, 2010). The Museum had become a cultural institution on the state budget in 2007, and with the new team, a program of following the new tendencies could begin, creating narrative and establishing an identity through cultural policy and realization of the program (Gnjatović, 2014, 62).

**CHANGE OF PERSPECTIVE**

*Novi Stari muzej [The New Old Museum]* was a project that represented a change of the perspective and questioned the institution’s core narrative – Museum of History of Yugoslavia was shifting from a traditional institution with the petrified narrative to the open and dynamic institution, a museum that creates space for discussion, creates questions and offers multiple solutions, migrating to the idea of interrogative museum (Karp, Kratz, 2014). The transformation is signified by the title of the project, bringing up the importance of continuity by underlining the process of renewing an old institution. The project included a series of debates, panel discussion and discussion programs, aimed to initiate the transformation and redefine the process of the

---

152 Non-governmental, non official sector, representing a network of alternative institutions which often occupied experts from different areas, experienced in the work under the pressure, fast and creative thinking and transforming the structures they work with. In one word, th were owning the skills that were needed for the survival of the alternative institutions in the time of ever present crisis.
Museum evoking the museum forum, museum that participates in change of social life through discussions and critical approach (Belting, 2006) as one more possibility of a new museum.

The continuation of the project was exhibition *Originalni naslov [Yugoslavia from the Beginning to the End]* in 2012 (anticipating the renaming of the institution in 2016) bringing the overview of Yugoslav history, from the perspective of the historians from the whole post Yugoslav region, also bringing the phenomenon of Yugoslavia in the spotlight, enlightened from the various perspectives.\(^{153}\)

The exhibition was opened on 1st of December in 2012, and closed 17th of March 2013.\(^{154}\) The preparation of the exhibition lasted for three years, with the main aim of representing the core phenomenon of Yugoslavia, as a state which doesn’t exist anymore, but still has certain influence on everyday life in successor states. With no ambition of representing the historical overview, nor giving the final conclusions, neither whole picture of period in which First and Second Yugoslavia existed, authors and contributors of the exhibition aim to open the space for dialog about Yugoslav legacy and to offer the starting points for new interpretations development (Panić, 2017, 24).

In the same time – it represents an example of the project which narrative discovered affinity of the experts to perceive Yugoslavia as an experiment, as the matter of the past, from one pretty negative perspective, and to petrify its narrative by closing it in the particular period of time. On the other side, opening towards multidisciplinary approach and participation of the experts from different areas is an opening towards multiperspective and participatory approach (Simon, 2010).

The exhibition *Yugoslavia from the Beginning to the End*, as a part of a long lasting project (*The New Old Museum*) represented a basis of the work on the future permanent exhibition at the Museum of Yugoslav History, and as its result, for the very first time, after dissolution of Yugoslavia. As Kisić stated about the evaluation and exhibition, it requires contextualization:

> /.../ the exhibition itself was a work in progress within a bigger project and should be evaluated not only in itself, but through shedding light on the context, dynamics and turning points of the process leading to it and the one that followed it (Kisić, 2016, 190).

\(^{153}\) *During three months of the exhibition, there was an unprecedented interest, with more than 12,500 visitors across generations attending. Despite running from December to March, during bad winter weather and holidays, the guided tours on Saturdays were crowded with people, sometimes up to 300 people for one tour* (Kisić, 2016, 219).

\(^{154}\) Authors of the exhibition texts, including the texts in publication/catalogue emerged from the project and exhibition, were, Ana Panić (curator of the exhibition) Jovo Bakić, Srdan Cvetković, Ivana Dobrivojević, Hrvoje Klasić, and Vladimir Petrović. Curatorial exhibition concept and object selection were made by Ana Panić. And for team of reviewers were chosen Tvrtko Jakovina, Husnija Kamberović, Oto Lutar, Predrag J. Marković.
And also deserves the reading as a whole, due to its representation as one whole, round and finished process. Through the evaluations of the exhibition, authors should come to the final conclusions that would serve as important ones for creating the narrative and permanent display for the Museum of Yugoslavia. Considering a fact that a ‘curator’s task is to transpose the exhibit from its original context into a new narrative, while at the same time transforming its meaning according to the desired concept’ (Wróblewska-Trochimiuk, 2019, 45) the interpretation of the Yugoslavia as certain ‘experiment’, in publication following the exhibition (Bakić, et all, 2013) represents the step back towards traditional pedagogical museum and didactic approach.

It represents the closing up of Yugoslavia into the certain (recommended) story and diminishing of its legacy. Following the traditional model of institution marginalization of the Yugoslav legacy that often happens through the imposing of the linearization of the narrative, commercialization of the heritage, and imperative of objective reading (Simić, 2017).

The assumption that texts following and explaining the exhibits, also text which followed the exhibition, and the exhibition itself, was ‘colored’ (interpreted through the unifying lenses) and contributes to the old model of museum, traditional, didactic, providing control and top down narratives (Wróblewska-Trochimiuk, 2019, 42). The project brought a one-round interpretation of Yugoslavia already declared in the title of exhibition. In the opening text of the catalogue, Ana Panić, curator, stated about Yugoslavia as the country that does not exist anymore, but carries importance as the specific experiment (Panić, 2013).

In evaluation of the project some of the scientists involved stated about the project as a space where Yugoslav legacy has been diminished (Toroman, 2013) and Yugoslav experience was limited and marginalized. If not by the exhibition itself, the project created the space for dialog provoking different opinions, reactions and statements.

As it is described in the theory of Krap and Kratz (2014) and their idea of the interrogative museum, a new museum should be a place for requisitioning and dialog where a curator’s project and exhibition material should be just an opening for the discussion and the possibility of creating the specific place for social engagement. From the perspective and theory of interrogative museum project Jugoslavija od početka do kraja [Yugoslavia from the Beginning to the End] succeeded in opening the dialog even without an intention to do so.

In the narrative following the artefacts, in the following texts and structure of the exhibition, starting from the title Yugoslavia from the beginning to the end, was so much of the
provocative material that the most valuable scientific reach happened in debates organized as an evaluation of the exhibition, making the Museum of Yugoslavia modern critical museum.

Exhibition followed a chronological axis and partially owned linearity as a structure, trying to give simple and clear explanation about idea of Yugoslavism, and ideas in a core of Socialist Yugoslavia as ‘brotherhood and unity’, avoiding the deeper survey through traumatic events as were war conflicts in 90s. Exhibition was divided into the sequels and little rooms called ‘niszas’ which function was to better illustrate a certain phenomenon connected with life in Yugoslavia that could give a wider and clearer picture to the visitor (fig. 32).

Figure 32. Sequence from exhibition Yugoslavia from the beginning until the end / Jugoslavija od početka do kraja. Constellations of photographs and drawings on canvas (prints) and sculptures, dialog of different artefacts

Sources: https://www.muzej-jugoslavije.org/exhibition/jugoslavija-od-pocetka-do-kraja/

All segments were represented as a whole and a round ‘story’ shaping together the narrative of Yugoslavia, from its beginning to its end. Exhibited artefacts included the large number of printed photographs, documents and fragments of newspapers on the beige canvas accompanied with other objects (some smaller sculpture from the Museum of Yugoslavia collections) with the story printed beside the photography as an explanation, so the visitor could follow the line history,

155 Those sequels could be read as an anticipation of the exhibiton Sequences in Museum of Contemporary Art, 2017, already described in previous chapter.
as well as gifts to president Tito (sword that president Stalin gave to Tito, for example) stones from some historically important borders – all representing historical part, and metaphorically, old traditional museum (fig. 33).

Figure 33. The items representing the artefacts from the collection of the Museum of Yugoslavia. Sources: https://www.rts.rs/page/stories/st/story/16/kultura/1221676/jugoslavija-od-pocetka-do-kraja.html

Among those artefacts were also printed famous posters, commercials, then cans and other boxes of different products (ever present while being in use in Yugoslavia, and famous by its design in post Yugoslav time) mascots of big sports championships or other events, phones, jackets, dolls, representing the part of exhibition that emotionally involves those visitors which used to live in Yugoslavia or those who somehow get in touch with the ‘artefacts’ (fig. 34).
Figure 34. Exhibition Yugoslavia from the beginning until the end, video installations, photographs on canvas, and everyday object (jackets) with ambles transformed in artefact Combination of different mediums

Sources: http://www.seecult.org/vest/podelite-secanje-na-ex-yu

An emotional reaction of the visitors is already within their participations, and a questionnaire that was given to every single visitor for their comment at the exit was one more step forward in transformation towards a new participatory museum. The Museum that creates a space for dialog by involving the perspective of the audience into the exhibition narrative (Simon, 2010).

Even though the art and culture, bearing a large emotional potential were just briefly mentioned by a couple of sequences which made a common cultural experience as an important part of Yugoslav history and identity – marginalized and diminished (Duda, 2013, 172). Even greater, that is the space where Yugoslavia still exists and in which had been present before the first union, so the silent passing through of the art and culture space could be the part of the exhibition solution that dictated the concept ‘from the beginning until the end of Yugoslavia’ and which linearity cannot stand the complexity of the Yugoslav Artistic Space, nor share or understand its legacy.
The main disadvantage of the project and exhibition was in a simplification it imposed while aiming to show complexity – it brought certain one dimensional perspective while aiming to bring the unlimited possibilities for interpretations, escaping the emotional language, personal experiences, witnessing and valorizations in order to give objective overview (without attempt to give overview at all). Project brought one colored image of Yugoslavia, while pointing out its diversity, insisting on the objective approach while marking all negative aspects, and skipping the art and culture achievements insisting on an effective statement about the end of Yugoslavia – with the full stop (Petrović, 2013).

A valuable attempt of giving an ‘overview’ of the history of Yugoslavia in photos, documents, and other objects and text was still an example of a traditional didactic approach to the task. The exhibition *Jugoslavija od početka do kraja* [*Yugoslavia from the beginning until the end*] as a most concrete emanation of the project *Novi stari Muzej* [*New Old Museum*] represented the amalgam of the traditional (19th century, and first half of the 20th) and innovative model of the museum, combining elements of prerogative (Karp, Kratz, 2014) participatory (Simon, 2010) and critical museum (Piotrowski, 2011) and bringing important novelties.

Except for the opening space for discussion, the significant innovation was that authors of the exhibition connected various institutions and experts also other individuals in order to collect significant artefacts for the exhibition. That was the first example of cooperation between institutions aiming to realize a project connected with researchers of Yugoslav history. The pioneer project led to gathering the experts among the same roof a couple of times more, as it happened for a conference named *Muzealizacija Jugoslavije* [*The Musealization of Yugoslavia*] in 2018.

So, the *New Old Museum*, as the first regional project institutionally framed and dedicated to Yugoslavia,156 conceived as a long-term process, has been conceptualized in stages. The project

---

156 We embarked on this ‘voyage’ together with renowned experts and young professionals, from all over the former Yugoslavia, at the conference / public panel discussion and a workshop, held from 10 to 12 December, 2009 at the Museum of Yugoslav History. The next step consisted of professional work with a smaller international team that formulated a proposal of the Yugoslav 1918-1991 project – a permanent exhibition at the Old Museum, which is part of the Museum of Yugoslav History. The team consisted of the following members: Dr Hrvoje Klasić, professor at the Department of History, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Saša Madacki, director of the Human Rights Centre of the University of Sarajevo, Dr Predrag J. Marković, research advisor at the Institute of Contemporary History in Belgrade, Marko Popović, director and co-founder of the Centre for Visual History at the Faculty of Media and Communications in Belgrade, Robert Rückel, director and founder of the DDR Museum in Berlin and Katarina Živanović, the then director of the Museum of Yugoslav History in Belgrade. After the adoption of the proposed exhibition concept that introduces a new reading of this period of history, including cultural and social history of Yugoslavia and contemporary interpretations of the experience of co-existence in Yugoslavia, a new regional team that worked on the implementation of the concept was formed. The team of authors and curators consisted of Dr Jovo Bakić, professor at the Department of Sociology, University of Belgrade, Dr Srdan Cvetković, research fellow at the Institute for Contemporary History in Belgrade, Dr Ivana Dobrivojević, research fellow at the Institute for Contemporary History in Belgrade, Dr Vladimir Petrović, research fellow at the Institute for
represented a basis for the new identity also for the narrative and permanent display of the Museum, which was summarized in the exhibition and catalogue/publication in 2012, with the following paragraph on the same beginning:

Throughout the most of the 20th century, in the Balkan peninsula, there was a country inspired by the desire to form a union of South Slavs. Yugoslavia, which was formed and disappeared several times, changed its name, borders, political and social systems, was marked by an exceptional diversity of ethnic groups, religions, cultures and customs existing in a comparatively small geographical area. Praised and disputed, built and undermined, it vanished from the geographical and political map of the world, in the late 20th century, but its legacy still exerts a strong influence on the lives of people in the region (Bakić, et al. 2013).

Through these sentences, the narrative frame looked defined by the dichotomy that characterized the perspectives and interpretations of Yugoslavia, also in its controversial status in contemporaneity, without any official consensus and still not a completely owned heritage nor defined legacy, but obviously well experienced. The following pages and exhibition itself, did not show the announced constellations in space and time, which would define the phenomenon of Yugoslavia. Almost all evaluations confirmed that, with the except of providing a good start, besides creating the basis for dialog and engaging the audience, the exhibition did not bring the round picture that was announced as its aim:

The aim of the exhibition was to create a space that will introduce the visitors, in a modern, attractive and objective way, to one of the most interesting and most controversial state-building experiments in the 20th century, as part of a modular exhibition, which opens up possibilities for adding content, the creation of multiple perspectives and involvement of visitors (Bakić, et al. 2013).

Imposing the interpretation of the Yugoslav state as a ‘controversial state-building experiment of the 20 century’, meant already strong input and a lens through which the ordinary visitor should perceive all the given facts and showed exhibits. In that ‘experiment’, following analogy goes the building of an identity, through design for example, and all the phenomenon of everyday culture, also economic and political manifestations together with a cult of personality.

The art and culture, being a vital and independent force, did not fit in the ‘experiment’ interpretation, so they have stayed marginalized in this project. On the other hand, an engaged
audience with the emotional identifications (especially moved by artefact representing products from everyday life) and numerous comments, were proving the vitality of Yugoslav legacy, also cultural and art space which did not let the full stop or nail on the coffin of ‘Yugoslavia experiment’ to stand as a conclusion of exhibition. That kind of contribution is the significant characteristic of a new, participatory museum, ‘an important aspect in this kind of perception is to engage audience embodiment in the process of creating the meaning of the perceived content’ (Wróblewska-Trochimiuk, 2019, 42).

The exhibition space was divided into six larger entities, Yugoslavia – ID, The Peoples of Yugoslavia, The Seamy Side of the Regime, Yugoslavia in the World – the World in Yugoslavia, Economy and Society and The End of Yugoslavia, and four smaller sections outside the main narrative of the exhibition, (the so-called niches) Assassinations, Croatian Spring and Serbian Liberals, Bad Debt – the Agrokomerc Affair and Neue Slowenische Kunst. The entities were thematic whole, well rounded and concepted as a rooms, so the visitors could gain the whole picture after visiting every room, while niches had the descriptive function. They were giving the additional information to main narrative line cause the aim was not to give overview nor the linear structure, but at the end, in the publication, it appears as the only logical structure:

In each room, the visitors will gain an insight into one well-rounded thematic whole, while they will be able to get the complete picture only after discovering all the rooms. The purpose of the ‘niches’ is to highlight the ‘details’, mainly crisis situations that should point to the permanent presence of destabilizing elements in the above-mentioned territory and the above-mentioned period of time (Bakić, et al, 2013).

Insisting on the destabilization elements, could lead to the conclusion that those elements were predominant, which is the cause why some experts, during following debates, stated negative interpretation tangled in exhibition narrative.

For the aim of the description, I will mark couple of sequels with its artefacts – catalogue of the certain exhibition in Serbian and English languages especially today, represents an integral part of the exhibition, its representation in different forms, and in on line space like in libraries and other archives – its substitution. The catalogue lasts longer than exhibition, becomes the object of multiple readings, citations, quotations, having sometimes larger audience than exhibition. And, at the end, it appears that the average museum visitor does not buy catalogues, so the reception of the particular one could be something completely else, and recipient of the catalogue content does not need to be at the same time, exhibition visitor, and vice versa (fig. 35).
In the publication that followed exhibition *Yugoslavia from the beginning until the end / Jugoslavija od početka do kraja*, 2012, the idea for the project and aim of the exhibition, following texts and results of the evaluations, were given in more than 60 pages, with the images of artefacts, and a spatial solution for its display. At the exhibition, the artefacts were shown on the panels, in the color of beige, rough and old paper, sepia colorized, like the color of the very old photographs or documents, appeared as the effect of aging. In the catalogue, white and black is predominant; as the effect of the numerous images used to illustrate historical narrative regarding the creation of Yugoslavia, from the beginning to the chapters dedicated to the design, pop culture, posters and products in Socialist Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslav art and culture were represented by paragraphs dedicated to sculptor Ivan Meštrović, with mentioning his never realized Vidovdan’s Temple, as the illustration for imperative of creating cultural closeness between ethnicities in the First Yugoslavia, by creating
the common narrative in order to establish a common mythology, and by that – a Yugoslav identity (fig. 36).

![Figure 36](image)

Significance of culture and art appeared as just one moment more, in the sequel dedicated to popular culture and film in Socialist Yugoslavia, with the images of famous Hollywood actors (Richard Burton as Tito, for example). Modernist culture, art of modernism, architecture of Socialist Yugoslavia, did not find its place in this exhibition, nor in following articles, but it was mentioned several times during debates about exhibition.

The exhibition *Yugoslavia from the beginning to the end* represents the descriptive example of a struggle between two conceptions of the representing Yugoslav legacy in official institutions, also struggle between two conceptions of museum institution itself. On the one side is the traditional understanding of the museum as an institution (19th century) which archives and preserves making official narratives and creating national identity, and modern forum museum (Belting, 2006) or critical museum (Piotrowski, 2011) that investigates, opens space for dialog, debates, creates different programs, mediates social change through emerging questions without
giving the final answer, letting audience and experts to involve, making it an interactive environment (Karp, Kratz, 2014).

While the conception of the exhibition anticipates the critical museum, its realization is a little step back in the direction of the traditional petrifying linear narratives, cleaned from the provocative emotional political content and ready to become consensual, and by that official, ‘from the beginning to the end’. Debates and panel discussions (described further on in this chapter) organized as an evaluation of the exhibition, represent the example of the modern museum activities- forming the creative field for authentic and critical dialog.

According to statements of the curator and the author team, before opening of the exhibition, the important part of the project was planned and expected evaluations. The most of the experts agreed at the end, when focus indeed was on those evaluations, that a possibility of discussion and debate about exhibition was its most valuable aspect (Panić, 2017, 26). The last chapter of the catalogue publication was dedicated to evaluations, interviews and impressions of the experts about the project declared during panels in the Museum, organized as a following program of the project Novi stari muzej [New Old Museum].

All the participants in the debates and panels, experts, agreed to one – such a project was needed and represents the interest and scientific effort in the study of Yugoslavia, an important attempt of giving a material form to the research (Duda, 2013, 173). It was a great impulse at the start and for creation of the similar future events, an important contribution in an attempt to regain the past and a beneficial use of the Yugoslav legacy, in an institutional environment. Through the evaluations of the interviews with the audience, the authors team received feedback regarding the complexity of the exhibition, which could not be seen entirely in just one visit, and also the large volume of texts, absence of basic information.

Therefore, if the visitors were not already informed about Yugoslavia, as most foreign tourists, they would not be able to follow the story without guidance nor to follow the exhibition. Following the narrative and getting the full and clear picture was difficult without guidance even for those who knew a little bit of the important moments in Yugoslav history (Panić, 2017, 35).
DISCUSSING THE YUGOSLAV HERITAGE- ACCEPTING THE YUGOSLAV LEGACY

Public discussions were planned and announced as the part of the program Novi stari muzej [New Old Museum] They were organized with the aim of opening a space for experts, not only about the exhibition, but also regarding large scale of different topics around the question of Yugoslav history, post Yugoslav period, its interpretations and representations.

The first public discussion at the Museum of Yugoslav History, with a focus on different approaches to the subject, was Studije Jugoslavije: kako istraživati i učiti o Jugoslaviji [Yugoslav Studies – How to Do Research and Learn about Yugoslavia] (February 8th, 2013).157

The second public discussion at the Museum of Yugoslavia, was dedicated to Sećanja na život u Jugoslaviji: prikupljanje usmenih svedočanstava o Jugoslaviji [Memories of Yugoslavia, Collecting Oral Testimonies about Yugoslavia] (February 12th, 2013).158 The experts on the culture of remembrance and its narrative history, researchers and representatives of non-governmental organizations working on the projects in the region specializing in collecting oral testimonies, insisted during the debate, on significance, uses and role of oral testimonies, as sources of knowledge about the history of Yugoslavia.159

157 Participants were, Ivan Kovačević (Belgrade) Aleksandar Životić (Belgrade) and Hrvoje Klasić (Zagreb, one of the co-authors of the exhibition) with Tatomir Toroman, as moderator. Dr Ivan Kovačević (ethnologist, anthropologist) stated about definition of Yugoslav heritage, and fact that heritage cannot be everything that happened in period of Yugoslavia state (‘Moreover, elements of Yugoslav cultural heritage can be found both before and after the existence of Yugoslavia as a state. Take for example, the idea of Yugoslavism that was producing ideas and artefacts before the establishment of the state itself and the contemporary phenomenon of Yugonostalgia.’ (catalogue, 2012, 67). Aleksandar Životić spoke about the problems at the time of the establishment of the Department of Yugoslav History, due to the ideological agendas and political pressures that prevented scientific research. He stressed that ‘these issues and the long-time lack of availability of certain sources were the reason why the things that we do not know about Yugoslavia still outnumbered the things that are known about the country’. Hrvoje Klasić (historian) accentuated that the study of Yugoslavia should be divided and viewed at three different levels – research, teaching and presentation and that new paradigms were needed in each of these three segments, with comparative study in which Yugoslavia can be perceived in the context with other countries. Klasić also insisted on comparative approach in study about Yugoslavia itself, inside of the borders, including more entities then we are used to (mostly, researchers were focused on life in Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana, while Skopje, Podgorica, Sarajevo were also capitals of the state).

At the end, he stated that the interest young people showed in Yugoslavia was raising and that there was a huge difference between those who were born and lived in Yugoslavia and the post Yugoslav generations, the fact that could appear in comparative research of official and nonofficial institutions. As we will see in the example of Kvaka 22, generations born in post Yugoslav period are used to treat the Yugoslav legacy on more natural and spontaneous way, which can help in finding the true place for its legacy in continuum.

158 Contributors, Sanja Petrović-Todosijević (researcher, Serbia) as moderator and participants were, Olga Manojlović Pintar (research fellow Serbia) Ivana Pantelić (research associate, Serbia) Maja Dubljević (Zagreb) Marko Popović (Belgrade) and Marija Glišić (represents Heinrich Böll Foundation).

159 The historian Olga Manojlović Pintar, examined the relation between historical research and remembrance, by positioning the problem at three levels, archives and remembrance, truth and remembrance and Yugoslavia and remembrance, accentuated at the end the importance of history as one of the humanities disciplines, bearing in mind that with the shift of methods in humanities, the nature of the historiographic account changed too,
The third debate organized as the following discussion of the exhibition, was probably the key discussion most connected with the subject of the exhibition itself, considering its goals and programs, *Jugoslovensko nasleđe: interpretacije i reprezentacije [Yugoslav Heritage - Interpretations and Reinterpretations]* (February 19th, 2013) with Tatomir Toroman as moderator. The aim of the debate was to encourage an interdisciplinary approach to the complex history of Yugoslavia, and any questions of the legacy taking the example of the exhibition as a starting point.  

The discussion becomes an example of the critical museum itself, the emanation of the Piotrowski idea how the creative and critical program can run in museum space, opening the different fields, sharpening the questions, offering the solutions. In this discussion whole provocative potentials of the exhibitions, being in its core misconceptions and mistakes, showed its values, by raising the awareness among experts about the necessity of taking the question of Yugoslav Legacy as serious and complex, and also considering all the benefits from giving the answer(s). Almost all the participants agreed about the pioneer role of the exhibition and project itself. But they were also emphasizing the negative perspective towards the subject of exhibition – simply, it was an exhibition against Yugoslavia, in which priority was given to political history, while the social and cultural history were neglected.

The experts pointed out that the nature of the project required the joint work of sociologists, anthropologists, art historians and historians, to prevent the attachments to certain aspects of

‘after which the science of history showed more readiness than ever before to emphasize the emotional and individual dimension’. That was because private lives of forty interviewees had been one of the fundamental fields of her research. Ivana Pantelić referred to the significance of eye witnesses within the framework of the oral history research. The project launched by Zagreb-based Documenta - Centre for Dealing with the Past named Personal Memories of People about World War II and Other Forms of Political Violence from 1941 to the Present was presented by Maja Dubljević. She described one of the most detailed and most important projects in the region, based on oral accounts, Maja Dubljević talked about the methods that were being developed even while working on the project, pointing out the enormous potential of an interview for understanding the attitude of the communities, towards the ‘common’ past.

Marko Popović, one of the founders of the Centre for Visual History presented the project Video Archive of Socialism that started in 2010, the project that aim to collect the testimonies of people coming from different backgrounds about their everyday life during the socialist era.

Marija Glišić of the Heinrich Böll Foundation presented the project, Oral History – Testimonies of the Participants in the Fight against Fascism that the foundation has been carrying out in collaboration with the Anti-Fascist Alliance and the Independent Journalists’ Association of Serbia. She emphasized the importance of the implementation of projects based on recording oral testimonies, opening dialogue and creating a more relaxed atmosphere in which to discuss the past that is still a burden to the society today, which opened a wide range of questions regarding the use of oral testimonies.

Dr Radina Vučetić (historian, Belgrade) Dr Ildiko Erdei (ethnologist and anthropologist, Belgrade) Dr Ana Sladojević, (Belgrade) and Dr Branislav Dimitrijević, (Belgrade).

Before beginning a public discussion, Ana Panić, co-author and curator of the exhibition, made an introduction, pointing out the complexity of the entire transformative process in the frame of the New Old Museum project, while also emphasizing the importance of the evaluation, collecting impressions and conclusions about exhibition, opening questions. Ana Panić accentuated once again and pointed out that discussion has the same goal like an exhibition - to gather experts, open dialog and make the basis for the future research.
Yugoslav history interpreted from the certain simplified perspective, and to give more complete interpretation by taking the important accomplishments in the field of Yugoslav art, culture, architecture and sports into the research and into display. Study of the Yugoslav past (and heritage) requires interdisciplinary, with special emphasis on a wider historical context (Cold War and policy of non-alignment) (Toroman, 2013). These were all the necessary changes that would be provided in the future in order to make the project in which the image of Yugoslavia, a narrative of her history and legacy would appear in accordance with reality and through its meanings gathered with its values.

The main expressed conclusions were about exhibition as a valuable attempt and important event, marking that the discontinuity between the two Yugoslavias, the Kingdom and the socialist state, as the biggest problem (Toroman, 2013, 66). Also, World War II, was not evaluated enough, in spite of being a very important transformative event. The personal experiences, memories, stories and witnessing together with the representations of the everyday culture, the culture in a wider sense, was missing (Duda, 2013, 173).

Contributors pointed out the fact that was important from the start – a legacy is not something that belongs to the past, considering the fact that is owned by the present moment, and can be shaped from any present or future point. The Museum should deal with various interpretations giving space to plurality of narratives, having no preferences, searching no prerogatives and having the completely different role nor historiographical institutions or history itself. The Museum should be a place where it is possible to show all the shades and angles of the subject, so it should be a place for representing the emotional side of the story also.

Commenting the project New Old Museum, together with the exhibition, and at the first place debates, conference debate showed all the spectrum of Yugoslav experience, in spite of the fact that for historiographical conclusion which requires the distance, still isn’t a time. What I found the most important regarding transformations in institutions is the best the Museum can offer to the audience and experts – a space for emerging questions, for open a dialog and the possibility for different and plural narrative to exist.

It appears as an important role not just considering the relation to the Yugoslav past, also considering the structure, role and methodology of museums itself. Even though a number of museums all around the world still practice the traditional role of national narrative making, following the tradition from the 19th century, which makes the question of Yugoslav legacy even more interesting in context of institutions in Serbia. In a period of transformation of the museum as an institution, the main question is how to represent the history and legacy of Yugoslavia,
searching also for the specific dynamic of the period and phenomenon, more than of characteristic objects (Sladojević, 2013).

The Museum should not be the institution which would try to represent just one (official) interpretation, but should be considered within the whole context of earlier representations, in the case of Yugoslav history and legacy, including those in official institutions but also those bottom-up projects in alternative institutions, including personal memories, statements and various emotional expressions (Karp, Kratz, 2014).

Museum of Yugoslavia is an institution that should deal with the primary narrative about Yugoslavia, but it should not be limited to only that, while Yugoslavia, history and legacy, should not be closed into a single institution. The Museum of Yugoslav History, from the time it was established, was the only one institution to which the narrative of Yugoslavia could not be derived for obvious reasons – was built to contain, preserve, maintain, and cover up the narrative of Yugoslavia.

The museum should bring the possibility of education to the audience and experts, by giving the multiple options, pointing out to multilayered meaning, different perspectives and various methodologies that could coexist and cooperate in creating new narratives and representations of the not just Yugoslav legacy, but legacy as such (Sladojević, 2013).

Contributors of the conference accentuated the importance of the whole project and exhibition as its part, but pointed out that the biggest problem was absence of important moments in history of art and culture, consequently elements of historical revisionism, with marginalization tendencies toward three main pillars of socialism – War of National Liberation, self-management, and modernity (Toroman, 2013). The official culture of the country had been a modern culture, with a recognizable visualization, therefore the visual identity of the exhibition should be important too, and at the same time accentuated and criticized (Duda, 2013).

According to Tanja Petrović (Petrović, 2013, 39) the project from which emerged exhibition Yugoslavia from the beginning to the end was one of the attempt to musealize the socialist experience and the period of socialism almost always marked by the imperative of the objective value adding, critical rethinking and emotional distance that was used as a way of auto-censorship and popular tendencies in Europe – disowning the socialist and communistic legacy (Petrović, 2013).

The exhibition Yugoslavia from the beginning to the end, with the emphasis on the experimental nature of the state project called Yugoslavia and with skipping achievements made
in modern culture and art as well as the personal experiences and witnessing of generations who lived in Yugoslavia, also with the strict bordering of the Yugoslav space in time, contributed to the tendencies of the marginalization and negative interpretations of the socialist legacy in Eastern Europe (Petrović, 2013).

Exhibition *Yugoslavia from the beginning to the end*, with an imperative of overcoming a traditional linear narrative by choosing the organization based on themes, ended up in the projects that insisted on the linearity and threatened Yugoslavia as an experiment which had its beginning and end. Treating Yugoslavia as the matter of the past, the project limited in that way its multilayered legacy and multifaceted existence.

**Museum of Yugoslavia (2016) - Work on New Permanent Exhibition**

Various interpretations of historical and social circumstances influenced the museum’s narrative and its policy of displaying the collection (by making a permanent exhibition). Work on new permanent display in the Museum of Yugoslavia finally started with the project *The New Old Museum* in 2009, \(^{162}\) after years of working on the margins of cultural life. This was the beginning of the transformative process for the internal structure of the Museum, from traditional towards a critical institution. Also it was a step towards an active approach and modern interpretation of the Yugoslav past. Through the permanent open dialog, active perception of the present, space and place of the Yugoslav legacy, encouraging the culture of remembrance as the important social factor, the museum gained the new basis. Its tendency is to insist on development and cooperation with other institutions preserving Yugoslav heritage (Gnjatović, 2014).

During the transformative process, cooperation between two sectors (governmental and nongovernmental) appeared beneficial with a new management team, ready to develop new programs, were mostly curators with experience from NGO (non-governmental) sector. The new visual identity was brought to the Museum, together with the new team, that should decide about the new program and narrative.

---

\(^{162}\) ‘The turning point in this was a new director, appointed in 2008, a woman with 20 years’ experience as a journalist and as a director of an independent activist cultural center. The appointment of Katarina Živanović came one year after the museum was officially recognized as a museum. She required that a Board be formed to govern the museum and introduced organizational changes, the establishment of a Program Council; weekly team meetings, regular email checks, official email addresses set up, connections established with European Voluntary Service, curatorial internships for graduates; and the employment of a younger generation of curators.’ (Kisić, 2016, 193).
The interrogative type of the museum (Karp, Kratz, 2014) that aims to take active participation in social and cultural life, was slowly appearing in the case of the Museum of Yugoslavia, emerging from the traditional one. The previous traditional type aimed to preserve, save and display, creating national identity by following strict official narrative (Kisić, 2016).

From 2012 to 2017, the second shift in the transformative process took place. This was the period when a series of thematized exhibitions treating the Yugoslav heritage (but not just) and collection in a new and creative way, were placed in the Museum of Yugoslavia.163 The inclination toward the museum collection and program to be more approachable to the audience and more interesting to younger generations who never experienced living in Yugoslavia and also to foreign tourists, became obvious. The curators team, preparing the exhibitions, was obviously led by the idea of creating a popular narrative about an (un)popular theme164.

The exhibitions were dedicated to the modernist design in Yugoslavia, famous brands, (extra)ordinary life of President Tito outside of the political context, were often present, with a tendency to repeat in different variations. With every innovation the Museum was making one more step towards popular culture of nowadays165.

Representing the Museum collection and narrative, in a way attractive to popular culture and subcultures, and close to mainstream tendencies among young people, was one more way to marginalize the legacy of Yugoslavia, and one more illustration of the fact that – during the transformative process in museums, the hardest part was to conceptualize and realize the educational function of this institutions. Due to the crisis, and lasting through the transformative period which is a period of vulnerability and difficulties for maintaining authority, was necessary


164 As Tanja Petrović stated in her articles about socialism heritage in museums (Petrović, 2013, 32) the trend of marginalization communistic legacy is not specific for the former Yugoslavia countries due to the War in 90s, it’s a European and World trend of the labeling Socialism and Communism as the Tottelarism regime, putting it shoulder to shoulder with the fascism or even Nacism. So, the prescription for the musealization of socialist legacy, can be Museum of Terror in Budapest.

165 Project Summer in Museum/Leto u Muzeju, described in the following chapter, can be an illustrative example of an accommodation attempt- making the past close to the present through entertainment and popular culture, and bringing the audience to the museum by giving them the occasion to perceive the content of museum in different context. The big question is, does making the step toward hipster subculture (interested in retro design, ‘old stories’ and rare objects) mean making the museum and its core narrative more visible. Does the Picnic Yugoslavia, in front of the museum participants mean museum audience and when? Project still waits for evaluation.
for an educational role, making new, authentic narratives, values, meanings and contexts. Museums, even in transformation, could not easily give up from authority.

MUSEALIZING YUGOSLAVIA, TOWARDS A CRITICAL (PARTICIPATIVE) MUSEUM

Exhibition Yugoslavia from the beginning to the end was imagined as a pilot version of the permanent display for the Museum of Yugoslavia as already mentioned emanated from a project called New Old Museum (2009–2013).

Until 2008 the building of the former Museum of the Revolution was used mainly as an exhibit space for representative traditional exhibitions and art shows that ranged widely from Chinese bronze to Swedish contemporary design to diploma exhibitions for the Faculty of Fine Arts – none of which had established an active relationship with Yugoslav history.

It is the story in which the Museum makes steps to transform from a mere mirror of its socio-political context to an active creator within that very context. The turning point happened in 2008 with the change of the institution status, the appointment of a new director with NGO (non-governmental organization) background, and establishing a new Board to govern the museum and introduce organizational changes. Also, a significant change was the establishment of a Program Council; including holding weekly team meetings, establishing connections with the European Voluntary Service, introducing curatorial internships for graduates; and employing a younger generation of curators. Those were followed by structural changes, emerging of an official souvenir and museum shop, new modern visual identity, and the most important a new role and responsibility for the museum as a public institution (Kisić, 2016, 194).

Already in 2009, the first evident problems were defined: the lack of a permanent display, the lack of communication with the audience and connection with other similar institutions, also lack of the exhibits and artefacts from the period from establishment of the Museum in 1996 (due to the marginalization of the institution during the ‘90s, until the shift in 2007). The New Old Museum was a project to solve those problems, dealing in the first place with the fact that the main role of the museum was to represent the Yugoslav heritage which was neglected and undermined during the ‘90s and after, instrumentalized after 2000, and still not valued and recognized in a time of the projects’ conception, with no institutional framework for its research nor regional consensus and cooperation through NGO projects.
In a plan for next three years the regional cooperation in a field of art and culture, as a step towards post-conflict integration, and joint of the research results, perspectives, and opinions, was vital for the creation of a new permanent exhibition (Panić, 2017). The project required the participation of young professionals from various backgrounds, forming a new team, ready to maintain on-going discussion and visibility about and during the process, and willing to deal with the current political situation. The last point was the most important innovation in project New Old Museum, readiness of the management and authors team to gain independence from the national and official narratives of the governing institution.

Then to strengthen international and regional cooperation, and in that way try to ensure the objectivity, reconciliation, reconnection, communicativeness and visibility of the project, handle the political tensions connected with the subject and regional cooperation, despite of Museum being the institution of national importance of Republic Serbia, funded by Ministry of Culture of Serbia. The project New Old Museum was also the first donor/funded project, turning to local and international funds and donors that could understand the project and its mission.

This shift in realization of the project process came from the customs of funding in the NGO sector, which were dealing with similar projects previously and in which dynamics the director and members of a new team were experienced. The independence in funding brought a freedom that the Museum needed to build the new museum as ‘an institution with regional scope, regional responsibility and regional mandate for fostering cooperation and reconciliation’ (Kisić, 2016, 198).

In the case of the Museum of Yugoslavia, reconciliation needed to be an important goal in the institutional program and part of the events it developed as the legacy of Yugoslavia was also a war in ‘90s with all its aftermaths. Furthermore, from the perspective of the search for meaning, new narratives and new perspectives that new Museum should provide, from the perspective of inventing the best of possible worlds in process of regaining the past (Bruner, 1987) conciliation takes important role due to its very nature: ‘conciliation stipulates the possibility of establishing a new reality (that constitutes its prospective nature) being a space of coexistence of axio-normative systems which heretofore were in opposition’ (Wróblewska Trochimiuk, 2017, 68).

The first step of the project was a three day conference in 2009, gathering almost hundred people from the whole region interested in Yugoslavia and making the Museum space for mediating knowledge about Yugoslavia in a regional sense marking in that way the project path.

---

166 Funded by Balkan Trust for Democracy, and exhibition by Ministry of Culture of Serbia.
which should be crowded with meetings, evaluations, debates, propositions, considering and containing multiple perspectives, voices and texts (Panić, 2017, 42).

The main topics considered musealization, methodology, conceptualization and practical realization in representing Yugoslavia, Kingdom, Socialist Federal Yugoslavia and its emanations after conflict of the ‘90s. The aim represented a broader theme for the institution, which was dealing with the Socialist Yugoslavia and Tito’s life at first (bearing in mind that collection is made from the collection of Tito’s museum and Museum of Revolution). Considering the mentioned fact, creating of the new permanent display was the question of making the new collection, which would cover the period of the Yugoslav state and Yugoslav idea, before the Socialist Yugoslavia, also dissolution of Federal state in the ‘90s, and in post Yugoslav period (Panić, 2017, 33).

The conference opened a lot of important questions, mapping the possible solutions and answers, but did not give the final conclusions about a permanent exhibition concept. That concept appeared for the first time in exhibition Yugoslavia from the beginning to the end, and, even by the plan, became immediately the subject of controversy.

The most discussed exhibition in a history of museums in Serbia, and a pilot project, was not just that – it was a turning point in the process of creating the permanent exhibition. Before it was opened, in 2012, the management of the museum changed. Katarina Živković left the position and the new director faced the new challenges ahead. The exhibition was evaluated, with the numerous discussions in and out of the institutions, but not in a way that was planned. The evaluation and discussions never took place that was expected for this step, as an important one for gaining new narratives and making a permanent exhibition (Gnjatović, 2014, 87).

The opening text, together with others in the catalogue, which were suggesting the openness of the exhibition (Duda, 2013, 72) did not really succeed in communicating this message nor input it directly in the project New Old Museum. Further, the structure of the exhibition itself – panels that could move, rows of paper and shapes which were suggesting an open structure with the possibility of adding or changing where overwhelmed with the detailed text on the canvases, that projected a different message – there is nothing to be added here.

Due to the all artefacts in the shape of texts and documents, also due to the approach of the authors – scientists and researchers from the academic community – the exhibition figured as a completed project, with the big full stop at the end. In spite of the (rare) suggestions of some curators that the exhibition Yugoslavia from the beginning to the end (as a most concrete emanation
of the project New Old Museum) should be taken as a permanent exhibition, that was not the case (Panić, 2017).

They considered the strong effort of creating the different conceptions that was invested in the project pointing out the fact that it probably needs more time to show its results. The fact that the exhibition was a part of the project New Old Museum, as a pilot exhibition project faded, and those two are today perceived as completely separate projects. The New Old Museum still represents the first attempts within the transformation process, strongly connected with the latest ones, in a direction of finishing the permanent display (and open by the plan – in 2020).

An on-line platform for commenting, open meetings for working teams, some debates and panels were not realized nor held due to a change in management and a lack of funds. The project of creating a permanent exhibition was almost stopped after the exhibition. Continuation after the exhibition and the second phase was named Laboratorium [Laboratory].

A first attempt to create the permanent exhibition emanated in Yugoslavia from the Beginning to the End was an effort of historians to agree on regional (international level) without valorizing, without giving the final conclusion nor an image, insisting on an objective perspective and objective presentation of selected points. Academics were authors of the text, who never worked in the museum before, and for many of them this was the first time to collaborate on the project that insisted on an open narrative and multi-perspectives of the museum’s environment. Program of the project was developed and planned in a direction of collecting opinions, testimonials, comments, and suggestions from the audience and evaluating them to find a solution for a permanent exhibition (Panić, 2017, 31).

