

Strokovni članek/1.04

prof. dr. Joel Martin Halpern

YUGOSLAV SOCIALISM AND ITS AFTERMATH AS VIEWED THROUGH THE LENS OF PERSONAL EXPERIENCES IN THE BALKANS, 1953-2004

Introduction

In this brief essay it is my intention to focus on how Yugoslav government policies affected my research. At the same time I wish to explore the much more important question as to the ways in which the Yugoslav variety of socialism, as developed in a centralized communist and ideologically bound state, affected the everyday lives of the people in that country. The time frame I am considering is some four decades beginning with the early 1950s. The events recounted here from memory are not intended as an established view of the past but rather as a compilation of selected reflections.

As I came to know it, the Yugoslav communist system was far from as brutal as in Albania, where there was, for example, an attempt to abolish religious institutions. Nor was it as dogmatic as in Bulgaria, which had a dominant orientation, based on its unswerving allegiance to the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, the Yugoslav system was, in essence, based on a hierarchical organization of power and privilege using the Stalinist idea of democratic centralism. Thus, in my view, ultimate power always resided with the police and the army as directed by the Party. (Djilas, first publicly discussed these ideas in the early 1950s. This was first done in a series of articles and, subsequently, in his initial book, *The New Class*. His writings first appeared at the time of my initial fieldwork in 1953-54. His other books, both historical and biographical, followed. He had adequate time to create these during his multiple jail terms imposed by his former wartime leader and subsequent political colleague, Tito.

Yugoslav government policy as developed by the Communist Party was not always uniformly interpreted and implemented in this historically and ethnically diverse country. This diversity of manifestations of state policy impacted on my fieldwork from the beginning.

There was also a variation in the ways in which I was treated by different government ministries such as Interior, on the one hand, and Foreign Affairs, on the other, with their contrasting mandates. Given that I was a doctoral student my primary, and most rewarding, contacts were with universities, research

institutes and museums. One important aspect of Yugoslav socialist society was the significant state support provided to these institutions and organizations. Along with this support, however, came elaborate ideological controls. Since my initial focus was on village and small town society, perhaps the most difficult, were the local officials who lacked experience in dealing with a foreign researcher. Most often they were not welcoming, since my presence created another burden and one that could be potentially dangerous. Always looming in the background was the pervasive presence of the Cold War.

I was thus also immersed in the contrasting worlds of the public face of the government on the national and local levels.

It is also important to stress that this was also a time of drastic internal change. The socialist government had ambitious plans for economic and social development. An aspect of this planned innovation was evident in the official world of Party leadership in constructing "new" political forms of political organization as in ongoing constitutional revisions and the formal experimenting with social policy as in Workers' Self Management. But, on the other hand, in all the years that Tito and his associates were in power there never was anything resembling a free public opinion to say nothing of steps toward a truly democratic system where competing ideas, ideologies and programs were linked to a meaningful electoral process. As current developments in the Southeast Europe well indicate this option does not necessarily engender easy solutions. But clearly it was an option that was not tried in the decades before the breakup of Yugoslavia. But there certainly was a form of constant diversity as official policies always had a strong regional variation. Thus while the formal political policies were essentially the same in Slovenia and Kosovo, their manifestations were vastly different.

Beginning with the End of Yugoslavia

One cannot escape the change in perspective in writing from North America in the year 2005, four years after the experi-

ences of 9/11 in New York City and Washington, D.C, the American invasion of Iraq, the war in Afghanistan, the Madrid and London bombings the unrest in France – it is not possible to be complacent and distanced in our analysis of the failures of Yugoslav socialism and the wars of the 1990s. In the United States there is a new governmental Department of Homeland Security, a direct result of 9/11, one cannot be moralistic and self-centered about differences between “West” and “East.” The idea of the Cold War, which so dominated the second half of the 20th century, is now an historical artifact. That said Western democracies cannot easily act in the same ways as totalitarian states. The status of radical Muslims and Muslim communities in Western Europe and in the U.S. after 9/11 and in Europe after the Madrid bombings does reflect a degree of restraint both institutional and individual toward a minority group. Even the public killing in the Netherlands has had a measured response Tragically; current U.S. restrictive and undemocratic policies with respect to detention of suspected terrorists have undermined this country’s goals.