That method was challenging for the academics as authors of the texts, also curators as guides, and Museum as an institution that gave authority to the narrative of the exhibition. Comments were numerous, that the audience was huge, and many of the visitors, experts or not, did not recognize ‘their country’ or the Yugoslavia they used to know, in the exhibition (Duda, 2013). The distance that authors took, skipping all the area that may have different interpretations among experts from the different former Yugoslav states, or cause conflicts among them, all the moments that were not approved by the agreed consensus and also the personal experiences, caused a lot of negative comments from the same sources – experts and audience (Panić, 2017, 34).

Therefore, the insistence on ‘being consensual’ came under question – due to the images that appeared at the exhibition. Yugoslavia was an experiment, with a huge risk and a shadow side,
of the same beginning – destined to fail. The fact that the authors insisted on a continued process with an open ending came to a full stop, and a word ‘end’ in a title, making from the exhibition an experiment, in the context of New Old Museum and preparation of the new permanent display – destined to fail. The most rewarding element of this experiment were the questions that curators and authors raised – not just those in questionnaires, or those during debates and meetings, also the questions about Museum as an institution, about its transformation, meaning making, old and new, roles, functions, and existence of the Museum in contemporary institutions context.

The exhibition Yugoslavia from the Beginning to the End, evaluated by the audience as the highly successful and among everything objective so from which realized its main goal, was just a step forward (Panić, 2017, 34). It was also a step forward toward a new interrogative museum (Krap, 2014) at least partly bypassing the legacy of a traditional museum which was the narrative and meaning maker and giver of the official, monolith narrative representing objective and historical ‘truth’. The whole project New Old Museum represented something completely different then that a project hitting towards a new, modern conception of critical museum (Piotrowski, 2011).

At the start, the project aimed to include experts from the all former states which was impossible due to the lack of finances, and also the regional cooperation was not easy – the connections among official institutions had not been (re)established yet. The Ministry of Culture did not provide the necessary financial support considering the new program of the Museum. Employees of the Museum were in the positions to guessing what would be the best for their community, giving the priority to official narrative of the authorities in Serbia (even though something like that does not exists) among perspective to other states, by also bringing in the same time interpretation based on the scientific research that was free from the social or political influence.

That was significant for the fact how museum perceive itself, and how to concept future plans, even unaware of the Scheherazade strategy, as Višnja Kisić explains (Kisić, 2016, 226), telling the peace by peace of the story, since the entire story could mean end of the process and death of the institutions. That is supported by the narrative of the project, exhibition, and declarations about the new display which was changed several times until 2015, planned first for the 2017, and then 2020, bringing the imaginary of the Laboratorium167 as a space of constant
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167 ‘We continue to create the permanent display with transformation of the Open Storage Room into a kind of a museum laboratory – a field of research, experiments and creativity, the environment where Yugoslav heritage and the very institution of the Museum will be reflected upon. The activity we begin this stage with is a presentation of the Museum fund created after 1996. Afterwards, we turn to mapping of specific and/or authentic phenomena that
preparation. The numerous questions became *modus vivendi*, mostly about preparing the new display.

*The New Old Museum* project made a path for the second phase in transformation – with the new customs, awareness, feedbacks, intentions, incorporated processes from NGO dynamics, alternatives. It also gave a conclusion regarding a display of the ‘whole story’ about Yugoslavia and its history, making it less important, less desirable and less productive which led to the final conclusion and change of the name of Museum of Yugoslav History to Museum of Yugoslavia (in 2016) releasing the institution from the historical narrative.

The name of the Museum was changed on its 20th year jubilee in 2016, after evaluation of the project *New Old Museum* as the first phase of creating the new permanent display, when it was obvious that the Museum deals with the larger spectrum of themes connected with Yugoslavia (the official reason why the name is changed). Until the beginning of the second phase of creating a permanent display called *Laboratory of the Museum of Yugoslavia* (05/04/2017-12/01/2019) the Museum realized conceptual and thematic exhibitions like it was already custom (after 2007, when Museum started with its dynamical work).

With the first phase of work on permanent display, in the frame of the project *New Old Museum*, opened the storage, bringing out the content of the collection, facing the dichotomy within, caused by a different origin of the artefact, being collected in two connected but still divided institutions (from their emerging in 1959 until 1996). The space of an Old Museum was already transformed in the first phase, bringing together the collections in the second, and possibility of changes further on, to experiment and represent the field of creative engagement of the curators and audience, together with scientists, researchers, domestic and foreign tourists.

The second stage brought a lever of the platform already made in the first stage – museum as a space of dialog, open for interactive concepts, as a space where the process is in the core narrative, and where the permanent display emerges from the cooperation between different and similar institutions, regional cooperation and debate with the visitors, on the theme of Yugoslavia and Yugoslav legacy. The Laboratory of the Museum is accompanied with the different

were generated by the existence of a Yugoslav state, presenting them in the form of themes in the exhibition space that lies before you.’ (Quotation from the official site, link in Bibliography, online sources).

168 As it is described on the official Museum site, the Museum ‘continues to create the permanent display with transformation of the Open Storage Room into a kind of a museum laboratory – a field of research, experiments and creativity, the environment where Yugoslav heritage and the very institution of the Museum will be reflected upon. The activity we begin this stage with is a presentation of the Museum fund created after 1996. Afterwards, we turn to mapping of specific and/or authentic phenomena that were generated by the existence of a Yugoslav state, presenting them in the form of themes in the exhibition space that lies before you.’ (official site, in Bibliography).
programs and exhibitions, debates and workshops (like it was the case with the New Old Museum, some workshops are conceptualized for the youngies, so the children can be active part of the creative process\textsuperscript{169}).

The third phase should conclude in 2020, with the opening exhibition – and announcement of the new permanent display, with the postponing of the several years. It is obvious that the concept of the second phase is a wise interpretation of the innovative methods that the project New Old Museum brought to the institution. Opening of the storage, maintaining and making connections and cooperation, insisting on discussion in and out of the institution, imperative for the team work, and popularization of the collection content, role of the Museum, and Museum as a space and place of everyday social life which was accentuated in the program Summer in Museum.

\textit{We are All Exhibition}\textsuperscript{170} – Museum Nowadays towards Popularization of Yugoslav Legacy or Popular Museum

Since the experiences and changes that the project New Old Museum brought into the institution dynamics, the Museum started to open towards participation and cooperation in academic environment that was open for the audience, discussing Yugoslav legacy and getting large attention.

A good example was the conference \textit{Konferencija Muzealizacija Jugoslavije – zamrzavanje ili aktivno pregovaranje zajedničkog nasleđa [Musealization of Yugoslavia – Freezing or Active Negotiation of the Common Legacy]} (beginning of December in 2018) that took

\textsuperscript{169} Interesting title of the article, Museum laboratorium, children discovering the world through the Tito's gifts! Muzejska laboratorija-deca otkrivaju svet kroz Titove poklone. Activities in Museums, following the exhibitions, interpreting collection, or discussing Yugoslav legacy, aim to place the inheritance of the past into the ‘now’, to connect past and present (with the future?) (on line source, in Bibliography).

\textsuperscript{170} ‘In the middle of December, I was visiting the exhibition Participatory Art / Participativna umetnost of the author Kristina Sedlarević in Galerry Remont. Curating meant not just discussion between artists (artpiece) and audience about society, it meant also discussion with the society. Galerija of Matica srpska enabled different perspective on the reality of museums with the project Youngs are choosing/Mladi biraju. Museum of Yugoslavia invited all of us to be ‘exhibition’ in Project Yugoslavia. So the question is not if we (museums, T.V) want to (re)define. The question is if we want to ‘with eyes and heart wide open’ be also seen like that.’ (Krstović, 2019, 3). Translation TV

place in the venue called Belgrade Youth Center\textsuperscript{171}, in a first three days of December, on a great jubilee – 100 years from the establishing of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (known also as First Yugoslavia) in organization of the Museum of Yugoslavia and non-governmental organization Kiosk – platform for contemporary art\textsuperscript{172}.

According to the program of the conference, lectures and discussions were dedicated to the research of the various conditions of Yugoslav legacy, also the potential of ideas and values which that legacy has in the present moment. Also, a meaning it could own in the future, but at the end the discussion was much wider.

Organizers attempted and succeeded to raise following questions: Is the past of Yugoslavia already a matter of the museums and archival institutions? Is it packed in historical texts, debates, discussions, artefacts, documents, memories? Can we consider Yugoslavia as a finished project in a linear passing of a time which is already behind us or yet as a political and cultural space always in the move and always in emerging? Does and how the common legacy can help us to understand what is going on nowadays, to understand the crisis of the contemporary world? Is it possible, in the example of Yugoslavia, as the multinational, multiconfessional state with its authentic path to socialism, and it’s dissolution, almost three decades ago, to think about possible solutions for nowadays challenges?\textsuperscript{173}

\textsuperscript{171} Belgrade Youth Center (Dom omladine Beograda; DOB) is a cultural center in Belgrade. DOB organizes numerous programs in the area of contemporary art and culture, as well as educational-debate programs, around a thousand different programs per year. It aims to encompass all art forms, prose, poetry, music, theatre, film, visual arts, new media and others. The Center was founded in 1964, under the auspices of the Secretariat of Culture of the Assembly of the City of Belgrade. The Assembly provides the main funds for the center Belgrade Youth Center functions as a platform for promoting new artists, ideas and initiatives. Additionally, Belgrade Youth Center is a meeting point for domestic and foreign artists. DOB is a member of local, regional and international cultural networks. (\textit{Dom omladine}, online source, Bibliography).

\textsuperscript{172} Kiosk – Platform for contemporary art is a non-governmental, non-profit organization working in the fields of arts and culture. Kiosk facilitates and supports cooperation between artists and cultural operators from all fields of contemporary art. It believes innovative artistic activities foster openness and provides better understanding of the social and political difficulties underlying modern society. It believes innovative artistic activities foster openness and provides better understanding of the social and political difficulties underlying modern society. With this aim in mind, Kiosk creates exhibitions, publications and research projects that generate understanding about social problems, the theory and practice of contemporary art, and the role of art in mainstream culture. Since 2002, Kiosk has collaborated with artists, cultural operators and the general public to create large-scale participatory projects and new networks that foster dialogue between ethnic and national divides. Kiosk is a co-founder of the Association of the Independent Cultural Scene of Serbia and the regional platform for culture Kooperativa. (Kiosk, online source, Bibliography).

\textsuperscript{173} Problems represented in program and plan of the conference in Serbian, ‘Tokom dva dana, u okviru različitih panela, zajedno sa sagovornicima i publikom otvorilićemo neka od sledećih pitanja, da li je prošlost Jugoslavije već istorijski obrađena i pohranjena u muzejima i arhivima? Da li je sadržana u istorijskim tekstovima, raspravama, predmetima mnogobrojnih kolekcija, sećanjima? Da li je možemo razumeti kao završeni period u linearnom protoku vremena koji je iza nasi li pak kao politički i kulturni predeo koji je uvek u pokretu i uvek u nastajanju? Da li nam to zajedničko naslede može pomoći da razumemo neke od kriza kroz koje svet prolazi? Da li na primeru multinacionalne, multikonfesionalne zemlje sa sopstvenim putem u socijalizam, koja se rasprala pre gotovo tri decenije, možemo razmišljati o mogućim rešenjima sadašnjih izazova?’
The first day was dedicated to the lecture *Konfiskacija kulture* [*The Confiscation of the Culture*] and panels *Pro et contra*, then a panel titled *Jugoslavija danas* [*Yugoslavia Today*]. The last panel of the first day was dedicated to the *Projekat Jugoslavija* [*Project Yugoslavia*] (Platforma za savremenu umetnost KIOSK / Contemporary Art Platform KIOSK). This was an important project created in an environment of unofficial institutions, but developed in a way to be an important part of the Musealization of Yugoslavia process.

*Project Yugoslavia* is created through the collaboration of the Museum of Yugoslavia and Kiosk platform for contemporary art, within the working process on the Museum’s permanent display, which is multi-perspective and trans-disciplinary. The project represented a large shift towards the performative exhibition and participatory museum in which the audience (in the same time participants) give meaning to the ‘artworks’ (exhibited objects) through their own interpretation, without which exhibition would not exist at all (it is not just added interpretation on the curator’s one, or discussing of the suggested or assumed concept, it is imposing the meaning on the content of the exhibition) with that kind of structure, ‘exhibition becomes an open work’ (Wróblewska-Trochimiuk, 2019, 47).

This project involved 100 participants, people of different ages and backgrounds from the region of the former Yugoslavia. It contains video interviews, with ‘answers’ associated with the important subject referring to the Yugoslav state. Every participant received a card with a description of an object from the Museum’s collection. Participants interpreted text on the card, through their perspective, motivated by their own experience or other context available to them.

175 *The Confiscation of the culture* (Dubravka Ugrešić, writer) and panels *Pro et contra*, with participants, moderator dr Tvrko Jakovina (Faculty of Humanities and Social Science, Zagreb) speaker, dr. Ljubinka Trgovčević, Dr. Dragan Markovina (Center for the Study of Democracy and Human Rights, Zagreb), dr. Husmija Kamberović (University of Sarajevo), dr. Milan St. Protić. Then panel titled *Yugoslavia Today* with a moderator dr. Tanja Petrović (Institute for Cultural Studies and memories SRC SASA, Ljubljana) with a speakers dr. Olga Manojlović Pintar (Institute for Recent History of Serbia, Belgrade), r. Jernej Mlekuž (Slovenian Institute for Migration, SRC SASA, Ljubljana), Ana Dević (WHW, Zagreb), Vladimir Arsenijević (Crocodile/Krokodil, Belgrade) and for the end of the first day Project *Yugoslavia* (Contemporary Art Platform KIOSK) with moderator, Stevan Vuković, curator and art theorist, Belgrade, with speakers: Ana Adamović, artist (Kiosk, Belgrade), Milica Pekić, art historian (Kiosk, Belgrade), dr. Mitja Velikonja, culturologist (University of Ljubljana), Iskra Geshoska, cultural worker (counterpoint, Skopje).

175 ‘Is the Yugoslav past already musealized, historicized and stored in the archives? Is it inscribed in historical essays, debates, artifacts of various collections, in memories? Do we understand it from the perspective of a linear timeline, as a completed period that is behind us, or as a cultural category that is ‘all around us, equally ahead and behind us’ as suggested by philosopher Boris Buden. Can that past offer us any explanation about the present moment? Can it help us to understand the crisis which exists in the world today? For example, the constant messages about the European Union being on the verge of collapse since it is daily facing disruptions and challenges. Can we use the example of the multinational, multi-confessional state that disintegrated 25 years ago as a starting point in rethinking the alternatives for this present moment in which we live? This project starts from the assumption that the past is not a set of dead facts and completed events, exploring the potential of different ideas that had constituted the concept of Yugoslavia in the contemporary period as well as in the future.’ Text in program and description of the Project Yugoslavia available on following site (About *Project Yugoslavia*, online source Bibliography).
So, the Museum collection was translated through their personal experience, which gave additional meaning to the collection. Those interpretations were displayed in the frame of video installations in Serbian, Croatian or Slovenian languages with the English subtitles.

Every visitor could identify with the participants, comment and share their own opinion about the concept of the exhibition and exhibited ‘artworks’. The given notions were from the different areas of culture, art, and sociopolitical life, from various periods in Yugoslav history, monuments, events, objects, gifts to President Tito, popular culture items, organizations, famous cooperation, plaquette, albums, drawings, photographs, orders. The items were chosen to fulfill a didactic role, and organized in thematic circles, discovering the core notions of Yugoslav legacy in the Museum, such as Antifascism, Yugoslav heritage, Yugoslavism, Art and Authority, Brotherhood and Unity, Economic models, Foreign policy, Gift, Modernizations, Nationalism, Yugoslav Heritage.

As Ewa Wróblewska-Trochimiuk stated about another exhibition dedicated to the period of socialism and various kinds of artefacts in its display:

The combination of the different kinds of artefacts originating from all possible layers of culture also had another function, it united the fragmentary world preserved not in the official, but rather in private memory, into a continuous image explaining reality. Furthermore, the exhibition that had been developed in this way presented modernity as an idea realized on many planes of social life, whereas the socialist culture – as a total project encompassing all areas of human life (Wróblewska-Trochimiuk, 2019, 45).

This was the missing element in a project New Old Museum – information and sometimes whole story, given from the personal (rather emotional) experience of the people who used to live in Yugoslavia. Also, from the people who have vivid remembrance of the life in Yugoslav state (maybe even post Yugoslav period, but in connection with Yugoslav state).

According to the evaluation of the project Yugoslavia, live comments and personal experience were the missing link from the traditional historian approach to Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav legacy (emanated in the exhibition Yugoslavia from the Beginning to the End) to the conference Muzealizacija Jugoslavije [Musealization of Yugoslavia] with the meeting of different approaches and methodology of research. Joined together, personal experience and different narratives about Yugoslavia, with the open space for discussion, led to the programs such as Leto u muzeju [Summer in Museum] dedicated to the citizens, building of audience, and finishing of permanent collection.
The second day began with reviewing case studies of Museum of Contemporary History of Slovenia, then of the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and case of the Museum of Yugoslavia, forming the first panel *Jugoslavija u Muzeju* [*Yugoslavia in the Museum*]. The second one was dedicated to the amateur praxis of collecting, preserving and interpreting of the Yugoslav legacy and the last one to the future– *Muzealizacija Jugoslavije, postkapitalistička prošlost za neizvesnu budućnost?* [*Musealization of Yugoslavia, Postcapitalist Past for the Uncertain Future?*].

Together with the Project *Yugoslavia*, conference *Musealization of Yugoslavia* was a continuation of the project *New Old Museums*, and one more step towards the participatory model of the new museum.

The project of creating a permanent exhibition emanated in *Otvaramo depo* [*The Store Room Opens*] and brought the dialog of the two collections, one from Memorial Center of Josip Broz Tito, and the second one from Museum of the Revolution of Yugoslav People and Ethnic Minorities, positioned towards each other. Both ‘lines’ could be interpreted as traditional chronological exhibitions, but the structure and effect of the storehouse with the accumulation of the artefacts in one long hole, and the contrast between them, without one unique concept of narrative, to encourage the audience to participate in creating the exhibition story. Informed space of contrast, dialog, and meeting, the possibilities of various narratives emerging and different new interpretations, are rooted also, both for the audience and for the researchers (Ziębińska-Witek, 2018).

The second phase of the work on new permanent exhibition, started in 2017, was marked by the project Laboratory of the Museum of Yugoslavia, a specific experiment characterized by two collections facing together for the first time, the collection from the Memorial Center with the collection from Museum of Revolution, bringing the interesting contrast and opening the space for endless potential of dialog, or causing the feeling of confusion, impression of discrepancy, dichotomy, fragmentation and chaos in part of the audience not well informed about identity and narrative of the museum.

The second phase brought the concept of the future permanent exhibition focused on the 10 phenomena as a framework for understanding of all phases of the existence of Yugoslav
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176 Moderator, Tatimir Toroman (Museum of Yugoslavia, Belgrade) Speakers, Žarko Gvero Gera (Associations of memories youth work actions Serbia, Belgrade) Mario Milaković (Yugodom Belgrade) Milenko Petković (Jugoizvuk, Belgrade) Nebojša Jakovljević (History of Yugoslav football, Subotica) (dr Rasto Močnik, Faculty for media and communication, University of Singidunum, Belgrade).
heritage (from the appearance of the Yugoslav idea, through the age of the Kingdom and the Socialist Yugoslavia, until its disintegration and Yugonostalgia). This concept is a reminder of the *Sequences* and solution that Museum of Contemporary Art invented to represent its fund and accentuate the diversity of the Yugoslav heritage, and also to save the continuity but address obvious and well present discontinuity in an interpretation of Yugoslav narrative and heritage.

In 2018, Museum started the program *Leto u muzeju* [*Summer in Museum*] with the aim to attract an audience which is not often in attendance at the museum – on the first place, younger people and teenagers. The program continued in 2019, with the same goal and a similar program, concerts, promotions, and celebrations of important dates (connected with museum identity and narrative, *Birthday of President Tito, 25th May*) panels and debates (festival *Krokodil*).

Events took place on the plato in front of the museum pavilion 25th May, where there is a large fountain with a concrete structure around it, like an amphitheater (where the audience could sit). The aim of the museum management was to popularize museums as a place to visit regularly, and through popular social and artistic events to popularize the museum collection. The visuals were attractive, modern and popular, still evoking the design of the posters from the period of the '70s and '80s in Yugoslavia (fig. 37).

![Figure 37. Visual solution as promotion of the Summer in Museum / Leto u MuzeYU events, 2018](http://www.seecult.org/ves/leto-u-muzeju-jugoslavije-od-25-maja)

In 2019, the museum organized an event named *YU-Piknik* [*YU-Picnic*]. Collaborating with the popular club, brewery, and restaurant from the city, the Museum held a picnic event, which raised its popularity and attracted many young people not often drawn to the museum space.
However, the comments among stuff in museum were different – opinions were divided, and some of the curators shared the attitude that a picnic was not a proper event for the museum space, not even outdoor, and not even in purpose of promotion – which will end up in the wrong direction having nothing in common with the promotion of the narrative and collection of the museum\textsuperscript{177}.

It is under question if \textit{Summer in Museum} is a promotion of the collection and museum program, bearing in mind that there are no common denominators between collection and program, except the fact that program uses the modernist esthetics, YU emblems, has retro concept and integrates different waves in hip culture. The collection was not a subject or object of the program \textit{Summer in Museum}. But, on the other hand a large number of visitors attended the museum circle for the first time, thanks to the \textit{Summer in Museum} event. The museum buildings are not in the city center, and popularization of the map of the museum buildings makes a huge progress towards popularization and marketing. The audience of the \textit{Summer in Museum} could possibly become a museum audience one day.\textsuperscript{178}

The popularization of the Yugoslav heritage (programs like \textit{Summer in Museum}) obviously engaged in a new program of the Museum of Yugoslavia, could also represent another way for misinterpretation, limitation, and marginalization of Yugoslav legacy. Similar to Yugonostalgia, as a phenomenon described in post Yugoslav period, which often serves for making the attempts of (re)gaining Yugoslav legacy similar to sentimentalism, and by that discrimination of the legitimate attempt for reconsidering and owning the Yugoslav legacy as a valuable heritage, ‘popularization’ of the Yugoslav culture in sense of making pop culture, is one way more for misuse and misinterpretation of the past (Petrović, 2013, 39).

Still, the Museum of Yugoslavia, as well as the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade, migrates towards the new conception of museums, for example critical museum (Piotrowski, 2011) offering one or many (possible) readings of the collection (exhibition) but numerous opportunities for different new readings to arise. Further, the museum would offer meanings and contexts, creating the plurality of narratives as the one more characteristic of the new modern and open

\textsuperscript{177} The assumptions and opinions collected during my research in Museum of Yugoslavia in interviews and informal talks with the curators and other members of the Museum’s team, also with the visitors.

\textsuperscript{178} All the described exhibitions (projects) New Old Museum/ Novi stari muzej (as an example of the beginning of the transformation from the old model towards new model(s) from the nostalgic institution towards modern critical museum) Project Yugoslavia/ Projekat Jugoslavija (as an example of the participatory exhibition and performativity taking place and important role in the dynamic of the museum) and Summer in Museum/ Leto u Muzeju (as an example of the popularization of the Yugoslav legacy in museum, and ambivalence it brings within) will be wider and further analyzed in my next work dedicated to the subject of model transformation in Museum of Yugoslavia, and through that perspective understanding (and interpretation?) of Yugoslav legacy in this institution.
museum (Preziosi, 1999) with no intention of giving a closed and finished narrative structure as a core of exhibition (leaving the traditional position of power and control).

That kind of change of authority interpretation changed the dynamics during the project New Old Museum and continued to be present and developed in the Museum. Not just in the second phase, it also appeared in two more important segments of the Museums’ functioning – the research and presenting of the results in academic and scientific programs (Conference The Musealization of Yugoslavia, 2018) and popularization of the Museum as the institution.

Working on popularization as a way of building Museum audiences, made an institution present in everyday life of the citizens, offering a different program, creating space for socialization and education, promoting the content of the museum (collection and narrative). It also promoted the research made in the Museum, a new perspective towards Yugoslavia and its legacy, and also, made it all visible to the large groups of people which were used to be engaged in cultural and city life. Partly, all events organized by the Museum of Yugoslavia had its promotion elements, aiming to build museum audience and to attract new visitors which makes Museum of Yugoslavia exceptional in comparison with other official institutions.
IV YUGOSLAVIA IN ALTERNATIVE INSTITUTIONS

4.1 ALTERNATIVE INSTITUTIONS, CULTURE OF PROTEST AND BOTTOM-UP TRANSFORMATION

Taking in concern that there is no unanimity about what institutions are (Hodgson, 2006), in spite of the large use of this term in last few decades (from economical science to humanistic science, while in social science term is present for a long time), the following definition (description) of the alternative institutions represent the amalgam of the opinions and interpretation, as well as illustrations through particular examples (mentioned further in text).

Douglass C. North (1990) defines institutions as ‘humanly devised constraints that structure human interactions. They are made up of formal constraints (rules, laws, constitutions), informal constraints (norms of behavior, convention, and self-imposed codes of conduct), and their enforcement characteristics.’ From North’s theory emanates the conclusion that formal rules are created by polity, while informal ones are matters of legacy that we identify as culture.179

The distinction of formal and informal institutions which often appears in literature, appears as a distinction between legal and structured institutions (official, organizations) and ‘spontaneous’ institutions that describe and define human behavior (culture) (Hodgson, 2006). In spite of distinction, the correlation between rules and regulations emerged from customs, values and habits, and official institutions must be considered (vice versa, also). Being defined in a vague and different way, the notion of institution is like the notion of culture, blurry identified, with no clear consensus and straightforward definition (Alessina, Giuliano, 2015).

179 ‘Many writers attempt distinctions between ‘formal’ or ‘informal’ institutions or rules. However, these terms have been used misleadingly and in different ways. Does the term formal mean legal, written, explicit, codifiable, or something else? The ambiguities surrounding these terms mean that they cannot be taken for granted. One is required to specify more clearly what is meant in each case or use more transparent terms such as legal, non-legal, and explicit instead. Generally, the idea that there is a dividing line between institutions that are entirely ‘formal’ on one hand and entirely ‘informal’ institutions on the other is false, because ‘formal’ institutions (in any of the above senses) always depend on non-legal rules and inexplicit norms in order to operate. If laws or declarations are neither customary nor embodied in individual dispositions, then ‘formal’ or not - they have insignificant effects. They are mere declarations or proclamations, rather than effective social rules. Some declarations simply codify existing customs. Other proclamations may eventually become effective rules but only through additional powers, such as persuasion, legitimization, or enforcement. To put it differently, legal or ‘formal’ institutions that do not have strong ‘informal’ supports are unsupported legislative declarations rather than real institutions. This does not mean that legal rules are unimportant but that they become important by becoming incorporated in custom and habit.’ (Hodgson, 2006,18).
The possibility of identifying informal institution as culture itself (Alessina, Giuliano, 2015), which then causes mutual influence between formal and informal institution, helped me choose the term ‘alternative institutions’ (not to make confusion using the term ‘informal institutions’) to describe phenomenon of other structure of (cultural) institutions, which emerged parallel to official ones. Culture is a background, context, larger and wider space, and at the same time, a part of formal and alternative institutions (even though alternative ones are closer to culture, while official ones are closer to politics and governing structures). Alternative institutions are, in most of the cases, nonofficial (nongovernmental), independent organizations, developed in the state of economical, sociopolitical, environmental or some other crises (bottom-up organizations). The notion of alternative institutions is strongly connected with social change – civic resistance, moment of crisis, post-conflict space and time (Metcalf, 2015).

The notion is undefined, and rarely mentioned, it is descriptive – but undescribed, even in the field of commons and alternatives, which relates the most. Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines alternative (among other meanings) as different from the usual or conventional – existing or functioning outside the established cultural, social, or economic system, then - something which can be chosen instead, with offered synonyms such as choice, discretion, druthers, election, liberty, option, pick (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 1984). The alternative institution is the second choice compared to official institution, and if we are talking about institutions of culture and art, sometimes they are related to the alternative art, but mostly to the civic initiatives and NGO (nongovernmental organizations) structures (Dragićević Šešić, 2018).

Also, between terms nonofficial, bottom-up institutions, independent and alternative institutions, which are synonyms, or at least strongly related, I have found the term alternative institution as the most descriptive, most appropriate for the difference between governmental and civic sector during transition in Serbia (end of 20th and first decades of 21st century).

Even though all the mentioned terms are applicable for the phenomenon, notion and its representation, alternative institution represents the whole network of different organizations as one (bottom-up) developed structure, alternative structure to diminished official institutions of culture and art.

At the same time, I will use this notion to mark the distinction between alternative art and alternative institution, bearing in mind that, in this certain context, it is really important not to consider the alternative institutions as a place for producing and displaying alternative art (at least not just alternative art), even though the culture of protest is important for both.
In Serbia, during socio-political transformation, alternative institutions (by their narratives and status - non-governmental organizations and initiatives) emerged from the need of an institutional system to fulfill the void that appeared with closing up of the official institutions (Museum of Contemporary Art, National Museum, which lasted more than ten years). Following the fact that every system is a vital organism trying to survive, alternative institutions emerged from the civic initiatives instead of the governmental (like top-down institutions).

They are marked by that process as a bottom up institution (Easterly, 2008; Harper, 2018) and characterized by the high level of spontaneously developed rules and regulations, also narratives, in the particular case of institutions in Serbia. Alternative ones were colored by esthetics of protest, due to the prolonged transformation, permanent crisis and obvious neglect of the art and culture field by authorities. Emerging and developing alternative culture institutions in Serbia, started with new waves and interpretations of art and culture in Yugoslavia in the 80s.

It was a period of alternative art movement, artists and groups (Dragićević-Šešić, 1992). During the 60s, the 70s and the 80s (the 80s as the last decade of Social Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, several years before its dissolution) alternative art constituted itself in Yugoslav artistic space as a contra-culture and subculture (Warner, 2002).

It was parallel discourse, space for all suppressed narratives and culture groups to show up, forming counter-public (Fraser, 1990,67) and creating the foundation for alternative (non-official) institutions to emerge (Dragićević Šešić, 1992). During the tremendous crisis in the 90s, alternative art took the aesthetics and ethics of bunt and protest, which alternative institutions kept until nowadays (in a year 2020).

From the beginning, new, alternative tendencies in art and culture were showing and anticipating the huge changes in every segment of social, political and cultural life (Gržinić, 2005).

---

180 After the dissolution of Yugoslavia, the official cultural institutions in Serbia, as the space and network for creating (new) identity, should have transformed its core narratives according to new circumstances in the 90s. In the same time, they should have followed the official policy of the governing structures, which was the only way to gain approval and modest support, and to follow the continuity which emerged from the core narrative of the institution itself, art and cultural process. That discrepancy caused confusion, fragmentation in core narrative, disfunction and crisis. Discontinuity is accentuated also due to the often change of a management structure, sometimes dramatic and abrupt ones, and long, postponed restorations of the main buildings, like in case of the National Museum or Museum of Contemporary Art (ten and more years).
Milena Dragićević Šešić in the book *Umetnost i alternativa*, [Art and Alternative, 1992], wrote about the period of engaged and alternative art in the 80s, which was oriented towards ‘national awakening’ and aimed to make the distance from communism and Yugoslavism (it was an answer to official culture and art policy in Yugoslavia, towards censorship of social realism).

On the contrary, engaged and alternative movements in culture and art in the 90s, were oriented towards preserving Yugoslav artistic and cultural space, protesting against dissolution and war conflicts (Dragićević Šešić, 2018). In that period, the period of dissolution of Yugoslavia and war conflicts, alternative movements, arts, creating the whole ‘culture of protest’, started to evolve in organizations, and in time, in cultural institutions (especially after 2000, when the second phase of the transition process started).

The alternative institution (cultural centers, civic initiatives, art groups, squats) at the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century in Serbia, in time of Yugoslavia dissolution and sociopolitical transformation, should be described also as a structure which emerged (simultaneously) with the collapse of official cultural institutions (Bolčić, 2013).

The official institutions collapsed due to fragmented core narrative (internal structure) caused by dissolution of Yugoslavia and bloody war among states, and therefore marginalized and forbidden Yugoslav narrative. Years of crisis, war conflict and embargo, caused discontinuity, marginalization of Yugoslav legacy, corruption and blocked transformation, and at the end cultural trauma.

Lack of finances, marginalization of cultural manifestations and prioritizing of other areas in social and political life, which were made, all together, through absence of cultural strategy and policy, were ever present in institutional and governing system (Dvornik, 2009; Dragićević Šešić, 2018).

That durable absence of sources – lack of finances together with the chronic lack of official cultural policy and applicable strategy – became, problem number one in the field of culture and art (since blocked transition in 1991 and war conflicts, until 2020, for almost 30 years). The context was non–existent of an official consensus (among authorities) about important questions, among which - legacy of Yugoslavia. Representing the structure in theory and practice equivalent to

---

181 ‘Cultural trauma occurs when members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways’ (Alexander, 2004,1).
official institutions network, alternative institutions are proving the possibility to create bottom-up cultural institutions, especially in turbulent times.

Arguing the spontaneous approach to the process of regaining the past, alternative institutions are closer to create safe space for finding the consensus and common ground in the reconciliation process. Due to cultural trauma (Alexander, 2004, 1), caused by the war conflict in the 90s, finding (and creating) continuity in narratives about past, was, and still (in 2020) is, a tremendously hard task. Forming civic organizations as an opposition to the regime of Slobodan Milošević was an important fact in their development (Pavlović, 1995).

Following the period of the 70s and the 80s with institutions being a space of freedom, in the 90s, with the sociopolitical change and regime of Slobodan Milošević, they became controlled and programmed places, left behind by experts, managers and workers, that did not want to support the policy of Slobodan Milošević and with that – the rise of nationalism, war conflict and ultimately the dissolution of Yugoslavia (Dvornik, 2009).

In 1993, a protest appeal against public service RTS (RadioTelevisionSerbia) was signed by 200 intellectuals and artists, anticipating the beginning of gathering and engaging in protest against political and economic situations in the 90s. That was the beginning of engaged alternative (independent) art scene, which will evolve in independent organizations and cultural centers (Center for Cultural Decontamination, REX, festivals like FIAT) (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 108).

And after the tremendous period of crisis in the 90s, during the second phase of transition after 2000, cultural centers, alternative space and independent organizations, established in the ‘90s, will evolve into alternative institutions. Alternative art from the 80s, art of protest and bunt, which was picking different scenes in the city, street, squares, public transport during the 90s, after 2000, took place in cultural centers and organizations that emerged in the previous period, but transformed into alternative institutions after 1995.

The big difference was lying in the fact that, during the 90s, independent cultural organizations were in a strong opposition to official one, while after 2000 (period of democratic changes in institutions), independent cultural scene started to look for financial support from official institutions, becoming in that way part of institutional network, but never reached proper status (Dragićević Šešić, 2018,65).

While the 90s were the period of ‘deetatization’, after 2000, with the first democratic changes made with new cultural policy in 1997, (Turudić, 2006) cultural institutions entered the new phase of transformation – democratic changes, new rules and regulations, based on imperative of cooperation between all three sectors – public sector (official institutions), private sector (nowadays called creative industry) and civic sector (unofficial, independent, alternative organizations and institutions). (Dragićević Šešić, Mikić, Jovičić; 2007).

In the period before the democratic change in 2000, the cultural policy did not contain clear programs nor defined priorities. Governing structures did not perceive culture as one of the priorities. (Turudić, 2006) After 2000, the main orientation was the cooperation between sectors (opening towards private and civic organizations, NGOs). Then, establishment of new authority structures (decision should be brought by the most prominent experts and institutions should guarantee the realization of those decisions) and revival of institutions (huge number of them were institutions dedicated to Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, but during the crisis in the 90s, this number was reduced) were among priorities.

The aim was forming and building new institutions, opening towards cooperation with foreign countries. Even more complex questions and tasks were included- such as a policy of remembrance, memory and reconciliation (this stood in a strong opposition with the policy of forgetting during the 90s). Also, a new policy of representing history and musealization took part in the cultural policy program. (Dragićević Šešić, Mikić, Jovičić; 2007, 285).

Speaking about cultural policy during the first democratic change (after 2000), its program and conception was wide. All the biggest tasks were marked - but realization was something completely different. Those spots stayed the most important ones (and the least realized) in the period of twenty years (2020). From the period of the first democratic government onward, several years brought important changes in the system of cultural institutions, mainly in the area of cultural policy. But the whole institutional system had more weaknesses that were not possible to surpass
in a short period, and after years of crisis, the institutional system in culture and art started to show first signs of collapse.183

After the Museum of Contemporary Art, and the National Museum were closed in 2007 (when the last state, as emanation of Yugoslavia, Serbia and Montenegro ceased to exist), it became obvious that the network of official institutions needs additional space and structure to fulfill the void.184 Unofficial organizations, independent cultural scene, by providing space and place, projects and events, cooperation in region, and with official institutions, emerged in alternative institutions.

That is how the imperative of making more space for cooperation between sectors, became reality. It was the surviving mode for the institutional system. The private sector was not developed enough and creative industries were taking the first steps in the cultural scene in Belgrade, while the civic sector already had developed and rich structure, ready to take the challenge of alternative institutions. With the change of status of the civic sector (even that was not ever formal) and close cooperation with public sector, the narratives which were slightly pushed into the shadow, came on the surface – need for cooperation between ‘former Yugoslav states, relation toward Yugoslav legacy, finances, funds, cooperation with the foreign organizations, independent and official, road

183 "The existing system of institutions, art organizations, together with a certain number of artists in Belgrade and Serbia, was formed and developed for the need of the entire former Yugoslav territory (Belgrade, as the capital city, was the center of artistic life). With the dissolution of Yugoslavia, cultural production (movies, books, newspapers, festivals etc.) lost its audience (ex-YU), readers and market. Cultural infrastructure was too large for maintaining and mostly devastated during the 90s. Since 2001, systematic investing started mainly in the repairing of infrastructure (technical basis) and that represented absolute priority for the cultural policy of Belgrade" (Dragićević Šešić, Mikić, Jovičić; 2007,298) Translation TV

184 During the 90s the main narrative was one, of and about victim nation (Assman, 2011, 87), which was partly continuation of the Kosovo Myth from the Middle Ages. The continuity was created by revival of the myths from the Middle Ages, about the chosen people (nebeski narod) that will rather risk survival than to accept domination of Ottoman Empire. (Dragićević Šešić, 2018) The discourse of socialist Yugoslavia, was highly forbidden (due to the war conflict in the 90s). Before Yugoslavia, there was the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, which was also inappropriate, so, the regime based its legitimacy on the story of the Middle Ages narratives, the Kosovo myth, the Royal family Nemanjići, especially Dušan and Lazar, ruler during the Kosovo battle. With anticommunist and nationalistic narratives, glorification of the past flourished. The cultural institutions were places for the exhibitions dedicated to those narratives, displaying mainly what was in accordance with regime tendency – patriotic relation towards past and present. Parallel with this big return to the ancient past, in official culture, the strong current of ‘Estrada’ (the container for fun) also represented escapist mode. Made from commercial and popular culture – a phenomenon called Estrada, contained a famous element of turbofolk. Estrada characterized the so-called popular and private sector in culture, connected with the private television and radio stations. As I already mentioned, the alternative, civic sector, occupied alternative space, streets, public spaces and a small number of cultural centers. Period after 2000 (unblocked transition) brought a certain change in narrative of official institutions. But the damage was already made. The discourse of Yugoslavia was still a taboo, the narrative was fragmented due to the war conflict and huge economic crisis which at the end brought culture into traumatized condition (Eyerman, 2019). In the next few years, official institutions made some changes in internal structure, but they were not the lasting ones.
to European Union and other, which were already rooted in civic organizations and important for their aims and survival, but marginalized or even skipped in acts of official institutions.

In the civic sector, due to its history and development, organizations were connected and oriented toward cooperation and common good. The unofficial institutions also got through the transformation since the democratic change in 2000, especially after the European Union, Council of Europe and European cultural foundation came to the region, when the new stage of transformation began.\(^{185}\)

The main values of unofficial institutions, which they brought into the state of being alternative to official institutions, beside cooperation and solidarity, are always connected with the phenomenon of social change. Unofficial cultural institutions were always advocates of social impact, bearing in mind social components of the art and cultural projects. With this orientation of unofficial institutions, new subjects and new themes appeared in cultural policy, and also new narratives became part of the cultural and art space in Serbia. As it is already mentioned, mainly after 2000, and even more – after the fourth phase of implementation, in 2010 (Šešić; Stefanović; 2017, 30) or together with the youngest generation of alternative institutions (such as Kvaka 22).

Aiming to show the significance of alternative institutions, I have chosen three examples of cultural institutions in the period of transformation. These examples of cultural institutions must have the following elements in their program, creating the new narrative respecting the old, actually creating continuity in narrative (regaining the past and rethinking the future). Those three case studies are, by structure, different type of institutions, but similar in its core narrative and representative by the influence they made, or they are still making, CZKD (stands for Center for

\(^{185}\) The network of unofficial institutions contained organizations from at least two ‘generations’ or with different main orientation, (1) Among cultural centers which were established in the ‘90s, the most prominent are REX established in 1994, Center for cultural decontamination (Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju /CZKD) in 1995, Dah Teatar in 1991, Beton Hala Teatar which ceased to exist. In the 90s, most of the organizations were in the first place engaged in resistance towards regime of Slobodan Milošević and politics, protesting against war, nationalism, xenophobia, economic crisis, persecutions. (2) And after 2000, the new alternative institutions were established - Zgrada BIGZA (2005), Kulturni centar Grad (2009), Magacin u Kraljevića Marka (2007), Inex (2011), Kvaka 22 (2015), KROKODIL Literary Regional Gathering That Alleviates Boredom And Lethargy (2009, and Center for contemporary literature (2018). A new, third phase of NGO development was implemented. This stage was devoted to the capacity building of organizations and its leaders and managers (Dragičević-Šešić, Dragojević 2005), including strategic planning skills, managerial skills, intercultural competencies, etc. After 2010, the fourth phase of development began, including the rise of more complex capacities and number of activities towards lobbying, advocacy and creation of national or regional cooperation networks (NKSS and Kooperativa). (Šešić; Stefanović; 2017, 30).
The important criteria was also their cooperation and relation towards official institutions. Still, their attitude and respect towards Yugoslav legacy and Yugoslav artistic space, was crucial, causing spontaneously created continuity, and regaining the (Yugoslav) past through various regional and international projects. The aim was to show how alternative institutions form the place for new beneficial narratives to emerge, by creating the space for discussion about Yugoslavia and Yugoslav legacy, then, through the maintenance of regional cooperation and allowing the individual stories and voices to appear in projects.