Focusing on Southeast Europe, the inadequacies and even brutalities of socialism in postwar Yugoslavia have been minor compared to the violent conflicts, large scale killings and widespread destruction that characterized the struggles of the 1990s in Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo. But there can be little question that the Leninist “democratic centralism” of socialist Yugoslavia played a significant role in setting the stage for these tragedies. . This is so because, while ethnic-national conflicts were readily apparent, they were not the subject of open debate and potential solutions were not publicly considered. These were matters monopolized by the Party hierarchy.

In the 1950s in Yugoslavia the security forces of the Interior Ministry, then know by their initials as UDBA, were omnipresent in everyone’s lives even though their actions were usually less severe than in Stalin’s time in the Soviet Union. In Western Europe the shadow of the Nazi past was still much present in the new German state and inhibited their foreign policy. In the new Cold War atmosphere the U.S. had become involved in Communist witch hunts as exemplified by the security mania of U.S. Senator Joseph McCarthy whose influence reached into the U.S. diplomatic community in Yugoslavia when his assistants came looking for “Communist books” in the U.S. Information Service Library in Belgrade. Fortunately, their provinciality and stupidity confined their passions.

Yugoslav socialism came into existence as a result of the victorious Partisan struggle in World War II and the associated destruction of the pre-war Yugoslav state. For the Partisans their simultaneous defeat of the fascist German invaders and their destruction of the remnants of prewar Serbian based monarchical state provided the Communists with their charter of legitimacy for ruling Yugoslavia as a socialist, Communist state under the leadership of Tito, the wartime leader. This sense of legitimacy and their monopoly of power enabled them to endless memorialize the “truths” of their struggle, excluding all variant views. Including the unresolved nationality and ethnic issues, which had assumed new form in the postwar setting. These monuments to those who had fallen were exclusively for the now martyred victors. The vanquished opponents in the civil war were banished from history. Their names

were on no monuments, nor were their views given any voice in the torrent of publications and in the many special museums memorializing the NOB, the People’s Liberation War.

It surely is an irony of history that when in the 1990s the Serbian army gunners surrounded Sarajevo and purposely targeted the National Library the priceless Ottoman era manuscripts were destroyed while somehow the literature of socialist Yugoslavia survived because of its location in the library. Ironically, also destroyed by the Serbian gunners was the museum of the revolutionary Gavrilko Princip, erected by the socialist government to honor this assassin of the Austrian Archduke Ferdinand, a key event leading up to World War I. Here was the then established order erecting a museum to honor the perpetrator rather than the victim (oppressor?), a memorial tribute, in turn, destroyed by a “new” nationalist order yet linked to earlier Serbian struggles. Seeing these ruins among the destruction I witnessed in Sarajevo in 1996 gave me a perspective on the historical claims of the Socialist era sandwiched as it was between struggles against the Habsburg Empire, a nationalist monarchy and a more recently reconstituted nationalism.

Iconography of Tito, A Part of Yugoslav Socialism

Linked to our new learning about the existing Yugoslav socialism as of the 1950s was a whole related iconography of Tito in various media - in bronze busts, wood carvings, oil portraits and even, on occasion marzipan. On the title page of all school-books there were portraits of Tito as the benevolent friend of children. In programmed portraits there was the fearless warrior for the military, the statesman for the foreign ministry, the earnest apprentice for the workers, the thoughtful leader as an inspiration for the intellectuals. Fittingly some of this imagery now resides on a humorous Web site. Writing about this now vanished world a half century later it is not possible for me to consider Yugoslav socialism as a modernizing ideology whose goals included enhancing ways of life and living standards without the accompanying imagery of the wartime Partisans and, especially, their leader.