Gathering

The biggest problem for the alternative institutions was always the finances (mainly those from the state budget) and the chronic lack of proper support from the government. The Association Independent Culture Scene of Serbia (Asocijacija Nezavisna kulturna scena Srbije) represents the umbrella organization, which gathers large number of other organizations under the same roof, through creating certain ambitious mission and vision. This organization used to represent the large spectrum of aims, and at the same time, the large spectrum of independent

---

186 The case study of CZKD is chosen for this research due to its relation to the dissolution of Yugoslavia which was the primer impulse for creating the center dedicated to the ‘purification’ of the dominant nationalistic discourse, tendencies of devastating the common Yugoslav cultural field, policy of hatred, separation and as the protest against economic and social crisis, corruption and personal interests. One more reason for the case study dedicated to CZKD, was the influence this center made as an institution on creating other alternative institutions and their work.

187 ‘Association Independent Culture Scene of Serbia is a joint platform of organizations, initiatives and individuals in the fields of culture and arts in Serbia. By implementation and exchange of programs in Serbia and abroad, by activities that build capacities of the Association as well as its members, and by dialogue with decision makers at all levels, the Association aspires to promote the development of innovative and critical art practices, impact cultural policy and other related public policies, contribute to decentralization of culture in Serbia and establish regional cooperation in Southeast Europe. The Association ICSS goals are, to develop innovative, critical and experimental art and cultural production; to impact the formulation and implementation of cultural policies in Serbia at national, provincial and local levels and to impact the formulation and implementation of other related public policies; to develop international cultural cooperation, especially cultural cooperation in Southeast Europe; to develop intersectoral cooperation in the field of culture in Serbia, especially regarding the development of new models of organization and partnership between civic and public sectors; to decentralize culture in Serbia; to develop intercultural dialogue and nurture cultural diversity; to build capacities of independent cultural scene partakers; to spread and improve education in the field of culture; to improve professional and scientific research in culture; to acknowledge the culture of equality and diversity and build respect towards cultural, national and religious diversity; to contemplate strategically and constantly update fundamental principles of independent organization and action at the independent scene in relation to previous, present and future socio-political context.’ (Association Independent Cultural Scene in Serbia, online source, Bibliography).
sector issues. The mission of the Association is, actually, the list of goals and moreover, the list of demands, spread in front of all the cultural institutions from the three sectors, governmental, civic and private (Mikić, 2014; Cvetičanin, 2014).

Gathering of alternative institutions in one Association, had, in the first place (above all), the surviving function. In spite of the widespread mission, in reality and everyday life, almost all the projects of the Association itself and the organizations under its roof, have the same nature. They are protests against marginalization of the civic sector in culture, finances (just 1% of the whole budget goes to NGO in culture and art), lack of the cultural strategy, program, and development initiatives from the government (Cvetičanin, 2020).

The festivals (Na sopstveni pogon /Just on our own engines), meetings, publications (such as magazine MANEK), are all oriented (even not just) on the bad and worse position of the organizations and individuals working in the art and culture production in independent sector, also focusing on marginalization of art and culture in everyday life, civic rights and right on participation and decision.

The evaluation of the projects in non-official sector are in their core narrative - pointing out and enumerating of the deeds, listing of the numerous projects, huge achievements of some or all organizations in Association, through which Association and its members are trying to make their work more visible to public and government and to gain the proper support.

According to the official cultural policy and governing structures, those requests were the matter of luxury in the time of economic and political crisis which lasted from dissolution of Yugoslavia until 2020. The contract about cooperation which was made in 2011 between independent organizations and government was ended already in 2013, without giving any fruitful cooperation. The biggest problem was and still remains – funding (Mikić, 2014).

And there is a huge paradox among alternative institutions in Serbia after 2000, the financial support they seek from the authorities makes them at the same time – dependent and connected to the network of official institutions. The paradox of financing the independent cultural institution by authorities, actually reflects in the fact that while financed by the government, they are not actually independent.

That could appear as an even bigger problem, if we consider the role of the alternative institutions in Serbia – to influence the transition process in a direction of fulfilling civic needs and rights. And of course, due to the fact that, on the other side, there were foreign funds and donors, which always had their own agenda and their own views on how the transition process from communism to liberal capitalism should appear (Dvornik, 2009).
The narratives of the articles about alternative institutions and readings, that could be found in the whole region, discovered one more phenomenon connected with alternative institutions in Serbia in the transition period and that is identification of the project with its author and also - its temporality. Being new (several or ten, twenty years), alternative institutions are young, and in most of examples temporary, raised from the bottom-up. Organizations, in most of the cases, owe their status to people who are making their internal structure.

The change of a team sometimes means the end of the organization. That phenomenon (or process) sometimes occurs in official institutions, the periods in which experts from NGO sector were part of the managing structures in Museum of Contemporary Art or Museum of Yugoslavia, represented the periods which differ from the previous or following, when institution became something else in theory, praxis, inside and outside, which means more connected with two other sectors, open for international cooperation, moving towards modern forum and critical institution of culture (Dimitrijević, 2016).

Even more, the human resource (‘human treasure’ as Borka Pavićević named it in one interview188) factor is the most accentuated in temporary alternative institutions – centers and groups in squats like INEX, were significant on that level which can decide the fate of the institution.

4.2 ALTERNATIVE INSTITUTIONS IN SERBIA, FIRST GENERATION. CENTER FOR CULTURAL DECONTAMINATION

In the book Jugoslavija u Hrvatskoj, od euforije do tabua [Yugoslavia in Croatia, from euphoria to taboo] (2018) Dragan Markovina wrote about the reasons for the dissolution of Yugoslavia, stating that the war in the 90s was, also, the war for Yugoslav legacy. Those tragic conflicts took different spaces for expression of its consequences, changing structures in states, among people and in institutions. The 90s were the time when the first generation of alternative organizations emerged in Serbia in order to fight for the preservation of the bright side of Yugoslav legacy and against war conflicts, hatred and nationalism. CZKD, stands for Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju [Center for cultural decontamination], is one of the first independent cultural organizations in Serbia. It emerged in 1995, from group meetings of Belgrade intellectuals named

---

188 Interview with Borka Pavićević (Center for cultural decontamination, Belgrade) in magazine Vreme, 2009, with significant title Čin ljubavi i prijateljstva [The act of friendship and love].
Beogradski krug [Belgrade Circle]. The circle has also been known as Druga Srbija [Second Serbia], meaning Serbia which is completely opposite to the governing regime of Slobodan Milošević (Čolović, Mimica, 1992). Second Serbia\textsuperscript{189} was an answer ‘of citizens’ to war conflicts, nationalism and desolation of Yugoslavia in bloody firefights and rising hatred.\textsuperscript{190}

It was a circle of Serbian intellectuals, gathered to fight nationalism, war and dissolution of Yugoslavia. The list of the intellectuals gathered around the ideology of the Belgrade Circle was interesting then (to both sides) and it is obviously interesting now (more in the article of Borka Pavićević from 2017).\textsuperscript{191} Nowadays, Second Serbia still stands for a group of people being on the opposite side of the regime, every regime since the regime of Slobodan Milošević, which could illustrate the traumatic freezing and blocked condition of the society in Serbia, thirty years from the dissolution of Yugoslavia (Hirschberger, 2018).

The Center for Cultural Decontamination (further on CZKD) was opened on January 1st 1995 as a nonprofit cultural institution. Since then, CZKD has been an institution whose work is based on critical thinking, cultural and artistic production. Center emerged in the building (and from the place) called Museo, representing the house of the first and oldest private museum in the

\textsuperscript{189} On the opposite side of the Slobodan Milošević regime, Belgrade Circle emanated in unofficial cultural and civic organizations and individuals. They were often subjects of numerous attacks, due to the antinationalistic discourse, labeled as perpetuums and traitors of their own people. Due to the strong polarization, in years to come, both option (government and strongly opposite one, defined through the regime of Slobodan Milošević) showed themselves as non acceptable for the citizens in the process of reconciliation, overcoming of war trauma and creating a space for new narratives. With the already reactivated old myths (chosen trauma), such as Kosovo, the alternative ways of dealing with the past, skipping the polarizations and accentuating understanding, should be searched for (Volkan, 2006).

\textsuperscript{190} \textquoteleft That winter 1994/1995 was cold as it should be. We were not aware yet of the warming up in the country, in every sense, even in literary one. The walls of the Pavilion (CZKD in its establishing) were brownish because of age, rooflight was leaking, the electricity was coming in from just one cable passed from the house of Veljković where Dinka from Split, teacher of extraordinary beauty, used to live alone for some time already. When we entered, with great effort, technical and juridical, we threw out what we found in Veljković’s house, we got the space that should be transformed through work and production, into public space’ (Pavićević, 2018, 65). Translation TV ‘Te zime 1994/1995. bilo je hladno kako i dolikuje. Tada verovatno još uvek nismo bili svesni zagrevanja zemlje u svakom smislu, pa i doslovoce. Zidovi Paviljona (CZKD u osnivanju) bili su braonkasti od duga vremena, krov, svetlarnik je prokišnjavao, struje je bilo samo preko jednog kabla provedenog iz kuće Veljkovića u kojoj je boravila sama, useljena davno, Dinka, Splićanka, učiteljica izuzetne lepote. Kada smo već, što je bio veliki napor, tehnički i pravni, iselili ono što smo zatekli u Paviljonu u kuću Veljkovića, ostalo je mesto koje je trebalo stvoriti kao javni prostor, radom i produkcijom’ (Pavićević, 2018, 65). Translation TV

\textsuperscript{191} Regime of Slobodan Milošević remained a significant referential point, due to the collective trauma that emerged during the period of his government (Volkan, 1997). The opposition was formed as a radical opponent, and stayed in that frame in years to come (opposition that emanated from the Second Serbia circle). Later on, attitudes, organizations and individuals, gathered or emerged from Second Serbia, influenced the strong polarization in socio political life in Serbia. In the freezing condition as characteristic of the trauma world, neither governing structures nor opposite ones (in spite of the cosmetic changes) missed to transform and adapt to the requests of the transition process. In the mentioned article, among other information and comments, a whole list of intellectuals, scholars and artists, forming the Second Serbia, is given. (CZKD, online source, Bibliography).
region. After CZKD settling, the place was renamed Pavilion Veljković, as a contribution to the memory and respect to the owners.\(^{192}\) (Fig. 38).

\[\text{Figure 38. CZKD – Center for cultural decontamination, building called Pavilion Veljković know also as the first private Museum in region called ‘Museo’. Photo: CZKD Source: https://www.czkd.org/2018/09/jednodnevna-konferencija-nove-generacije-u-susret-nasledjenim-problemima/}\]

According to its description and program, CZKD functions with the ‘firm belief that nationalism, xenophobia, and any kind of violence can be questioned in the same way that they are developed – through culture, art and public speech.’\(^{193}\) Since its foundation, the center has organized several thousand events, various programs, plays, performances, exhibitions, concerts, public discussions, film screenings, workshops, seminars, conferences, lectures and complex performance experiments (Pavićević, 2017).

Aiming to become a place of political and cultural dialogue, a public space that is open for both critique and affirmation, CZKD reached to offer a possibility for initiatives, individuals and organizations and to realize programs, projects, meetings and actions of solidarity (Čirić, 2017). The collective trauma that occurred after war conflict in the ‘90s (dissolution of Yugoslavia ended up in war, hundreds of thousands of people killed and displaced, embargo, enormous economic

\(^{192}\) The valuable informations about the program of institution, being declared in vague and emotional way, witnessing about the nature of institution and time it was emerged (and not just).

\(^{193}\) Source: official site, link in Bibliography.
crisis and lack of the basic nutrition in Serbia, then bombing in 1999, derivation and deprivation of the image in front of the world public), occurred in every Yugoslav country (Lazarević Radak, 2018).

Dissolution of Yugoslavia influenced every structure of sociopolitical life in every part of the former federation (Dvornik, 2009). Cultural trauma caused fragmentation (in almost all structures), but also different coping mechanisms and interpretations. Huge splitting in institutions and among citizens, caused by the rising nationalism and war conflicts, created a gap (on one side supporters of the regime, on the other supporters of the so called Second Serbia, protesting against the regime).

That huge splitting marked, and captured, Serbian society until nowadays, in 2020. The majority of citizens had been trapped in between – being constantly confused by not getting enough information from both sides, and also by lack of the empathy and sympathy for the problems of ordinary citizen which does not support the regime (nor that during the ‘90s, nor this in 2020), but also does not belong to any of the Belgrade intellectual circles, nor to any other. As a consequence, that opened a space for instrumentalizing memories and different manipulations, causing deep ambivalence in society towards the recent past (Petrović, 2012).

Yugoslavia was not just culture, art, economy, communism and socialism, antifascist combat, brotherhood and unity, multiculturalism. In collective and personal consciousness and memory Yugoslavia also represents its bloody dissolutions, wars, crisis, crime, guilt and punishment. Deep ambivalence of Serbian society towards past is covered in the above mentioned dichotomy194 (Šuber, 2006). Especially when it is about the last period of Yugoslavia (‘90s), ambivalence is rooted not just in the official treatment of the past, it is an influential part of the translation process - from individual to collective memory (Assman, 2011).

___

194 Alternative institutions, including CZKD if not led by CZKD (during the 90s), were safe space for emerging from different perspectives in the recent past, perspectives of all sides, considering the critical approach and dialog - the only way for its overcoming (Kuljić, 2006). The phenomenon of free space for creating, exploring and expression, was also part of Yugoslav legacy, bringing the notions of avant-garde movement back. Space for Yugoslavia to emerge in dialog, or monolog, written or spoken, brought new knowledge about culture of memory, in theory and praxis (Community of Memory, project). On the other side, implementing theories, gaining information and founding proves, aiming to change the society and sociopolitical situation, was not easy. Those projects have been influencing mostly intellectual circles, if not only the Belgrade Circle, leaving the splitting in Serbian society highly functioning and untouched (Kuljić, 2006). Even though, goal of institutions such as CZKD - aiming towards creation of free space for everybody, was and still is an important achievement. For that process, an attitude of openness was needed, also readiness for cooperation from both sectors - official and independent cultural institutions, especially from the perspective of cultural policy (Dragičević Šešić, 2018).
The lack of cooperation and polarization of perspectives towards the past led to the ‘sacralization of traumatic memories’ on both (every) included sides (Lazarević Radak, 2018, 5). For recollecting the memories and their integration in narratives, both ways top-down and bottom-up, official and nonofficial, need to participate, in the common space with mutual interest. CZKD’s mission from the very beginning has been to provide that kind of opportunity, for example Delegirani javni prostor [Delegated Public Space], the long-term platform for meeting of the official and nonofficial sphere from the public life (Dragićević Šešić, 2018).

At the same beginning, CZKD became a symbol of activist movements and resistance to war conflicts in the 90s, protesting against desolation of Yugoslavia, trying to maintain connections between organizations, institutions, groups and individuals in former Yugoslav states (Čirić, 2017). The founder and director of the Center was Borka Pavićević (1947-2019) dramaturg, theatre director, producer and manager, one of the most influential cultural workers, activists and speakers, during the 90s and after, agitating the preservation of Yugoslavia, pacifism and reconciliation, maintaining the connections between intellectuals from all post Yugoslav countries (Dragićević Šešić, 2018).

In interviews and columns of Borka Pavićević, as a main source when the word is about ideology of CZKD, the center represents the place for freedom and catharsis in turbulent times, place for decontamination – by definition the neutralization or removal of dangerous substances (Pavićević, 2009). (fig. 39)

In the context of socio political circumstances in Serbia in the ‘90s, when CZKD emerged, decontamination stands for neutralization of manipulations and misinterpretations in culture and sociopolitical life, as protest against regime of Slobodan Milošević and marginalization of critical thinking importance, as well as democratic and human rights values (Antonović, 2015).
Key notions in the program of the organization are activism and protest, using art and culture as medium, aiming to express human and democratic values through art production. Also, part of the CZKD’s mission is a creation of a space for dialog and discussion (Čolović, 2019).

It was an attitude of the Belgrade Circle and Second Serbia as well as almost every non official, civic organization which formed counter publicity (Dragićević Šešić, 2018). They were agitating the preservation of Yugoslavia, as a space of brotherhood and unity and engaging against nationalism, xenophobia and violence of Slobodan Milošević’s regime (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 395), taking it as a ‘chosen trauma’ (Volkan, 2001).

At the same time, for the people around CZKD, in the time of its dissolution, Yugoslavia represented a guarantee of the progress towards humanistic values such as solidarity, equality, brotherhood and unity (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 397). The memory of Yugoslavia in CZKD appears intertwined with the avant-garde movement - with its fundamental meaning such as innovation, progress, imagination, inspiration, experiment, revolution, new, which emanated in CZKD as a synonym for Yugoslavia they were not to preserve.195

More than artistic movement, avant-garde at the end of the 20th, and at the beginning of the 21st century exists as an ideological complex (Bogusławska, 2020). At least, when the word is about CZKD ideology and the place Yugoslavia still has in it. The part of motivation for preserving memory of Yugoslavia, was in the fear of regression towards the period before its progressive ideas which means to the period of pre-modernity and tribal mentality (Jezernik, 2018).

So, the breakup of Yugoslavia could mean a regression to an old patterns (patriarchal values of a Balkan country under Ottoman Empire196). With that kind of assumptions, Yugoslavia arises as a symbol of progress, modern values, and liberty (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 396), which legacy is worth fighting for (through the culture and art, in protest, at the conference, or through the exhibition).

195 In the years of the emerging avant-garde movement in Yugoslavia, the constitutive myth of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians was the myth about the Kosovo battle (Jezernik, 2018). The Kosovo myth was also Serbian chosen trauma, according to Volkan (1997) misused by the regime in the 90s). The elements – images and metaphors are present, for example, in the book *Lirika Itake* [Lyrics of Itaka], by the famous poet Miloš Crnjanski, which publishing in 1919, marks a significant moment in the history of Serbian literature and the beginning of avant-garde movements in its most influential manifestation – expressionism. Probably it is not just accidental that part of the project *Moderna* (described in this chapter), was the reading of Crnjanski’s poem *Lament nad Beogradom* [Lament for Belgrade], an ode to the eternal city of Belgrade and its dissident faith.

196 Petrified and omnipresent belief mirrored in opposition modern-traditional, while traditional means back to the time of slavery, for example, under Otomans.
Part of that combat, and victory, is already free speech about Yugoslavia, enabling Yugoslavia to exist in dialogic space as a possibility for supporting social transformative processes (Freire, 1972; Lambirth, 2015).

YUGOSLAV LEGACY I - NATIONALISM AND HATRED, TRANSLATED INTO CATHARSIS

From the urge for change and resistance to repression of any kind, CZKD became a free space in struggle for cultural memory and remembrance in the period of revisionism (Markovina, 2018). The name Center for Cultural Decontamination, comes from the intention for the center to be an antidote for nationalism and chaos that is provoked under the governing of Slobodan Milošević’s regime (Ćolović, 2019). Idea was to form a center which will try, through art, performance, exhibition, to translate nationalism and hatred, into catharsis. In its core, emerging from the center was a political act (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 365).

The notion of decontamination in the name of the center, should represent deconstruction of the nationalist narratives, narratives against Yugoslavism and Yugoslavia, and those which were war agitating (Antonović, 2015). Culture and art should serve as a medium for catharsis, against nationalism, violence, and war - as its escalation. Also, CZKD protested against media manipulations, repression, and actions which were just diminishing of cultural and civic space together with human rights.197

Besides CZKD, almost all organizations from the ‘first generation’ of alternative institutions, with its ideology and program, cooperation and influences, stayed under the important influence of two ‘facts’, protests against breakup of Yugoslavia and war conflict during the 90s, and fighting for civic society and civic organizations, together with respecting of human rights (Dvornik, 2009). The distinctive characteristic of CZKD, in comparison with other emerging organizations and civic initiatives, was the charisma and leadership of Borka Pavićević, due to

197 In another interview, 20 years after the establishment of CZKD, Borka Pavićević stated that ‘decontamination’ is still needed in Serbian society, because confrontation with the past did not finish. Still there are contaminations like nationalism, corruption, ignorance. And still, no meaning is added to past events. People are staying without any explanation of what happened, even though that „what happened” caused what is now. As Borka Pavićević also delighted in this interview – the past period (90s) had an experience of both Yugoslavia states, while nowadays that’s not the case, alluding on fragmentation caused by the policy of Yugoslav legacy marginalization. (Zarez, online source, Bibliography).
which CZKD kept the halo of eternal opposition to nationalism and xenophobia, especially during the 90s (Dragićević Šešić, Stefanović, 2017).

Through performance, theatre, debates, dealing with the recent past and present, in turbulent historical periods, it required special measures in a sense of organizational conception. Borka Pavićević’s leadership style was important for the wide outline of projects maintained in the center from the very beginning.198

The story about the protest behind the CZKD's official program, reflects the transformation of Serbian and Yugoslav cultural and political space in the second part of the twentieth century. It shows the forming of civic organizations and independent cultural institutions (Koković, 2013), based on the values of previous periods – modernism as an artistic movement, combined with socialist values such as unity, common cultural space and equality.

The main values of CZKD emanated from the Yugoslav legacy: ‘brotherhood and unity’, Yugoslav Artistic Space as it was described by Jerko Denegri in 2011 (Denegri, 2011), common artistic space rooted in cultural similarities and professional and personal relationship and interconnectedness. Projects dedicated to the past as a theme, also projects that gathered actors from the entire region, then thematizing transition process or projecting the future with regional cooperation – that was all part of the post Yugoslav cultural space establishment, on the strong platform of common cultural ground that was never questionable (Markovina, 2018).

The experience of Borka Pavićević was crucial in establishing the ideology and program of CZKD. She was working in the Atelje 212, city theatre, and was engaged in the famous theatre

---

198 ‘On the 1st of January, 1995, exactly at noon, the Centre for Cultural Decontamination was opened with the 'First decontamination’. From that moment, the long-lived custom, tradition was established. Every year, the 1st of January, was the time for gathering of the CZKD audience, friends, co-operators, community. And the time to prepare the program according to the program orientation of the Centre for Cultural Decontamination to be also a production house. One of these programs, during twenty and more years, was the auction of Vesna Pavlović’s photography work, photograph of one epoch in which are formed anti-war initiatives, actions and gathering’ (Pavićević, 2018, 65). Translation TV


What is obvious from this statement – is family character of the organization, rituals which were part of the dynamics since the beginning, and which, sooner or later – led to the hermetic structure of the centre and limited influence – it become owning of the entitled, making wider influence occasionally, closed towards spontaneous emerging of the cooperation and narratives.

---
festival called BITEF (1967), known also as a creator of one of the first independent cultural organizations, Nova Osećajnost [New Sensitivity, 1981]. Theatre, in theory and practice, took an important part of CZKD artivism, since opening. The important fact is that ‘dissolution of Yugoslavia and the rise of nationalism turned her (Borka Pavićević) career more towards political engagement and political activism’ (Dragićević Šešić, Stefanović, 2017, 36) which was the primary orientation of CZKD.

The idea for establishing CZKD emanated from Borka Pavićević`s experience gathered during work in other organizations or groups, ideologically similar, such as UJDI (Udruženje za jugoslovensku demokratsku inicijativu / The Association for Yugoslav Democratic Initiative, 1988), The Second Serbia (Druga Srbija, 1992) and Belgrade Circle (Beogradski krug, 1992) (Čolović, 2002).

The last two were formed as the protest against Milošević`s policy of war and Yugoslavia disintegration, representing the group of intellectuals which did not want to be part of the governing policy, nor rising nationalism (Pavićević, 2017). They have protested against war conflicts, disintegration of federation, anticomunist and anti-Yugoslav narrative, which became an official one, and fragmentation of cultural Yugoslav space with dissolution of a state.

The first meeting was an act of gathering as a protest against Memorandum Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti [Memorandum of Serbian Academy of Art and Science Resolution] and protest the support that document achieved in the late ‘80s and ‘90s (leaked in 1986) among people in Serbia (Čolović, 2002). Belgrade Circle was formed as a civic protest against war, animating artists, cultural activists and scientists in order to form one center against raising nationalism, which led to the Centre for Cultural Decontamination (1995).

The protest and culture of bunt, was obvious at the very beginning – first of the cultural production events in CZKD was theatre play Zli dusi [Demons], Alber Kami’s drama based on Dostoevsky’s novel, here (CZKD; 1995) directed by Ana Miljanić, in a very decisive moment,
carrying symbolic significance. Dostoyevsky's novel is dedicated to the revolution and human (in)ability to create a better world due to their limitations.

Chosen texts were never accidental, and interpolations in CZKD projects are illustrative, creating the symbolic world of post Yugoslav reality. Together with projects such as exhibition Živeti u Sarajevu, [Living in Sarajevo] in 1995, that should have marked the possibility of CZKD to become a space for citizens of all countries to attend and talk about life in their cities, during the crisis (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 368), and project such as Tranzicija pravda [Transitional justice] in 2003/4, the plan and program of the center were framed.

After project Moderna (more about it further in these texts) and discussion about old and new identities in the process of transformation, the logical continuation was the project Tranzicija pravda, with a series of articles and discussions about the notion of transitional justice, pretty unknown in Serbian society. The significance of those events was in the arising of many questions as a theme for discussions, evaluated in a book Zajednica sećanja [Community of Memory] (Savić, Miljanić, 2006).²⁰⁰

In twenty five years (1995-2020) CZKD held numerous (over 5000) different programs, debates, exhibitions, panels, theatre plays, lectures, conferences, performances, being a host venue for different artistic projects and collaborations between various institutions, international and domestic, with the theme from the recent past, referring on the topic of cultural memory and remembrance, often in taking responsibility manner and overcoming of the past (among them, Will

---
²⁰⁰ Tranzicija pravda should represent a series of books with relevant theoretical contribution (collection of texts), discussing the notion of transitional justice, together with texts related with particular cases of transition in Serbia. As Obrad Savić stated in an introduction to the Community of Memory, the project should help with the overcoming of the past, through the actions of democratic governments (the editions of Belgrade Circle and CZKD should help in understanding and developing that process). With the planned cooperation with institutions in the whole region, on the „overcoming of past‟, and establishing an international forum for transitional justice in the area of former Yugoslav states, in CZKD - Yugoslavia emerged in dialogic space. The Project of Community of memory brought the phenomenon of taking full responsibility (together with the question of collective guilt) under the spotlight. In the following years that would be one of the predominant perspectives on the Yugoslav past – from the point of insisting on taking responsibility in war crimes as a way of overcoming past events, together with accentuating the civic organization‟s crucial role (Kroker, 2006).
For the majority of projects support was found in international programs and funds, like in most of the alternative institutions and independent cultural centers. The foreign support caused a distrust towards CZKD in a part of society that was still confused after events in the '90s, especially after the bombing in 1999 (Mihaljinac, 2019).

Even though the events in CZKD are part of different programs or circles (panels, exhibitions, theatre plays), with different subjects and themes, they always had the component of social activism, as addition to artistic expression. Projects were containing certain social value and

---

201 ‘Are we ever going to be happy again?’ the German population asked themselves at the end of the Second World War. A significant part of the Serbian population is facing the same question in the wake of the new millennium. The Germans called that moment ‘hour zero’, to symbolize their desire for a fresh start. But this appeared to be an illusion, because one cannot escape one’s own history; one can only hope to survive it.

Will You Ever Be Happy Again? is a piece for one Serbian and one German performer. Developed around authentic autobiographical accounts of its performers, Will You Ever Be Happy Again? employs documentary strategies to explore how nationality influences one’s personal identity. This issue has been acutely pertinent to both Serbia and Germany, which, at different points in their national histories, have been perceived in negative terms within the international community.’ (CZKD, online source, Bibliography)

202 ‘Media Archaeology’ is a long term research and program project, initiated in the Academic Film Center in October 2006, by a pilot program Economic Propaganda Program. Presenting this research in a dynamic program model of the discussion of two hosts and with participation and contributions of the audience turned out to be a right model of communication with the generation which did not have a chance to observe the emergence and development of current and the transformation of past media phenomena. The series of lectures was focused on media forms in Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, continuing the concept of presenting decades through the media forms specific for those periods, a complex research was performed before starting with a demanding task of analysis of the 1990’s in Serbia. In this research, from a time distance not so big, we are trying to analyze the way a dramatic social crisis was followed in the media and to remind us of the depth and influence these changes still have in media production.’ (CZKD, online source, Bibliography)

203 ‘Throughout 25 years, the MAFAF – a no longer existing alternative film festival that was held in Pula (Croatia) between 1965 and 1990 as an annual prelude to the Yugoslav Feature Film Festival – showcased works of outstanding Yugoslav filmmakers such as Tomislav Gotovac, Želimir Žilnik, Dušan Makavejev, and others. During MAFAF years numerous artists and filmmakers emerged that gained an important role in contemporary art, visual culture as well as professional cinematography. Despite having been the biggest event dedicated to alternative and non-professional filmmaking in Yugoslavia for almost three decades, the MAFAF seems to have dropped from collective memory, becoming invisible to the public eye. Two decades later, aided by available documents and archive material, we want to try and make the festival’s invisible history visible, in order to best contextualize it, reassess its real significance and rehabilitate the memory of an important event where the sheer number of applicants and their works made it the biggest event dedicated to alternative and non-professional filmmaking in Yugoslavia.’ (CZKD, online source, Bibliography).

204 ‘According to the literature (Dragićević-Šešić, Dragojević 2005, 149), most of independent cultural organizations use strategies of linkage (networking, partnership, decentralization, and inter-sectoral linkage) and strategy of public action (public commitment, changing public space, lobbying, and advocacy). Research showed that all of these are used extensively by the CZKD, not only locally but also internationally, as the CZKD and its leader Borka Pavićević succeeded in creating a strong international lobby for their support. On the other hand, it could be said that the CZKD was created as a result of networking among different agents such as 8 Network for East West women, Woman in Black, Centre for Gender Studies, Labris, Woman in Action 9 Programs such as, Pertej, an exhibition of Kosovo Albanian artists (1997), Women activists for peace are crossing borders (2002), The Bridge Pristina – Belgrade (2008), Panel debates with Igman initiative (2005), Who is to you Reihl-Kir (2010). Since 2010, this regional collaboration has mostly developed through art and knowledge production such as projects with Shadow casters from Zagreb, related to the traumatic cultural relations between Serbia and Croatia.’ (Dragićević-Šešić, Stefanović, 2017, 39).
intention to make beneficial change during the transition process, in direction of ‘cultural decontamination’ (Antonović, 2015; Ćirić, 2017).

For the understanding of the ways of remembering (in the states of former Yugoslavia) it was important to investigate the ways of forgetting the Yugoslav period (Dvornik, 2009). That was something which was not hard to evaluate: marginalization and neglecting of the Yugoslav legacy, and suppressing the urge for regaining the Yugoslav narrative in order to make continuity, were ever present (Petrović, 2013).

It came from belief that Yugoslavia was a mistake and a waste of time (Jović, 2016). Yugoslav past, post Yugoslav identities, and Yugoslav space, was, in that moment, and after, a controversial theme (Kurtović, 2010). Project was anticipation of the events, panels and conferences that will come in the following years, dedicated to the memory and status of the Yugoslav idea after Yugoslavia, with the culmination moment in 2018, on the first day of December as the jubilee of the First Yugoslavia establishment (Markovina, 2016; Markovina, 2018).

Besides the conclusion regarding the common cultural space, which existed before the state of Yugoslavia, no other consensus about Yugoslav legacy was ever made (Kurtović, 2010), not in official nor in unofficial institutions. Today, in 2020, the question is still open, and debates are numerous.

Even the alternative institutions like CZKD were announced in academic and artistic publicity as a home of the projects with particular intentions – to gain more social justice, to fight the nationalistic discourse and corruption, and to regain memory loss connected with the Yugoslav narrative and legacy (Dragićević Šešić 2018,103), they were not completely independent – the EU donors have the particular image of how transition process should look like and how post-conflict societies deal with the difficulties, which is not always and completely correct nor applicable for certain society (Dvornik, 2009).

The contributors were underlining the danger of the dominant discourse about Yugoslavia belonging to elites and official institutions, still interpreting the idea and attempt of common state realization as the biggest mistake in the newest history, for all (Drašković, 2019). The urge of imputing the new acknowledgments into the official discourse, was obvious. Altogether, contributions demonstrated the search for Yugoslav legacy, in different spaces and areas, architecture, film, public policies, public space, institutions of culture and art, individual experience, but without certain conclusions, and consensus, showing that process is still on the beginning, representing the ‘on-going revolution’.

For example, in Krokodil, center for contemporary literature, numerous panel discussions were and are held, with the theme dedicated to Yugoslav past and legacy, and dealing with that burden and gift, at the same time. Krokodil produced a publication titled Identities, or Yugoslavia, emanated from the debates dedicated to Yugoslav legacy.
Aiming to develop projects, fulfill the need for alternative space and to answer the requests of donors and funds, alternative institutions such as CZKD were struggling to maintain the role of ‘memory regaining’ arbiters they were taking voluntarily. Especially during the 90s and in the first decade of the 21st century this was necessary, and provided space for nonofficial narrative to emerge.

In the case of CZKD, the focus was on creativity and critical thinking, developed in the middle of nineteens. It emanated in praxis of CZKD and network of people and projects dedicated to initiate controversial questions (for example - to raise an awareness among people in Serbia, about the crimes which were committed in their name, without their knowledge) (Subotić, 2000).

**Yugoslav Legacy II - Moderna Project. Striving for Continuity**

This affirmative interpretation of Yugoslav legacy in CZKD became obvious in the project *Moderna*, during 2000, that took modernism as the characteristic of the previous historical period (Yugoslav state). Creating a continuity among the First and the Second Yugoslavia, in post Yugoslav space (after the Yugoslavia dissolution), appears significant, considering that emerging of both states was on very different pillars.

The continuity is merely accentuated through the notion of avant-garde (and modernism) that lasted during the whole 20th century. One more paradox is hidden in that tendency – not once, the period between two wars was glorified as modern, emancipatory and progressive in comparison with socialist Yugoslavia. From that perspective, the Second Yugoslavia was a workers’ project and blocked the further progression in culture that occurred in the early decades of the 20th century during the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (Petrović, 2013).

This kind of dissonance between historical facts and treatment of Yugoslav legacy in alternative space, where Yugoslavia provides a continuity that does not exists as a historical, shows the imago of Yugoslavia, Yugoslavia that occurs only in memory, if not as idealization, then as conceptualization. So, there is a specific image of Yugoslavia for every space where it shows up, emerged through projects, in every single institution. Since its emerging, CZKD expressed the intention for ‘salvation’ of Yugoslavia, or at least it's valuable legacy, demonstrating within both characteristic approach to Yugoslav legacy: activistic and nostalgic (Markovina, 2018).
The illustration for the second one is the *Moderna, srpski nacionalni identitet u 20 veku* [Moderna, Serbian national identity in the 20th century] project, as the most precious example for nostalgic approach. Besides that, it is a tendency of making continuity through the notion of avant-garde, and glorification of avant-garde movement together with the early period of the First Yugoslavia and growing of civic culture. The *Moderna* project started with the initiative of Branka Prpa, who opened the event with the reading of the *Manifest jugoslovenskih intelektualaca* [Yugoslav Intellectuals Manifest] from 1919 (edited by Miroslav Krleža in Zagreb).

The project *Moderna* was realized in 2001, and contained various events, beside reminding of the Yugoslav intellectuals manifest, a debate dedicated to relation between antifascism, modernism and national identity in the 20th century (*Antifašizam, moderna-srpsko nacionalno pitanje u 20.veku*) as well as the theatre play *Bordel ratnika* [*Bordello of warriors*] directed by Ana Miljanić, based on the book of Ivan Čolović with the same title.207 (Bogusławska, 2020,29). Relation between Moderna (modernism) as both art and cultural movement (avant-garde), with the contemporary identity, created through events in the project frame, made the avant-garde ideology significant for the present Serbian society in the 21st century. The book *Bordel ratnika* and theatre play, thematized the newest events in Serbian history, war in the ‘90s and popular culture of turbo folk. The project delineated the relation of CZKD as organization toward Yugoslav legacy, in the first place, CZKD emerged from the movements and gatherings created in order to preserve Yugoslavia and stop conflicts.

Through its first projects, such as *Moderna*, CZKD represented the interpretation of Yugoslav legacy and its significance (Dragićević-Šešić, 2018). The avant-garde movement as ideology (the First Yugoslavia was evoked with the *Manifest* from 1919), together with antifascism as attitude, ideology and legacy of the Second Yugoslavia, showed the tendency of making historical continuity by owning the legacy of Yugoslavia mainly through culture and art. *Moderna* was a connector between the First, the Second Yugoslavia and contemporary Serbia (in that moment, in 2001, Yugoslavia still existed – as a union of Serbia and Montenegro).

As Borka Pavićević stated, the *Moderna* project was very important and its opening was the beginning of a new period started in CZKD. Year 2000 was a turning point for Serbia, it was

207 Discussion took place in the Museum of Yugoslavia, with participants, Borka Pavićević (CZKD), Branka Prpa (historian), Latinka Perović (historian), Todor Kuljić (sociologist), Filip David (writer), Mira Erceg (theatre director), Jovica Trkulja (university professor of law), and represents an example of cooperation between formal and informal institution, which will be pointed out as the most important way in searching and finding consensus, continuity and stability in relation towards past.
a year when the regime of Slobodan Milošević’s ended, the time of unblocking the transition process, together with the establishing of first democracy government.

In a conversation published in the book of Milena Dragićević Šešić (Dragićević Šešić, 2018), where the author speaks with Borka Pavićević about CZKD, the description of *Moderna* took significant space, from its beginnings with the Manifest and reading of *Lament nad Beogradom* [Lament for Belgrade] poem of Miloš Crnjanski, the great Serbian poet, dissident, huge opponent to Tito and his regime.

Then through the mention of Skerlić’s famous ‘Put Srbije je put na Zapad i isključivo na zapad’ [Road of Serbia is road to the West, and only there], and a comment of Milena Dragićević Šešić about the importance of the *Moderna* project[^208], that is partly placed in affirmation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, or the First Yugoslavia, which appeared as a role model of emancipatory and modernistic society.

Glorification of the civic society tendencies and modernistic culture, together with emancipation from the beginning of the 20th century, was not rare in Serbian contemporary civic society (Markovina, 2018). This intention arose due to a strong urge for making continuity and finding stronger roots in search for meaning in the period of crisis. In an attempt to break the chains of nationalism and hatred which was the main aim of the *Moderna* projects, and CZKD projects at all, the organization needed strong back up.

According to Borka Pavićević, beginning with the reading of appeals of Yugoslav intellectuals, through the theatre play in the Museum of Yugoslavia, straight to the ending with the drama play *Smrt Uroša Petog* [The Death of Urosh the Fifth] by Stefan Stefanović, the whole project seemed to be cathartic - decontamination from nationalism, conflicts, traumas, discontinuity, disappearing of one narrative, but making the new ones on the legacy of the previous one (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 388).

*Moderna* brought the metaphor of circle in its immanent structure and through chosen texts, showing the intention of making a whole and round narrative – in search for cathartic effect. *Moderna* was an attempt of pointing out the trail of modernism as a possible track of future development of Serbian society, as a possibility for making continuation with emancipatory policy.

[^208]: One new culture of memory appeared, dedicated to the historical events and the civic society values at the beginning of the 20th century, that were suppressed by the communist Yugoslavia (being too ‘burguois’, and in time of Slobodan Milošević’s regime to being too cosmopolitan or too Yugoslav) (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 388).
and progressive ideas such as equality, multiculturalism, focusing on new and future, cosmopolitanism, diversity. The ideology of *Moderna* appeared as an opposite to conservatism and nationalism, and as a suggestion of a new cultural model. Following the CZKD poetics of artivism (activism through art as medium) every segment of the project Moderna was significant and meaningful.

For example, with the first Serbian original historical tragedy from 1825 as a theater play at the end of the whole project *Smrt Uroša Petog* [The Death of Uroš The Fifth], the history of Middle Age together with the Serbian chosen trauma of Kosovo battle (Volkan, 1997), was brought to the scene.

The ancient heroes, stories, myths, toponyms in the modern frame, with the influence of Shakespeare and Schiller, should be reminiscent of the wealth that should be discovered in the myth, but approaching it from the perspective of tolerance and democracy, taking its emancipatory potential, instead of using it for creating more intolerance, fragmentation and raising hatred (Šuber, 2006).

Pairing of CZKD place with the space of Museum of the 25th of May (Museum of Yugoslavia), also had a symbolic value – decontamination should close the circle near the place where Slobodan Milošević was taken to Hag (from the residence Mir, the complex of residence near the Museum), in debate about Antifascism, Yugoslavia, and modernism, identity and cultural policy, then through theatre play Bordel ratnika [Bordello of Warriors], causing the emotional impact that should close the past and open community towards the future.

But, as Borka Pavićević stated, in years to come, limitations of the project(s) became obvious – nationalism and misusing of the Yugoslav legacy still requires full attention (Petrović, 2013). Ana Miljanić, in her overview about the debate, as one of the actors, stated about contemporary Serbia and antifascism being not just the matter of the past, yet that it should be the ever present combat, with the contemporary and domestic fascism. While avant-garde evokes first half of the 20th century (if we consider that insisting on one idea continuation concerns in the first place its epicenter rather than periphery), and the First Yugoslavia, then antifascism cannot be recalled without the remembrance of the Second Yugoslavia (Markovina, 2018).

Being an emanation of antifascist battle and communist party actions, the Second Yugoslavia left antifascism as its legacy – in its widest sense as an attitude and eternal struggle for human rights against any oppressor. Regarding the Yugoslav legacy emanations in CZKD, the
The *Moderna* project is important due to its establishment of the pillars. Those are modernism as a synonym and symbol for artivism (activism through art), progression, emancipation, equality, and diversity, tolerance, together with antifascism – as a Yugoslav national kombat legacy and contemporary attitude and meaning (Milošević, 2012).

The *Moderna* project, as I have already mentioned – took one more assignment – to suggest the importance of continuity, tradition and urge for the wholeness in Serbian society, choosing the first historical theatre play, with mythological narrative and characters, through the Manifest from 1919, to the contemporary theatre play thematizing the 90s (McLean, Pratt, 2006). It brings the 20th century under the spotlight as an emancipatory period (Šuvaković, 2019).

Through that identification, the *Moderna* project ‘admits’ to Yugoslavia its emancipatory role (Šuvaković, 2019) – one philosophy of progress and one progressive state (of mind). Both, have been, probably, pretty much idealized. The participants in the project were also searching for the possibilities of investing achievements of the 20th century movement (avant-garde, modernism) into the future, in the first place as ideology and program (Dragićević Šešić, 2018).

But, the interpretation of Yugoslav legacy through avant-garde could be just one more limitation added to Yugoslav legacy, discarding the socialism and democratic values (the belief present among cultural workers in Serbia that the Socialist Yugoslavia broke the continuity of modernization). Milena Dragićević Šešić in her interview with Borka Pavičević (2018, 388), stated about the treatment avant-garde had from the Socialist Yugoslavia, for example – the Socialist Yugoslavia showed itself to be intolerant toward intellectual content of some projects, discarding it as a ‘too Burquois’, so moderna could not be appreciated as it should be, before the period of the Socialist Yugoslavia.

That is one more signal how a gap between one, civic, ‘burquois’, intellectual Yugoslavia, and the second one, socialistic, rural, peripheral Yugoslavia, was created and maintained during years, even in alternative and free space, and even when – Yugoslavia ceased to exist (Markovina, 2018). The splitting and fragmentation continued to be maintained in Serbia, unintentionally, both from the official institution’s side, and as it seems – from the side of noninstitutionalized organizations also. It did not disappear with the change of regime and transition process.
The *Moderna* project was a protest against robbing of the Yugoslav idea and ideology by the regime in the ‘90s and a cultural policy afterward\(^{209}\), that used to mask the nationalistic and chauvinistic interest under the interest of Yugoslavia preservation. The violence under the mask of Yugoslavia ‘preservation’ continued to fragmentize society and collective consciousness, trapping it in confusion and posttraumatic freezing (Mihaljinac, 2019). In spite of the mentioned effort, as I am trying to accentuate through the examples in this research – there is a long way for regaining and owning the majority of Yugoslavian legacy, and a huge request for cooperation between institutions and individuals.

In an interview in the book *Umetnost i kultura otpora* [Art and Culture of Resistance, 2018] the author Milena Dragićević Šešić talked with Borka Pavićević about emerging of the civil society organizations, during the 90s and in the middle of war trauma, describing the atmosphere as the space where, at the same time, memory of diminished country was present together with the tremendous need for its preservation (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 367). That did not change in years to come, and as Miško Šuvaković stated in a lecture about the Yugoslav period being an emancipatory one – emancipation and modernism are the most important legacies of the Yugoslav period (Šuvaković, 2019).

Center for Cultural Decontamination emerged, strongly related to avant-garde movement and ideology, attending to become a permanent opposition and protests toward xenophobia, nationalism, violence and injustice. Protest against dissolution of Yugoslav space was the primary motive for creating the center and need for an organization which will gather other NGOs, in its own space, as the secondary (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 363).

As Borka Pavićević stated, the center should be ‘more concrete, more influential, emotional, empathic’ (that was the time when culture and art still were not directly connected with civic actions and human rights), and new center pretended on that connection (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 363).

\(^{209}\) The Yugoslav legacy represents socialistic values, sense for equality and community behind the curtain of ‘brotherhood and unity’, common artistic and cultural space, and also, the legacy of avant-garde (as inheritance of the First and the Second Yugoslavia, together), considering the values of everything which is new, experimental, innovative, modern, progressive, where avant-garde appears more as ideology then artistic movement (Bogusławska, 2020).
The above mentioned debates were important as a support for developing the attitude in the new generation of the artists, groups and movements (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 71). The projects in CZKD are mainly oriented towards emancipatory character of the Yugoslav past, perceiving it through modernism, as movement and ideology, and through antifascism as historical period and contemporary attitude (Šuvaković, 2019).

The first one is more connected to the period of the First Yugoslavia, while antifascism cannot be disentangled from the fight against fascism during World War II, Yugoslav communistic party [Komunistička partija Jugoslavije, KPJ] and National liberation combat [Narodna oslobodilačka borba, NOB], despite of the tendencies in contemporary post Yugoslav societies and anticommmunistic movements to relativize historical facts (Markovina, 2018).

The CZKD intends to be the place available for different perspectives, dialog and imperative of official narratives, which meant also to be free for revival of antifascism values, threatened in official discourse of raising nationalism and intolerance (Milošević, 2015). As already mentioned, in the context of the Moderna project, creating continuity in CZKD, is a way of overcoming the traumatic fragmentation (Pavićević, 2012).

The ‘shadow’ side of the struggle for freedom that took place in CZKD was hidden in maintenance of high levels of polarization in Serbian society. CZKD stayed devoted to the policy and ideology of decontamination, and that supposed that ‘contamination’ always exists. Sometimes the mass of ‘confused citizens’ in the middle, between ‘alternative’ and ‘official’ narrative, in time of cooperation between official and nonofficial sectors (after democratic changes in 2000, forward a few years) felt like taking the place of ‘contaminated’ Others.\(^\text{210}\)

\(^{210}\) The citizens to whom it should be explained what happened during the 90s- the citizens which were never on one or the other side, suddenly they were a burden for the transformation process. Even though those situations are rare, and the pendulum has been oscillating between official and nonofficial institutions since the 90s, with a rare excuse such as Kvaka 22 (Catch 22). The dynamic went similar to the Karpman drama triangle, which represents a social model of human interaction – the triangle maps a type of destructive interaction that can occur between people in conflict. In spite of having three positions, a game needs just two entities, which will ‘circle’ leaving one position empty. The drama triangle model is a tool used in psychotherapy, specifically transactional analysis (Karpman, 1968).
The oscillations in need for allies or enemies during turbulent times (Volkan, 1988) were part of the process of overcoming trauma, regaining legacy of the previous periods and owning critical approach towards the past (Kuljić, 2006), present in the official and nonofficial sector. The oscillations between polarities are visible also in the perception of the Yugoslav past and the acceptance of the Yugoslav legacy. The memory of Yugoslavia has been experienced through activism and nostalgia, representing one more example of polarization (Markovina, 2018).

Nostalgia grew into a specific phenomenon of Yugonostalgia, accentuating the fact that nostalgia is, by definition, opposite of utopia (Basset, Baussant, 2018), and evoking the fact that utopia was not a rare label for Yugoslavia (Jezernik, 2018), since its beginning in country and abroad. For example, in collection of articles from 2018, Yugoslavia and its legacy is threatening from very negative perspective, together with applied notion of utopia, History of an utopia, hundred years of creating Yugoslavia, Belgrade, 2018 [Istorija jedne utopije, 100 godina od stvaranja Jugoslavije, Beograd, 2018].

Yugoslavia became a blank wall for projection, and every single institution or organization that pretended to deal with the Yugoslav legacy had its own interpretations of Yugoslavia, built, represented or expressed through projects – exhibitions, debates, conferences – in language and image.

**Concrete Utopia in CZKD**

If we do not consider on-going project about Yugoslavia – that Yugoslav past and legacy is something that should be discussed all the time until consensus, conclusions and integration emerge (Petrović, 2013), one more project with characteristic of ‘giving the space for Yugoslavia’ has been organized in CZKD as the international forum Stvaranje konkretne utopije: arhitektura Jugoslavije 1948–1980, međunarodni forum [Creating a Concrete Utopia – Architecture in Yugoslavia 1948-1980]. The additional program has been organized by the Faculty of

---

211 The Belgrade gathering held at CZKD (Creating a Concrete Utopia, The Architecture of Yugoslavia, 1948-1980, from the 12th to the 15th of November 2018, in CZKD) was conceived as an international forum, through four thematic days. Participants were, Vladimir Kulić, Maroje Mrduljaš, Jelica Jovanović, Anna Kats, Ana Ivanovska Deskova, Vladimir Deskov and Jovan Ivanovski, Martina Malešić, Luka Skansi, Łukasz Stanek, Merjema Zatrić, Irena Šentevska, Mila Turajlić, Milenija Marušić, Dragoljub Bakić, Miodrag Živković, Branislav Dimitrijević, Ljubica Slavković, author and project manager, Ljubica Slavković.
Architecture, University in Belgrade and Architecture Online Platform from Berlin. It was held from 12th to the 15th of November 2018, in the CZKD main hall (fig. 38).

The project was dedicated to the socialist architecture and huge socialist monuments in Yugoslavia (so called Spomeniks/Monuments), interpreting the exhibition in MoMA New York (Toward a Concrete Utopia, Architecture in Yugoslavia, 1948–1980), bringing under the spotlight the socialist monuments - inspired by the vision of a Yugoslav state, revolution, brotherhood and unity, incorporated in their stone, emanated in concrete (utopia). Represented in CZKD, the project got one more dimension – it was a reminder of the antifascist struggle in the 20th century, and its legacy in the 20th, especially in the context of anticommunism ideology, which was dominant in the 20th century in the post Yugoslav area212 (fig. 40).

212 For more than two decades in Serbia, all the values of antifascism are neglected or, basically, thrown away, announced for communistic fraud. The notion itself kept the legitimacy, empty from real content. In Serbia, by antifascism is called something that antifascism is not anymore, while true values are suppressed, internationalism, diversity, tolerance towards various differences, emancipation, and especially – marginalization of national, religious, gender, sexual, political, and other differences, as politically significant characteristics. Antifascism was and still is, in the tradition of its real meaning, progressive idea and moral attitude, more than ideology, and assumes constant spreading of freedom and tolerance. If discrimination is the key word of fascism, then tolerance is a key word of antifascism. (Milošević, 2015). Translation TV
The word play that the title of MoMa’s exhibition contained (\textit{A concrete utopia}) had two meanings, the utopia made from the concrete, and a concrete utopia) and is found also in CZKD gathering, creating a concrete utopia, referring to the monuments of concrete, or to Yugoslavia, and its ‘utopist’ ideology.\footnote{The project in MoMa, even realized due to the impulse from MoMa itself, was created by the team from Balkan region, and CZKD invited the curator Vladimir Kulić, as a guest of the four days gathering. The first day of the international forum was named Creating a Concrete Utopia, New York. Contributions marked the increasing interest in post-war Yugoslav architecture, and the relevant questions and topics related to previous representation of the socialist architecture in Yugoslavia, for example the documentary TV series Concrete Slumbers (Betonski spavači), accentuating ‘the relationship between Yugoslavia’s architecture and its society, artistic freedom and accomplishments, the culture of remembrance, and the fight to preserve the heritage of local communities and their way of life’ (Slavković, 2019). Vladimir Kulić, curator of the MoMa exhibition, described the structure and making of the exhibition at MoMa, contributing to the understanding of the process itself, as well as the important topics, country’s modernization through post-war rebuilding and construction, mass urbanization by large projects such as New Belgrade, technological modernization (Belgrade Fair and the Avala Tower) also social modernization (buildings of schools, hospitals, museums, libraries, etc), then projects connected with global networks such as Non-Aligned Movement, and the company Energoprojekt, then the rebuilding of Skopje after the earthquake in 1963.}

One way or another, it was a call for debating about Yugoslav legacy on the example of the heritage in architecture (Markovina, 2018). Referring to the Yugoslavia state as a utopist project is one of the most proclaimed spots in official discourse and justification for revisionism (Drašković, 2019), Yugoslavia was just an unsuccessful project, idealistic idea and by that – a
utopia. Also, the ideology of CZKD regarding preserving Yugoslav cultural space, connections in region, tolerance, reconciliation – is sometimes described as a ‘utopian’ project, due to the pressure and obstruction that CZKD suffered from opposite structures (mainly right oriented, nationalistic in its core).214

But, the architecture presents how the ‘experiment’ seems to has more concrete consequences in shape of monuments and in every state they were emerged. The major theme of the exhibition and theme of the CZKD’s forum, was the complex question of identity, built around ‘brotherhood and unity’ and the People’s Liberation War (Narodnooslobodilačka borba, NOB) notions. Forming the whole structure of memorials and memorial complexes, creating the kind of network ‘which the authors see as a sort of network holding the entire Yugoslavia together, on the basis of antifascist struggle during the World War II (Slavković, 2019).

That is the key points regarding Yugoslav legacy, shaped in movies, museum collections, architecture. Then, the antifascist attitude in wide meaning is also Yugoslav legacy (from NOB, the Revolution and People’s Liberation War). Then opening towards international cooperation and support (Non-Aligned movement, presence in manifestations and exhibitions in Western Europe, US) represents form of Yugoslav legacy. Also, modernization as an emanation of accepting and spreading intercultural influence, and more than anything else - Yugoslav Artistic and Cultural space which existed simultaneously with Yugoslav state and continued to exist after its dissolution, with content and experience that was collected during one hundred years of its presence.

The theme of the Revolution and People’s Liberation War was unpopular since the dominant narrative during the ‘90s and afterwards. As Todor Kuljić stated (Kuljić, 2006) those narratives where clearly anti-antifascist. In CZKD, the antifascism combat rose again as a theme through the material about monuments, presented in MoMa and unpresented too, showed by Vladimir Kulić to the audience of CZKD gathering, and followed by discussion. The discussion should enable, according to the conclusions of the project, pulling out the monuments and its context (NOB, communism, Yugoslavia) from oblivion.

214Borka Pavičević spoke about it in almost every interview. The activism and strong opposition towards every nationalistic point of view, was in the program of the Center. Sometimes, the constant accentuating of the „decontamination‘ moment in events and projects of CZKD, caused this institution to be the ideology institution, more political than cultural, more closed nor open despite the insisting on values like tolerance and openness. Opposite to the Inex and Kvaka 22, the cultural centers of younger generation, CZKD stayed the place for entitled ones, for the people, organizations, projects and attitudes that can be numbered as it is said in 20years jubilee through the exhibition Živi, mrtvi i ostali (Alive, dead and the rest).
Even though monuments and architecture of Yugoslavia, being obvious and present in physical sense, are representing the most concrete Yugoslav heritage, they were also ignored and diminished by de-contextualization. In Croatia this forgetting process took more concrete forms and measures – a large number of monuments was devastated. So, the gathering in CZKD bared one aim in mind, to activate remembrance of monument’s contexts, by showing their value and evocating their history, also including personal experience and by that – individual memory and witnessing (Horvatinčić, 2019) (fig. 41).

Figure 41. Creating a concrete utopia, conference at CZKD. Surprising scenography of the conference could symbolize the complexity of the subject, also large archive of testimonials that must be included in the process of (re)owning the past. Photo: Tijana Vuković, 2018
Bearing in mind the context of the Yugoslav legacy and its place from the wider perspective, the important conclusion of the gathering, was conducted with *Missing Knowledge*, a thematic circle placed on the fourth and the last day, evoking and anticipating other projects dedicated to the Yugoslav legacy (*New/Old Museum* in Museum of Yugoslavia, *Musealization of Yugoslavia* in 2018, *Regaining the Memory Loss*, Venice Biennale in 2019).  It contained discussion about memory, collective and personal, its representations, artistic and academic valorization, continuity and discontinuity, old and new narratives, revisionism, official and alternative discourses – the same was part of the additional program.

Exhibition in MoMa represented the proof of the big interest in the architectural and urbanistic production of socialist Yugoslavia, as a Yugoslav heritage that is hard to oversee. It also recalled the need for dealing with Yugoslav heritage at home, in former Yugoslav states. At least, that was the motive for the team of CZKD to conceptualize conference and meetings as a four-day-long international forum, with the impulse to empower the process of (re)owning the Yugoslav legacy, or regaining the (Yugoslav) past (Begić, Mraović, 2014).

It was the most ‘concrete’ example of the Yugoslav legacy - social architecture as a good example and accepted one, in 2018, when Yugoslav legacy overall is still a controversial question, with multiple offered answers and narratives without consensus, with no definition, nor frame.

---

215 The individual experience as main tool for translating the personal memory into the collective (cultural) one, had an important role in conference, while the first three days of the forum were dedicated to the creation of A Concrete Utopia, the second part of the gathering represented the experience of the artists and architects from the time of socialist Yugoslavia, the creators of a concrete utopia themselves, such as Milenija Markušić and Dragoljub Bakić, architects who created the most recognizable projects in socialist Yugoslavia.

216 The additional program had been managed by the platform Architectural Online. Results of the photo contest organized by the Faculty of Architecture and its Research Center for the students from the Faculty of Architecture in Belgrade, together with colleagues from other faculties at home and abroad, were put on display at the University of Belgrade Faculty of Architecture Library. The educational component of the conferences held in CZKD, more than twenty years in row, was important and accentuated, the exhibition held in the CZKD, after the forum discussions, represented the collection of the student’s audio and video work together with the graphic installations. The website The Archive of Modernism (Arhiva modernizma) representing the digital repository, was one more product of the four-day intense debate, forming the valuable resource of various materials for the scholars, doing research in the area of Yugoslav heritage. Gathering in CZKD was made by the support of the Heinrich Böll Foundation’s Belgrade OfficeThe international forum conclusions emanated in additional program and its authors, ‘Understanding the construction and material – architecture of post-war Yugoslavia 1948 – 1980’ – CID student photo-competition, organized by the Faculty of Architecture University of Belgrade, jury, Milorad Mladenović, Luka Skansi, Nevena Poledica.

‘Missing Knowledge (On Forgotten Monuments)’, student workshop, organized by the Faculty of Architecture in Belgrade, CZKD and Architecture Online. Organization and workshop realization, Boštjan Bugarić, Ljubica Slavković, Hristina Stojanović.

‘Archive of modernism’, online archive, authors, Ljubica Slavković and Jelica Jovanović, researcher, Jelica Jovanović, associate, Jana Gligorijević
Infrastructure from the socialist times is still in use in Serbia, being a basis of the city functioning and cultural heritage at the same time. The buildings and monuments from the second half of the 20th century are the witnesses of the whole social political period, showing by their form and function the idea of modernization in former Yugoslavia. Also, the talk about their structure, position and dedication, recalls the ideology of the former state, its development, the break up, and fate of the monuments - different in every state of ‘former Yugoslav federation.

Architecture and urbanism of the second half of the 20th century in Yugoslavia were based on widespread emancipation and networking, creative freedom and authorship, experiment and research. They were developed both in Yugoslavia and all over the world. However, instead of valuing the cultural and creative heritage, this creative force is being marginalized in our environment.217

Without cooperation with official institutions, gaining consensus and giving answers cannot be achieved. Altogether, with this project, Yugoslavia arose once again as a theme of international significance, which brought one more narrative about Yugoslav legacy under the spotlight. Presence on the world artistic and cultural map insisting on cooperation is part of the legacy of the Yugoslav period.

That openness toward international projects, discussing and representing (Yugoslav) art and culture, its authenticity and dynamics, ceased in Serbia together with the Yugoslav state. Without recognition from the official institutions and authorities, owning Yugoslav legacy in alternative space is just one sided and incomplete. It cannot become a matter of consensus (on a local, state or regional level) nor produce lasting change in cultural memory (Kuljić, 2006).

Projects developed and realized in alternative institutions like CZKD in foreign institutions such as MOMA could be just homage to Yugoslavia. The ‘combat of memory’ as Brankica Drašković described the processes in public discourse in Serbia, writing about the Jubilee of the First Yugoslavia (2018) and its representation in media, accentuates the opposition official – nonofficial.

The two-sided nature is represented by a contra memory which is a critical perspective, as an opposition to sentimentalism and revisionism, as an official discourse when the word is about

217 The aim of the CZKD team contribution to the MoMa project, was to enhance the interest for the Yugoslav heritage in ‘former Yugoslav region, to make the platform (once again) to discuss and regain its value - even though, this discussion about Yugoslav heritage, was still just opening of the space for new coherent narratives to emerge, and just search for consensus (and that was something that CZKD used to do from ’95, 25 years with same results).
Yugoslavia (Drašković, 2019). The critical perspective should avoid sentimentalism, dramatization, together with demonization of Yugoslavia.

Projects dedicated to the past, in alternative institutions, somehow, are still ‘talking in the house’, where people who think similar gather, to empower their point of view, to collect more evidence for that, to prove themselves something they already know. But also, they gather to try to attract more people as audience and participants, and from that point to reach authorities and try to influence the change of their perspectives and intervene in creating official cultural policy, undefined since the breakup of Yugoslavia (Kuljić, 2006).

THE PERMANENT NEED FOR DECONTAMINATION. CONCLUSION

From the large archive of more than 5 500 projects, the one I have been representing here, is chosen by the criteria of the most related or dedicated to the aim of the rethinking and regaining (Yugoslav) past. In those projects, the Yugoslav legacy appears shaped by several notions, common cultural and art space in region as emanation of the Yugoslav artistic and cultural space, antifascist ethic as emanation of NOB (Narodna oslobodilačka borba/ National liberation battle), reopening toward international cooperation and multiculturalism (as a legacy of modernism and Yugoslav cultural policy), values of unity, community and within activist approach towards life and world (legacy of ‘brotherhood and unity’).

CZKD with its program brought those themes back on a contemporary cultural scene, which had the huge gathering potential with the aim of solving the crisis ‘in the most beneficial way’ for the Serbian art and culture (Dragićević Šešić 2018). Probably due to its dynamics and numerous projects, academic researchers participated in the activity of the center and discussed it, but written sources about its development and functioning are rare and hard to find, same as regarding the conclusions. The debates and projects are mainly gathering the organizations from alternative institutions or network of alternative institutions, scholars with the similar perspective towards past and present, also towards Yugoslav legacy and its space.

So, consensus is not a matter of questions, or the true consensus is still impossible to gain, due to the fact that official institutions representatives or representatives of authorities are rarely
present. ‘The space for dialog’ (Pavićević, 2017) is still far from the dialog that can lead to consensus and integration. It often turns into a center of monolog.

The ‘space of freedom and cultural catharsis’, CZKD has been a home for different projects, some of them were conceptualized, created and produced in the center, and some of them were created in (international or regional) cooperation with various organizations. The common denominator for most of the projects is the relation toward (Yugoslav) past, valuing common cultural space of the region and investing in post Yugoslav cultural space as common.

The representatives of all three cultural sectors in Serbia, especially in the first decade of the 21st century, were functioning in their own circles (more or less), without systematic and planned cooperation. Overcoming the gap in between sectors is the reason why alternative institutions are trying to get more attention in public space. Better integration and visibility are not important just for alternative institution’s values and aims, it is crucial for their survival too (Cvetičanin, 2014).

Those projects were supported and evaluated (as successful) from EU funds, also ‘domestic’ official institutions such as National Museums or Ministry of Culture (present as a support to international projects in CZKD). They have been represented in accordance with the strategy of horizontal networking among organizations in the region. Those projects achieved less in overcoming the conflict inside the country among cultural sectors (official/nonofficial/private), among different perspectives toward memory considering recent events.

In spite of the main aim to make the whole story about the Yugoslav past, from its fragments (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 377), CZKD insisted on the colorized interpretation, which fluctuated, including sometimes different aspects but excluding so much more. The accent was on the multiculturalism and modernism of Yugoslavia, ‘brotherhood and unity’ have been reserved for the ‘former Yugoslav country, and its sense (legacy) was rarely brought back to civic structures and citizens in Serbia. It is still a question if CZKD emerged on the opposite side of the radical nationalism, came closer to the need of the people in the middle of two poles – need for truth, explanations, and reconciliation.

First interpretation of the Yugoslav legacy was the first exhibition in CZKD, where it was obvious a certain type of dramatization. Dramatizations of high intensity have been omnipresent in the work of CZKD, which led to the specific atmosphere, and lack of the space for gaining objective perspective or real facts, something which we can mark as a truth, if it exists. Being in its core – opposition and protest, CZKD failed in giving enough chance to the voices in the middle (majority of citizens in Serbia), and by it – failing to give the whole picture about the past and its legacy, and failing to project into the democratic future.
Projects in the area of new politics considering the solidarity in culture were debating freedom in the cities and communes in the Balkan region, together with the knowledge production projects. Always accompanied with the themes such as solidarity, pacifism, gender equality, intercultural dialog – making continuity with avant-garde and antifascism of the 20th century, CZKD brought the culture of memory, regional reconciliation, and culture heritage, as main themes in art, activism and culture of the 20th century in Serbia.

After 25 years, through the projects that gathered artists from the whole region, CZKD did influence the change in public discourse and awareness of the past and present, making more space for different interpretations, voices and discussion, also for developing new institutions with new narratives (Dragićević Šešić, 2018) (fig. 42). Without its voice and activity, and voices of other civic organizations, marginalization, ignoring and suppressing of the Yugoslav legacy would be far more successful.

---

219 Main projects in CZKD were thematicized by the following notions, regional truth and reconciliation programs (since the first Tuzla in Belgrade exhibition in 1996), and social equality and transitional justice, the artistic activism for meeting ground of ideas from the whole region. Those are the projects developed as the product of joint work and partnerships with numerous other social movements and artist collectives, mostly from other 'former Yugoslav countries, or Kosovo (Multimedia Prishtina, City from Tuzla, and Shadow casters from Zagreb).

220 CZKD events were mainly supported by the foreign donors (EU funds, cultural foundations). Following the program of donors, which was different every year, or project, and which sometimes collided with the need of a particular society in transformation (Dvornik, 2009), organizations sometimes failed to fulfill their own requests. From that perspective, CZKD could enlarge the dialog space for the sides in the Serbian society itself. In the first place, that was the need and the aim of making the whole (consensual) story about the past, from present fragments and different perspectives, first on the local and state level, then the regional one. Sometimes, answering on different calls just to get the fund for projects, organizations fail to deal with the important questions and certain situation, unique in its dynamic, different from the handbooks about transition (Dvornik, 2009) which was obvious on the example of CZKD projects that passed leaving no trace, or staying as a fade existence in an archive lists of CZKD (CZKD, online source, Bibliography).
As an alternative institution, which is not just by emerging date, the closest one to the original trauma, CZKD reflects it completely, in its ideology, program and projects, narratives and visual identity. Being the eternal opposition, even when the address does not exist anymore (or it is not the old one like during the regime of Slobodan Milošević), CZKD kept the ethics of protest, reminds on the danger of freezing, caused by the cultural, war, transitional trauma (Šuber, 2006).

Sharing the fate of other civic institutions, CZKD was trying ‘to hold the door’ (of dealing with the past) which they could not open, but was able to prevent it from a complete closing (Dvornik, 2009). Dedicated to support for collaboration between alternative and official institutions in the country and in the region, CZKD has been working with cultural organizations in Europe and the world, making the necessary network of institutions and organizations. It was
one of the main institutions which contributed to the strengthening of civil society in Serbia (Dragićević Šešić, Stefanović, 2017). Due to that function, the center was one of the prominent contributors in the process of ‘dealing with the past’ (Savić, 2006).

Unfortunately, those projects were not the one which will circle the Yugoslav legacy corpus – they belong to the first phase of pulling out Yugoslavia from oblivion and dealing with revisionism, with the lack of the policy of memory and remembering (Šuber, 2006).

Borka Pavičević summed up 25 years of CZKD as part of the interview a Croatian magazine Zarez, as an answer to what ‘decontamination’ means after the period of the transformative 90s, describing the whole generation of alternative institutions, emerged together with CZKD. She accentuated the process of facing the past (taking responsibility for war conflicts during the 90s), as the main collective and individual task that should be done, and still is not.

She continued by describing how people at the public square did not get the explanation that what is going on is the result of the past, actually the consequence of what was going on and ‘what happened’. Culture also can and must give explanations to the people and that is what activism in center serves for. Cultural decontamination is still needed, just not in the form that it was during the 90s.\(^{221}\)

---

\(^{221}\) ‘The name of the centre was easily explained at the beginning. What we have today for decontamination? Everything we have in front of us, populism, social arbitrage, governing through the help of press conferences – all of it wouldn’t exist if it was announced in a proper time frame of what is called facing the past. But that was on the contrary, before it was placed in reality, before it was explained to the people on public square (fruit market) that way of life is consequence of what is called ‘what happened’. When was that explanation of what actually happened? What is the dissolution of one’s country and creating new, and the way we live today, what is that? In fact, I’m not sure if it’s completely clear what we have today are consequences, something that in spite of all, makes a difference in people’s lives. The new generations are coming and they could take for granted this way of life, thinking that is only one possible, and that this kind of culture production that we have today - is the only possible way for doing it. If we consider it from a more complex perspective, like the one which demands a historization process, we can calculate the consequences on real life. So, I wouldn’t say that today we don’t need decontamination, at least not like we needed it in the 90s. We still do. The Law, for example, functions if it prevents crimes. That’s how we get State as a Rule of Law. From that attitude we can make a question of the Culture also, and find the answers to what happened in the 90s. Activism should bring explanations, and we did not have enough time for that… Maybe that is also the problem’.

Translation, TV
‘Sve ovo što imamo pred sobom – i populizam, i društvenu arbitražu, vladanje pomoću pres konferencija – svega toga ne bi bilo da je na vreme obavljeno to što se naziva suočavanje s prošlostu. Ali to je, na žalost, pre nego što je spušteno u stvarnost, pre nego što je objašnjeno ljudima na pijaci da je način života posledica upravo toga što se u javnosti zove ‘ono što se dogodilo’. Kada se to jasno objasnilo što se dogodilo? Šta je to raspad jedne zemlje i formiranje novih država, odnosno na koji način mi danas živimo? Ustvari, ne znam da li je potpuno jasno da to što imamo je poteklo iz konsekvenca ipak nečeg što je presudno u životima ljude. Dolaze generacije koje će shvatiti zdravo za gotovo da je jedini mogući način života ili jedina produkcija kulture danas ova koju imamo. Ako uzmemo to u složenijem smislu, to što je historizacija, vidimo koje su to konsekvenca na stvarni život. Dakle, ne bih rekla da nam je to danas manje potrebno nego što nam je bilo potrebno. Pravo, recimo, ima smisla ako intervencijski u stvarnosti, ako spreči sledeći zločin. Zato je i smisljena država prava. Iz tog uverenja se i u kulturi može postaviti pitanje i dati odgovor na ono što smo imali 90-ih. Aktivizam treba da ide s objašnjenjima, a mi nismo za to imali dovoljno vremena... Možda je i u tome problem.’ (Zarez, online source, Bibliography)
But, the unhappy fact is that CZKD managed to show what happened just to the circle of dedicated ones, while ‘people on the square’ were left confused and contaminated (especially if that square is not one of the larger ones in Belgrade). Perhaps, more than conclusions and solutions - open ending of debates, opening of the space for conversations, raising questions are the key notions for CZKD.

Unfortunately, in many cases, the dialog space also appeared in a small circle and among entitled. As Todor Kuljić stated in his article dedicated to critical approach to cultural memory (Kuljić, 2006), the citizens were sensitive and distrustful when the word is about collective guilt, and taking responsibility, especially those who never consider themselves political subjects.

At the end, CZKD has been an outstanding case of the bottom-up institution, helping the maintenance of the Yugoslav cultural space as a phenomenon and cooperation in region and creating a path for ‘younger institution’ to follow, such as KC Grad, Ministry of Space, Street Gallery, Magazine in Marko Kraljević’s Street, INEX, and at the end, the youngest in a row, Kvaka 22. In spite of this important influence, for the consensus about Yugoslav past and Yugoslav legacy to be defined and accepted, owned and appreciated, both official and unofficial institutions are needed to participate in building the cultural memory, translating individual memory to cultural memory (Assman, 2011).

The topics that should be discussed together (in a present of both sectors) are in the first place, past, relations towards Yugoslavia and its legacy, reconciliation and cooperation with the states from the region. Those are, at the same time, core notions of the plan, program and ideology in CZKD. Even though the production in the center is dedicated to engagement in a wide spectrum of human rights battle, it enlarged the number of cultural and art events on a contemporary art scene in Belgrade, creating different art and cultural projects with wide range of themes.

Those themes are not without connection with Yugoslav past, they are more continuation of the modernism ideology and values delineated in project Moderna. CZKD emerged in an atmosphere of cultural and social deep crisis, during the first phase of social and political transformation. That fact will determine its program and main themes, also causing the fragmentation and discontinuity about organization itself - numerous of repetition in projects and closing into familiar circles of ‘friends’, themes and organizations, living in eternal opposition with the ‘enemy’ (and in need for allies) (Volkan, 1988).
That eternal opposition showed the limitation characteristic for the alternative institution of the older generation in Serbia, that built the narrative and ideology as opposite to the regime of Slobodan Milošević, war conflicts, and the dissolution of Yugoslavia. So, Yugoslavia as a matter of past, but still alive, is ever present in the space of CZKD (through objects, events, conversations), but in the shape that just seems to allow different interpretations.

Actually, Yugoslavia exists as a space of freedom, unity, human values, modernity, multiculturalism with an aureole it got through the protests and fight against nationalism, manipulation, hatred and violence during the 90s (Dragićević Šešić, 2018) as it emanates from the projects and mission of the CZKD. It is a one limited edition of Yugoslavia, filtered and colored.

In the narrative about a common cultural space, larger than it was the Yugoslav state - CZKD was advocating, from the same emerging, existing and vitality of the Yugoslav Art and Culture space- independent from the Yugoslav state, politics and changes at the end of the 20th century. The fate of the CZKD, the common of all the alternative institutions in culture in Serbia, is to be an opponent to official politics and stay controversial. Alternative institutions are mostly emerged in the 90s with the protests in the 90s, so they are constantly targeted by nationalists and every other individual who thinks about alternative institutions as the structure being formed by foreign intentions and donations, for the interest of foreign countries which are, after the dissolution of Yugoslavia, interpreted often like intentions against Serbia.

The strong belief in animosity of the West Countries towards Serbia and Serbian people, strongly rooted as the consequence of repeated trauma and posttraumatic stress (especially after the bombing in 1999) among a huge number of citizens (Lazarević Radak, 2018). CZKD, with its aesthetics of bunt and ethics of protest, with strong and penetrative activism and with its projects dedicated to reconciliation by admitting the mistakes and crimes of all sides involved in conflict, were often an object of numerous attacks – even from official, governing structures. As a consequence, the people from the whole region that institutions gathered were often endangered.

---

222 ‘The center’s (CZKD) activities in theater, art and politics were seen as oppositional from the very beginning. The opposition was directed not at reactionary drama but at a whole way of thinking that for the last decade had valorized Serbian nationalism. Although a justified fear of the regime’s reactions made directors wary of producing content that was transparently anti-Milošević, there were also direct attacks.’ (Weiss, Kulić, 2001).

223 Complexity of the civic sector in culture lies in the fact that it existed and had a huge role in the process of creating the national identity. Those organizations were shut down, or they were euthanized and became official institutions, or something similar to – informal institutions nowadays, but – as soon as they showed independent and subversive behaviour, they were censored and at the end – closed (Dragićević Šešić, 2018, 72).
Since the ‘90s, official discourse (of official institutions, authorities, government, mass media) is mainly nationalistic, anticommmunist, antisocialist (Kuljić, 2006). Together with the strong imperative of moving towards (uncertain and undefined) future and with neglecting the Yugoslav past, official narratives were insisting on victim mentality and outcome, instrumentalizing the memory in order to maintain conflict with other ‘former Yugoslav states, or just manipulating with the memory in political and economic interest of small groups (Kuljić, 2002). The resistance towards this manipulation, then activist interpretation of memory and its importance, was voluntarily chosen by the nonofficial and civic institutions.

4.3 Alternative Institutions in Serbia, Second Generation

Voices of the Past in Inex Squat

Yugoslav Legacy I - Squats, Shelters for Culture and Cooperation

The breakup of Yugoslavia by the witnessing of artists and cultural workers was experienced as a loss of space for contact and cooperation, and even more dramatically, interpreted as a comeback to the backward and closed Serbia of Ottoman period (Dragićević Šešić, 2018). Inex as a project was an experiment in direction of reviving the ideology of commons, free artistic space and cooperation. It represented an attempt of a group of artists and activists, cultural workers and civic nongovernmental institutions to form a (bottom-up) platform for cooperation, cultural center, place for meeting, discussing, and creating. The approach towards cooperation in the region invokes common space older than the Yugoslav state, based on cultural similarities, partnership, friendship and being of art to spread and arise. Artists and artistic collectives from the whole post Yugoslav region were welcomed in Inex from the very beginning. (fig. 43, 44, 45)
Figure 43. The building of Inex Company, devastated and abandoned, 2011

Photo: Radomir Lazović

Figure 44. Entering a Ruin. The same beginning of the Inex
(squat, cultural center, movement, organization, and institution), 2011

Photo: Radomir Lazović
The action started in April 2011. Inex film was a public cinematographic company engaged in film production and distribution, a part of a former large Yugoslavian enterprise group – Inex Interexport. Activists and artists in 2011 found the Inex Film building, with all of its 1500 square meters, covered with garbage, abandoned and completely devastated.

When they entered (squatted) the building, it was not a rare example of the brutal privatization process and capital transition, which left numerous of the known public places devastated and ‘bearing no traces of its history. The action was announced as the Inex Film
Expedition often known just as Inex. In this work, I will use the name Inex as the most prominent and used.

Inex Interexport Company was one of the most prominent export systems in ex SFRY (Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) This company held its offices in almost every bigger city in former Yugoslavia, also in all the most prominent world metropoles. Part of the huge ownership were buildings in the city center of Belgrade, among which was the Inex Film building in Belgrade suburb Karaburma, until 1990, when the dissolution of Yugoslavia started. In controversial privatization, the building belonging to Inex Film, was sold.

When the group of young activists occupied the building, they were firstly negotiating about using the abandoned space with the Belgrade City government and the state structures and after that with the owner who, at the end, approved the alternative cultural center to exist in his property, until he makes a decision about its function in the future.

The Inex Expedition, squat and cultural center that emerged in the building, became known as just Inex. It lasted as the most prominent alternative cultural center, specific space for art production like no other in Belgrade (as it’s already mentioned, Belgrade has no squats tradition) with numerous events placed over in the period from 2012 until 2016.

The building became the symbol for the brutal privatization that left Yugoslav state properties abandoned and after that devastated. The devastation often happened due to the unclear privatization process in which was not transparently revealed to the public to whom the property was sold and under which circumstances. For the artists and activists from the Inex Expedition it was quite a task to find out the identity of the owner of the building in Višnjička Street. Once they

---

224 Through various projects, dedicated to raising the awareness about commons, pointing out the social and transition justice, hosting young artists from the whole region, alternative institutions like Inex and Kvaka were on the path of re-owning the values of previous (Yugoslav) times.

Being the act of political activism since its beginning and emerging as a process together with alternative institutions, in the early 2000s, squatting was unwanted and criminalized. In Serbia, squats are strongly connected with alternative and independent art scenes. At the same time, during transition process in 2000s, the costs of renting increased, the availability of social housing is disappearing instead of increasing as it stood in government plans and states (Kušjuhas, 2008). The number of abandoned and neglected buildings was larger in time, and their devastation more and more visible. Being a home of alternative cultural institutions, mostly with no proper legal background (documents, registrations), which often had an attitude opposite to official narratives, concerning politics of memory, cultural politics, strategy for development of civic society, democracy and humanistic values (Govedarica, 2012) squats became a problem for governing structures, more than a solution.

225 The shortage of space and resources (of any kind, even in budget or plans or cultural policy) for culture and art developing, praxis of squatting for cultural needs entered the dynamic of sociopolitical life in Serbia. If not Yugoslav, that was a legacy of the post Yugoslav period – shortage in the 90s and transition process after 2000. At first sight, it looks like the statement triggers only the situation in the independent sector, but as we witnessed in a chapter dedicated to official institutions and Museums in Belgrade, that was not the case.
reached him, the whole collective was excited by the fact that they could stay in an already emerged cultural center until the owner of the building decided to use or sell it.\textsuperscript{226}

As it was officially stated by the members of The Inex collective, project has been dedicated to exploring of the possibilities of self-organization, gathering together individuals and organizations in need of a space for their creative work and cultural production, and who, despite their knowledge and willingness, generally have limited or no access to necessary resources (fig. 46, 47).

\textbf{Figure 46. Open-air concert}  
Photo: Natalija Simović, 2012

\textsuperscript{226} The disappearance of common and public spaces connected with the privatization as a part of the transition process, together with commercialization of culture, fragmentation of the cultural core narratives and closing of the main official cultural institutions, caused unofficial institutions to search for more alternative ways to get the space for its activities. Also, to find a space for cooperation with official institutions – again, in alternative ways.
Revitalization of Inex Film building meant a huge cleaning up. Building was treated as a garbage depo, left without water and electricity, doors and windows, covered with waste. Before restoring the building and its surroundings so the space could be used for hosting the meetings, discussions, exhibitions, artists, activists, to offer a space of establishing a cooperation with different institutions and artists from the region and the whole Europe (Moore, 2005).

At the beginning, the Inex was a space for gathering unofficial institutions and independent artists, under one roof, in an attempt to change the devastating situation in culture and art of Serbia in the 21st century. Inex was organized as a social movement with the influence in making new cultural schemas and shaping cultural institution’s structure (Brenner, Mayer, 2011). Due to the history of the building the place became a home for site-specific artistic or architectural interventions (cooperation with Museum of Contemporary Art, as I will describe further in this text).

The case of Inex was contributing to the development of strategies for the revival of devastated urban spaces (Dee, 2012). Also, for accessing the beneficial narratives towards recent past and making continuity with accepting Yugoslav legacy, cultural space, cooperation,
commons, diversity in cultural policy, regained through the numerous projects\(^{227}\) (McLean, Pratt, 2006).