To make the system work it was, of course, necessary; first, to suppress all potential political opposition that might threaten the system. In the consolidation phase this meant the execution of primary opponents and the imprisonment of others less threatening. Tito’s former close associate Milovan Djilas has given a useful insiders’ view of this process. Slogans such as “Death to Fascism, Freedom to the People,” “Brotherhood and Unity,” continued to be officially used in bureaucratic ways long after they had lost their original meanings Continual suppression of unresolved issues between national groups both actual and potential was one of the reasons that the system ultimately disintegrated so rapidly and so completely amidst the mass killings of the 1990s.

This comment, of course, begs the question as to why some former communist states like Czechoslovakia were able to peacefully split into national components without violence. A portion of that explanation certainly lies in the historic conflicts between Rome and Byzantium, Orthodoxy, as manifested in churches linked to a national heritage, and the uni-

versality of the Catholic Church. To this must, of course, be added the significance of the medieval Ottoman conquests and the subsequent presence of Islam in Europe, a question hardly resolved in Europe today in countries outside of the Balkans as in Western Europe.

The events of the 1990s and the subsequent breakup of Yugoslavia and the emergence of new states did, however, create a new linear time frame, which bracketed the existence of Yugoslav socialism. In all my experiences in what was Yugoslavia from the 1950s through the 1980s life courses of people of my generation were always bracketed by the temporal statement, "pre i poslje rata" (before and after the War, i.e. World War II). Now, of course, there are whole sets of new meanings attached to this expression the before and after now referencing the wars of the 1990s as the primary reference. Perhaps earlier wars had served similar functions for structuring memories.

An Abbreviated Memoir - The Beginnings

Initially I resided for approximately a year in the Serbian village of Orašac but also spent considerable time in Belgrade and also traveled widely in all of the then Republics. Subsequent stays in the succeeding decades varied from summers, to multiple residences of six months to a year or more. In the 1990s and the first decade of the 21st century visits were of shorter duration but did involve travel in what were then war zones in Croatia and Bosnia.

It cannot be too strongly stressed that when we (my wife and I) first arrived in Yugoslavia in the summer of 1953 it was the height of the cold war. Given my age (I was born in 1929) I was then barely 24. Although I had had a bicycle tour of Western Europe in 1949 and had traveled extensively in North America, this was my first visit to a Communist country. Also I had no overt family ties to Europe as my ancestors had all migrated to America by the beginning of the 20th century. It is important to note that my experiences were much shaped by a rural focus and the community study mode then very much predominant in American anthropology. I have also noted the Cold War perspective linked to those aspects of my graduate education, which focused on the then Soviet Union. Further, while in Yugoslavia I was significantly influenced by local ethnologists, especially in Serbia. As a result I came to see socialist ideology as something imposed from above and not an integral part of the lives of rural folk.

Education and the Cold War, the Early 1950s

I began my education in anthropology as an undergraduate majoring in history at the University of Michigan, and had become interested in Eastern Europe and what was then the Soviet Union. As a graduate student while I was engaged in the Ph.D. program in anthropology at Columbia University I also took courses at the Russian Institute of Columbia. These courses dealt with Russia and the Soviet Union - its economy, legal system, history, and literature. I had a unique and challenging education in this self-selected mix of courses. In a given semester I would have courses in physical anthropology,

and at the Russian Institute, Marxian economics. Similarly there was anthropological theory and the international relations of the Soviet Union or Russian literature and kinship systems. It is a wonder I survived with a coherent outlook and that my graduate career was not destroyed. Fortunately I had understanding and supportive professors.

The ideology of the Cold War was dominant. As noted, in the United States this was the period of rabid red baiting personified by Senator Joe McCarthy. He ultimately died in disgrace but not before he had inflicted much damage on American society. He also caused great difficulties for many Americans who were loyal citizens. Some years ago I explored the Columbia University Archives and found evidence as to how this period affected my professors, who were among those most prominent in the study of Soviet and East European affairs in the United States. Some were engaged in extensive consultation with their personal lawyers should they ever be brought before a congressional committee of inquiry!