**Yugoslav Legacy II - The Squat’s Ideology of Commons**

The ‘brotherhood and unity’ almost ‘cursed’ during the ‘90s, and also after 2000 (when the official discourse and politics of memory was still strongly ethnocentric and nationalistic), emanated in the squat’s ideology of commons. Free space for expression of the artists and cultural workers from all former Yugoslav states emerged spontaneously through art and culture projects (Govedarica, 2012). Also, the emblems of antifascist struggle were not rare in the Inex projects dedicated to the past.\(^{228}\)

When the word is about cooperation, squatting practice included Serbia and Serbian cultural scene, in the regional network of squatters and world network.\(^{229}\) After the dissolution of Yugoslavia, regional networking and cooperation were rare for artists in Serbia, as well as any other cooperation outside the borders, which led to the traumatic isolation and permanent feeling of ‘being other and different’ (Šuber, 2006).

Common cultural ground and common resources, together with cooperativeness, could be accentuated as a key notion of the Yugoslav legacy in Inex. Mainly using the synergy of activism and art, artivism, where narratives (debates, dialogs, lectures, conferences) were an important space. Even though, younger generations of alternative institutions appear to communicate more through visual mediums, above all, exhibitions and multimedia projects. In that space, space of

\(^{227}\) Among which, the exhibition World Communal Heritage by Rene Readle and Vladan Jeremić; the workshop Activism and public spaces led by Dušan Šaponja and Dušan Čavić; the launch of the 2nd Micro Festival of Amateur Film; the seven-day festival Art and Shovels; the comic-book festival New Age; and also the forum Artist as Audience; numerous concerts and DJ performances, and many other events., and finally the exhibition From Dionysian Socialism to Predatory Capitalism organized by the Center for Visual Culture, a department within the Museum of Contemporary Art. The last one was thematizing the question of continuity, previous historical period and place of Yugoslavia in contemporary Serbia, among young artists, academics in official and nonofficial institutions. The project, as we will read in following chapters, was dedicated to the transition process and culture and art in turbulent times.

\(^{228}\) For example, at the last exhibition of Gallery in Inex at Faculty of Fine Arts in Belgrade in 2015.

\(^{229}\) Squatting practice was common in Croatia and Slovenia, while in Serbia it was never present enough to figurate as an important activists’ phenomenon. Since 2011, squatting in purpose of occupying and using the space for artistic and cultural production, can be represented in the case of two or three spaces Inex, Cinema Zvezda and Kvaka 22. Squatters typically choose unused properties owned by a state or unpresent private firm or individual, that still does not plan to use it. Even though, squatters do detailed research about the history of the building, future plans and the background of the owners, they are never respected by the official institutions as a people in need for space, and ready to make it useful not just for themselves, making them rather beneficial for community nor leaving them empty and devastated (Mayer, 2013).
exhibition, alternative institutions could come closer to official ones (museums, galleries), in a permanent urge for cooperation, as a guarantee of stability and opening of new opportunities (Novy, Colomb, 2012).

From the perspective of new opportunities emanates that exhibition can be a connective spot where space for cooperation seems to become wider (Traore, 2008). In that third space, space of cooperation, a field that opens when the official and nonofficial institutions gather on the same assignment, alternative institutions are shaping their narratives and identities through the process of mirroring (Phaneuf, 2005).

The important part of creating a new identity is relation to the past (Hammack, 2008), also the relation to the official narratives of the past. The younger generations of institutions grow a dose of relativization towards most of the ‘prescriptions’. 230 The fact that trauma causes blockade and fragmentation of the narrative (part of stories, or images, that cannot be connected in a coherent structure), the urge for resolving cultural trauma of the past emerges from the need of better functioning in the present and developing plans and projections for the future. The coherent and consensual story about the past, subjects that can own it, tell it and share it, means overcoming the traumatic freezing (Dori, 2012).

The space has a significant role in that process. It should be valued as free from official narratives and demands and completely independent. Squats such as Inex and Kvaka 22, were communicating not just values that were kept as a Yugoslav legacy – cooperation and common cultural space, they were communicating shortage of space, lack of freedom in culture and art and a suspicious privatization process in post Yugoslav period.231

230 Mainly being placed in the buildings which are perceived as a Yugoslav ‘heritage’, or at least they were owned by the Yugoslav state, alternative institutions of younger generations (mostly emerged after 2000) are creating their own understanding of Yugoslav legacy and projection to the future, putting practical cause in the first place (Dee, 2012). Paradoxically, the independence from academic circles and official institutions, leads to one more spontaneous and more authentic, also more beneficial way of treating the Yugoslav narrative, making from its content the connective material between institutions in the region and institutions in Serbia (even the official ones). Also, the independence and creative space ensures the basis for self-discovering through the lessons of the past, lectures for the future (McLean, 2018). Also, the cooperation in the region and wider had vital significance in enabling the search for meaning Glasovi prošlosti [Voices of the Past] as a way of dealing with collective trauma (Hirschberger, 2018; Volkan, 1997).

231 Together with the problem of valuing socialistic and communistic past in the official sector, on an ideological level, came one problem more – a relation toward its legacy, in concrete and metaphorical way. All the institutions of culture and cultural institutions (official and unofficial), suffered from the difficult and prolonged process of transition. For example - Common space (schools, firms, factories), and public space (streets, parks, parking) had become investment opportunities and had been sold in the period of unblocked transition in Serbia, after 2000, sometimes in a blur process for a symbolic amount of money. The process of privatization was and still is, followed by numerous affairs and marked by suspicious legality. Serbia was not the only one - after political transformation during the 90s and after, in
The lack of space for art and cultural production remained a permanent problem in former Yugoslavia, and after the dissolution of its last emanation in 2006 (splitting of unity of Serbia and Montenegro), Serbia kept the issue. The shortage of space (which means place and finances) for art and cultural education and production, for housing, for new business, civic organizations and initiatives, become ever present (Kušjuhas, 2008) (fig. 48).

Figure 48. Artists in Inex used to give the lessons for the future students of Faculty of Fine Arts in Belgrade
Photo: Darko Stojkov, 2015.

Considering the fact that some large common or public spaces were neglected, devastated and abandoned, in the context of space shortage, squatting seemed to be a proper solution, especially for young artists in the time of culture and art marginalization (Martinez, Piazza, Pruijt, 2013). In spite of the fact that squatting for housing was present in the period of Yugoslavia, squatting for art production is rare in Serbia, and at the beginning of the 21st century just few

East and Southeastern Europe, ‘increasing social inequality is making some urban spaces inaccessible to those who used to inhabit them’ (Dadusc, 2017).
places were known for it. On the other hand, squatting for housing has been a more known practice in comparison with squatting for culture.

In most of the cases, when an empty apartment is discovered or more often a common space in a building, the squatters need to transform the space they enter, renewing devastated buildings and bringing them back to functioning as a home, or adapt it and transform it in the cultural center. Every type of squatting is, in its core, activism and protest, stating the need for more space in cities which will represent common good or fulfill the primary need of an individual and cultural needs of a collective (Martinez, 2013).

As William Whyte suggests relaying on a work of Mikhail Bahtin, ‘the interpretation of architecture comprises a series of transpositions. As building is planned, built, inhabited and interpreted, so its meaning changes.’ (Whyte, 2006, 153). According to this statement, the meaning of a building changes due to the circumstances, which is, as a fact, important for the meaning of the Inex Film building in the context of Inex squat.

It literally evocates the Yugoslav legacy, official perspective on it, and need of reinterpretation of the past. Devastated condition of a building, as a result of unsuccessful privatization, represented in symbolic way the neglecting of Yugoslav legacy itself in wider meaning and suppressing of the Yugoslav narrative (Milosavljević, 2013). Occupying of the Inex building by young artists and activists meant revival and recalling of the beneficial from the past, such as the Yugoslav cultural and art space, ideology of cooperation, unity, and openness toward different cultures, especially sense of community and ‘old story’ of being and doing together (Mikić, 2013) (fig. 49).

232 Between those, just BIGZ; Inex and Kvaka 22 made an important influence on the cultural scene, being cultural centers and centers of social life and activism for several years in a row, and Kvaka 22 is now a productive cultural center of younger generation, example for maintaining continuity in narrative, owning the Yugoslav Art Space and respecting its legacy.

233 Squatters story ‘includes creating collective platforms for free access to basic needs and social activities otherwise available for profit, not only housing, but also kitchens where food is collectively prepared and distributed, informal services providing legal advice and community support, workshops for sharing knowledge and skills, as well as recreational cultural activities (from free concerts to cinemas) (Dadusc, 2017). Squatters can create grassroots communities that highlight a shared right to use the city outside a profit motive.’ In spite of being provided in desperate need (homeless people, refugees, young artists or cultural workers) squatting is illegal, in most of the European countries, including Serbia.

234 ‘The first is that architecture, like all meaningful human action, is capable of being understood; that it is, as Paul Ricoeur (Ricoeur, 1971) would have it, in some respects a text. Indeed, as Bakhtin has observed, ‘if the word ‘text’ is understood in the broad sense-as any coherent complex of signs-then even the study of art ... deals with texts’ (Bakhtin, 1986).
The old assumption that building means or conveys a meaning is important for understanding the significance of alternative institutions in Serbia, among them Inex. They are in most of the cases placed in buildings that were common and public during the Second Yugoslavia, in ownership of the state and by that in ownership of its citizens (Petrović, 2013).

With the dissolution of the state, dishonoring of its legacy and the neglecting of its property, were present, reflecting on the buildings, leaving them through time in bad and worse condition. The space that is occupied by the Inex Expedition, Kvaka 22, Magacin Kraljevića Marka235, was in the use of a Yugoslav company or institution and after its dissolution became a witness of the official treatment and relation towards Yugoslav legacy.

The fact that we can interpret the architecture, buildings and its meanings (Whyte, 2016) significances that there is a certain symbolic engagement with architecture in everyday life, which contains and provides certain messages. Neglected buildings from the Yugoslav period

---

235 Alternative cultural center Magazine in Marko Kraljevic Street.
communicate, in this particular case, something similar to the attitude provided by official institutions towards Yugoslav past, which can be freely interpreted as, if I may invoice it in a sentence ‘the period of Yugoslavia is over, we do not need and do not want its heritage nor legacy, it was and it is, an unwanted past’ (fig. 50).

Figure 50. The artist involved could achieve no legitimacy, and most of the time, their engagement was voluntarily. In spite of all difficulties, most of them stayed part of the Inex, from the beginning until the end. Photo: Radomir Lazović, 2012.

Abandoning the buildings that were in the ownership of SFRY, escalated in selling the properties, in a blurry process of privatization, during which it was completely unclear to whom, with what purpose and with which cost they were sold. That often made the process of privatization suspicious in the sense of being legit and legal, that all can be read on the facades of the buildings and interpreted as one huge deprivation of the past. It is not by accident that alternative institutions have been choosing the places such as Inex, giving to those buildings opportunity for new life and communication of another supra meaning.

There are always reminiscences of the building’s previous purpose which becomes part of the alternative institution’s identity. Mostly, abandoned and neglected building, bearing the whole Yugoslav narrative inside itself, were transgressing it into the new narrative which represents the new institution. While official institutions suppressing the Yugoslav narrative avoiding to deal
with trauma that is part of legacy, in alternative space, past could not be bypassed (Hirshberger, 2018).

Architecture is an important witness of the past in every of its forms, monuments, buildings, bridges. The emergence of the New Belgrade was an example of the creation of identity through architecture in Yugoslavia, especially in institutions (Museum of Contemporary Art) (Kulić, 2014). Building is proved as the important initial contact in communicating the culture and in the communication with citizens or audience, in case of museums and official institutions. But, space where an institution or organization is placed is also an important part of the identity of an unofficial institution.

Regarding the official institutions, the communication and significance of a building was obvious, due to the fact that the building was projected and built for a certain institution before its establishing (Museum of Contemporary Art) or it is in stronger connection (symbolically and traditionally) with its dedication (Museum of Yugoslavia). The same is significant when the word is about nonofficial institutions (CZKD in Museo, one of the oldest houses in Belgrade that used to represent a private museum) and nonofficial institutions that squatted buildings which belonged to Yugoslav official institutions or companies. Symbolically, the building in which the institution is placed, has a role of the first bridge towards communication with the past.

Inex and Kvaka 22 are squats established to fulfill the concrete need for the artist and workers in culture to have space for production, displaying and attracting audiences. Inex community was not ‘obligatory’ ideologically engaged as an opposition towards official narratives, nor moved by the circumstances as the war conflict, authorities’ attitudes or regime (which is the case with CZKD or Rex).

Organizations that emerged in squats developed more freedom in program and ideology but kept the shared values that could be recognized as inheritance from cultural policy of the Yugoslav state, cooperation in region, common cultural space, openness towards multiculturalism.

---

Squats are playing an important role in art and culture production in Europe, enabling new social (artistic and culture) practice, forms, and narratives to emerge, which would cease in the same beginning without free space of squats (Moore, 2015). Squatting in Serbia is not just about housing, nor forming counter institutions, always in opposition with official ones, forming the ‘shadow’ place where everything unwanted and unpleasant in culture is being suppressed. At least, nonofficial institutions are not just that, even though ‘unwanted’ contain, events, legacy are suppressed and finally emerge in free, unofficial, alternative space. So, the institutions that have been mentioned as nonofficial, are representatives of alternative structure (system) that arises when the main one does not function properly. Squats in Serbia were and still are, mainly dedicated to art and culture production, (which is rare in squatting tradition in Europe) (Martinez Lopez, 2012). That fact draws attention to the marginalization of culture and art production, especially during transition in Serbia.
The complexity of the privatization process was witnessing the consequences of war conflicts, economic crisis and prolonged embargo. The same factors cause the lack of the finances in the state budget, minimal support to the cultural institutions and also the negative approach toward Yugoslav legacy. The Inex building at the beginning stood as a symbol of the desolation of Yugoslavia, neglecting its heritage and marginalization of its legacy. Also, the whole movement was illustrative for the devastating economy situation, prolonged transformation and its consequences, poverty and lack of enthusiasm. In the same time, the Inex was a sign of still alive activism and alternative art projects, sense for common and cooperation in the region (Milosavljević, Nikoletić, 2013).

Figure 51. One of the numerous performances in Inex thematizing the transition process in Serbia.

Photo collage: Tijana Vuković, photos: Radomir Lazović, 2014

237 „Finally, neglecting to address the issue of land use and land ownership further skewed the process by introducing real estate motives that should not have been present in the privatization process. Real estate and land development becoming a central motive in some privatizations led to corruption in urban planning and strengthened the belief that wealthy businessmen and politicians were beneficiaries of the privatization process at the expense of the public. The fact that a large number of privatizations were annulled and that there was asset stripping and tunneling in the meantime, leaving companies as empty shells, only cemented this perception. The large number of annulsments created a pool of companies that needed to undergo privatization again. To this must be added the overwhelming majority of the 75 enterprises left for restructuring before being subjected to the privatization process. In fact, little was done in terms of restructuring, thus creating a long-term subsidy to these firms, which were mostly suffering losses. As time went by the chances of restructuring these firms diminished. The last round of privatization aims to complete the process that began fifteen years ago. At this point, most of the companies cannot be revitalized. Chances are that most of them could not have been turned into profit-making enterprises at any point in time. The expectation is that the vast majority will end in bankruptcy proceedings. Such an outcome will only augment the general resentment of the public towards the privatization process.” (Vujačić, Petrović-Vujačić, 2016, 74).
The collide of this two space, one physical (building) and one anthropological and symbolical (civic organization), in particular time, made the Inex cultural center and alternative institution, which was paradigmatic for the bottom-up institution in Serbia after 2000 (Milosavljević, 2013). The building brought the strong symbolic frame to the cultural center, shaping it with Yugoslav narrative aureole.

YUGOSLAV LEGACY III - POLYPHONY OF THE PAST IN INEX

The cooperation with the Museum of Contemporary Art (mentioned in the chapter dedicated to this institution) on the project with the significant title Od dionizijskog socijalizma do predatorskog kapitalizma [From Dionysian Socialism to Predatory Capitalism] in 2010, represents an illustration of the Yugoslav legacy placed in Inex and at the same time an example of cooperation with an official institution. The Museum delivered one interpretation of the Yugoslav legacy, while the part of the project is in Inex. The project had a pioneering role in establishing the platform for cooperation between official and nonofficial institutions – in alternative space.

The project From Dionysian Socialism to Predatory Capitalism developed by the Centre for Visual Culture of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade [Centar za vizuelnu kulturu Muzeja savremene umetnosti u Beogradu] was dedicated to ‘analysis and new reading of the social history and art production in Serbia and Yugoslavia after 1949, through the series of workshops and cooperation between young artists and mentors. The accentuation on the critical approach towards narrative of the past, especially official ones, signalized the existence of awareness between artists and cultural workers about revisionism and political construction of history (Erić, Vuković, 2010). The project was on a track of tendency that could be noticed in the period of the
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238 ‘The project was conceived as a series of workshops with young professionals and mentors focusing on the analysis and new reading of the social history and art production in Serbia and Yugoslavia after 1949. The project’s primary objective was to help the workshops’ participants develop an actively critical relationship vis-a-vis the way the history is written through continual discussions and subsequent practical work, so as to put this attitude to practice in the creative process within their respective media, drawing upon the archival film and audio materials made available for that purpose’ (Erić, Vuković, 2010).
first decade of the 21st century onward - considering history and stories from the past as a subject of art projects, in order to rethink it during the creative process (Erić, Vuković, 2010).

Participants were students from the Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade, academic researchers and professors. That was uncommon for the cultural center placed in a squat (Moore, 2015). Squats as illegal places could not provide the basic legitimacy, often needed in cooperation with official institutions. From a certain point, all the participants were the authors of the project. The project represented cooperation between official and nonofficial institutions with an academic circle, joined together to express the dynamic and consequences of the transition period. The main assumption of the project was that historical narratives are constructed, so they can be deconstructed or reconstructed also:

The historical narrative is always constituted in retrospect from a viewpoint of the present situation. In this process particular events are included and specific meaning is attributed to them, while others are left out and erased. Even among those dealt with, some are given pre-eminence as having key importance, and some are marginalized, However, this is not a matter that is done once and for all…

… There are more than one way to address and inscribe a historical event into historical perspective, and it is only through comparing this varying accounts that we manage to get the proper grasp of it. On the basis of the fragments of this stories, in a creative synthesis with the fragments of material life, which we encounter everywhere around us, and which bear in themselves the traces of past events, the possibility of producing new versions of historical narratives opens up.’ (Erić, Vuković, 2012, 5).

To do so, the project was composed of three parts. The first one, an audio workshop, was led by Miodrag Miša Savić, the second one, a film workshop, by a film author Želimir Žilnik. The third part and the most significant for my research, specially produced for Inex, was led by Milorad Mladenović, and represented the ambient settings created for already produced audio works. The main methodological challenge in this project was transmitting the contents from one field to another, from the context of one institution to another, gaining various interpretations of the fragments from the past. The main material consisted from untold or unfinished narratives ready to be (re)interpreted. Historians were also helping with the creative process as guest lecturers during the project.

239 Creative rethinking of the past could mean a „lifesaving” integration. It represented a „missing link” quest, „Artists, as well as other explorers in the art world, including also art historians, are increasingly centered on the examination of the historical context and historical heritage of the culture in which they operate, instead of passively endorsing it’ (Erić, Vuković, 2010, 4).
In context with the forbidden Yugoslav narrative, marginalized and neglected legacy (Markovina, 2018), through the cooperation of the mentors and young artists and their projects, participants were developing different modes of critical reception of historical narratives. Opening the space for dialog of the generations, old and new voices, represented the first step toward deconstruction of the ‘old’ and construction of the ‘new’ approach to the past (Bornstein, Tomkins, 2015).

Inex was a space without an official institution status, while Museum of Contemporary Art was an official institution without space, due to the prolonged restoration of the main building. The new potential of alternative institutions was discovered in cooperation with official institutions (Dragičević Šešić, 2018). The project From Dionysian Socialism To Predatory Capitalism was contained from film workshops, mentored by Želimir Žilnik, and audio-spatial workshops (in the Inex Film building), mentored by Milorad Mladenović. The film workshops explored the social and cultural currents in Serbia and Yugoslavia during the past half of the 20th century thematizing socio political circumstances and personal experiences in Socialist Yugoslavia. Every participant should find one story which was left untold, ‘a story related to some of the key-events from aforementioned period’ (Vuković, Erić, 2011), and through creative process give it novelty expression.240

The choice of themes such as the nationalization process in Yugoslavia, expressed one negative attitude towards the Yugoslav legacy, accentuating the phenomenon which are the painful spots of the recent past. The chosen stories are not just ‘untold’, they are tabooed, by the previous or the on-going regime, marginalized by official discourse and chosen to be deconstructed (Gilbert-Walsh, 2007). Giving an example - a story about nationalization from the perspective of the people that were left without their properties during the communistic period, was the referential point for the anticommunist narratives that search for tragic personal memories to incorporate in collective ones, to intervene with nostalgic memories.

The students/participants were free to choose from the corpus of untold stories from the past. They could accept the advice of their mentor or to choose in cooperation with him. The obvious distinction between the results of the different parts of the project is significant. Only in Inex, in installations and creative solutions appears the positive interpretation of the Yugoslav

---

240 Every personal (private) story should give another more perspective on the past events and through that develop critical thinking in connection with the past events (Assman, 2011). Due to that fact, I have chosen this project to show how alternative institutions participated in changing the official narrative about the past events.
past as a valuable and beneficial basis from the (creative) future. For the wider image, I would try to create an overview of the themes and ‘transformed stories’, with their outcome.

From the perspective of the material, on the very beginning, the stories were not just ‘untold’ they were mythologized during the Yugoslav period and after, thrown through nostalgic lenses, and now taken back to be ‘deconstructed’. The attempt of deconstruction, radical change of the interpretation and perspective in comparison with ordinary beliefs, represents a movie Konac, igla, mastilo [Thread, Needle, Ink] by Marija Đorđević. The movie is a story about a famous JNA - Yugoslav National Army’s tattoo. Famous tattoo JNA (those letters in different shapes and sometimes accompanied with a date) was not a rare case of the devotion expression and memory capturing, during the obligatory army year, among citizens of Yugoslavia.

In a movie the tattooing process and its result is represented as a matter of circumstances and lack of awareness. Sometimes it was a result of unwilling tattooing instead of a real decision motivated from a feeling of loyalty (fig. 52).

![Figure 52. JNA. The capture from a movie Konac, igla, mastilo [Thread, Needle, Ink] by Marija Đorđević. (contribution to the project Od dionizijskog socijalizma do predatorskog kapitalizma [From Dionysian Socialism to Predatory Capitalism] capture by Tijana Vuković, 2020)](image)

The fame of JNA tattoo appears as something different than awareness about the (Yugoslav) identity and belonging to the one community – it is, actually, a permanent sign of the lack of recognition. Furthermore, according to the movie and regarding the decision, conscious or not, of the one generation to be somehow marked by the community it belonged to, can provide shame in the next generation, generation of daughters and sons (fig. 53).
Figure 53. *When I was a little*. The capture from a movie *Konac, igla, mastilo* [Thread, Needle, Ink] by Marija Đorđević. (Contribution to the project Od dionizijskog socijalizma do predatorskog kapitalizma [From Dionysian Socialism to Predatory Capitalism]). Photo: Tijana Vuković, 2020.

Through the story about tattooing emerges attitude towards Yugoslavia after its dissolution and in post Yugoslav societies. Even the painful process (like tattooing) provoked by certain emotional and social circumstances with the permanent results (lifetime consequences) could be excused by the simple lack of recognition, of course in an already changed socio political environment. In radical antiyugoslav campaign in ‘90s and after that, until today, it was difficult to advocate certain decision from the past, especially those considering acceptance of Yugoslav identity (fig. 54).

Figure 54. ‘Unwanted legacy’. The capture from a movie *Konac, igla, mastilo* [Thread, Needle, Ink] by Marija Đorđević. (Contribution to the project Od dionizijskog socijalizma do predatorskog kapitalizma [From Dionysian Socialism to Predatory Capitalism]) Photo: Tijana Vuković, 2020.
It is not certain that author of the movie provides critical dimension. The one-sided, flat and linear composition could be a way of imposing the commentary without direct expression. A consistent denial of the past in the narrative of contributors, persistent diminishing of the personal involvement in its event creates the grotesque imaginary. Through the statement of one of the participants we realized how painful the tattooing could be in the improvised circumstances, using just an ordinary needle and ink. At the same time we are suggestively informed that tattooing can happen during sleep without permission of the person, especially during the year in JNA.

The demythologization in almost every movie that came out as a result of the first part of the project, is based on simple principles – to expose the shadow side of the ‘untold’ story (Worthman, 2001) and with that a reason why it was left ‘untold’. The forgotten and suppressed story appears to be well known, and the novelties of the project were in giving the another subjective but collective perspective in the post Yugoslav context. Even the antiyugoslav attitude is not new just represented from the opposite perspective. In years of transition and for its unsuccessful elements (many of them), a root was searched and found in the previous period – in Yugoslavia as a state project which failed on so many levels including the one that should be its brightest side – social care and equality.

The social status of the citizens in the post Yugoslav period is thematized in the film titled the Makiš City [Makish City] by Ivana Todorović where the author shows the treatment of social problems after socialism, people on the margin of society and the city and symbolically the old factories transformed into the ruins (fig. 55) that old socialistic factories had.

241 Makiš is an urban part in Belgrade, peripheral from the perspective of the City center. The most non-residential (it had a population of only 1,217 in 2011), but important for the city industry and transportation.
One contemporary grey side of everyday life in Serbia is accentuated in order to change the myth of the social project in Yugoslavia, which was a contribution to critical approach towards cultural memory (Kuljić, 2006). The defeat of socialism reflected and accentuated in the difficult economic condition in life of ordinary citizens represents an already proved way for the one to successfully dethrone the past in post Yugoslav period (Petrović, 2013).

The film titled *Lopata je previše mala* [*The Shovel is Too Small*] by Romana Vujasinović and Nemanja Babić thematised the ideology (and idealization) of the working class during socialism, and its fate after. Their representatives were expressing doubt towards new generations and the gap that appeared between generations in the post Yugoslav times. *Lopata je previše mala* [*The shovel is too small*] is a famous statement of Alija Sirotanović, coal miner that made a Guinness record in digging in the period of 8 hours, becoming the living legend and symbol of the working class in the whole Yugoslavia, receiving the medal for special deeds from Josip Broz Tito.

A banknote of 20000 (dinars) was printed in 1987 with the image of Alija Sirotanović and used until the reform of Ante Marković. ‘Comrade Tito, the shovel is too small’ was a motto for

---

242 Authors Romana Vujasinović and Nemanja Babić.
the working class in Yugoslavia, being one of the pillars for creating the heroic image of the workers and working class, especially during voluntarily taken working actions, for (re)building of infrastructure of the country. In the interpretation of curator Zoran Erić under the mentorship of Želimir Žilnik, the working class is confronted with the treatment of its legacy among the representatives of younger generations.

The contrast, as an artistic choice, was translated from reality with a minor transformation. Enthusiasm of the working class ceased with the Yugoslav state. Despite different themes and stories, a common denominator could be discrepancy in a sense of identity that occurred after the transformation in the ‘90s. The collection of fragments (short movies) should participate in forming a narrative identity, from two perspectives – the past one and the contemporary one (Singer, 2012). While the past experience brings the old coherent story (sometimes even myth), the new one should come with a change (McLean, 2008).

In case of the part of the project under mentorship of Želimir Žilnik, new narratives dethrone the Yugoslav narrative and nostalgic narrative of the post Yugoslav period. The aim of the project – revisioning the ‘life span’ from socialism to capitalism, which means Yugoslav past together with the transformation process, reflects in a metaphorical sense in every contribution (Staudinger, 2001). A contribution represented at the beginning Kako sam ostao bez krila [How I lost my wings] by Ivan Tasić showed on a personal level, an example of the individual story, and in a symbolic way, the path through self-defying moments that collide with periods of history. It represents in a metaphorical way an absurd situation of the individual during ‘interesting times’ and time of sociopolitical changes.

Since the beginning (birthtime), life of the person is marked by the regime (symbolized by the picture of the ‘president’/’ruler’, that used to be placed in every official institution during communism, for example Tito/Stalin, among others, here placed under the bed of the subject). The scene is simple, open space in cultivated nature (flat meadow with the three in the middle, bed of the subject (male) under the tree, and different scenography of the important changes in life). The influence of historical and political changes on the life of the person, family, society is given as a parallel flow that should be constantly incorporated into one’s life in searching and creating of identity (Cohler, 1993).

Personal ‘untold’ stories should collide with the nostalgic narratives (Museum of Yugoslavia could be overlooked as an institution with the Yugonostalgic narratives among others,
which can influence the creation of collective memory on the pillars of idealization and sentimentalism). Project from *The Dyonisian Socialism to Predatory Capitalism* in its title had one critical perspective towards themes and periods as its objects and subjects. The part of the project that took place in Inex, described as a historical frame to the voices from the past (2011), brings a new dimension to the project – with the innovative solutions in combination with the Inex building as a stage for the past. In this part, students and young architects cooperated during workshops under the mentorship of architect and university professor author Milorad Mladenović in developing spatial solutions for exhibition (installations) specially created for the Inex building (fig. 56).

![Figure 56. ‘Creative Articulations of Historical Narratives’. Spatial solution in Inex.](image)

Author of the photography is Iva Ćukić, participant of the project.

Like most of exhibitions in the Gallery in Inex, the project was multidimensional and mobilized different types of the medium, audio and visual material, in spatial manipulation. The artworks were dedicated to evoke past, delineate the importance of past experience and make it present for the audience. The deconstruction of the important Yugoslav narratives (nationalization,
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243 ‘The cultural field in which this project has taken shape was perceived as an opened setting for free debate on the critical moments in cultural history of this part of the world, and also on all those disputes that divided their commentators in adverse camps at these critical moments’ (Erić, Vuković, 2012, 4).
working class, army) from short films was transformed in construction (assumptions and projections) of the Yugoslav legacy in the future – listening of the voices from the past and its transformation represents the reflective process of autobiographical reasoning (Habermas, Bluck, 2000).

That process of linking past and future, old and imagined identity, in post-conflict societies takes time and effort in developing the connection between the previous and wanted (Yugoslav and post Yugoslav identity) (Hirchberger, 2018). Cooperation (official/non official institutions, old/young generations) enables change of perspective and distance towards old self (but also towards an emerging one) which is important for understanding the fluctuations that emerge in search of stable relations towards past, and narrative identity (McLean, 2008).

The material for audio workshop were the archival footages of the Radio Belgrade broadcasts featuring prominent figures from the postwar period with influence on nowadays politics and cultural workers (Josip Broz Tito, Edvard Kardelj, Oto Bihalji Merin, Mića Popović, Miodrag Protić, et al.). Those fragments became material for interpretation during audio workshops, and at the end, in spatial installations and constellations, those interpretations got one layer more. They should be included in one larger narrative, that again should contribute to the large image of the Yugoslav legacy dedicated projects – search for meaning and old/new identity.244

The Historical framework of Memory (ambient settings for listening to the voices of the past), according to mentor Milorad Mladenović, represented the synthesis of architecture and music in the modelling of spatial ambience for each particular musical intervention. With the historical framework of the Inex Film’s building as the spatial dimension to the event, the project brought ‘a totalizing space for events along the lines of the original concept’ in spite of the authors individual aspirations. The important conclusion of the project was about the age of participants and their experience with the theme:

/ …the space for the reflection on the past, about which most of the authors surely did not have any substantial knowledge given their age. In a simple and convincing manner, they have demonstrated that the culture of

244 ‘As for the choice of location, the crucial aspect was that the building was recognized as a symptom of social transformation in today’s Serbia, where the vestiges of the previous social system live on side by side with the new forms of self organized use of derelict spaces for cultural purposes. Together with the collective Expedition Inex Film, which, exploring the possibilities of self organization, solidarity and DIY philosophy of life in Belgrade at the beginning of the 21th century, operated in this building, an adaptation of the space where these installations were set was prepared’.
memory very often leads us into vague and unreadable settings of the past, which by the way, as used samples, cannot be more than the sound and its ambience. (Mladenović, 2012, 26–27).

The treatment of the Yugoslav legacy as vague voices of the past, implies a space for interpretations, and a free space for concretization, important for younger generations – participants of the project or community in Inex. Constructing a connection between past and future, in aim of making the change (in relation towards the first and also towards another), ‘suggests that one is looking to the future’ (McLean, 2008) younger generations in institutions such as Inex, treated the Yugoslav legacy as a fund from which they should choose according to the image of the future self (identity) and not vice versa (obvious already on the project I have describing here). While the Yugoslav narrative in official institutions and nonofficial institutions of older generation means ‘preserving’ as a key notion, in nonofficial institutions of younger generation it means ‘transformation’ (McLean, 2008, 255).

Whole polyphony of the project situation functions as the imaginary projection of the need for free creative space on the cultural scene in Serbia in order for the new narratives to appear. It was and still is a strong statement. Also, it represents a certain type of recipe, how to deal with the crisis of cultural institutions during the transformation process through joint projects of official and unofficial institutions, which thematize past (Polleta, 2018).

The important moment is gathering of the artists, curators, activists and professors of different generations under one roof (Whithier, 2002) which does not accidentally belong to the building from the Yugoslav legacy corpus. The Historical Frame contained the artwork, multimedial spatial installations, emerged from the following cooperation, Pavle Popov and Marko Salapura (Years), Danica Vujošević and Iva Čukić (Budućnost jučerašnjice /The Future of the Yesterday), Luka Barajević and Luka Mladenović (Boje zvuka/Colors of Sound), Endre Barna and Zorana Matić (Metamorfozal Metamorphosis), Srđan Popov and Nikola Andonov (Protić igral/Protić Dances). For the aim of illustration and analysis of the project (‘one part for the whole/pars pro toto’)245, I have chosen two installations (composition and spatial design), Metamorphosis and Protić Dances.

245 Every single contribution (artefact) was create to represent the whole – real and possible life in Socialist Yugoslavia. ‘One part for whole’ is an explanation for synecdoche, a figure of speech in which a term for a part of something refers to the whole of something or vice versa. As Mike Bal stated about the piece which could represent the whole: ‘The ethnic artefact, in contrast, is first and foremost considered to be a representative of the larger context of the culture it comes from. Hence, it is not a metaphor but a synecdoche. For synecdoche is the figure of speech where an element, a small part, stands for the whole simply by virtue of its being a part of that whole. Thus, the artefact is only readable as culture, no matter what aesthetic qualities it may also have. The use of metaphor and synecdoche respectively is based on an emphasis that represses in each case its ‘other,’ the necessary activity of the figure that is
In a fragment of a project where the composition *Metamorphosis* of a young author Endre Berna meets the spatial solution of Zorana Matić, the investigator’s room appeared in the Inex building. The significant title of the project implicates the transformation process and change in society, and in the same time analysis, fully controlled and monitored search for knowledge and owning the truth. Then occurs the question – if truth is possible under the controlled conditions and presence of existential fear. The clash between traditional concept of the investigator’s room and the contemporary concept mirrored in technological stuff for delicate monitoring that amplifies convenience – difference between two lays in a fact that contemporary investigator’s room means certain type of amenity, chairs, microphones, while traditional concept requires minimal distraction in the interrogation process and room without extra furniture, colors, paintings, just table and couple of chairs, minimum light, so nothing could interrupt the process (fig. 57).

![Image of a scene with two individuals discussing a project, labeled as Figure 57. *Metamorphosis* (authors Endre Barna, Zorana Matić). Photo: Iva Ćukić](image)
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not activated. For as the Rothko case suggested, the metaphoric function is based on the principle of synecdoche as well, it is because the work ‘fits in,’ is part of a larger context, in this case Western modernism, that it can fulfill its lofty metaphorical function. Conversely, the synecdochally read ethnic artefact can only be a synecdoche for its cultural background on the basis of an assumed unity of that culture, thanks to which it is metaphorical for the ‘essence’ of that culture as much as a Rothko is a metaphor for its aesthetic.’ (Bal, 2012, 148).
Interesting application in the use of this metaphor, metaphor of investigator’s room and interrogation process for depicting and spatialization of *Metamorphosis* in context of social change, lays in a fact that interrogations were common in communism, that Yugoslavia dissolved in a bloody conflicts accompanied with the investigations of numerous people, being suspicious for the betrayal, war crimes, or enemy of the nation. ‘Enemies of the regime’ were a well known danger during communism, and struggle in the interrogation room often meant a decision between life and death.

That is how ‘traditional’ in this spatial solution recalls previous ideology and confessions, while *Metamorphosis* to contemporary concept meant covering up, certain ‘makeup’, in a manner of ‘predatory capitalism’ and technology ever present in contemporaneity.

What is really new is a solution for the multiple interpretations of what is said and heard, emanated in technology for recording, what actually meant less freedom and more of the control and should guarantee higher levels of truth presence and less free space for personal interpretations. *Metamorphosis* also evokes the importance of personal story (witnessing) in search for the truth – actually, a consensual and critical approach to the past. Also, *Metamorphosis* evoked whole European culture, through the capital literal artwork such as Ovidius *Metamorphoses*, or also Franz Kafka’s *Metamorphosis (Die Verwandlung)* – every transformation brings multiple crises and conflicts.

A spatial solution of an interrogation process reflects in, table and two chairs without armrests, then microphone and camera, room without a window, the walls made to look like from concrete, and citation of the paragraph from Danilo Kiš’s novel *Nož sa drškom od ružinog drveta [The Knife with the Rosewood Handle]* were enough to create the atmosphere of the ‘traumatic now’ (VanDer Kolk, 2015), recall the past and the presence of freezing existential fear. The whole set, also according to the description in the catalogue, brought at list two paradigms of meaning. The first one, known from the Old Greece language, means transforming, transformation, change, conversion, makeover.

Then the second one means more precise and linked to the place and time of a project – change of society, political and social transformation, and at the end, concrete situations and power games in interrogation process such as direct approach, stimulating approach, emotional approach, intimidation, pride and ego centered approach, futile resistance, ‘we know everything’ approach, cross examination, ‘good cop, bad cop sort of thing’.
The last paradigm contained the criticism of brutal games in society, manipulation in human relations and cruelty of hierarchy in official institutions. The audience could take one of the chairs, taking the role of investigator or the suspect, and making with each pair a different constellation, giving a new interpretation and by that a new narrative. The fact that the authors (participants of the workshops under mentorship) were very young, most of them were still students, and the fact that they did not have personal experience with Yugoslavia, nor lived in an atmosphere of the communism regime, marginalized the element of nostalgia and Yugonostalgia, which became the prerequisite for rethinking, reinventing and researching of the Yugoslav narrative.

In that constellation, a contribution expressed the value of the self-reflecting process, together with one’s understanding of self through the story about the past, both important in post-conflict societies and search for the new identity (Cohler, 1993). Participation of younger generations was crucial – the quest for change was added to every single ‘voice of the past’ (McLean, 2008).

The second contribution I have chosen to describe is the composition of Srđan Popov Protić Dances emplaced by Nikola Andonov’s spatial design. It was a part of the installation named Double Negation. The room has been divided by a wall made of mirrors in order to get a quadrangle chamber. The floor of the entire room has been covered with yellow autumn leaves in thick layers, where the microphones were installed to capture the sound of the footsteps. Only the column in the middle of the room was whitewashed, whereas the walls and ceiling are left in their original color.246 According to the authors, the important part of the project was mirroring, doubling the space and quoting the hyperreality of the present. Walking over the leaves is a tactile thing with dramatic effect. The installation brought poetic dimension in relation to the past, together with the phenomenon of mirroring, established effectively with the use of mirrors (Crane, 1997). Blackening the room made this effect more present.

---

246 The authors gave their own impression of the installation explaining its form in space. Catalogue is exhibition after exhibition and a chance for the author to perceive and articulate the impression about their own expression (artwork). As for the lightning – it will consist of six spotlights (dotted sources of yellow light with about 2,800K). Four of them are attached around the column so as to have it singled out, with minimum light cast on the surroundings, and two are fixed on the beam to illuminate two laminated posters with the text on. The loudspeakers are also hung along the beam directed to all four sides (each to itself). Since the intensity of light is fairly low (camera obscura), loudspeakers and all cables on the ceiling will be minimally visible. As far as the subwoofer (bass loudspeaker) is concerned, it can be placed behind the mirror. Also, additional loudspeakers tucked around the chamber in the corner could be from time to time suddenly activated to produce the effect of unidentified sounds like in the films of David Linch (following Srdan’s suggestions)” (Andonov, Popov, 2012, 46).
The moment where the author stated about architectural intervention being minimal but important in details such as ‘leaving the windows opened as a reminder to the fact that the best thing in a museum are windows’ (Andonov, Popov, 2012, 46) he made an instant identification between the Museum and the Inex building. Even if that was just for the need of the project, it was obviously present as a fact – Inex was a Museum of Contemporary Art during this project, stating the importance of alternative institutions and their nature.

The moment when the audience became a participant in the project carrying leaves on their feet from room to room and leaving traces (like from the past to the present), also leaving the material of the installation in a building, that moment has been an important state of the internal presence of the past in present and future. The Double negation emanated the message that no one can be quite sure of what is real, and that real and unreal are constantly jumping into one another due to the instability of meaning, referring to the past and present intervening between one and the other all the time.

In a publication following the project, the author Nikola Andonov stated, ‘All things left unfinished after a while come back as ghosts, evoking the fact that dealing with the Past is a huge task in Serbia (and this attempt was standing as a part of it)’ (Andonov, 2010). This project as a symbol for cooperation between two sectors and made a special space for discussing the possibility for acting and developing together, not without certain sociopolitical context and activism, characteristic for alternative space (Dragićević Šešić, 2018).

The Inex squat (Gallery in Inex as a part of it) was already marked, just by its nature, with a Brian O’Doherty’s theory about the certain type of gallery being a gesture (O’Doherty, 1999), bringing the additional meaning to every exhibition held in this particular building, bringing into the narrative transition and privatization,

Yugoslav cultural space and post Yugoslav period. In spite of, as Greenberg stated, the fact that most of the contemporary art exhibitions and its context (explanation and critics) minimize the importance of the location (Greenberg, 2012, 246), the place of alternative institutions in Serbia, mostly belonging to the Federation of Yugoslavia during its existence, has its story to tell.

That is how, in the first place, alternative institutions represented (and still do) the Yugoslav legacy – mostly they are placed in squatted buildings that belonged to the Yugoslav Federation (Inex, Street Gallery, Storage in Marko Kraljević’s Street, Kvaka 22). In that way, in
cooperation between the official and nonofficial institutions, the Yugoslav narrative is always present. Not just by representing the transition and state of culture caused by the transition process, more like representing the Yugoslav legacy, heritage, cultural space and demanding the reconsideration of their space and place in nowadays culture and politics (suppression often leads to symbolic expression).

The need for reconsidering the relation of official institutions towards the Yugoslav past and treatment of its legacy comes under the spotlight through (occasional) cooperation between official and nonofficial institutions. Those mutual projects are so rare, that they can be marked as incidents. The character of activism presence in alternative institutions and almost all formations of independent scene in the whole region (Višnić, Dragojević, 2008, 11) could not be a recommendation for cooperation considering official perspective on Yugoslavia.

At the end, instead of the analysis that the project promised at the beginning, just an indication of ‘dealing with the past’ appeared. The pathway is a ‘story left untold’, ‘personal experience’, and new shape of old voices (ambient installations in Inex) but conclusions are again postponed for some other time and projects. In a way, it was also anticipation of the projects that gave more space to the personal experience and its importance in creation of historical narrative (Assman, 2011), such as projects in the Museum of Yugoslavia.

More than any other important information or conclusion, the project brought the awareness that there are untold stories on a path from socialism to the capitalism, and that some voices need to be heard again, interpreted again, put in some other contexts, and if it’s needed – reinterpreted all the time (Erić, Vuković, 2010). The alternative space, such as Inex and alternative institutions of the new generation appeared as the space of transformative energy (Dragićević Šešić, 2018), symbolical meaning, strength of a medium in the process (re)owning the past.

Meanwhile, the Inex became a new model of cultural institutions, with open calendars, open space and various cultural and artistic events (together with projects such as free kindergarten) emerged spontaneously on the roots and legacy of the previous period (socialism, communism) such as unity and community, raised in radical bottom-up process.

With this project and cooperation with Museum of Contemporary Art, the Inex Film Expedition became one of the first examples of alternative institutions in the 21th century in Serbia ready for a change, new movements, new type of organizations, funding, and what is most
important, ready for cooperation with official institutions with the aim of transforming the current situation in culture and art.

EXHIBITIONS, FRAGMENTED MIRROR OF FRAGMENTED SOCIETY

Serbian history and history of the countries on the Balkan peninsula are marked with discontinuity. It can be described as a chain of periods, a continuity of discontinuity. Every segment was finished with a cultural trauma in order for the new one to begin, without a connection or communication between them. The next one was a proof that the previous one should be erased and forgotten (Petrović, 2013).

Due to the cultural trauma that appeared too frequently in the last century (almost every 20 years) and became transgenerational, which then led to the fragmentation instead just of the next period, completely disconnected from the previous one (Alexander, 2016). The fragmentation that occurred after the war in the 90s, bombing in 99, revolution in 2000, and also disappearing the last emanation of Yugoslavia in 2006, lead to the crisis that is still present in Serbian society, collapse of internal structure of almost every institution, caused by identity crisis (Mihaljinac, 2019).

The fragmentation, which is in psychology and sociology, symptomatic for vulnerable, weak, and psychotic structure, became a dynamic of the core narratives (Sieff, 2017). Not just that certain groundbreaking events, where traumatic, some processes where never-ending source of trauma, such as privatization process, known by the controversial cases, unexplained decisions, banned information and unclarified tenders (Vujačić, Petrović-Vujačić, 2016).

Companies were sold for coins, an enormous number of people left jobless. It contained several stages, due to the war conflict between states in the 90s, also showing discontinuity (present even in stage’s name, blocked and unblocked transition). The privatization and the whole

247 As authors of the process overview, one of many, stated about its dynamic in Serbia. ‘Privatization in Serbia as the centerpiece of the transition process had several phases, for many reasons. The armed conflict in former Yugoslavia led to prolonged instability. United Nations sanctions also affected the economy significantly. These were no small constraints, which basically led to privatization being carried out in a setting of serious economic devastations after the overthrow of the Milošević regime in late 2000. The regime change itself, as shall be argued, created the need for speedy privatization in dire economic circumstances, which then led to the neglect of certain institutional features that were to deeply affect the results of the privatization process’ (Vujačić, Petrović-Vujačić, 2016, 46).

The transition process in Serbia could also be marked as postponed or late. Infrastructure was damaged through the 1999 bombing by NATO, and also by the sanctions period, which lasted almost a decade, being for the economy in Serbia, exhausting and devastating. The regime changed, but democratic structures could not reach high levels in the
transition dynamic were marked as a failure due to the characteristics of the previous period (Petrović, 2013), as one way more to point out all the negative sides of Yugoslav state.

***

Due to the isolation after the dissolution of Yugoslavia and the crisis in the 90s, communication with foreign countries (and its trends) was lacking in Serbia. So, emerging practices such as squatting, could not reach alternative structures and independent institutions in Serbia, and could not influence the dynamic of its development. Inex was never a typical squat. Squat was never typical for social and cultural reality in Serbia. It became practice in the 20th century in some former Yugoslav countries, such as Slovenia (Moore, 2015).

In spite of that fact, some of the squats are known and significant until nowadays, even though there are just a few that exist now in 2020 in Serbia (Mikić, 2013). Some of them were famous for their pioneering role, occupying the public or private space for the citizens’ use (as a meeting and gathering space, for clubbing or living, temporary or sometimes permanently). The Inex ‘expedition’ that occupied the Inex Film abandoned building is remembered by its cultural and art production, playing the role of important cultural and art center, home of ‘doing by yourself’ practice and example of bottom-up emerged institutions (several institutions emanated from the Inex after those 4 years of existence and several institutions were already connected with the initiative and the Inex Expedition project from the very beginning, all alternative ones) (Milosavljević, Nikoletić, 2013).

The fact that for all of four years Inex listed hundreds of different art events, including exhibitions, panels, performances, different projects and was supported by official institutions and the Ministry of Culture, is what makes the Inex Expedition an extraordinary squat and a significant alternative place (Milosavljević, 2013). Also, the Inex Initiative was a result of chronic shortage of space for culture and art, lack of support for nonofficial institutions and young artists, the space for regional and intercultural meeting of artists and practices, for which the squatting of a 1500 m² building was a temporary solution. The lack of the working space was one of the main problems of the alternative institutions in Serbia (Cvetičanin, 2010).

democratization process, and certainly not high levels of success in privatization, which stayed marked by institutional failures. That dynamic of transition process ‘led to poor overall results’, being until nowadays unpopular, controversial, and by the huge number of suspect cases of manipulation and corruption, marked with ‘general public aversion to privatization’ (Vujačić, Petrović Vujačić, 2016, 46).
After the ‘occupation’ of the building, the Inex Expedition was soon to become an alternative institution of new generation, that had an ‘artivistic’ approach toward socio-political reality, but also one wider and more theoretical perspective than older generation of alternative institutions in the 90s (Dragićević Šešić, 2018,145). Exhibitions in Inex were everywhere, not just in the gallery in Inex. They were in almost every room, as murals on the walls of the façade, in every ‘atelier’ in the building.

Some exhibitions of foreign guest artists were curated for the gallery in Inex (The Great Q, Pehrsdoter/Halberg, Swedish artists, 2014), but mostly narratives of exhibitions (often – group exhibitions) were fragmented with no coherent story. Even if the common denominator was found and accentuated (like Presek stanja svesti /Cut through Consciousness), the structure is more paradigmatic and discursive or narrative. The memory here appears as an object, image, sequence. It is personal and ‘immature’, it is still a memory, with strong emotional potential, but still without words or added meaning (Habermas, Bluck, 2000). The Gallery in Inex exposed the process of translating personal into collective memory. Inex was full of art works and ongoing creative processes thematizing personal past, often connected with the past of the building which evoked the Yugoslav past in personal and collective interpretation.

For example, the exhibition Šta god [Whatever] by the author Žarko Aleksić, contained two parts. In the first one, personal objects of the author, remembering past experience, were exposed in the Inex space all over the place. In the second one, the audience was called to do the same, to bring the memories in the form of the objects and place them somewhere (personal things: pieces of wardrobe, books, cosmetics, dolls, photos). Constellations played an important role. The exhibition name suggested the absence of conclusion and supposed story. The constellations should have been enough and interpretation ‘intentionally’ appeared as postponed. Fragmented

---

248 ‘Artivism connects art and activism. It focuses on how art in its multiple forms can embrace political intention, or how political action can become creative, poetic, sensorial. Artivism looks for new ways of political intervention, opens up new forms of disobedience and action that move beyond traditional paradigms of activism. This encounter between art and activism also shakes our representations of artistic practice, teasing it out of its usual circuits and habitats such as galleries and museums into the domain of daily life and public space. Art is not constrained anymore to the representation of reality but engages in its transformation.

Artivism uses creativity to raise awareness, mobilise, and inspire the spectator. Such indiscipline does not pretend to change the world through creation, but has the conviction that change takes shape through individual acts and awareness and through inviting artistic reflection into the gestures of everyday life.’ (Artivism, online source, Bibliography)

249 The Inex Expedition did not have ‘charismatic’ leadership like CZKD, nor an ideology emanated from the strong protest, the aim in the core of the organization and its core value were fulfilling for the public interest. The Inex Expedition was often ‘in the other half’ of alternative organizations, having no regular strategic planning practice but being clear about working in public interest when the word is about representation of organization events (Dragićević Šešić, Stefanović, 2017).
society expressed by the objects alienated in the space, having no real connection, except the common denominator – memories and the past.

Exhibitions that were curated for the Gallery in Inex had their lives in other galleries (such as FLU – Faculty of Fine Arts in Belgrade Gallery). Developing the narrative of alternative institutions that offered what the official ones could not, for example, continuity, respecting the regional art space, communicating with the whole region and wider, Inex was the source of the recipes for later revival of the cooperation, community, commons, openness towards region and world, narratives and practices in institutions such as Kvaka22.

Exhibitions in the Gallery in Inex were the pillars of communication with other institutions, the Ministry of Culture and foreign institutions. They had steadiness and continuity that was hard to maintain with other practices such as performance and at the same time, the Inex building had capacities for exhibitions, such as huge walls and open space, that were not approachable to the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade in that moment (in 2010). Often chosen way of communication, exhibitions became the most frequent event for both official and nonofficial institutions, with the same decency, probably due to the fragmentation that occured after the dissolution of Yugoslavia, and exhibition itself, containing several or more artworks, (often) is a priori fragmented in its nature.

In comparison to panel discussions, debates and conferences placed for example in CZKD, where narrative is a way of expression and conclusions are expected, exhibitions in Inex, being also straightforward, guaranteed one distant and metaphorical approach which often needed interpretations and by that have been more acceptable as discussions? on sensitive and controversial subjects such as the Yugoslav legacy. For example, part of the Nova kolekcija [New Collection] project (in 2014) thematized chronic absence of Museum of Contemporary Art from the art scene and devastating situation on the cultural scene. The project gathered young artists and students with mentorship of prominent curators, professors and artists. The name New Collection suggests emerging of the new narratives based on the critique of the (not) functioning official institutions. One of the installations was Kada Stari ode [When Oldmen goes…] (fig. 58).

250 The Exhibition itself, as a phenomenon, became the most important way of communicating the present and the past moment, especially in the period of the omnipresent marginalization of the Yugoslav narrative and importance of the Yugoslav legacy. Why is that? Just because of the dominance of the image in the 20th century and onward. Or does it have it’s due in the ‘fragmented’ nature of the exhibition, which goes together with the fragmented consciousness of the posttraumatic reality in Serbia after the 90s?
It brought a red star as a symbol of the communism period, leaking its red color, suggesting the passage of time, leaving an empty space, just a construction (red is symbolically strong color associate, referring to life, strength, blood). The exhibition *Plodovi gnevnih* [*The Grapes of Wrath*] held in Inex in October 2014, as a part of the project *New collection* contained a collection of artworks with strong denominator in a form of emotional complex, anger, frustration, anxiety, despair, helplessness.\(^{251}\) In the collection of works, artists were referring to the historical narratives by 

\(^{251}\) One part of the project, referring to the present moment, emanated in exhibition with a title *Pitaj sadašnjost, mogu li da pričam o tome?* [Ask Nowness – may I talk about it], accentuating lack of free space for critical approach towards socio political situation in past and present. Then, also – *Pitaj prošlost, transformiši Prošlost* [Ask Past, Transform...
of institutional critique, trying to empower the weak position on which they were referring in the project (especially in relation with the Museum of Contemporary Art, expressed in artwork of Andrea Dramičanin and Tea Lukač, *Artwork that did not save the Museum, T-shirt that did*, fig. 59).
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**Figure 59.** Andrea Dramičanin, Tea Lukač, *Artwork that did not saved the Museum*, Gallery in Inex, 2014, photo by Stanislav Drča

With the predominance of visual arts, complaining or due to the acceleration of time (Zherebin, Vershinskaia & Makhrova, 2015) and developing of different dynamic of perception that involve both objective and subjective dimensions (Bauman, 2007), exhibition became the most expressive artistic form and, instead of literature, taking the first place as a mirror of society.

What is also important, especially for the perception and the reception of the art work in the Gallery in Inex (large whole where the exhibitions were held), modern art is influenced by context and perception of the art work is always followed by certain context, even it is not clear enough in which way and which level this influence changes the nature of art and art piece (Gartus, Klemer, Leder, 2015).
From the perspective of the alternative institutions in Serbia, in this certain case, in the Gallery in Inex, almost every exhibition is burdened by socio political context. Mostly, two elements are dominant in that burden, the treatment of culture and art in official institutions and governing structures (marginalization causes deprivation, for example dedicating even less than one percent from national budget for culture), and self-destructive marginalization of the Yugoslav legacy which reflects in the lack of cultural policy and cooperation in region and wider, is just a side effect of the previous two. It’s not a rare case that the whole exhibition concept goes to fade in front of the socio-political circumstances or that conception is read in a key of actual happenings in sociopolitical contemporary life in Serbia.

In 2015, after four years and a half of the Inex, the exhibition *Presek stanja svesti* [Cut of the state of consciousness] announced the summary of the previous work of curators and artists in the Gallery in Inex and closing of the Inex squat and cultural center. Activists and artists had a spoken agreement with the owner to stay in the building until his decision about its future (purpose and functioning). The cultural center in the squatted Inex building lasted for more than four years. It hosted more than thirty exhibitions in the Gallery in Inex, numerous events including panel discussions, regular meetings of the artists and activists, performances, circus rehearsals and shows, concerts etc. Exhibition *Cut of the state of consciousness* witnessed not just about the previous exhibitions in Inex, it brought once again the context of every single one:

Not long ago, we were witnessing the end of one community's existence, in spite of ups and downs, this community succeeded and resisted market requests, taking the position which allowed them to escape the tasks of answering those requests during the four years and a half of existence. On those pillars, in April 2013, the Gallery in Inex emerged on the first flour and 100m2 of freedom. Freedom which did not mean that only to those people who developed it and worked there, it was in the first place freedom for the people who worked and created in Inex, and very often lived there, in their minds far away from tiring administration, permissions and limitations. Lack of those dues to financiers from the various sectors created the sense of relief which had its good and bad effects. Inex Film and Gallery in Inex during its period of presence have been in the whole region the source of buried and forgotten resources of enthusiasm and togetherness. If we have succeeded in this experiment or not, we will find out in the future, but just in case of new initiative appearances which could figure as reference. With this exhibition we aim to close the circle of the questions about events related to the Gallery in Inex. Nevertheless, questions which are related to ideas of self-organizations and independent communities which are active in abounded places and need to climb one step more in (re)questioning of the culture and society.252

---

252 *Nedavno smo bili svedoci prestanka postojanja jednog kolektiva koji je, uprkos usponima i padovima, uspevao da odoi težnja tržišta i zauzme poziciju koja mu je dozvolila da izbegne dovijanje istom tokom 4 i po godine postojanja. Na istim temeljima nezavisnosti, u aprilu 2013. godine osnovana je galerija na prvom spratu, 100
The main narrative and discourse formed around the closing exhibition of the Inex was dedicated to the sociopolitical context of the Inex community initiative. It was not, opposite to expectations, dedicated to art works displayed during those years nor to artists represented. The status of nonofficial institutions and within the official ones, in summary, the status of the whole culture and art scene in Serbia – has been the primary impression, together with the reactions of the artists it provoked. The current (and chronic) situation in art and culture overwhelmed the need...
to refer to display artwork. The Inex represented the important phenomenon firstly as the act of resistance towards maltreatment in the area of art and culture. Secondly, they were important as alternative institutions, example to upcoming unofficial cultural centers. The exhibition was held in Street Gallery, another unofficial and alternative institution, which was a gesture of accentuating the importance of the alternative space and networking among organizations.  

In spite of the mentioned exhibition being the summary of works in Inex, the closing of the Inex squat was marked with the exhibition held in one official and educational institution – the Faculty of Fine Arts. The exhibition was dedicated to the whole production in the Inex squat during four years and a half. The artists which have been working in Inex had different expressions, using different forms, so the last Inex exhibition was a multimedia event. The Inex was a host for more than 30 exhibitions in a year for more than four years in a time when ‘exhibitions are the primary site of exchange in the political economy of art, where signification is constructed, maintained and occasionally deconstructed.

Part spectacle, part socio-historical event, part structuring device, exhibitions, especially exhibitions of contemporary art, establish and administer the cultural meanings of art.’ (Grinberg, Ferguson, Nairne, 1996, 5). The Inex is the most illustrative example of the polyphony of the independent cultural scene in Serbia (and its fragmentation), due to the fact that various independent organizations or artists gathered in Inex or emerged from the cooperation between artists and activists in Inex during the period 2011–2015.

It demonstrated the polyphony of the independent scene voices, capacity for dialog between official and nonofficial institutions (project Voices of the Past) and accentuated the space and time limitation which is the main characteristic of alternative institutions (Moore, 2015), as well as the reason for their struggle, for resources and state institutions’ acknowledgment. The

254 Collective exhibition of all authors standing behind the Gallery in Inex production should remind of the significance of this center, project or even experiment (as it’s often called among people close to Inex). With the beginning in 2001, Inex gathered numerous artists and activists, among which artists displaying their artworks in its last exhibition Darko Stojkov, Ivan Jovanović, Vladimir Stanojević, Nicolas Jargić, Aleksandra Petković, Goran Rister, Andreja Krstić, Siniša Janjić, Kaća Krstmanović, Orjen Đurić, Jovan Ćurčić, Marija Avramović, Sofija Eftimovski-Božović, Nikola Hajduković i Marko Pejčić. Artists were pointing out the still unfulfilled need for art space (creating and exhibiting) in Belgrade, closed official institutions, lack of support for the unofficial ones. With the closing of the Inex space, Belgrade lost one significant cultural space. Inex was a fertile ground for various art practice, a lot of them new in Belgrade, appeared from connection with foreign artists and curators coming as guests in Inex. For example, Darko Stojkov and Ivan Jovanovic, as leading artists in the organization of the Gallery in Inex, were supporting the concept of Artist Run Art Space known in other countries, which gathers young artists and curators in creating and organizing the life in Gallery. The exhibition was a way of expressing gratitude to all supporters, artists, researchers, curators, journalists, academics and audience.
time limitation that conveyed the notion of ‘expedition’ appeared as an anticipation. After four and a half years, the Inex squat and cultural center ceased to exist.

Figure 61. A detail from the one of the numerous installations in Inex. Part of the permanent or temporal display. Created spontaneously from the objects founded on cite (ready-made).

Photo: Darko Stojkov
4.4 Alternative Institutions in Serbia – the Youngest (Third) Generation

On-going Revolution in Kvaka 22 / Catch 22

As a post-conflict society, still experiencing deep cultural and economic crisis, Serbia explore ways of making past experiences meaningful (Bruner, 1987). In that search, in spite of the personal experiences having the important role in translating personal into the collective memory (Assman, 2011), cultural institutions have a predominant role. As I already mentioned, a story about the Yugoslav past differs from institution to institution, including a huge gap between official and nonofficial institutions (Markovina, 2018).

Even though there are differences in understanding the Yugoslav legacy among two mentioned sectors, certain differences appear also among older and younger generations of institutions, mainly reflected in the perspective towards the Yugoslav past. Basically, that means interpretation of the past in search for meaning and change, instead of meaning and stability (McLean, 2008). In time of transformation and creation of the new identity both quests in relation to the past are necessary, a quest for stability and a quest for change. But, the predominant one describes and gives the core meaning to the narrative, personal or collective one, and also influences the identity of the institution.255

While interest in the past events is oriented to the analysis of the past in nonofficial institutions of older generation (such as CZKD), and answering to the question ‘What happened in the past? What does it mean now? For whom?’ In younger generations of institutions, questions are ‘What was that and what we need from there?’, how to manifest answers in praxis and help in exploring and establishing narrative identity (Wortham, 2001). In between is, for example, Inex as a large platform for (re)search and producing of cultural schemas both for official and nonofficial institutions (Polleta, 2015), together with new paradigms of cultural institutions. Kvaka 22 is an example of a new cultural, independent center, completely representative for, so called, new

255 ‘People actively interpret their experiences and store these interpretations in memory. When subsequently recalled, these interpretations can be important mediators of social behaviour. Often, what is recalled is a narrative account of particular experience. In fact, despite the apparent informational superiority of abstract propositions and generalizations, people often seem to prefer narratives. Constructing a narrative account may be the vital first step toward understanding an event. It may or may not be followed by making inferences or deducing abstract, propositional generalization and casual or moral principles. Understanding the construction of narratives should therefore be one goal of social cognition.’ (Baumesteir, Newman; 1994, 688).
generations of the cultural centers and probably paradigmatic for the new perspective towards the Yugoslav legacy, narrative description of the past serves to the creation of the world we want to live in the future (Habermas, Bluck, 2000).

To describe the relation towards Yugoslavia and space of the Yugoslav legacy in Kvaka 22, I will mention, among others, the theory of Jefferson Singer about self-defining memories, important in (re)gaining self-awareness and creating of identity. As self-defining memories (in individual) I will use interpretation (description) of past events and projects (in the cultural center Kvaka 22) dedicated to Yugoslavia or Yugoslav inheritance. In search of the identity of the institution together with its relation towards the past, I will choose projects of various types as an illustration of shaping memories (Singer, 2012).

Yugoslavia in post Yugoslav space exists as a common (regional) cultural space, with emanations of its ideologies such as ‘brotherhood and unity’. The Yugoslav legacy is placed mainly in a dialogical space, mirrored in solidarity and togetherness, in the community and the audience gathered around the cultural center. More than anywhere else, the Yugoslav inheritance emanated in language and appears as a discourse (paradigmatic, official institutions) or as a narrative (syntagmatic, nonofficial institution) through different mediums (Baumeister, Newman, 1994), such as exhibitions, debates, film projections. Dealing with a lack of written sources and literature, I have provided numerous informal interviews with the members of the Kvaka 22 collective, and also with the artists and cultural workers (representatives of the organizations that used to participate in Kvaka 22 events). The mentioned conversations, together with audio and video materials collected during my visits (audio and video) were the basic material for this research.

During the interviews, I have concluded that personal memories together with memories transmitted from the parents, grandmothers and grandfathers, when the word is about the place of Yugoslavia in Kvaka 22, have the most important role in forming the interpretation of the past, shaping the form and themes of main projects. The interesting and surprising impression was that, in spite of respecting the past and giving it prominent space, the decisive influence for identity forming was the orientation towards the future (McLean, 2008) characteristic for the young individuals’s way of remembering. The description, conclusions, and facts given in these chapters
emanated mainly from those conversations, then from published interviews, articles, and movies (academic studies in the field of unofficial institutions and cultural scene are really rare).^{256}

**YUGOSLAV LEGACY I - SEARCH FOR SPACE, SEARCH FOR MEANING**

Kvaka 22, an alternative institution of the younger generation, placed in a building representing the Yugoslav period, shows the new possibility of treating the Yugoslav past, spontaneous bottom-up remembrance reflected in the structure and program of the institution. With the experience collected during the Inex ‘expedition’, a group of participants (young artists and activists) decided to establish a new cultural center in an abandoned building which belonged to the Yugoslav Army, more precisely to the Yugoslav Army Orchestra in 39 Roosevelt Street in Belgrade.

After the closing of Inex, in spite of the four years appealing to the government and pointing out the difficult status of both unofficial and official institutions of culture, the need for cultural space and cultural institutions, center and organizations stayed unfulfilled (Milosavljević, 2013, 22). Young artists, the future collective of Kvaka 22^{257}, as they stated in interviews and informal speeches, decided to proceed with cultural activism after the closing of Inex. An idea for Kvaka 22 came with the discovery of an abandoned and devastated Yugoslav Army Orchestra’s Building, as a possible place for a new cultural center (2015)^{258} (fig. 62, 63).

---

^{256} As it has been the case in Inex (previous chapter), the Yugoslav legacy as a common cultural space of former Yugoslav countries, was ‘moved’ (suppressed) from official institutions and publicity toward ‘shadow space’ that usually represented counter publicity (Wortham, 2006). Counter-publicity should not be the most adequate notion for describing nonofficial institutions in Serbia. Also, counter-culture does not apply in a proper manner for this certain case – case of Serbian non official culture and cultural institutions in transition. The space of nonofficial cultural scenes is a space where alternative structure emerges to support and replace the main (official) one. (Slapšak, 2009).

^{257} The collective of Catch 22 represents young artists, Slavica Obradović, Ana Marija Ćupin, Goran Rister, Jovana Ćurčić, Nikola Hajduković, Luka Mihajlović i Siniša Janjić.

^{258} A significant number of videos, dedicated to the establishment and events in Kvaka 22, can be found in this profile on Vimeo platform. (link in Online sources, in Bibliography).
Figure 62. Inside of the devastated building: Stairs. Photo: Luka Mihajlović, 2015

Figure 63. Inside of the devastated building: room. Photo: Luka Mihajlović, 2015
The building required six months of extreme effort for the basic functioning to be enabled. The building was left abandoned with no electricity or water, covered with trash, used as a shelter for homeless people and addicts. The building has three floors and it is placed in Karaburma (Roosevelt Street 39) which is still the city core of Belgrade, approachable for the citizens (Fig. 64, 65).

Figure 64. Kvaka 22 in 2019, Photo: Tijana Vuković
The name Kvaka 22 [Catch 22] according to its establishers’ statement was given to associate the ridiculous and paradoxical situation on the cultural scene in Serbia. It also refers to political and social situations as a background of the cultural one. Similar to other representative and presented examples of alternative institutions Kvaka 22 even being the youngest one, demands an active approach to the past and reactivation of the Yugoslav narrative, in search for continuity and identity (McLean, 2008). From the very beginning, events organized in Kvaka 22 were dedicated to the whole region, especially the ‘former Yugoslav states, so first guests from abroad were artists from Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia.

The respect and reminiscence towards the Yugoslav heritage and post Yugoslav cultural and art space, was not occasional in the program of Kvaka 22. It represents an approach fully aware of the value of the Yugoslav legacy and diminishing treatment of the governing structures towards the Yugoslav legacy and alternative institutions, at the same time. Kvaka 22 is the only institution, alongside the Museum of Yugoslavia, that has a permanent exhibition dedicated to Yugoslavia. The most valuable evidence of the Yugoslav inheritance in Kvaka 22 is the Museum Kvaka 22 as the institution in the institution, placed on the first floor of Kvaka 22, beside the Gallery. The collection is composed of the artefacts (objects) found in the building during its cleaning. So, the objects are transformed into the artefacts on the site where they were found (ready-made) - mostly documents, records and photographs left after the Yugoslav Army Orchestra (fig. 66).

---

259 According to Merriam Webster Dictionary: Catch-22 could mean (1) a problematic situation for which the only solution is denied by a circumstance inherent in the problem or by a rule, also, the circumstance or rule that denies a solution; (2) an illogical, unreasonable, or senseless situation; (3) a measure or policy whose effect is the opposite of what was intended; (4) a situation presenting two equally undesirable alternatives; (5) a hidden difficulty or means of entrapment, CATCH. And a history of meaning ‘The original Catch-22 was a governmental loophole involved in Joseph Heller’s satirical novel Catch-22. Heller’s novel follows the exploits of a bombardier in World War II, and in doing so shines a light on the relentless and circular bureaucracy of war and wartime governments. The term is introduced to describe the apparent loophole, or catch, that prevents a pilot from asking for a mental evaluation to determine if he’s fit to fly. Catch-22 appears several times in the novel, always invoked to explain a contradiction or an inescapable paradox caused by the rule itself. It was adopted into general English to refer to an illogical situation, or a problem in which the solution is denied by the problem itself.’ Merriam- Webster, on line sources, Bibliography).

260 During four years, Kvaka 22 (Catch 22), became a modern stable unofficial, alternative institution, with a developed and rich program, covering the whole spectrum of art and culture forms, organizing exhibitions, debates, conferences, concerts, performances, workshops, educations.
Documents that were found in the building and deliberately pulled out the garbage were cleaned and sorted and finally became the artefacts of the Museum. Symbolically, that could be the fate of the Yugoslav legacy in future in a space occupied by future generations (in the most optimistic scenario). Even that concept could not emerge without referring to the current state in Museums in Serbia, where the Yugoslav legacy could not settle for years. The conceptualization of the Museum and the text (description) that follows this project (always available on the (non)official site and translated here on the following page) represent a certain manifest of the Yugoslav legacy in Kvaka 22.

Yugoslavia emanated as a common artistic and cultural space through cooperation with artists and organizations in post Yugoslav countries, also as an attitude of common inter and using the resources (socialism inheritance) together with antifascist attitude in the primary sense of valuing differences and freedom (antifascist combat, National Liberation Army / NOB) without ambition of the collective to analyze or define Yugoslav legacy (Milošević, 2012).

The main display in this specific Museum was a collection containing documentation and objects found in the building. As Goran Rister, artist and creator of the Museum stated, the
documentation meant different subjects, instruments and tools for repair, recordings, and paper documentation as a core of the Museum collection (fig. 67). Every object has its story to tell:

Museum Kvaka 22 represents the collection of objects and documentation found in an abandoned building in Roosevelt Street 39 in Belgrade. The previous workshop for reparation music instruments of Army Orchestra SFR had stopped working, and the mentioned facility was abandoned ten years ago. The huge amount of documentation material was left behind, as parts of instruments and paper materials that had been used as museum artefacts for display.

The Achievement of Museum Catch 22 is representative of one world which does not exist anymore, the pillars of that world are visible in the exhibition, antifascist combat, national revolution, and harmonic life of all the people in spite of their ideological differences.

In the permanent display and through the new use, found archival material is placed in new cultural and historical context problematizing (Yugoslav, TV) idea from which is taken its antifascist and international character in contemporary Serbian society. Together with the already mentioned context, display relates to the present moment where authorities as a cultural policy pillars, in relation with museums, employees in culture and culture itself, follow interests of the market. That attitudes endanger the survival of the vital cultural institutions dedicated to building of cultural identity.

261 'Muzej Kvaka 22 predstavlja skup objekata i dokumentacije pronađene u napuštenoj zgradi u Ruzveltovoj ulici 39, u Beogradu. Nekadašnja radionica za popravku muzičkih instrumenata vojnih orkestra SFR Jugoslavije, je prestala sa radom a navedeni objekat je napušten pre deset godina. Iza sebe su ostavili obimnu dokumentarnu građu u vidu predmeta, uglavnom delova instrumenata i papirne dokumentacijske građe koje sam iskoristio kao osnovu muzejske postavke. Arhivska građa Muzeja Kvake 22 je reprezent jednog nestalog društva a unutar postavke se vide njegova najvažnija uporišta, antifašistička borba, narodna revolucija i miran suživot svih naroda uprkos njihovim ideološkim razmnoženjima. Kroz postavku i novu namenu pronađeni arhivski material stavljen je u kulturno-istorijski kontekst problematizovanja ideje koja se u savremenom srpskom društvu potiskuje i oduzima joj se antifašistički i internacionalistički karakter. Uz već navedeni istorijski i ideološki kontekst postavka se odnosi na sadašnji trenutak u kome stav države kao nosioca kulturne politike prema umetnosti, muzejima, radnicima u sferi kulture i kulturi uopšte funkcioniše po modelu tržišne politike i samim tim dovodi u pitanje opstanak njenih vitalnih institucija koje grade njen kulturni identitet. Osam meseci rada u prostoru je bilo potrebno za čišćenje, sanaciju, uspostavljanje osnovne neophodne infrastrukture, klasifikaciju i finalizaciju postavke unutar prostorije koja je za muzej namenjena. Ovaj sajt predstavlja drugu fazu rada u kojoj je u saradnji sa Gete institutom iz Beograda urađena virtualizacija muzejske postavke i velike galerije.' Translation TV (official site Kvaka 22, online source in Bibliography)
Legacy of antifascism in the XX century emerged in contemporary cultural life through the new context of museum collection in Kvaka 22 (collection accentuating the collectiveness, togetherness, and ordinary community life of the working class, through photos, documents like protocols, notes, prescriptions). The collection and display also refer on the situations nowadays,
in which government treats culture and art through the perspective of the market interests and capitalistic values which causes disaster in core structures of the cultural institutions diminishing the values on which they are built, turning apart the continuity and breaking off with the Yugoslav inheritance (*Museum in Disappearing*).

In the manner of legacy preservation, Kvaka 22 made one step further than CZKD or Inex - accepting certain values of the past without discussing it (Pals, 2006), such as common cultural space, diversity, common good, equality, shared resources and work tasks as an inheritance of socialism, communism, antifascism. Treating the cultural institutions as part of the market and applying to them market policy and logic of liberal capitalism, was and still is fatal for their internal structure and identity (Dimitrijević, 2016). As Goran Rister stated in his description for the Museum in Kvaka 22, due to mentioned circumstances, eight months were requested for cleaning and developing the basic structure in the space dedicated for display. In cooperation with the Goethe Institute the second phase of the Museum’s collection displaying was grounded in virtual space through virtual presentation (2016 – 2017).

The motivation for virtual representation was the temporality as a main characteristic of every cultural organization that is placed in a squatted building (Moore, 2015). It also came from the awareness that Kvaka 22 with its relation to the past has certain characteristics of the movement that always, by its nature, represents certain challenges to authorities and official institutions (Polleta, 2005). Also, the movement as a protest should also provide possibilities and propositions for a change on personal and collective level (Thorne, 2004).

The Museum in Kvaka 22 is an important narrative in the creation of the institution's identity, representing the interpretation of the Yugoslav past. Through the Museum as a permanent project chosen moments are articulated as ‘pars pro toto’, transforming past moments through present moment, dedicating it to the future (McAdams, McLean, 2013).

In Kvaka 22 post Yugoslav identity was shaped through various exhibitions such as *Kuća sreće* [House of happiness] *Connections, Nova srpska mitologija* [New Serbian Mythology] numerous students exhibitions in cooperation with the Academy of Art, film projections, debates (i.e. *Razgovori o Jugoslaviji* [Conversations about Yugoslavia] in cooperation with the Museum of Yugoslavia, partnership between organizations of civic and government sector in cooperation with the Ministry of Culture), festivals (i.e. *Festival novih zagrebačkih bendova* [Festival of new
bands from Zagreb], *Samit nesvrstanih* [Non-alignment Movement], *Festival Festival borbenih filmova* [Festival of combat movies]).

The conception of projects, realizations, actors and audience are all part of transformation process, identity shaping and bringing one possible world to life (Bruner, 1986). Free space of alternative institutions enables various interpretations, lessons, personal experience, different perspectives to emerge (McLean, Pratt, 2006) as a possibility for consensual and beneficial common post-Yugoslav cultural space to be discovered.

![Figure 68. Museum in Kvaka 22, photo: Goran Rister 2017](image)

The Museum in Kvaka 22 (fig.68) was opened in response to the closed ones (Museum of Contemporary Art, National Museum). It emerged from the shadow in which the Yugoslav narrative is suppressed (Hirsberger, 2018). The respect of the post Yugoslav cultural place has been mirroring in the regional cooperation with different unofficial institutions, from the beginning of Kvaka 22. Regional cooperation was for alternative spaces, while in official institutions, it was forbidden for years, since the breakup of Yugoslavia (Markovina, 2018).

---

262 Shaping one new world, forming a new identity suppose that the world we create is the world we want to live in. The creation of new identity is the creation of new life, part of it can be also revival of something old (Bruner, 1986).

263 Every structure needs mirroring as a proof of existence, as a part of self-discovering and self-improving (Hegel, 1955). Instead of using the opportunity for mirroring in an organization and institution of independent cultural scene, the official institutions were made to follow political constructions about the past (discursive, paradigmatic one, without coherent narrative structure), which made them unnaturally suppressed. At the end, suppressed narratives left the space of official institutions and appeared in alternative ones (Dragičević Šešić, 2018).
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Transformation of the ‘unwanted’ Yugoslav legacy appeared as a negotiation of one whole new/old world, as a guarantee for a better future. As Jerome Bruner (1986) concluded culture is a forum for negotiation of possible worlds. An answer to the question ‘what is (now)’, emerged in narrative identity of Kvaka 22, appears as a logical starting point (Shroeder, 1989).

**STORY ABOUT YUGOSLAVIA AS ITS LEGACY. MUSEUM IN (DIS)APPEARING.**

The official opening of the Museum exhibition took place in February 2017. Permanent exhibition of archival material had taken the lower floor next to the Gallery. Creating the Museum, as a permanent exhibition, was followed by an open debate gathering the scholars from the area of cultural heritage with a concept of ‘unusual museology praxis’ and the title of the project *Muzej u (ne)stajanju* [*Museum in Disappearing*] (evolving in play of words – situation in museology in the official sector and the appearance of the Museum in Kvaka 22). The complexity and significance of the gathering discovered Kvaka 22 as an alternative institution ready to mirror the situation on the cultural scene in its wholeness.

Kvaka 22 became a completely organized and functional cultural center, emerged bottom up, from the previous experience gained in the Inex. Also, it showed interest of younger generations (adolescents and students) in the narrative of the past, especially the Yugoslav past. With the Museum project, this interest got its structure, name and duration (Fivush, 2006). Everything about and in the Museum was digitized, the whole concept was named and discussed, the intention which concerned the preservation of the artefacts that represented the Yugoslav legacy, not just in this in all Serbian museum, pars pro toto, were the most important statements and meanings this project should canalize.

Conclusion was that the Yugoslav legacy and the Yugoslav narrative should find their valuable place in the story about the past and provide the beneficial narrative and precious legacy. The following moves were made, according to the curators’s state, in an attempt to preserve the Museum in Kvaka 22 collection (and heritage):

- Scanning photos and documents, space virtualization of the still sustainable Museum Catch 22 and its exhibition, will enable a virtual walk through the authentic space and **exhibited items which together form a unique totality** (bold TV). This way the Museum remains stored in digital form and
continues its life in cyberspace. 3. The collection will continue its existence and further promotion via the Internet (by setting it on the appropriate internet platform, as well as on the websites of organizations and through social networks. This allows access to the Collection of a larger number of visitors and at the global level, which is also in accordance with the modern museum and gallery aspirations. 4. Forwarding physical collection to the appropriate institution (the Museum of Yugoslav History). 5. Presentation of the Museum Catch 22 to the public in digital form and discussion on the theme Museum in Disappearing.

The stories about an unwanted and untold past (Erić, Vuković, 2010) in official institutions become a core narrative events in alternative institutions. The most concrete manifestation of this assumption is the Museum in Kvaka 22, its artefacts together with conference for understanding and making a meaning why is cultural memory being so important for the future (Singer, Blagov, 2012). Author of the project Museum in Kvaka 22, Goran Rister, and moderator of the project Muzej u nestajanju [Museum in Disappearing] Milan Stanimirović, as a collective of City Guerilla stated about this project discovering in it its relation towards community, commons, equal rights, and cooperation as inheritance of the socialist Yugoslavia:

‘Collaboration (bold T.V) has been made due to the recognition of common spheres of interests and action of these two organizations, such as, the right to the City, right to the Museum, the (non)viability of the Collective, the attitude towards the city's cultural heritage, archive...’ (Stanimirović, Rister, 2017).

The Museum Kvaka 22 represents an institution inside of another (alternative) institution as a radical and concrete example of combat for one marginalized narrative (Worthman, 2002). Furthermore, that is combat for personal and authentic memory, memory of everyday life (fig 69).

264 ‘If somebody does not know, Kvaka 22 organizes the most dynamic, largest projects with the most freedom in our cultural scene. I wanted to make an exhibition right here, cause when they entered, this space, four years ago, was so ruined and neglected, and here – one cultural heritage was disappearing, heritage of the Yugoslav Army Orchestra. They have collected every piece, record, notebooks, cover, collected everything, sorted, in archeological manner and they have returned it to life in one room where the Museum is established. From a ruined building, without any resources, with a little help of friends and families, they have created a cult place which will mark the cultural happenings of the second decade of the 21st century.’ Maja Milovanović, author of the exhibition Collection of Happiness in Kvaka 22 thematizing memory, family memories, Yugoslavia, life in Yugoslavia and life in contemporary Serbia’. (on line source), Translation TV

265 The project was created as a collaboration between organizations City Guerilla (Gradska gerila) and Kvaka 22. Participants were researchers and academics from the field of cultural heritage preserving and museology, together with artists (Milica Pekić, Stevan Vuković and Branislav Dimitrijević).
Figure 69. The tools, documents, notes, handwritings. Detail from the permanent display.

Photo by Goran Rister. 2017

The founded objects even being placed where they were found, are not the same anymore. They are in completely different shapes and in different constellations. The exhibition itself discovers one new attitude regarding the large themes of the Yugoslav legacy which are predominant in the Museum of Yugoslavia, for example. The cult of Josip Broz Tito, even being present here, is not under the spotlight. It is not even accentuated. The ordinary citizen, in this case a musician is in the center of this permanent display.

Somebody ordinary, his notes, his tools, his records and photos with colleagues, friends, even with the President (Josip Broz Tito). The exhibition is organized with the one marked place in the middle of the room (fig. 70). A visitor could approach the artefacts from that position, placing himself/herself into the center, or she (person) can imagine somebody else there / maybe somebody from that time she can remember, maybe some prominent figure, maybe the person (s) to whom the artefacts belonged and then perceive from his perspective.
This is the moment when the alternative Museum in Kvaka 22 transforms itself from the traditional to participatory museum faster than official Museums. Appreciating multiperspectivism of the cultural memory and accepting the significance of every witness and value of personal memory could be a way of spontaneously emerging of the new authentic narrative regarding the Yugoslav past. Citizens are becoming Museum’s audience by stopping for a coffee or a chat in Kvaka 22.