But there is another view. Columbia University was, after all, in New York City with its long history of political radicalism and the site of the headquarters of the American Communist Party. Several local anthropologists had links to the "Old Left," of the 1930s. I befriended an "older man," an anthropological linguist. He had been an instructor in anthropology at the nearby City College of N.Y. (now part of the City University of New York) I was not sophisticated enough to realize that our conversations on linguistics and related anthropological topics had for him an instrumental focus. One day we went for a long walk and he broached to me the idea that I might be interested in joining the C.P., USA. I knew that he had recently been dismissed from his untenured position at City College because of his Party affiliation. This was, of course, a daring invitation given the tenor of the times. I don't remember being fearful of exploring this course of action but simply uninterested. (He subsequently resumed his career at the National University in Mexico City).

These events took place in 1952 and McCarthy's downfall was then some years off. It should also be noted that another anthropologist who worked on an Eastern European project sponsored by one of my professors, Margaret Mead. He was brought to trial as a Soviet agent and convicted. More directly pertinent, one of my anthropology professors was dismissed from her teaching position Columbia. She had publicly charged that U.S. forces then fighting in Korea were using germ warfare as a tactical weapon, a claim then made by the North Koreans, Chinese and Soviets. Like the anthropologist who taught at City College, she also subsequently resumed her career, in her case, at a smaller and less well-known University in the New York area.

Anthropology in the 1950s was then much oriented toward the notion of fieldwork in non-Western cultures as a way to validate one's professional status. But given the Soviet Union's attitude toward foreigner researchers generally and Americans in particular there was no chance to undertake fieldwork in that country or, for that matter, elsewhere in Eastern Europe. But Yugoslavia was different for in 1948 there was an ideological break with the Soviet Union.

Resulting in the severing of communist party relations

Yugoslavia in 1953, A Setting for Fieldwork

Although as of 1953 Yugoslavia was still an orthodox communist state its break with the Soviet Union made it a desired setting for expanding relations by the U.S. Thus at the time of my initial visit in 1953-54 there were very extensive United States civilian and military assistance programs in Yugoslavia. Subsequently, by the time of my second extensive visit in the early 1960s the extent of American food and economic aid to Yugoslavia had greatly expanded. During that decade the accumulation of local currency by the American Embassy had become very extensive for all food aid as well as other aid was paid for in local currency. During that time an official at the American Embassy told me that their bank account held about 10% of the value of all Yugoslav currency in circulation, an obviously politically intolerable situation. A major part of these funds were expended for public works on projects like the Dalmatian coastal highway. But there were also, relatively, large amounts of funds for academic research by U.S. and Yugoslav scholars working jointly as well as almost unlimited amounts for American libraries to buy copies of all books printed in Yugoslavia (this was the case even though funds set aside for this purpose were less than 1% of the total of all U.S. assistance.). But all these developments were in the 1960s, then very much in the future. It should be noted that I have gone into all this detail because a significant portion of my researches in Yugoslavia in the early 1960s were supported by these funds.

Role of Philip Mosely

My professor of international relations at Columbia, Philip Mosely, had been one of the founders of Soviet and East European Studies in the U.S., He also had been very much involved in U.S.-U.S.S.R. negotiations and had been an advisor at key conferences between the U.S., the U.K. and the U.S.S.R. Mosely had participated in the conferences of foreign ministers during the war in Moscow. In the immediate postwar period he had attended the Potsdam conference between Truman, Stalin and Churchill, (then Atlee) as an advisor to the American delegation. In sum, he had extensive experience in negotiating with the Soviets during and prior to the period he was my professor at Columbia.

With respect to Slovenia, Mosely had also been one the principal U.S. representatives at the treaty negotiations, which eventually ended the Trieste dispute between Yugoslavia and Italy. This matter was finally concluded only in the 1950s when we were already in Yugoslavia. But from my personal point of view, most significant was the curious fact that in the immediate prewar period, in the late 1930s, he had been encouraged by an American research foundation, the Social Science Research Council (New York), to undertake field research in the Balkans. As a result Mosely engaged in extensive field researches on the extended family unit, the Zadruga. He and Margaret Mead also my professor at Columbia had a long- term professional relationship. Mead subsequently was one of the major contributors to a book of essays dealing with Mosely's career.