Cooperation between cultural centers placed in squats and academic researchers are incidental. Alternative spaces and movements were almost insignificant for academics (Moore, 2015). Due to the challenge they represented in relation towards authorities, alternative institutions were often victims of ‘silent treatment’ (Polleta, 2015). In the context of the museums in Serbia, closed for ten (MoCaB) and fifteen years (National Museum), the project Muzej u nestajanju [Museum in Disappearing] had the character of protest, as an important pillar of the project and cooperation, but at the same time a common denominator of the alternative institution’s perspective on the Yugoslav past and cultural presence in Serbia.

Protest and urge for new and revolutionary was rooted (as a legacy of avant-garde) in alternative organizations of older generations such as CZKD (Boguslawska, 2020). Considering
the fact that the Museum of Contemporary Art and National Museum were closed for so many years in the moment when the Museum of Kvaka 22 emerged, the activists and artists described its protest against this situation in the fight for the museum based on the common sense and citizens right to the city's cultural heritage. The protest was at the same time a combat for the right to remember and struggle for the functional public institutions, as an expression of distrust and call for dialog and cooperation (Barmstein, Tomkins, 2015). Museum in (dis)appearing emerged as an attempt to preserve founded paper and audio-visual material, then to display it, after that to comment it, and at the end, collective of the Kvaka 22 emerged a monument for the marginalized Yugoslav legacy in the form of the Museum Kvaka 22.

A unique totality represents the story about Yugoslavia in a lifespan of Kvaka 22 and at the same time a cultural schema that Kvaka 22 as a movement and independent cultural space can offer (as its legacy). Representing the unusual alternative set of museology procedures and actions, Museum in Kvaka 22 is brought under the spotlight once more in the debate within the Museum in Disappearing project, the problem of cooperation between official and unofficial institutions, problem of cultural policy and inefficient official institutions.

**YUGOSLAV LEGACY II - COOPERATION AND COMMONS**

Cooperation with formal institutions meant, in some moments, survival for the non-official ones (status, funds, visibility, space), while the same cooperation for official institutions meant a touch with a potential change and vitality of protest, freedom and continuity, that independent institutions kept. The space of cooperation becomes a third space, where new narratives and consensus can appear as potentially free from ‘or-or’ freezing in a false dilemma (oppositions) characteristic for posttraumatic and post-conflict societies (Harchenberger, 2018). The nonofficial institution should bring the freedom of dialog (no forbidden notions nor narratives such as Yugoslavia and its inheritance).

In the first three years, from 2015 to 2018, in the Big Gallery in Kvaka 22, more than 60 exhibitions were held. Artists from the whole world, and mostly from the former Yugoslav space exhibited their artwork in Kvaka 22, being part of numerous projects (debates, panels such as a panel dedicated to Creative Europe Program, about cooperation between official and nonofficial
sector). After some time of functioning and receiving the support of other nonofficial institutions and colleagues from official institutions, Kvaka 22 got the support of the Ministry of Culture and Information. It was their pillar argument to postpone the closing in future times, together with the fact that more than 15,000 people liked to visit this place occasionally or regularly. Kvaka 22 organizes meetings and mediator events between sectors as pillars of future permanent cooperation between official and nonofficial sectors, vital for stable cultural development. Cooperation is, in the first place, a way of overcoming confronted narratives about the past, absence of coherent cultural policy and permanent crisis in culture (Koković, 2013).

Exposing attitudes, planes, expectations from both sides, avoiding dramatic expression of polarities (CZKD), Kvaka 22 and its cultural scheme (Polleta, 2005) represented the possibility of constructing a balanced narrative and maturity in the transition process in culture (Thorne, 2004). Turning to the themes about and from the past, where story appears not as nostalgia (Velikonja, 2006), or gaining (transitional or post-conflict) justice (Savić, 2006), it is discussing (and owning) the legacy of the past, emerging in Kvaka 22 as a sign of maturity in shaping of the new identity in post Yugoslav societies (Hammack, 2008; Bornstein, Tomkins, 2015) due to the Kvaka 22 independence.

Young generations of artists, born in the late 80s and 90s and gathered in communities and centers, did not become used to any kind of support, nor from authorities, nor from foreign funds. They needed to become self-sustainable as an expression of imminent urge for freedom. Collective of Kvaka 22 is creating a program based on cultural needs of audience (with the full acknowledgment of its diversity) instead of creating projects for open calls and programs of EU donors (Dvornik, 2010), which happens often in the space of organizations that used to create projects referring to the past in a way of high-level polarization (CZKD).

266 So called „insiders”, cultural workers and artists, curators and researchers that had occasions to work in both sectors, and stayed devoted to the linking and creating mutual projects (Polleta, 2015). In most of the cases, they support values of nonofficial institutions, protests and freedom, and legitimacy, visibility and structure of the official ones.

267 In spite of the signs of recognizing the value of alternative spaces emerged to alternative institutions, authorities from the Ministry still don’t recognize the structure and importance of those institutions, and they are not on the list of cultural institutions in Serbia.

268 The policy of independence left Kvaka 22 with modest resources but free from developing authentic narratives. Prominent example for cooperation with official institutions are also meetings and events organized by Creative Europe Desk in Kvaka 22, taking in consideration that the Desk is an Office in the Ministry of Culture, representing the fund for supporting the development of cultural programs and cooperation with the EU countries, governmental and nongovernmental organizations, national institutions of culture.
The cooperation with the squat such as Kvaka 22 is a rare example in the European context. In comparison with CZKD Kvaka 22 shows significantly less need for theoretical explanation of the search for continuity that emanates from different priorities in the transformation process, stability and coherence (CZKD), change and integration (Kvaka 22) (McLean 2008).

Kvaka 22 represents the new model of the internal structure, identity, narrative and program (orientation towards change and future, self-defining, independence) but also the infrastructure, representing in a symbolic way all three sectors on three floors. With the Museum of Yugoslav legacy on the first floor, Big Gallery which is a home for more than 30 exhibitions per year, gallery on the first floor with space for debates and panels, concerts and projections, workplace for artists and the room for their residence, creating and offering artworks, with buffet for refreshment. Kvaka 22 has huge possibilities for producing cultural and art events and offers the cultural scheme as a solution to the permanent lack of space and place for cultural production in Serbia. (Polleta, 2005)

Also, a wide range of program which supposes the audience of all generations and interests, assures the dialog space and forms a hub structure of the institution, approaching to the concept of forum institution that we already mentioned in the context of critical museum and Piotr Piotrowski’s innovation. Critical (forum) cultural institution exists as an imminent, ideal structure in almost every contemporary cultural institution in Serbia (starting from the conception of the Museum of Contemporary Art in the first decade of the 21st century (Dimitrijević, 2016). Spreading the range of themes and events and enabling the dialog space ensures the audience to become participants in developing and creating programs. Center is available for new members of the collective. Kvaka 22 is open every day, almost day and night, with more than one project ongoing, with artists and members of the collective present and open for conversation, promising the progress toward critical institutions (Piotrowski, 2010).

The cooperation between museums and alternative institutions is significant, especially when the theme is making continuity and owning the Yugoslav past in the aim of integration. One goal more could be forming a secure net of institutions as a way out from the crisis. I have already described how this phenomenon appeared in the case of the Museum of Contemporary Art and the Inex Expedition (Voices of the Past). In the case of Kvaka 22, the Museum which found the suppressed part of its own narrative relished and free in Kvaka 22 appears to be the Museum of Yugoslavia. Collective of Kvaka 22 has not an imperative of analyzing and presentation of the
result. So, the narrative about the past can emerge spontaneously. The Museum of Yugoslavia for example, bearing a role of narrative producers at the first place, does not have this luxury.

The motif for ‘dealing with the past” must be placed somewhere else, probably in a space that differs from romanticized memories (McLean, 2008), and ensures learning from the past experiences (McLean, Pratt, 2006). Analyzing the events and their narratives, the motif of discovering the narratives of the past probably is placed in rational sense and creative search for continuity, beneficial narrative and heritage (McNees, 2009).

Kvaka 22’s events (such as Museum in Disappearing, New Serbian Mythology, Collective of Happiness) dedicated to the past hold strong potential in a search for meaning as an important element of a new identity search (Baumaister, Newman, 1994). The potential represents personal stories and perspectives, a simple search for continuity in order to change the future, without too much of analize, with the assumption that the main concept of the past is enough for the first phase of discovering a new self (Cohler, 1993).

Placing the ‘found’ heritage on the respected bottom of the building as a pillar stone, unquestioned in its core, was with full awareness. Yugoslavia was a period and space where community had its importance and connection was highly valued. Collectivism (expressed in Kvaka through the notion of ‘kolektiv’/collective) and readiness for cooperation represent strong basis for dealing with the past and present. (McLean, Pratt, 2006).

The community of Kvaka 22 established a new approach to past stories, especially with the Museum Kvaka 22 and the concept of the Museum in (Dis)appearing as an open debate with scholars involved in comparing official and nonofficial institutions in Serbia and space of Yugoslav inheritance. In (re)making of (post)yugoslav cultural space the story is interpreted in order to bring benefits to the present and future, in the real sense of benefits if it serves to better

---

269 As Branislav Dimitrijević stated in an interview from 2016 (dedicated to his book Consumed socialism/ Potrošeni socijalizam) about the place of Yugoslavia in contemporary Serbian society – being completely excluded from the education program, the memory of Yugoslavia is marked by two extremely confronted positions. One is ‘totalitarian paradigm’, where Yugoslavia exists as a one-minded state, lack and political repression, and the second, opposite one, is the ‘Yugonostalgia paradigm’ where Yugoslavia appears as a country of progress, security and abundance. For the prosperity of the post Yugoslav society, new narratives are needed - not just as a middle way, more as an integration of the critical choice from the two paradigms. The syntagmatic structure of the new story could appear in cooperation between cultural institutions, and in space of the youngest one.
functioning and understanding of life. Meanwhile, a similar narrative is strange to the official institutions in Serbia, and in Croatia even the name Yugoslavia is forbidden. (Markovina, 2018).

In the last decade projects that were thematizing Yugoslavia were produced more often, signaling the narrative shift, in overcoming cultural trauma and in combat with suppressing the Yugoslav narrative from the official (government) discourse, the new period has been announced (Markovina, 2018). Every cooperation between official and nonofficial institutions matters and has a crucial significance in regaining trust as a part of establishing a new identity (Campos-Castillo, et al. 2016). The cooperation and connection between institutions in region, as a part of the Yugoslav legacy (common cultural space), must start with establishing cooperation with two divided sectors in Serbia. Every attempt means one step toward creating a space for search of the collective meaning in the healing process of post-conflict societies (Hirschberger, 2018).

The beginning of the Yugoslav studies, especially placing the lectures in alternative institutions, means the understanding of contact, dealing with the past in different areas, understanding the power of social movement in translation of personal into collective memory (Assman, 2002). For the cooperation between institutions, in spite of the significant role of ‘intruders’ (Polleta, 2005), working in both sectors, the important thing is the contact with vital energy of protest, as a strong impulse for change, that is often placed in the space of alternative institutions.

The possibility and significance of creating a beneficial narrative in Kvaka 22, is mirrored mostly in (re)giving the dignity to what is found (Meichenbaum, Geoffrey, 1993) than to transform it, if it's possible, to heritage and museum artefacts, but for sure with respect to the inheritance as a guarantee of continuity (Museum Kvaka 22) and ‘moving forward to next floor’ literally and symbolically. Also, Kvaka 22 reminds us about the possibility of an absolutely independent and free museum (a utopian version of this institution).

270 Talks about Yugoslavia, as a project, started in 2014, with the clear intention of the Museum of Yugoslavia to create a permanent research and study program through a series of debates. With the official site, facebook group, audio material on Mixcloud, numerous locations, the project is supposed to last. According to traces and time when activity ended (on facebook) the project lasted until 2018. The site is inactive today.

www.razgovori.mij.rs i https://www.facebook.com/razgovoriojugoslaviji

271 The numerous guest artists from the whole region, numerous events that took place in Kvaka 22 with the participants from the former Yugoslav states, and permanent cooperation based on the common past and common heritage, similarities and differences, enlightened the existence of the Yugoslav Art Space in the post Yugoslav period (for example / whole festival of young music bands in Oct, Nov 2019, from Zagreb). In informal interviews, actors of the collective of Kvaka and artists that participate were describing the cooperation and community work and life as a comeback to basic values of the previous sociopolitical period (communism).
Being a cultural center in a squatted building, representing a large spectrum of social movement characteristics, especially through the act of squatting and developing activities which are in the interest of the collective, inheriting the values of commons (donations, charity projects, offering jobs, home, program for people in need, especially immigrants and refugees), Kvaka 22 represents the activist approach towards reality of contemporary Serbia.

Taking actions towards better conditions for the community reflects in educational events and events for donating. Activist approach with a strong sense for unity, shared resources, community, represents in Kvaka 22, like in Inex and CZKD, an emanation of the Yugoslav legacy which considers preferences towards unity and close relations (brotherhood and unity). The critical and activist approach, a struggle for equality among institutions of culture, is in the first place, self-reflection, and auto-critic, then combat with authorities for better understanding, visibility and resources.

Almost every official and nonofficial institution on the Belgrade cultural map is witnessing or experiencing the lack of interest from governing institutions to support culture, and that’s not different in case of Kvaka 22. Even the crowded events and devoted audience are not a strong motif for authorities to support the institution (fig. 71).
Emerged in 2015, just five years old, Kvaka 22 regained old narratives transforming them into beneficial ones through renewing cathartic potential of the Museum on the first floor, through its permanent collection and following narratives. At the same time, it is a space for producing new narratives, mostly through exhibitions. In unofficial interviews, video representations, exhibitions and other projects emerges narrative which brings the past to the present, a narrative without the burden of the past, always strongly connected to the critical memory and brought only if somehow refers to the present moment.

The same thing is about a critical project that referred to the present, but thematizing the transition process with its results and effects, which is again connected with the previous period and identity. For example, the exhibition titled *Nova srpska mitologija* [The New Serbian Mythology] by author Danilo Vuković that took place in June 2018, Kvaka 22, refers to new narratives, new identity and result of transformation process in contemporary society and culture in Serbia, from a critical, and maybe pessimistic perspective. As the author stated in an interview, in a part of the Kvaka’s video promotion, even not having that kind of intention in the first place, the approach is critical, especially toward nowadays reality in Serbian society. The modern Serbian society with its new ‘divinity’ and ‘spirits’ is directly connected to old Serbian (Slavic) mythology (skipping all the unwanted legacies).

The exhibition was alluding to what happened to the Serbian culture when the Yugoslav narrative (and with that paradoxically narrative about the Monarchy period) went to fade, with the ignoring, isolation and marginalization perspective of authorities and official institutions. Also when Yugoslavia became unwanted and almost forbidden period in the recent past and period of Monarchy was still suspicious, the first connective spot for creating continuity was Medieval culture and Old Mythology (Kuljić, 2002).

That brought the old fears and new problems together, with the fairy tale solutions and, actually, paradoxically, without modernity and modernism which stayed buried with the ignored and skipped period of Yugoslavia (in this certain exhibition, the author stated about new/old narratives through the serial of drawings). The drawings represented the contemporary society in a shape of mythological beings from the old Serbian mythology but with attributes of modern

---

272 Since the first changes after 2000, when the second phase of transition started (Dragićević-Šešić, Mikić, Jovičić, 2007), and those after 2007, when the first wave of changed cultural policy ended with the State of Serbia and Montenegro, the situation in culture and art, is getting worse and worse (closing of significant institutions, permanent or temporary, lack of finances). Confusing and suspicious privatization processes together with the economic crisis, seem to be the only answer from authorities. That attitude is provoking protests and activists.
times and with the known phenomenon that’s escalated with a complicated and traumatic transition process in Serbia – Depth, Black Market, Depression, Corruption, Alcoholism, Poverty.

Interpreting exhibition and other projects as emanations of core narratives and programs of institutions as a main story, Kvaka 22 expressed a strong attitude towards reflection of the past, overcoming it, (re)owning and claiming its influence in the present and taking a beneficial part for the future. Bringing a picture, sign, notion, into conflictual discussion, such as mutual projects with official institutions, a part of the culture becomes alive again (Hall, 2009). With the numerous exhibitions and discussions Kvaka 22 appeared as an institutional space for enabling the new narratives to emerge, straight from critical (re)thinking, what one modern cultural institution should represent (Dimitrijević, 2016). Kvaka 22 became a hub or forum type of institution, as a space for contemporary art, similar to Piotr Piotrowski’s vision about museums being a forum space for developing critical approach towards society, culture and art (Piotrowski, 2010).

**MEDIATING BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS, MEDIATING BETWEEN GENERATIONS. CONCLUSION**

The healing power of time and creative art production in post-conflict societies (Assman, 2011; Sieff, 2010; Hoffman, 2011) is often neglected by authorities and cultural policy creators. Those spiral social moves, spontaneous and recovering, were allowed and supported in everyday activities in Kvaka 22. Part of the program, an important element of ideology, is giving space to young creatives to follow their own creative process, for which there is no real opportunity in official or academic circles. In the manifest of Kvaka 22, the attitude of distrust towards official institutions and authorities is obvious, which makes cooperation even more important.

273 Through the Museum dedicated to Yugoslavia, in Kvaka 22, and respecting the Yugoslav Art Space in post Yugoslav times, through cooperation, common projects and networking, Yugoslav legacy appeared in this institution already with its emerging. Referring in a critical way to new narratives and Serbian cultural identity nowadays, with Museum in Disappearing and then exhibitions such as Modern Serbian Mythology, and with discussions and debates dedicated to cultural policy, such as meeting with representatives of official institutions (Creative Europe, Ministry of Culture), Kvaka 22 established itself as a cultural center where critical rethinking is possible with no unwanted or forbidden stories (McAddams, 2013). With projects organized by Creative Europe as a program of funding international projects, Kvaka 22 appears as an (alternative) cultural center of new generation being a link in connection in time with past (making continuity with the Yugoslav period), and making connection in space horizontal connection with other, official and nonofficial institutions. The audience and participants are mostly really young people, confused about the identity and legacy of the Yugoslav period that has not been overcome since conflicts in the 90s, as a consequence of official relation toward the past (Dimitrijević, 2016).
Still, the appearance of space for new stories seems to stay reserved for alternative institutions, being an element of its activism and protest, challenging official attitude (Polleta, 2015). Still, Yugonostalgia kept the halo of the main way of Yugoslavia presence in cultural memory, while the activities among young people and in institutions of younger generations are pointing out other waves in the remembering and recalling process.

The non-existing legacy of a non exciting state (Gavrilović, 2012) is still making its way on the surface, the path to acknowledgement. The mirroring of projects (official/nonofficial, present in Kvaka 22, like in CZKD and Inex) is also important in the process of self-discovering which a transition process certainly is (Palls, 2006)\(^{274}\). Also, pairing institutions in common projects can lead to consensus about the past. Healing consensus can represent a bridge connection from the past to the future, as a way of healing cultural trauma (Sztompka, 1999).

The ideology of free space that provides freedom for creative expression, but also participation and sense of belonging, enhances sense of self-esteem on personal and collective level, which is important in times of identity crisis and search for meaning (Vignoles, et al; 2006). Instead of closing doors to history, which can be the primal reaction of the collective in traumatized condition in post-conflict societies (Hirshberger, 2018), the process of opening up towards conversations is taking more place, even in centers like Kvaka 22, dedicated to contemporary production of young generations of artists.

Kvaka 22 brings dissent, maybe even silent, but effective protest, in which the resignation of young generations after decades of crisis becomes obvious (Whittier, 2002). In those lines, the eternal attempt of deconstruction, characteristic for counter institutions, occurs together among the collective and participants in Kvaka, with described construction when it comes to the certain narrative of the past (Wortham, 2007). The mirror effect, ‘a reflection of one’s self through the gaze of others, used in education as a metacognition tool and as a vector of knowledge’ (Phaneuf,\(^{274}\).

\(^{274}\) There is no institution similar to a cultural center of younger generation in official sector (since the official institutions for young people such as Students Cultural Center / Studentski kulturni centar, became more inactive then active, and Student’s City Cultural Center / Dom kulture Studentski grad almost completely shut down in 2017, through official decision and by authorities. After 43 years of work, it was saved by a petition and refusal of citizens and employees to give up this institution and accept the decision. In connection to this closing is also the announcement of canceling the Festival of Alternative Film (Festival alternativnog filma), the famous FAF, after 38 years. Behind this festival is the mentioned institution, which even after „saving” did not get proper finances from authorities. The Ministry of Culture decided not to include this festival in the budget program, in spite of its influence and reach. The government planned less than 1% of the state budget for culture development and cultural institutions. (Source: SeeCult, in Bibliography)
2015) could be also the cause for authorities to decline the importance and structure to alternative institutions.

The suppressed Yugoslav narrative emerges in alternative space of younger generation and withdraws cooperation of nonofficial and official institutions, which is unnoted in squats tradition in Europe (Smiths, 2015). The aim of cooperation was the most important goal for Kvaka 22 to gain. The expressed mirroring effect between official and nonofficial sector discovers the common interest of the whole system that aims to fulfill the void. 275

Considering the fact that Kvaka 22 has a time limit as every alternative institution that occupies any of the public and/or private places (Moore, 2015), the cultural center would eventually need to move. According to the statement of the collective, the pressure is huge and it brings up the question about the meaning all the time. In that atmosphere, with the future that cannot be planned, emerges also the question about the past which should be (re)owned. 276

Alternative institutions, activism in art and culture and paradoxically in almost every new and old narrative, also using free space of art and culture for expressing anti regime and pro peace attitude, promoting tolerance and protesting against a marginalization of art and culture, bad and worse social and material status, are the most characteristic phenomena of the transition period in Serbia (Vilenica, 2011).

Following these points, Kvaka 22 represents the meeting place for all those key elements that are recently acknowledged as a Yugoslav legacy, common cultural space, regional cooperation, and multiculturalism (Dimitrijević, 2016; Markovina, 2018). Kvaka 22 should remind that sometimes invested effort in seeking for the solution represents the solution itself.

275 'In practice, the mirroring effect reflects a dual interest. It acts as a vector of knowledge because it encourages an ongoing restructuring of the student’s knowledge throughout the experience, allowing it to better identify its self-image which is useful for self-correction.' (Phaneuf, 2005,1) Students from this article can be any other subject or system.

276 The alternative institutions are not just space for alternative art and culture, they are space where it is possible to fulfill cultural needs of citizens which stays unmet due to the nonfunctional official institutions. The mirroring of that non functionality, is a side effect, which is unwanted by the authorities, so the alternative institutions were not and aren’t supported by the governmental structures (just 1% percent of the budget for the culture fell down in the plan for 2020 on 0,75 percent). In constructing the new cultural identity after the conflict in the 90s, which with the marginalization of the Yugoslav identity was just a construction without spontaneous bottom up emerging from the culture and society, the common Yugoslav art and culture space was an unwanted notion, so the space where it should have existed was unwanted too. That space is a space of alternative institutions, nongovernmental organizations and unofficial institutions.
4.5 ‘Suspicious to Many’

**Yugoslav Legacy in Alternative Institutions, Conclusion**

In the first decade after the dissolution of Yugoslavia, due to traumatic events such as war conflict, bombing of Yugoslavia in 1999 by NATO forces, transition from personal and intimate memory to cultural memory was blocked by posttraumatic stress and still alive traumatic experience, triggered by economic crisis and isolation (Assman, 2011). Official narratives marginalized and ignored the whole Yugoslav period, so the narrative about the recent past (almost hundred years) could safely exist just in alternative spaces.

In the second decade of the 21st century cooperation between official and nonofficial institutions considering the theme of the Yugoslav legacy was more present than before. The step forward was obvious, considering that the negative perspective towards alternative institutions by governing structures (MANEK, 2014) has been omnipresent since the 80s. It reflects mostly on the limited support, space, time and finances that the government provides for independent institutions.

Activism of alternative institutions and civic initiatives is still high on demand, it is even more complex than during the 90s, in spite of the fact that some researchers are pointing out the significance of that activism in the protest against Milošević, but not that much after 2000 (Dragićević Šešić, 2018). Indeed, after 2000, especially in the last decade, alternative institutions became alternative institutions in the meaning of being a solution for the non functioning network of official institutions. The fact is that the system of official institutions, being shut down by

---

277 Activists gathered around CZKD, are often called not just traitors, they were sometimes even described as the fifth column in culture (on line source, link in Bibliography). Interview brings a statement of former minister of information in the Government of Serbia, about CZKD being the fifth column in Serbian contemporary culture, in an original meaning of a group of people which collaborates against its own nation, state, movement.

278 In 2018, several projects in different institutions were dedicated to the period of Yugoslavia (Musealization of Yugoslavia, for example) due to the big jubilee (100 years of the establishing of the first Yugoslavia. At the same time, the official media (newspapers and TV stations) proceeded with emphasizing an old pattern, treating the Yugoslav legacy from three perspectives – revisionistic, nostalgic, sensationalistic. (Vučetić, 2018). Also there was one more perspective, a critical one, opposite to official ones (Drašković, 2019), that was placed mainly in unofficial discourse or in academic one, for example a conference for the Musealization of Yugoslavia, organized by the Museum of Yugoslavia.

279 Mostly regarding the fact that year 2018 represented the big jubilee of the Yugoslav first state establishment, the celebration of Yugoslavia’s first (and last) hundred years, attracted attention of researchers, academics, activists, artists and journalists. An interesting fact is that, while in Serbia the jubilee was followed by different programs from concerts to conferences, debates and exhibitions, with a significant number of visitors and followers, in other countries it was barely mentioned. (Drašković, 2019)
permanent lack of applicable cultural policy and characterized by fragmented narratives, is not capable to deal with the crisis (MANEK, 2014) caused by a ‘permanent transition’ since 2000 until now, 2020 (Bolčić, 2013).

Supporting the independent scene and alternative institutions had been a mission of a first generation of alternative institutions such as CZKD, together with Cultural Center Rex, and Cultural Center Grad (Dragićević-Šešić, Mikić, Jovičić, 2007). The whole sector in culture was ‘cursed’ by governmental and official structures and also marked as betrayal with prejudice and assumptions because alternative institutions are funded by the foreign money and by that full of the foreign interests and values, aiming to force them into the fragile Serbian society during its transition and destabilize it, as part of the foreign master plan (Dragićević Šešić, 2018).

For example, projects of institutions like CZKD, were funded by Soros foundation (Open Society Foundation/George Soros) which were demonized by the government during the Slobodan Milošević regime, marked as an enemy of the Serbian people. Also after 2000 and democratic changes, no more trust was given to George Soros in Balkan, his intentions and program of his organizations were always suspicious to many.

The ‘suspicious’ donors were a source of distrust in post-conflict societies, domestic organizations that were funded from foreign organizations, also. Even younger generations remained with this type of prejudice due to the transmission of the (cultural) trauma (Volkan, 2011). Insisting on the full responsibility for war crimes from own government, country, people (which burden CZKD often took for itself), caused splitting and polarization, enlarged distrust and fear in the same way as stubborn maintaining of nationalistic discourse (Kuljić, 2006).

Beside beneficial effects that projects funded through the European Union programs and foundations provide, considering art production, memory and reconciliation policy, development of civic and democratic society, the certain repetition in those projects, considering theme, subject, participants, donors, and lack of conclusions was obvious (Dvornik, 2009). The situation is different in institutions of the younger generation, due to the fact that they gain more independence.

---

280 CZKD represents the main space for discussing the problems such are position of alternative institutions in Serbia, their role and problems they’re facing, for example lack of support from government, lack of space and place for production, marginalization and underrating in media and official cultural policy (Cvetičanin, 2014). In conjunction with CZKD was the first of few organizations which created the space for raising a question and searching for the answer about the cause of the crisis in which are alternative institutions, civic initiatives, unofficial art and culture productions, (Dragićević-Šešić, Stefanović, 2017) also various others nongovernmental organizations in Serbia from the beginning of the transformation until nowadays.
by getting used not to being supported and to deal with modest projects, but have more freedom in the choice of themes, artists, guests.

Conclusions from those projects were not numerous but significant. Their influence on official institutions and authorities, also on a wide audience, were minor. From the other side, conclusions that influenced a particular audience and were implemented into civic and public sphere are relevant as pioneering attempts. They have succeeded to make the necessary first steps toward the place where the consensus can emerge, and to shape a space where at least for the moment, a story about the past appears as coherent. 281

Splitting and dissolution are coping mechanism number one in post-conflict Serbian society and they can be observed as the reality of at least two opposite perspectives (or/or, neither/nor). Cultural trauma occurred in the 90s when Slobodan Milošević’s regime represented itself as an urge for saving Yugoslavia, splitting society in a half, on those who were supporters thinking that they are supporting the survival of Yugoslavia, and those who were against nationalistic narratives and threatening of the conflicts. It continued in years after, when strong antiyugoslav narrative emerged (Assman, 2004).

Representing the moment which is so important for the community that everything that was known, accepted, owned and contained changes (Govedarica, 2012,170), after 2000 brought the emerging of the second generation of alternative institutions (Dragićević-Šešić, 2018). I have described the characteristics of the first generation by making an example of CZKD, the second generation through the example of Inex and the third generation through the example of Kvaka 22. CZKD emerged in 1995 as a representative of alternative institutions being the strongest opponents of the regime.

CZKD established its ideology during the biggest protests against the regime of Slobodan Milošević and war politics, based on the ethics and esthetics of the protest. It shaped the first and

281 Conference Zajednica sećanja [Community of Memory] in CZKD represented the opening toward controversial themes such as war crimes, responsibility, the first steps in attempt of defining what Yugoslav legacy is through art and culture, architecture, movie, relation toward display’s in foreign countries, or at least what it should be. CZKD was the place for those events and debates, ten years before the museum of Yugoslavia took this kind of project. The unofficial institutions due to its independence or being less dependent on the official structures and authorities, represented the place for raising the questions about the Yugoslav legacy and post Yugoslav identities.

For example, the part of the Community of Memory seminar was dedicated to the new left perspective towards Yugoslavia, delineating the interest for the Yugoslav legacy as the consequence of the crisis of capitalism. Besides that, the important conclusion was that the assumption about Yugoslavia being the historical fact, which makes the use of the notion ‘former Yugoslavia inappropriate, was awkward and false.
oldest generation of informal institutions in Serbia, holding the intensive character of the protest. In a way, the organizations of the oldest generations remain limited by (still) strong opposing and by that a connection to the official narratives, official institutions, their points of view, and ‘regimes’. They remain strongly opposite, strongly referring, and always strongly proud of that position, which blinds them to various ways of developing new spaces and narratives and still acting in a critical approach to culture of memory and remembrance.

Younger generations of alternative institutions, such as Inex and even more Kvaka 22 have been showing different approaches trying to give answers to the community and civic concrete needs (like one for the production space for artists and organizations) at the same time acting actively towards mutual aims. Projects which took the Yugoslav past and legacy as themes present from the same emerging of the alternative organizations of all generations showed the fact that Yugoslavia is placed among core values and core narrative in their internal structure. Aiming to influence the change in social and political reality in Serbia, alternative institutions were taking an important role in bringing personal experience under spotlight as important for recollecting fragments of the past and dealing with cultural memory tasks (Assman, 2011).

Through art production, advocating the democratization and transition process, since the 90s, interpretation of the Yugoslav legacy was expressed through various projects that I have mentioned. Metaphorically, it is represented in ‘putting everything we found in Paviljon Veljković, on its walls’ as Borka Pavićević stated about the first exhibition in CZKD, which was also the first exhibition about Yugoslavia (Dragićević Šešić, 2019,377).

As a consequence of the rigid polarization, the whole civic sector was often labeled as alternative and parallel in a negative meaning, responsible for destabilization in sensitive moments of transition (Madžar, Kovačević, Prnjat; 2010). In the aim of overcoming this type of dangerous prejudice, which maintains a gap between the official and nonofficial institutions in Serbia, it is important to seek comparing the similarities, insisting on the constructive confrontation and hosting all the subjects and elements of the discussion (Nikolić, Rogač-Mijatović, Dragićević Šešić, 2014).

Themes should include the most unwanted ones from the perspective of the governing structures, such as the Yugoslav legacy in the shape of cooperation with ‘former Yugoslav states, search for consensus and (new) common cultural space. The alternative institutions have a leading role in this process due to the fact that in alternative space, Yugoslav inheritance appears, without
coherence, as Yugoslav art and culture (architecture, movie, common space), legacy of antifascist’s combat emanated in antifascists attitude in the widest sense, socialism emanated in the sense of common togetherness and independence. In the official sector, as coherent and consensual narrative, or any other form of beneficial speech from a positive perspective the Yugoslav legacy does not appear yet (Dvornik, 2009; Kuljić, 2006).

The legacy of Yugoslavia stays without the official consensus and is understood mostly as a common cultural space, like emanation of the Yugoslav artistic and cultural space, leaving an impression of return to the very beginning, to the idea of Yugoslavism as a common cultural ground (Markovina, 2018). So, the (post) Yugoslav cultural space is interpreted mostly in ‘old fashioned way’, as a cultural space that existed before the state of Yugoslavia and that still exists (Denegri, 2010).

When the word is about the ‘brotherhood and unity’ legacy, it transformed and left the sense of togetherness and solidarity among ‘former Yugoslav people and also multiculturalism as the ‘invention’ of multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism of Yugoslavia which came with the avant-garde movement). Still Yugoslav legacy is about to be analyzed and defined, due to the fact that it is not even fully described yet, at least not in a proper manner (with consensus) and not by the international community, authorities, NGOs and civic initiatives, politicians, academics, artists (Kurtović, 2010).

The reason for absence of consensual rethinking could be placed in the fact that collective trauma and following isolation, forced or voluntarily chosen, together with fragmented narratives I was illustrating through the description of different projects, are also – Yugoslav legacy. Fragmentation is present everywhere, in every institution and even in every segment of sociopolitical life in Serbia (Pavićević, 2019).

Postwar and cultural trauma takes its time to heal. Healing requires time and effort, safe spaces, (re)connection and talks. It needs recollecting, regaining and integration. From that point of view, alternative institution’s projects considering Yugoslavia and Yugoslav legacy are valuable space and source mainly due to the thematizing the fragmentation and discontinuity caused by trauma (Alexander, 2004). It is also obvious in every project, program, history, and organization itself.
CONCLUSION

FORGETTING OR REMEMBERING YUGOSLAVIA – CREATING CONNECTION AND CONTINUITY

The ambivalent attitude towards Yugoslav past (since the ‘90s) and diminishing of its legacy by authorities creates a discontinuity in the central narrative of cultural institutions as a core of internal structure, making them non-functional and meaningless, which is often reflected in their closing down (e.g. for restoration) or some other kind of unavailability (reduced program, lack of strategy, plan and task realization).

The non-acceptance of Yugoslav inheritance with the reality of a common regional artistic space, not only within the boundaries of Yugoslavia, but today as well (Denegri, 2011), leads to a construed and petrified, unproductive and fragmented narrative that cannot be transformed into a field of creative energy, which has fatal consequences for cultural institutions. In those circumstances, space for dialog and discussion is severely constricted, if not absent. completely.

Without the communication, crisis could not be solved in a beneficial way nor consensual meaning could be added to previous events. Even if the official institution provides (occasionally) projects that succeeded in opening the subject and proposing the solution when the theme is remembrance and reconciliation, they are in a program from time to time, and continuity of discontinuity occurs as a permanent dynamic in the official institutions.

Even more, fragmentation could be also proper term to describe condition of official institutions trying to deal with the past (if we consider the period since the breakup of the last Yugoslav state emanation in 2003, and previously as well since the beginning of Yugoslavia’s dissolution in 1991). The attempt of defining the transition process often goes in the direction of describing a crisis or a traumatic condition in society, especially as a cultural trauma (Sztompka, 2000), which is easily applicable to particular cases of Serbian institutions, and maybe the most obvious in space of culture and art.

The projects in official institutions dedicated to the cultural memory and Yugoslav legacy, since the complete dissolution of Yugoslavia in 2003 and after, appeared just occasionally, expressing the internal fragmentation and confusion. For example, Museum of Contemporary Art by its dynamic and policy from 2000 to 2007 attempted a forward conception of museum forum
(Belting, 2007) or anticipating the critic museum (Piotrowski, 2013) with the additional program and planned debates and discussions that was never fully realized.

After the new management’s ambitious plans, the Museum was closed for restoration for more than ten years. In those ten years, the institution had activities (smaller exhibitions) in two saloons/galleries in the city center that also belonged to the Museum. But, that could not replace the absence of the Museum in its main edifice, and the citizens that were starting to forget the large white art piece of modern architecture once being a Museum, building near the river, among trees and sculptures (Gnjatović, 2016).

One of the last events that took place in the Museum of Contemporary Art before it was completely closed to the public, was the Marlboro Party – a completely commercial marketing event, lasting almost the entire night, with no connection with the meaning of museum or its edifice. After this withdrawal, the Museum appears again as a modern critical institution, paradoxically, with the critical non-exhibition Šta se dogodilo sa muzejem savremene umetnosti? [What happened with the Museum of Contemporary Art?] in 2012 that thematized absence of the museum making it at the same time – more present than ever.

Bringing the restoration of the edifice and edifice itself under the spotlight as the main theme of the artworks, the project illustrated what happened with the Yugoslav legacy in official institutions and how diminishing of that inheritance influenced the institution’s external and internal structure. The restoration that never ends symbolically represents the institution meeting new narratives without fully understanding and owning the old.

The non-exhibition was set in the main halls (gallery) of the Museum in the building which was already closed for the audience. Artworks (such as an installation displaying a constellation of empty chairs) meant not just an absence of audience, it meant absence of the museum itself, expressing the lonely position of the institutions behind yellow stripes.

The conception of the non-exhibition (the name itself was a protest) signaled not just estrangement of the institution from its role and audience, but the whole exhibition accentuated a detachment of other institutions, in country and abroad. Contributing in and organizing the international events used to be one of the main activities of the Museum and other official institutions which represented the (Yugoslav) culture and art. The connection with other institutions was needed more than ever, not just as a goal for the Museum of Contemporary Art to break out of the crisis (in spite of the closed main site), it would be imperative for all the official
cultural institutions to gain a consensual narrative about (its) past in order to regain pillars and create new narratives in the present.

In the first place, and regarding Yugoslavia’s past, the regional networking, shared interests, and mutual projects would be crucial. Unfortunately, in the space of official institutions, this was almost impossible for years. In Croatia, even the name Yugoslavia was forbidden by law, and cooperation between the institutions of the national interest on regional level, such as national Museums, was impossible (Ziebińska-Witek, 2018).

For the fragmentation to be controlled, for the cultural trauma to be overpowered, the story must be told in a dialog space (Eyerman, 2019) in a space that can provide for one side to be heard and for another to be seen, for one to listen (see), another to tell (express). The non-exhibition Šta se dogodilo sa muzejem savremene umetnosti? [What happened to the Museum of Contemporary Art?] and the entire project was significant by the protests it brought in the middle of cultural publicity, stating that cultural workers would not give up the space of official cultural institutions. In spite of the authorities and governing structures which did not include the culture into the state budget, nor cultural policy into the plan and program, the cultural scene exists.

The project was valuable even more through the cooperation it created, through the new connections between the Museum and the artists from the NGO (non-governmental organizations) and by their contribution with the network of alternative institutions. It was a legacy of the period before closing of the museum when management was (partly) created by experts with experience from the nongovernmental sector.

Project Od dionizijskog socijalizma do predatorskog kapitalizma (From the Dionysian Socialism to the Predatory Capitalism) was conceived as a series of workshops focused on the analysis and new readings of social history and art production in Yugoslavia after 1949 with the primary objective to help the workshops’ participants and young professionals with the help of their mentors, to develop an actively critical approach to the past.

The three-part project moved the Museum from its space to an alternative institution of the Inex expedition, making the creative intersection of one official institution without the site, and one alternative institution in a specific site that could provide context (of the Yugoslav past) from both. The dialog between the part of the project that took place in the Museum and part of the project that took place in Inex expressed why the cooperation between the official and nonofficial institutions could be beneficial – the meeting of different narratives, rules and regulations, generations, expectations, and results. In part of the project that was placed at the
Museum, the Yugoslav narrative appeared through the stories that elevated the restrictive policy and dynamics of the state, limitations, and encasements. In the Inex, the polyphony of voices characteristic for the alternative space was predominant and old archival material appeared as new transmitted through various lenses of young artists’ creative work – linking the past with the present.

Those links are important for the regaining of the sense of the interconnectedness and relatedness ruined in post-conflict societies through various traumatic experiences (Edkins, 2004). The cooperation between official and alternative space was also a mirroring role, as a way of self-recognizing and self-defying crucial for overcoming a crisis in a period of identity transformation. That transformation in this case was considered a prolonged condition in which all cultural institutions in Serbia ended up, after the breakup of Yugoslavia. Emerged as an institution of the Yugoslav and Serbian Art and Culture in New Belgrade as a new capital of the federation, with the dissolution of Yugoslavia in the ‘90s, Museum of Contemporary Art suffered the loss of its main narrative. In that situation, the Museum was not alone among official institutions.

In search for meaning to overcome this kind of collapse, institutions gained no help from authorities. That could be an answer why the solutions emerged in alternative bottom up raised institutions (NGOs). Betrayed by the top down structures and unable to connect on a horizontal axis with similar institutions from the region, official institutions were left with a lack of finances and in need of restoration that once construction began, it lasted five times longer than it was planned. They were also left without a narrative to be communicated to the audience once when the Yugoslav narrative was cursed, diminished, marginalized and forbidden.