Mosely and Filipović and Beginning My Yugoslav Research

During the course of his research in the Balkans in the late 1930s Mosely met Milenko Filipović, who was to become one of the leading Yugoslav ethnologists, particularly with respect to the study of Macedonian, Bosnian and, especially, Serbian areas. In 1952, when I had completed my course work, I was ready to undertake field research for my doctorate. Mosely introduced me to Professor Filipović who was then in the United States under a Rockefeller Foundation grant. He had received a fellowship from this organization on the eve of World War II but did not accept it because he chose to remain in his homeland even though war was then clearly inevitable. After the war Mosely helped Filipović renew his grant. After an initial meeting with Filipović my fate was then decided for here was the opportunity to do research in an exciting land. In a sense, I was following in Mosely's footsteps, a pathway he had pursued less than a decade and a half before. I was to do my research in Serbia under Filipović's sponsorship. It is important to add here that Filipović had been an advisor to the Chetniks (those supporting the royal government in W.W. II). Thus after the war he had been marginalized and not permitted to teach at the University in Belgrade and had to assume a research position.

Departure for Yugoslavia

We took a Yugoslav freighter from New York and landed in Dubrovnik in June of 1953. Our first introduction to the system was our contact with University students in Belgrade with whom we exchanged English for Serbian lessons. At that time visiting foreign students, especially those who wished to undertake research in rural areas, were a rarity so we had to make our own way through the system. A series of small events set the stage for our initial understanding of part of the dynamics of Yugoslav socialist society.

I also detail all this background to illustrate the fact that my selection of Yugoslavia as a research area was very much embedded in the political context of the time. For my research I had to use my personal resources since no financial assistance was forthcoming. Thus in this respect, despite the context of the times, my initial work in Yugoslavia was independent of any organizational impetus. In June 1953, when we first arrived in Yugoslavia, despite the large existing American aid program and the earlier break with Stalin, that country was still very much an orthodox communist state operating in a relatively poor and marginal country with a significant part of its economy peasant based. The massive program of industrialization had not yet really begun and the large-scale migrations to the cities were still getting underway.

The significant achievements of Yugoslav socialism in building a modern industrial economy were in prospect but communist state power was already consolidated. An aspect of the confirmation of state power entailed the techniques for the purposeful manipulation of public opinion to support the implementation of state policies. Such manipulation, which had its limitations, was played out in many ways. A local example of that purposeful manipulation took place in the early part of our initial stay.

Viewed from an early 21st century perspective the long-lasting significance of the events described below can be seen as, at best, marginal to the historical record. However, from a personal perspective, they were overwhelmingly significant to me at the time and nearly ended my work in Yugoslavia just as I was getting started.

Initial Fieldwork and Trauma

By the fall of 1953 we had settled in the central Serbian village of Orašac, about sixty miles south of Belgrade. One day the village council president invited us to accompany him and some other local officials to a “meeting” (rally) in the nearby rail and market town of Mladenovac. It also then had a few nascent industries. Something presumably important had happened and we didn’t know quite what. Our household lacked a functioning radio and they didn’t get a daily newspaper.

We left the village the next day at dawn to arrive in time for the rally. There were no private automobiles in the village then so we went by horse carriage (fiacre) of the kind I had seen only used in the village for weddings. The site of the gathering was a huge open field adjoining the rail junction. As we approached the site I noticed long lines of boxcars, which I later learned had been used to transport peasants and workers to the rally from various places in Serbia. While the relatively short ride was a bit uncomfortable given the state of the springs of the carriage but the discomfort was less than on a crowded urban bus in Belgrade with windows closed. It wasn’t until a decade later that the Yugoslav economy had matured to the extent that buses came into widespread use throughout the country.

People were arriving in a large stream, pouring out of the boxcars and onto the open fields. We kept close to our village friends but I also had a camera and ventured a photo of some of the placards. At that point a police official came by and suggested that my wife and I accompany him to headquarters. There he asked for our passports and proceeded to enlighten us about the crisis and the reason for the rally. He began by inquiring if I knew that the Americans were responsible for excluding Yugoslavia from their claimed territories in the region of Trieste? Our village friends had, of course, mentioned nothing about this only indicating that we would might enjoy a visit to a “meeting” which we naturally assumed would be combined with a large local market. It seemed apparent that the official was quoting from the most recent edition of the communist party newspaper (Borba), which was invariably found in good supply in all the official offices we visited.

I did recall that my Columbia professor had been the American representative on that boundary commission but, of course, I said nothing. Following the lecture he suggested that we would need protection from the genuine outrage of the workers and peasants who were attending the rally. I did not protest his decision but only expressed my appreciation. that neither my film nor camera was confiscated. We were assigned two officers who proceeded to follow us around for the rest of the afternoon. They were apparently good friends since they held hands, as men do in parts of Eastern Europe and the Middle East. They seemed self absorbed and the day passed without further incident.

The planned part of the gathering commenced with the eventual arrival of the Interior Minister, Ranković, who delivered a speech of “outrage” to programmed cheers. We had heard in Belgrade that he was famous for his tailored suits but we did not get close enough to check this out. On the way back our village hosts said nothing about our encounter with the police but since we were in the village under official auspices with a formal letter of introduction there was no outward evidence of their concern. After some fifty years this incident would seem to have merited little more than a mentioned as a small detail of our stay. But that did not turn out to be the case. It has often been remarked that youth is stupid and certainly young apprentice anthropologists are no exception to this rule. After this encounter I was determined to return to Belgrade immediately. In retrospect my time would have been much better invested in pursuing my ongoing fieldwork. But there was no stopping me. The next morning we boarded the narrow gauge train in a neighboring village and then transferred to a standard gauge train at Mladenovac for our trip to Belgrade. We made the approximately 100 kilometer trip in just under six hours because we managed to catch an express train to Belgrade at our transfer point.

Although determinedly curious about the context of the rally about Trieste, once in Belgrade I was so self possessed and pleased to return to our urban apartment that it never occurred to me that there was any danger to my person and to vary my usual urban routes. Therefore I first visited some of my favorite bookstores to browse for research materials and then walked over to the U.S. Library anticipating getting the Embassy news bulletin and reading recent American papers to see what they were reporting of these events. Of course, I might have first checked the local press. The American Library was located in downtown Belgrade near the Serbian Academy of Sciences and the University. As I crossed the lot adjoining the Library (made vacant by German bombing during World War II) I suddenly felt a pinprick and then another and a mob surrounded me. I broke free and started to run. As I entered the main street fronting on the Student Square I noticed a woman being herded by a jeering mob. On her back was a sign in Serbian, “One who takes the American Embassy Bulletin.” Just about that time a waiter called out to me from a nearby restaurant to get the sign off my back. I rounded the corner and in panic headed back to the U.S. Information Library collapsing at the feet of an American journalist. As I got up the journalist, Helen Thomas, (who later was the senior correspondent at the White House becoming a fixture there for decades) proceeded to interview me. She explained that her story would be front-page news in the U.S. the following day but that my name would not be used. (Present readers will find this part of my story quaint, as there once was a time when an American student being beaten up by a “foreign mob” would have been a major news story.)

Turning Point for My Research in Yugoslavia

After the interview with Helen Thomas, two American diplomats escorted me to my apartment. On our walk there they told me stories about the difficulties they had with organized mobs as they closed down the American consulate in Shanghai

in 1948, after the victory of the Chinese communists. Unintentionally, they nicely set the stage for what was to follow. They left me at the door to my apartment house apparently unaware that we had been followed. As I stepped inside a group of Yugoslav police in plainclothes, masquerading as “outraged citizens” began to beat me. I first shouted to them in Serbian and then, as the beating intensified, I switched to English. I later learned that the instructions issued to the organized demonstrators and widely disseminated were that foreigners were not to be harmed. Although they had clearly not finished their beatings the police then left apparently convinced that I was indeed a foreigner.