After the exhibition in Museum of Yugoslavia in 1999 titled Kako su ubijali jednu zemlju [How one country was killed?], dedicated to the NATO bombings of 1999, which could be good introduction to critical rethinking of the sociopolitical situation in a country through the collection of museum and new exhibitions (artifacts) in spite of the change of the regime (in 2000), but that did not and the Museum of Yugoslavia stayed almost inactive, barely functional, with the visiting domestic exhibitions and events like the exhibitions of the graduated students from the Faculty of Fine Arts. ‘Barely functional’ culminated in the complete absence of the Museum of Yugoslavia as a cultural institution with the ceremony in 2006 where the remains of the former President Slobodan Milošević were exhibited at the Museum of Yugoslavia, after his death in prison for the War crimes in Hague (Pintar, Ignjatović, 2013).

The step forward to a new cultural institution (museum), and step back toward traditional institutions representing the artifacts with no critical interpretation, occurred as a dynamic of the
official institutions, mirroring the fragmentation as a consequence of cultural trauma after the breakup of Yugoslavia.

The case of the Pavilion in Venice expressed the urge for the traumatic experience to have its representation at the international level, to communicate its experience and find its resolution in a space that symbolically represented the old and new at the same time. That space still belongs to Yugoslavia through the omnipresent context of the former state narrative and at the same time occupied by the nominal successor in the Republic Serbia. The “nationality and supranationality” of the Pavilion emanated in the exhibition Paviljon Jugoslavije [Pavilion Yugoslavia] in 2003, in the same year when Yugoslavia ceased to exist in the last unity of Serbia and Montenegro which would last three more years.

**INTERCONNECTEDNESS AND RELATEDNESS**

Simultaneously, because the system always attempted to fill the void, alternative cultural institutions were created. That was the conceptual backbone of my thesis: the necessity of re-conquering the past as a source, a support, a space of creation and re-creation, a space of fact and thereby an evident or possible truth, in order to create a wholeness and avoid further fragmentation in narrative and identity, time and space. Also, I was accentuating a transformative process within the transitive one in cooperation between official and nonofficial institutions, through various and common projects.

In order to own its legacy of the past (before that – to deal with it), every structure needs a certain sense of identity and certain self – conception like a center in the present from which the subject can spread in search towards the past and to projects into the future. That sense of identity and self-conception is often ruined by trauma, fragmented, and dispersed. Trauma causes the sense for relatedness and interconnectedness (between the parts of the one’s self and with others) to diminish. Some parts of one’s self could stay unreachable, locked in a past in moments when trauma occurred (as there is a saying that accidents do not come alone, also trauma as an accident by the nature and always brings with it re-traumatization, one or multiple, during denial of the trauma consequence or also during the healing process).

In the culture and art field in Serbia after the traumatic events that occurred during the ‘90s (and still continue to occur in 2020), the discontinuity and fragmentation emanated in dynamics ‘step forward – step back’. After the acute period of cultural trauma, consequences and response,
the sense of relatedness and connection should be rehabilitated. We could be wrong to insist on
the continuity at any cost. Actually, making new narratives and connections is possible and urgent
firstly on a horizontal axis in a sense that an individual or collective should first center in the
security of here and now, through the connection of fragmentized parts, and then go back in the
past to collect the missing parts.

In the field of art and culture in Serbia on the institutional level this means rearticulating
the narratives, accepting and incorporating the past events and its consequences through debates
and dialogs until a consensual and coherent story appears. Also, the important task was to create
new cultural policies and programs for the future first among the institutions and organizations of
different types from all three sectors (governmental, non governmental and private). With the
attitude and imperative of forgetting the Yugoslav past provided by authorities and governing
structures creating a coherent narrative about the past in order to exit out of the crisis just by its
own strength – became an impossible quest for official institutions of culture.

In my argument, through the examples of the official and nonofficial institutions, I have
shown the existence of Yugoslavia after Yugoslavia in projects – exhibitions, debates,
conferences, in official institutions (in spite of the Yugoslav narrative being marginalized,
diminished and even forbidden) (Sztompka, 2000, Hirschberger, 2013). Mutual projects emerged
from gained (shared) interest among institutions that have a decisive role.

In the official institutions, Yugoslavia appears more as a traumatic past that should be
revealed. Non-official institutions are more ready to consider the Yugoslav past as a source,
accentuating the progressive character that Yugoslav state had, trying to supersede it and inherit
(CZKD and project Moderna, Inex and ‘commons’ as a legacy of socialistic Yugoslavia, Kvaka
and owning of Yugoslav legacy without nostalgic feelings and sentimentalism).

Also, I have assumed that the Yugoslav legacy appears as common cultural space through
mutual regional projects, cooperation between artists in the whole region, among every former
Yugoslav country, mainly in alternative space. Then through antifascist attitude toward life and
the world as a legacy of antifascist struggle (one of a pillars of communistic Yugoslavia), with the
sense of commons and togetherness (as an emanation of the “brotherhood and unity” which
transformed into “togetherness” in the ‘80’s). Describing the mutual or mirroring projects of the
official and alternative institutions, which could be rare but influential, I have shown the
importance of cooperation between sectors in culture due to the fact that in alternative institutions
cultural memory appears to be more ‘alive’, free from suppression of authorities (narratives and
interests).
In the circumstances of unclear and undefined relation towards the Yugoslav period, its heritage, then its influence on today and importance of its influence on tomorrow, the ‘legacy’ appears as a full potential of the word meaning. In spite of positive connotation, as a main perspective of this work, this legacy has a wider meaning. Representing a symbolical inheritance, influencing new identity shaping and revival of structured meaning towards life and world (especially in post conflict societies), part of the legacy appears to be cultural trauma itself, a crisis of identity, and fragmentation of core narratives, as constitutive elements of (institutional) structures.

At the same time, struggling for the cultural memory to incorporate the period of Yugoslavia means the nostalgic temptation and posttraumatic response of turning to the past. Idealization of Yugoslavia, so called Yugonostalgia (Velikonja, 2008), is an omnipresent term to describe life of Yugoslavia in post-Yugoslav societies, in the personal and collective memory. It became a prismatic tool (optic prism) for research and analysis of the representation of Yugoslavia, after its dissolution.

Actually, almost every interest for Yugoslavia in post-Yugoslav societies was interpreted as a result of extreme a nostalgic feeling, causing the interpretation of exhibitions and other cultural events, for example exhibition in Museum of Yugoslavia, to be nothing more nor nostalgic acting-outs (Ziebińska-Witek, 2018). Yugonostalgia, in cases like this, should be present by curators and an audience, as a connective form that makes a strong platform for individual memories to pass through to the collective.

Taking into consideration the warnings of researchers about Yugonostalgia being another way of marginalization of the Yugoslav period and its significance (Dimitrijević, 2016), together with lowering the need of its objective valuing in presence, I have chosen the independent, nonofficial cultural center of the youngest generation (it supposed that „collective“ of this center are people born after dissolution of Yugoslavia, that have never lived in this state), to show how the memory of Yugoslavia exists without a nostalgic coloring.

Even though, nostalgia can also be a result of transmission (trans-passing of memory, feelings and meaning from older generations) especially in posttraumatic societies (Hoffman, 2010), and occur in generations which did not have personal experiences connected with the certain events in the past. In the case of alternative institutions of the younger generations in Serbia, for the example of the Kvaka 22, those feelings occur transformed in a particular beneficial way, representing the awareness of the past and a source for the future. From the perspective of the alternative institutions Yugonostalgia is likely to be just a phase in overcoming crisis and
search for the meaning of the past events, while in the case of official institutions could be seriously misleading and simplification of the Yugoslav narrative and legacy (Museum of Yugoslavia and identification with the House of Flowers as a grave of the Josip Broz Tito, and through that with the cult of the ruler, pilgrims and remembrance on communism, while the Museum itself was hasting towards critical and modern cultural institution).

Simplification and discarding of the Yugoslav legacy and memory of Yugoslavia was possible even in the Pavilion in Venice, through the (mis)interpretation of the Serbian artist portrayal. Containing a critical approach and sometimes provoking the public, questioning responsibility and world dynamic, influences and a change of socio-political map of the World (Ivan Grubanov, United Death Nations) Serbian Pavilion in the site of the former Yugoslav Pavilion represents the intersections of complex narratives. After 2003, it became the space of memories, and a space for many questions and dialogues to occur. The possible interpretation of the Serbian exhibitions thematizing Yugoslav past – such as Yugomuseum in 2007, by Mrdjan Bajić as an expression of Yugo-nostalgia – represents severe simplification and diminishing of the Yugoslav legacy.

According to research and scientific meeting from 2012, Okviri konstruisanja jugoslovenskog kulturnog naslјeda [Frame of constructing of Yugoslav cultural legacy], (Kovačević, 2012) consensual conclusion about Yugoslav legacy is still missing, with various ways and attempts to describe and to answer – if it is possible to predict if and how the conceptualization of Yugoslav legacy could appear in the future.

The most prominent and frequent conclusion as mentioned in research and collections of articles, also in historical overviews such as Jugoslavija od početka do kraja [Yugoslavia from the beginning until the end] regards the Yugoslav idea and common cultural space as most present (and visible) emanations of the Yugoslav legacy. The forms of this interpretation of Yugoslav legacy, could appear in cooperation among artists and cultural workers. Also, in creating new contacts and common projects among organizations and institutions. Personal contacts and individual attitudes have played an important role in creating contacts and new cooperation.

Deep rooted resemblance in the cultural field among different areas of former Yugoslavian states, could be described as emanations of the Yugoslav legacy – common cultural and artistic space, but also as an emanation of ‘brotherhood and unity’ ideological attitude. Combat for (transitional) justice, freedom of expression in (alternative) space, and multiculturalism, resemblance towards commons, could be a legacy of Yugoslav socialist state visible in core narratives of alternative institutions. Due to the prevalent influence of cultural trauma, conclusions
of the conferences, and meetings, together with coherent narrative of the exhibition, could represent ‘presence in absence’.

I was aiming to investigate the influence of cultural trauma on institutions – that can be detected with the presence of high level fragmentation emanated in the lack of cultural policy. Also, emanated in the phenomenon of detachment and splitting, which is noticeable in examples of exhibitions and conferences. These events thematize the mentioned phenomena in search for connection and dialog as a certain cure, but not just – they represent the phenomena of traumatic detachment and the splitting itself, staying with no significant or lasting conclusion, sometimes completely apart from each other (in time, and in creation of meaning).

Following the theory of Aleida Assman dedicated to the cultural memory in post-conflict societies (Assman, 2011), and request of time for eventually overcoming it, I had reasonable doubts regarding the possibility of discovering the coherent and consensual image/narrative about Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav state/period, in any of the represented institutions. Due to historical revisionism and repressions, with the highest intensity when the word is about the legacy of newest history (Markovina, 2018), the question being if Yugoslavia is a subject of for remembrance or for forgetting.

Marginalization, suppressing and erasing of the Yugoslav legacy and heritage, obvious on material heritage (devastation of monuments, changing names of the cities, streets, changing program in schools and texts in school books), together with an anti-Yugoslav narrative in official and public discourse, did not diminish thirty years after the dissolution of the Yugoslav state. The representations that can influence transition from individual to collective memory, and should be created through cultural institutions, are rare in Serbia.

Preservation of the Yugoslav legacy, in the form of modernism, progression, multiculturalism, cooperation and openness toward Other (region and West?) meant protection of possible regression towards a “Balkan mentality” country, with all negative stereotypes that definition contains: rigid, backward, conflict genic, inferior in all aspects, guided by mental map created after dissolution of Ottoman Empire in crisis of the transition from the ceased old to unknown new. (Sujecka, 2015)

Without Yugoslavia, the danger of going back to previous mental maps was enormous, and required the full mobilization of intellectuals and artists, movements and organizations, in prevention of ‘regression’ to happen. The defense mechanism arose during the regime of Slobodan Milošević in organizations like the Centre for Cultural Decontamination (CZKD). I have tried to
show if the coping mechanism (‘decontamination’) still had a beneficial influence, and how alternative institutions of first generations contribute to the remembrance of Yugoslavia.

CHOOSING BETWEEN ILLUSION OF GROUND ZERO AND REGAINING THE PAST.
IN SEARCH FOR MEANING AND THE OLD/NEW IDENTITY

Trauma is not just an injury (on a material or psychic level, to the person, community, or environment) it is the event where ‘the very distinctions between body, psyche, community, and environment are called into question’ (Edkins, 2004). The severe fragmentation causes the loss of awareness of the whole, and what is the most damaging – the loss of the sense for relationality and interconnectedness (Edkins, 2006). Sometimes, trauma appears or causes effect of the time zero, or ground zero, I will use here to describe the atmosphere in which all institutions I investigated were drawn into. That is the gap where the old no longer exists, but there is nothing new yet.

The Ground zero represents a moment of severe crisis, moment between life and death, moment of decision, and – deceitful moment. Even if it seems like a very new beginning containing an endless number of possibilities, like the gift and good start, freed from the burden of the past, that is just the Ground zero paradox. That paradox reflects the fact that ground zero as a very new beginning that would not exist without trauma itself, so in its nature ground zero is a result or consequence of the traumatic event. That fact makes ground zero just a part of injury and its consequences should be conquered as well, like other trauma outcomes, through meaning making, and (re)connecting with the past.

World War II in which First Yugoslavia ceased to exist, for the Second to appear after war ending, was a huge trauma on a global level, and marked a year 1941 or 1945, as a ground zero. Dissolution of Yugoslavia in 1991, was also a Ground zero for all former Yugoslav states. Including World War I, that is, for one century and people from the Balkans, three ground zero moments, in the same time are – three self-defining memories (Singer, 2012), all traumatic. In search of a new identity, ground zero dictates the beginning from the zero, which can be represented in the malfunctioned motto ‘leaving the past behind’.

Sometimes, the ground zero comes from the natural dynamic in personal life, life of some collective, organization or a state, and sometimes, it is the consequence of a shocking, distressing, or even devastating event. And in a third case, it can be constructed and provoked through the planned actions like revisionist projects in all former Yugoslav states that falsify the past events in
perverted interpretation, discredit it through various attempts, in order to make the subject discard it.

That attitude should serve in ‘overcoming the past’ but in a way of discrediting its value, marginalizing its legacy, even demonizing it. Linearization of narratives, and locking the story of the past into the archive without an attempt of revitalization and revival of some of its elements could become an official cultural policy. Refusing to perceive the past events as a basis is more than a non-beneficial process. It is a contaminating process which petrifies narratives from the past into the ‘stumbling blocks’ that should be bypassed. causes high levels of fragmentation.

For the continuity to be established again, after traumatic injury, ground zero as a false start from the zero, should be conquered also. On first glance it seems that making continuity in a sense of linearization could mean overcoming of the suspicious breaking point (for example the project Yugoslavia from the beginning until the end in Museum of Yugoslavia in 2012) which could be one trap more and closing up of the Yugoslav narrative in the past. The presence of ground zero means discontinuity by itself.

When the first euphoria in regards to a ‘new beginning’ fades, the search for continuity starts (again). First response of the subject to the quest for continuity is to create a stable – which means linear narrative, then to connect the past and present in logic – which still means – linear way. That is one more paradox of ground zero – it leads to linearization even when it looks like it breaks it forever. In mentioned reality there is no learning from the past experiences and there is no creative freedom for unexpected solutions to appear.

In a space where nothing new can come, the past is free to repeat itself in the most monstrous way. And traumatic consequences of previous conflicts could thrive. In the transition process this requires transformation in every sense, linearization is dangerous simplification. In a traumatized society and culture, it seems like the only rational way of interpreting the (terrifying) reality and breaking out of the crisis.

Actually, opening up towards alternative solutions is a way of overcoming the crisis. Allowing for the dialog and dialectic space to exist in constant fluctuation of the old and new is also beneficial. And by accepting the “metaphor of spiral” to interpret time and space which is spontaneous and often emerges in alternative places and in nonofficial institutions, the past can become a source for the present in an attempt to build the future.

The Exhibition that opened the Museum of Contemporary Art after ten years of reconstruction titled Sekvence [Sequences] represented a great step forward – moving from the
linear narrative and perception to the nonlinear perspective. It offered more possibilities to create new/old narrative about Yugoslav and Serbian art of the 20th century and to make it more active and more present.

The Museum of Contemporary Art together with Inex already made a huge break into the transformation toward modern and critical institutions (Belting, 2007) a few years before Sequences while the Museum was under prolonged reconstruction. Changing perspective of the past and accepting the cooperation with the alternative institutions emanated in the project Od dionizijskog socijalizma do predatorskog kapitalizma [From the Dionysian socialism to predatory capitalism] (in 2012) especially with the part placed in Inex Glasovi prošlosti [Voices from the past].

Confronting the official and nonofficial institutions I had to attempt to show how the Yugoslav narrative appears in official institutions in two ways – as a fragment (an image, an interpretation, without a context), or as a whole, but in a fragmented and isolated way (story from the beginning until the end). Yugoslavia in official institutions, starting from the ‘90s until today, appears as a fragmented image, contained from the “little islands” (projects, events) vividly divided from each other. There, the narrative about the past that belongs to Yugoslavia is not still perceived as a fertile ground for new identity to arise, and in those conditions Yugoslav legacy cannot appear as coherent nor consensual.

Both processes – linearization and spiral curriculum – should serve in progress towards regaining the past and breaking the illusion of ground zero, where cooperation between official and unofficial sectors in culture appears as vital. The phenomenological approach to the Yugoslav period indicates a shift from extensive historiographical analyses and monographs towards interdisciplinary, cultural studies.

Thereby interdisciplinary approach represents an important link to the examination of cultural institutions and institutions of culture both official and nonofficial and could lead to better understanding of their specific and complex narrative in transformation. Fragmented by hiding the Yugoslav period and reducing it to an obsolete and superseded narrative(s), coherent stories about the past should be regained to the institutions (and their network) to become functional.

However, critical examinations, discussions and dialogs deconstruct the official narratives regarding Yugoslavia being a mistake. In discourse of the authorities that reflects on the official cultural policy and functionality of institutions, Yugoslavia still bears unwanted heritage. On the
other side, institutions themselves being official or nonofficial are struggling for the Yugoslav legacy.

The creative potentials of the past, contained in the phenomenon of legacy, must be returned to the present and, accordingly, to the future, for that is the only way to overcome the transition process understood as a period of crisis and to solve it in a positive way. The task is to regain the right to a past, to make it one’s own again. In the specific example of Yugoslavia and the SFRY republics, that would mean the acceptance of the Yugoslav legacy emanated in common cultural space, progressive attitude towards the world, multiculturalism, sense for unity and togetherness.

In more concrete cases, as the subject of this work, that means creating a continuity and connections in the internal narrative of cultural institutions and the formation of a basis for new narratives, the formation of an authentic identity and the gaining of functionality and creative activity. Even more than creating continuity, that means understanding and accepting the importance of the connection, inside of the one institution between its parts in every sense, then between official and nonofficial institutions, together with communication and connections between institutions of all former Yugoslavia republics. The task is to overcome the crisis – by accepting the past.
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- Figure 50. The artist involved could achieve no legitimacy, and most of the time, their engagement was volunterely. In spite of all difficulties, most of them stayed part of the Inex, from the beginning until the end. Photo: Radomir Lazović, 2012.

- Figure 51. One of the numerous performances in Inex thematizing the transition process in Serbia. Photo collage: Tijana Vuković, photos: Rdaomir Lazović, 2014.

- Figure 52. JNA. The capture from a movie Konac, igla, mastilo [Thread, Needle, Ink] by Marija Đorđević. (contribution to the project Od dionizijskog socijalizma do predatorskog kapitalizma [From Dionysian Socialism to Predatory Capitalism]) capture by Tijana

- Figure 53. When I was a little. The capture from a movie Konac, igla, mastilo [Thread, Needle, Ink] by Marija Dordević. (contribution to the project Od dionizijskog socijalizma do predatorskog kapitalizma [From Dionysian Socialism to Predatory Capitalism]) Photo: Tijana Vuković, 2020.

- Figure 54. ‘Unwanted legacy’. The capture from a movie Konac, igla, mastilo [Thread, Needle, Ink] by Marija Dordević. (contribution to the project Od dionizijskog socijalizma do predatorskog kapitalizma [From Dionysian Socialism to Predatory Capitalism]) Photo: Tijana Vuković, 2020.

- Figure 55. Old factory. Capture of the sequence from the movie Makiš City, autor Ivana Todorović. Photo: Tijana Vuković, 2020

- Figure 56. ‘Creative Articulations of Historical Narratives’. Spatial solution in Inex. Author of the photography is Iva Ćukić, participant of the project.

- Figure 57. Metamorphosis (authors Endre Barna, Zorana Matić). Photo: Iva Ćukić

- Figure 58. When Oldmen goes... (Kada Stari ode...), Stanislav Drča, Gallery in Inex 2014. Photo: Stanislav Drča

- Figure 59. Andrea Dramićanin, Tea Lukač, Artwork that did not saved the Museum, Gallery in Inex, 2014. Photo: Stanislav Drča

- Figure 60. Dejan Radisavljević, Zastava, Inex – artwork symbolically represents how new emblems are contained from the (individual) past (New collection in Inex, 2014)

- Figure 61. One of the numerous installation in Inex. Part of the permanent or temporal display. Created spontaneously from the objects founded on cite. (ready-made) Photo: Darko Stojkov

- Figure 62. Inside of the devastated building: Stairs. Photo: Luka Mihajlović, 2015

- Figure 63. Inside of the devastated building: Room. Photo: Luka Mihajlović, 2015

- Figure 64. Kvaka 22 in 2019. Photo: Tijana Vuković

- Figure 65. Gallery in Kvaka 22. Photo: Luka Mihajlović

- Figure 66. Artefacts in the Museum of Kvaka 22. Photo: Goran Rister, 2017

- Figure 67. Detail from the permanent display of the Museum in Kvaka 22. photo: Goran Rister

- Figure 68. Museum in Kvaka 22. Photo: Goran Rister 2016
Figure 69. The tools, documents, notes, handwritings. Detail from the permanent display. Photo: Goran Rister. 2016

Figure 70. The place for the dirigent (changing perspectives). Photo: Goran Rister 2016

Figure 71. Expectations. Opening of the exhibition. Photo: Goran Rister, Kvaka 22. 2017
SUMMARY

Regaining the Past.

Yugoslav Legacy in the Period of Transition: the Case of Formal and Alternative Institutions of Art and Culture in Serbia at the End of the 20th and the Beginning of the 21st Century

Before, during the existence of Yugoslav state, and in the post Yugoslav period, common cultural (and art) space was shaped by the similar language, culture, connections, mentality, territory, economic relations, (foreign) influences and art production.

After the dissolution of Yugoslavia in disastrous war conflicts, a large economic and cultural crisis hit the whole Balkan region. Cruelty of the Bosnia war, together with embargo, economic crisis, severe inflation, protests, caused a cultural collective trauma in all former Yugoslav countries. Simultaneously. High level of (narrative) fragmentation occurs in all institutions as the consequence of the crisis in society. It reflects in the dysfunctionality of institutions and eventually in closing down.

After the dark period of the ‘90s, in 2000, Serbia dived into progressive democratic changes and an unblocked transition process, that will become a large source of disappointment in Serbian society. During all the changes and fluctuations, Yugoslavia (idea and a state) figure as a main culprit for a crisis and a huge mistake in the newest history.

Individual memory and private space of citizens in Serbia was still crowded by the memories of the previous period, but translating into cultural memory became doubtful. For that kind of translation, and revitalization of the part of the culture, space for speech, discussion, search for meaning should be essential, initiated and placed in institutions of culture.

In my research I was trying to investigate if and how Yugoslavia continued to exist in cultural institutions as a phenomenon, through values of its ideology and common and wide cultural space, as a notion, motif, and theme of the projects and events, in spite of all mentioned
circumstances. I intended to represent the importance of Yugoslav legacy (as a symbolic heritage in the first place), from the perspective of making continuity and finding (creating) meaning about the past, as a way of overcoming cultural trauma.

The main categories and points of view I have chosen as a methodology of the research, could be named as interdisciplinary cultural study approach, through content analysis and notions of representations interpretation, discovering of symbolic or concrete presence/absence.

The material for my research were catalogues from the exhibitions and following publications, articles from newspapers and magazines, academic literature, non-official interviews, videos, comments on exhibitions, comments as a part of the program in institutions, personal interpretations of actors (artists, academics, curators, activists, audience) expressed in informal interviews and meetings, noted or recorded, so that could be incorporated in my research.

Entire argument is divided into the four parts: State of Art, Historical Context, Official Institutions; Alternative Institutions accompanied with the Introduction at the beginning, and Conclusions at the end (together with Bibliography, List of Photos and Summary in English, Polish and Serbian).

In the first chapter State of Art, with an overview of books, articles and projects that are connected with a theme of my work, I present different aspects of its formulation and content.

The second chapter titled Historical context is dedicated to the history of South Slavic unity with overview of Yugoslav history.

For the analytical part of my research I have chosen three official and three alternative institutions to describe and illustrate the place and role of the Yugoslav narrative and legacy in cultural institutions: among official those are Serbian Pavilion in Venice (Paviljon Republike Srbije u Veneciji), Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade (Muzej savremene umetnosti u Beogradu), Museum of Yugoslavia (Muzej Jugoslavije), and among nonofficial (alternative) institutions those are Centre for Cultural Decontamination (Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju/ CŽKD), squat Inex, and alternative cultural center Catch 22 (Kvaka 22). I had an assumption that choosing from the different types of the institution could help in creating the wider image, and form the basis for a more complete map of the institutions in Serbia in the post Yugoslav period.

Analytical part dedicated to official institutions placed after Historical context contains three chapters describing three institutions.
The first chapter in a part regarded official institutions is dedicated to the Pavilion of Republic Serbia in Venice, former Pavilion of Yugoslavia in Venice (all of state emanations). I have decided to investigate Serbian (former Yugoslav) Pavilion in Venice as the only institution where Yugoslavia still exists in the frame of international art and culture manifestations (even just as a living memory and context).

The second chapter is dedicated to The Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade, opened in 1965 as the most prominent cultural institution representing the Yugoslav and Serbian Art of the 20th century. The Museum of Contemporary Art appears to be the institution symbol of the Yugoslav art and culture creation.

The third one is dedicated to the Museum of Yugoslavia, the only institution in former Yugoslav space dedicated fully to representation of Yugoslavia. Institution showed the enormous capacity for transformation, communicating the possibility of the new modern institution.

Analytical part dedicated to alternative institutions also contains three chapters with the short introduction bringing the explanations and description of alternative institutions as a phenomenon. The first chapter in a part of research Alternative institutions is dedicated to the Centre for Cultural Decontamination (Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju / CZKD). Being one of the oldest non official organizations in Serbia, emerged from a decisive protest against the regime of Slobodan Milošević in 1995, CZKD was my choice for the alternative institution of the older generation.

As the second case I have decided to describe the squat and cultural center Inex established in a building of the Inex Film Company.

The end of the analytical part dedicated to alternative institutions represents the case of Kvaka 22, as an example for the youngest generations of the artists and cultural workers, activists and citizens, and their approach towards culture and art, past and present.

In the Conclusions I have presented in the same time common denominators of the all described institutions from the perspective of Yugoslav legacy, and wider context as a common space for them all. Also, I have accentuated the conclusion about the significance of cooperation between institutions, in the field of cultural memory but not just. The phenomenon of relatedness and interconnectedness appears to be crucial for the resolution of the cultural crisis.
STRESZCZENIE

Odzyskiwanie przeszłości.

Dziedzictwo jugosłowiańskie w okresie transformacji: oficjalne i alternatywne instytucje kultury i sztuki w Serbii na przełomie XX i XXI wieku

Wspólna jugosłowiańska przestrzeń kulturowa (i artystyczna) kształtowała się zanim powstała Jugosławia, w czasie jej istnienia, a także po jej rozpadzie. Czynnikami, które o tym decydowały był podobny język, kultura, powiązania, mentalność, terytorium, stosunki gospodarcze, (zewnętrzne) wpływy i produkcja artystyczna.

Po rozpadzie Jugosławii w wyniku katastrofalnych konfliktów wojennych omawiany region został dotknięty ogromnym kryzysem ekonomicznym i kulturalnym. Okrucieństwo wojny w Bośni i Hercegowinie, a także embargo, kryzys ekonomiczny, ostra inflacja i protesty wywołały zbiorową traumę kulturową we wszystkich krajach byłej Jugosławii równocześnie. Konsekwencją kryzysu społecznego był wysoki stopień fragmentacji (narracji) pojawiający się we wszystkich instytucjach. Wyrażał się on w dysfunkcjonalności instytucji, a następnie w ich zamknięciu.

W roku 2000, po mrocznej dekadzie lat dziewięćdziesiątych, Serbia rozpoczęła demokratyczne zmiany i odblokowała proces transformacji, który stał się powodem ogromnego rozczarowania społeczeństwa serbskiego. W trakcie tych zmian i przekształceń Jugosławia (rozumiana jako idea i państwo) zaczęła jawić się jako główny sprawca kryzysu.

Pamięć indywidualną i przestrzeń prywatną obywateli Serbii wciąż wypełniały wspomnienia poprzedniego systemu, ale możliwość przełożenia tego na pamięć kulturową stała pod znakiem zapytania. Dla tego typu kulturowego przekładu i rewitalizacji wspomnianego wycinka kultury konieczna jest bowiem przestrzeń dialogu, dyskusji, poszukiwania sensu, zainicjowana i umiejscowiona w instytucjach kultury.

W rozprawie podjęłam próbę odpowiedzi na pytanie, czy i w jaki sposób Jugosławia, rozumiana jako pojęcie, motyw, temat projektów i wydarzeń, przejawiająca się w określonym
systemie aksjologicznym oraz fenomenie wspólnoty kulturowej – funkcjonuje w instytucjach kultury wbrew powyżej zarysowanym okolicznościom. Moim zamierzeniem było zaprezentowanie znaczenia dziedzictwa Jugosławii (przede wszystkim jego symbolicznego wymiaru) w odniesieniu do procesu ustanawiania ciągłości i odnajdywania (tworzenia) sensu przeszłości jako sposobu na przezwyciężenie traumy kulturowej.

Główne kategorie i perspektywy badawcze, które stały się metodologiczną podstawą moich badań, tworzą podejście nazywane interdyscyplinarnymi badaniami kulturowymi i obejmują analizę treści, interpretację reprezentacji, odkrywanie symbolicznej lub rzeczywistej obecności/nieobecności.

Jako materiał naukowy posłużyły mi publikacje dotyczące wystaw i projektów, a także opracowania takie jak artykuły prasowe, filmy, komentarze do wystaw, komentarze zawarte w programach instytucji, literatura naukowa, osobiste interpretacje aktorów społecznych (artystów, naukowców, kuratorów, aktywistów) wyrażone w nieformalnych i formalnych wywiadach udzielanych podczas spotkań i zarejestrowanych przez media.

Rozprawa składa się z czterech rozdziałów: Stań badań, Kontekst historyczny, Oficjalne instytucje, Alternatywne instytucje. Poprzedza je Wprowadzenie i zamykają Wnioski. W końcowej części pracy znajduje się Bibliografia, Spis ilustracji i streszczenie.

W rozdziale pierwszym (Stan badań) zaprezentowałam przegląd literatury, prasy oraz projektów związanych z tematem pracy, podkreślając różnorodność w obrębie ich treści, a także w sposobach formułowania głównego problemu. Rozdział drugi (Kontekst historyczny) poświęcony jest historii idei jedności Słowian Południowych na tle historii Jugosławii.

W części analitycznej rozprawy do badania roli narracji o Jugosławii i jej dziedzictwa w instytucjach kulturalnych wybrałam trzy instytucje oficjalne i trzy instytucje alternatywne. Wśród instytucji oficjalnych znalazły się: Pawilon Serbski w Wenecji (Paviljon Republike Srbije u Veneciji), Muzeum Sztuki Współczesnej w Belgradzie (Muzej savremene umetnosti u Beogradu) oraz Muzeum Jugosławii (Muzej Jugoslavije). Spośród instytucji nieoficjalnych (alternatywnych) do analizy wybrałam Centrum Dekontaminacji Kulturowej (Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju, CZKD), squat Inex oraz alternatywne centrum kultury Kvaka 22. Przyjęłam założenie, że taki wybór z szerokiego wachlarza instytucji przyczyni się do zaprezentowania szerokiego obrazu, a także stanowić będzie podstawę pełniejszej mapy instytucji kultury w Serbii w okresie postjugosłowiańskim.
Część analityczna poświęcona oficjalnym instytucjom składa się z trzech podrozdziałów. Pierwszy podrozdział poświęcony jest Pawilonowi Serbskiemu w Wenecji, byłemu Pawilonowi Jugosławii w Wenecji (emanacji Jugosławii na każdym etapie jej politycznego istnienia). Postanowiłam poddać badaniu Pawilon Serbski (były Jugosłowiański) w Wenecji jako jedyną instytucję, w której Jugosławia wciąż istnieje w ramach międzynarodowych manifestacji kultury i sztuki (choćby jako żywa pamięć i kontekst).

Drugi podrozdział poświęcony jest Muzeum Sztuki Współczesnej w Belgradzie, otwartemu w 1965 roku, jako czołowej instytucji kulturalnej reprezentującej jugosłowiańską i serbską sztukę XX wieku. Muzeum Sztuki Współczesnej jawi się tu jako symbol procesu tworzenia kultury i sztuki Jugosławii.

Trzeci podrozdział poświęcony jest Muzeum Jugosławii, jedynej instytucji na obszarze biełej Jugosławii w całości poświęconej Jugosławii. Instytucja ta wykazała się ogromną zdolnością transformacji, wykazując jednocześnie potencjał nowoczesnej instytucji kultury.

Część analityczna poświęcona instytucjom alternatywnym również składa się z trzech podrozdziałów. Poprzedza je krótkie wprowadzenie i ogólna analiza instytucji alternatywnych jako fenomenu kulturowego. Pierwszy podrozdział poświęcony jest Centrum Dekontaminacji Kulturowej (Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju / CZKD). W związku z tym, że Centrum wyrosło ze zdecydowanego protestu przeciwko reżimowi Slobodana Miloševicia w 1995 roku i jest jedną z najstarszych nieoficjalnych instytucji w Serbii, zostało poddane analizie jako instytucja alternatywna starszej generacji.

W drugim podrozdziale omówiony został squat i centrum kulturalne Inex, założone w budynku wytwórni filmowej Inex.

W ostatnim podrozdziale części analitycznej uwagę poświęciłam instytucji alternatywnej Kvaka 22 jako przykładowi działalności najmłodszej pokoleń artystów i działaczy kultury, aktywistów, obywateli.

W części Konkluzje opisałam punkty styczne wszystkich analizowanych instytucji z perspektywy dziedzictwa Jugosławii, a także naświetliłam szerszy kontekst funkcjonowania tych instytucji jako ich przestrzeń wspólnotną. Ponadto opisałam wnioski dotyczące znaczenia współpracy między tymi instytucjami nie tylko w obszarze pamięci kulturowej. Zjawisko pokrewieństwa i wzajemnych powiązań wydaje się mieć kluczowe znaczenie dla wyjścia z kryzysu kulturowego.
REZIME

Posedovanje prošlosti.

Jugoslovensko nasleđe u periodu transformacije: državne i alternativne institucije kulture i umetnosti u Srbiji na prelasku iz XX u XX vek

Zajednički kulturni, kao i umetnički prostor, postoji na teritoriji Jugoslavije pre konstituisanja države, tokom njenog trajanja, i posle njenog raspada, stvaran pod uticajem srodnog jezika, kulture, ličnih veza, mentaliteta, ekonomskih povezanosti, stranih uticaja i umetničke produkcije.

Posle raspada Jugoslavije u razarajućim ratnim sukobima, ceo region na Balkanu zahvatila je ogromna ekonomska i kulturna kriza. Okrutnost rata u Bosni, zajedno sa sankcijama, ekonomskom krizom, ogromnom inflacijom, protestima, izazvali su kolektivnu, kulturnu traumu u svim bivšim jugoslovenskim republikama. Istovremeno, visok nivo fragmentacije pojavljuje se u svim društvenopolitičkim strukturama kao posledica pomenute kulturne traume i ekonomske krize, otkrivajući se u otežanom radu institucija i na kraju, u njihovom zatvaranju.

Posle mračnog perioda devedesetih, sa 2000. godinom, Srbija ulazi u progresivne demokratske promene i period odblokirane tranzicije, koji će doneti veliko razočarenje srpskom društvu u celini. Tokom svih manjih i većih promena, Jugoslavija je opstajala kao glavni krivac za krizu i kao jedna od najvećih greški novije istorije.

Individualno sećanje i privatni prostor građana u Srbiji i dalje su preplavljeni uspomenama na prethodni period, ali je prelazak iz ličnog u kolektivno sećanje, postao diskutabilan. Za takvu vrstu prevodjenja i revitalizaciju čitavog dela kulture, neophodan je prostor za govor, diskusiju, potragu za smislom, koji bi trebalo da su esencijalno smešteni u institucijama kulture.

Tokom mog istraživanja, pokušala sam da otkrijem da li i kako Jugoslavija postoji u okviru institucija kulture kao fenomen, pojam, motiv, i tema projekata i događaja, uprkos svim
pomenutim okolnostima. Cilj i tema istraživanja bila je važnost jugoslovenskog nasleda (najpre kao simboličnog), iz perspektive potrage za kontinuitetom i pronalaženja smisla u odnosu na prošlost, kao krucijalnog za prevazilaženje kulturne traume.

Najvažnije kategorije i perspektive u mom istraživanju u smislu metodologije koju sam birala, mogu da budu sabrane u interdisciplinarne kulturološke studije, zajedno sa analizom sadržaja, i fenomenom interpretacije u otkrivanju simboličnog ili konkretnog prisustva/odsustva.

Materijal za moje istraživanje bile su zapravo interpretacije (i analize) u akademskoj literaturi, nezvaničnim intervjuima, novinskim člancima, video-snimcima, onda komentari izložbi, komentari u programima institucija, lične interpretacije aktera (umetnika, naučnika, kuratora, aktivista ili publike) izraženi u neformalnim razgovorima, koji onda mogu biti uključeni u moju interpretaciju izložbe ili nekog drugog kulturnog događaja.

Rad je podeljen na četiri dela: Prethodna istraživanja, Istorijski kontekst, Državne institucije i Alternativne institucije, u pratnji Uvoda na početku i Zaključka na kraju (zajedno sa Bibliografijom, Spiskom fotografija i Rezimeom).

U prvom delu, namenjenom upoznavanju sa prethodnim istraživanjima, sa pregledom monografija, članaka i projekata koji su povezani sa temom mog rada, cilj mi je bio da pokažem i različite aspekte njene formulacije i sadržaja.

Drugo poglavlje, naslovljeno Istorijski kontekst posvećeno je istoriji južnoslovenske unije, u pratnji Uvoda na početku i Zaključka na kraju (zajedno sa Bibliografijom, Spiskom fotografija i Rezimeom).

U prvom delu, namenjenom upoznavanju sa prethodnim istraživanjima, sa pregledom monografija, članaka i projekata koji su povezani sa temom mog rada, cilj mi je bio da pokažem i različite aspekte njene formulacije i sadržaja.

Drugo poglavlje, naslovljeno Istorijski kontekst posvećeno je istoriji južnoslovenske unije u pratnji Uvoda na početku i Zaključka na kraju (zajedno sa Bibliografijom, Spiskom fotografija i Rezimeom).

Analitički deo mog istraživanja pripada trima državnim i trima alternativnim institucijama u cilju opisivanja i ilustracije uloge jugoslovenskog narativa i nasleda u kulturnim institucijama. Među državnim (zvaničnim, oficijalnim) institucijama nalaze se: Paviljon Republike Srbije u Veneciji, Muzej savremene umetnosti u Beogradu, Muzej Jugoslavije, a među alternativnim (nezvaničnim, neoficijalnim) Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju (CZKD), skvot Ineks, i alternativni kulturni centar Kvaka 22. Pretpostavka je bila da izbor primera iz različitih grupa ili tipova institucija (institucija različitog opredjeljenja) doprinosi stvaranju kompletnije slike kao i formiranju osnove za mapu institucija u Srbiji u periodu posle raspada Jugoslavije.

Dakle, analitički deo koji je posvećen državnim institucijama, i nalazi se posle Istorijskog konteksta, sastoji se od tri poglavlja koja predstavljaju tri institucije.

Prvo poglavlje u ovom delu predstavlja Paviljon Republike Srbije u Veneciji, nekadašnji Paviljon Jugoslavije u Veneciji ( i to svih emanacija Jugoslavije kao državne zajednice). Paviljon
u Veneciji je jedino mesto u internacionalnim okvirima i u okviru internacionalnih manifestacija kulture i umetnosti, gde Jugoslavija još uvek postoji (iako samo kao živo sećanje i aktivni kontekst).


U trećem poglavlju predstavljen je Muzej Jugoslavije kao jedina institucija u postjugoslovenskom prostoru u potpunosti posvećena predstavljanju Jugoslavije. Institucija je pokazala ogromnu sposobnost transformacije, svedočeći o mogućnostima nastanka novih savremenih institucija.

Analitički deo koji pripada alternativnim institucijama takođe sadrži tri poglavlja zajedno sa kratkim uvodom – određenjem i opisom pojma alternativne institucije kao fenomena. Prvo poglavlje u ovom delu predstavlja Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju kao predstavnik starije generacije nezvaničnih institucija u Srbiji nastalih u odlučnim protestima devedesetih godina protiv režima Slobodana Miloševića.

Kao primer alternativnih institucija druge ili srednje generacije i kao primer skvoterske prakse u Srbiji, inače dosta nerazvijene, izabra sam Inex skvot (drugo poglavlje ovog dela). Inex je zauzimalo nekadašnju zgradu Inex filma, i četiri godine funkcionisao kao kulturni centar sa mnogobrojnim i različitim aktivnostima.

U trećem poglavlju drugog dela nalazi se Kvaka 22 kao primer najmlađih alternativnih institucija u Srbiji, takođe mladih generacija umetnika, radnika u kulturi i aktivista.

Poglavlje Zaključci sadrži istovremeno zajedničke imenitelje svih opisanih institucija, i širi kontekst kao njihov zajednički prostor, naročito naglašavajući značaj saradnje dva sektora u kulturi (državnog i nedržavnog) na polju kulture sećanja ali i na drugim. Fenomeni uzajamnosti i povezanosti pokazuju se odlučujućim za razrešenje krize kulture i kulture u krizi.