We Will Give Our Lives But Not Trieste

I do not remember great pain and my injuries were not serious but they had significantly bloodied me. I was quickly given refuge in the nearby apartment of a friend from the American Embassy. While trying to relax in the safety of their apartment I could hear the organized demonstrators on nearby Marshal Tito Street shouting the by now familiar refrain - “We will give our lives but not Trieste.” Later, when I made a visit to the Embassy, I was told by our diplomats that they would protest on my behalf concerning the beating. They also told me that this would probably be the end of my work in Yugoslavia. I chose not to complain. Later, at a cocktail party, I met an American colonel with the U.S. Military Assistance Group to Yugoslavia; they had a large building in the center of Belgrade. He told me that prior to the demonstrations a colleague on the Yugoslav army’s general staff told him that there would be no demonstrations in front of the building housing the U.S. military assistance program. There were none. This was in contrast to the American Library, which had its windows smashed.

Certainly this tale of minor events long ago has few surprising aspects. Neither the duplicity of the Yugoslav state, or for that matter, the many faces of the American government are surprising. Nor, it should be added, was the relative indifference of the Belgrade population to events in far away Slovenia unexpected. Finally, it should be noted that despite the cries of the organized demonstrators then marching through downtown Belgrade, the whole matter was subsequently settled relatively quietly through diplomatic negotiation. As a result Yugoslavia gave up claims to certain areas near Trieste. The fate of the city itself had, however, never been in question, it always remained under Italian jurisdiction.

But there is another factor involved and that is and was the extreme national and historical divisions within the territories that composed the Yugoslav state. Slovenes were and are, of course, concerned about their borders with Italy and their other neighboring states and the people of Slovene nationality who live there. Clearly, these concerns were not shared with people in Serbia. Just as, more recently, Slovenes early on, and not without some initial casualties, uninvolved themselves in the wars accompanying the disintegration of Yugoslavia. Significantly, the Serbs did not persist in trying to dominate Slovenia, critically, there were no significant resident Serbian communities.

Aspects of Life in a Communist State

My bloody head massage was clearly minor but I wondered about the fate of the poor woman whom I had seen being paraded before the organized mob. Clearly, she had no place to hide and the international press wasn’t interested in reporting her situation. The brutality to which she was subjected relates, in my mind, to a visit I paid to the police station in Arandjelovac, the market town for the village in which I was working. I had come there to see about the renewal of my visa, then granted for only a few months at a time. Mistakenly I opened the wrong door and briefly saw an older peasant being beaten. It is not easy to put the pieces of the puzzle together. For from the moment we landed in Yugoslavia there seemed to be an enforced passivity of the population. As our taxi pulled away from the freighter our car hit a stevedore in the stomach and he came up over the hood. We were delayed a bit but no crowd gathered. As a New Yorker accustomed to seeing the results of critical accidents it wasn’t the injury that seemed significant but rather the lack of public protest.

No Questioning in the Village

But there was no doubt that at this time individual actions, which in any way questioned government authority, were severely repressed. This “fact of life” was made clear to us from the first day of our arrival in the village. On this occasion my wife and I were seated in the village café awaiting arrangements about our housing. A local woman had heard about our arrival. She came to the café, in itself then an unusual act, and told us about her brother in Chicago. She demanded of us as to why, when there were so many nice places in Yugoslavia, had we come to this poor and backward village, which she soon hoped to leave. Subsequently, we learned that she was absent from the village for some months. When she returned, we never had the opportunity to speak to her again, nor for her sake were we anxious to do so. This incident must, of course, be seen in a broader reality. Some years later we learned that her brother had been killed in a robbery of his Chicago restaurant, putting perspective on one aspect of the realities of life in America should one seek to make a contrast. Much more important to our research atmosphere was an incident associated with the local village elementary school. I had thought that it would be nice to sponsor an essay contest in which the children could write about the village and their aspirations for the future. I even offered some modest prizes. The director of the school and the teachers cooperated and I received a significant number of essays. Very fortunately neither the school principal nor the teachers made any effort to read the pupils’ work prior to turning over the papers to me. I took the school essays to Belgrade and went over them carefully. Most of the student essays were about the glories of Serbian history, the modernization of the village, and Partisan heroes. Some of their writings were obviously based on the school textbooks but a few were clearly original and described the realities of village life. Some of the drawings even showed the patched clothes of those working in the fields. One essay was unique in this respect. In the words of the pupil the Partisans weren’t liberators but destroyers for they had burned part of the village neighborhood in which he lived. Memories of the combined civil war and struggle with the Germans that was World

War II were still fresh for our fieldwork began less than a decade after the war.

I determined to leave this essay out of my ethnographic account. The pupil described how her family's home had been burned and she provided a crayon drawing of the event. What to do with this material? It seemed obvious to me that if village officials saw this picture it could cause significant trouble for the parents as well as for the child. The incident might also have made life difficult for the teachers and school principal who had helped me. I destroyed the essay and drawing. To this day I remember burning the drawing and essay and flushing the ashes down the toilet. It was right to protect the student but I was also ashamed of my self-censorship. I had accommodated myself to the system. From a broader perspective, I must now admit that I used this same self-censorship in my dissertation and subsequent publications, which, in general, have been positive about, post World War II developments in Yugoslavia. Probably my present style of writing about socialism in Yugoslavia and my reluctance to sufficiently acknowledge Yugoslav socialism's positive aspects, which as noted do indeed exist, may reflect my strong internal desire to "balance accounts," since I feel my earlier publications reflect too little of the role of the state in imposing passivity and suffering.

The Yugoslav Communist System, A Broader Perspective - Ideology and Actualities

What indeed was the system to which people were accommodating? In this essay I cannot do more than offer a few brief comments. First, it is important to observe that enormous changes were underway throughout Eastern and Southern Europe during the second half of the 20th century, quite apart from the dominant ideological system in a particular country. Overall there were the ongoing processes of industrialization and urbanization and with it technological modernization. This was taking place at a rapid rate not only in Yugoslavia but also in all the non-Communist countries that bordered on Yugoslavia such as Italy and Greece.

In my initial work the early 1950s provided a kind of baseline against which to measure subsequent change. Communism, of course, put something of a special face on these changes but the long-term transformations made that centralist based ideology increasingly irrelevant. A small but significant indicator of the changes were the transformations in the types of garbage that the society produced. We observed in the village, in the early 1950s how virtually nothing was thrown away including used tin cans. These were turned into receptacles and even cooking utensils of various kinds.

The Old War - Frugality and Poverty

This frugality was also a reflection of the real poverty of this period. People were accustomed to wearing patched old clothes, especially in the villages, as well as reusing most everything possible. I well recall the minimum tableware we had then in the village. There were badly made aluminum forks and spoons that broke and bent easily. These contrasted with the sturdy homemade wooden spoons of the pre-industrial local craft era, which we also used. These latter items were reminiscent of the time when there was a greater degree of

isolation and self-sufficiency in the village economy. By contrast the household in which we lived also had the remnants of a German soldier's mess kit with its stainless steel knife, fork and spoon. I recall asking myself as to how it was possible for a people who couldn't even produce useable basic household items such as cutlery and who had used wooden spoons to have defeated such a technologically superior foe. We were reminded of this every evening at dinnertime when mixed in with the poor quality aluminum tableware were these remnants of the German soldier's field kit. Therein lies the primary justification for, and the primary legitimization of the regime, their defeat of the technologically superior Nazi invaders.

The other justification for the regime was that its socialist form of government would bring an equitable form of modernization. But these initial changes resulting from these processes of change, although widely shared, also brought with them a hierarchical, entrenched bureaucracy with a monopoly on the methods of innovation which were always imposed from above. From the outset people were primarily not inspired but coerced. This happened despite the enthusiasm of some youthful cadre who contributed unskilled labor to road and railroad construction. There was also the constant drumbeat of propaganda about social ownership, and worker participation in a so-called shared self-management system along with every few years a new constitution touting these and other new forms of political participation. But then new forms of individually based consumerism began which produced the new forms of garbage; non-biodegradable plastic was a chief component.

Old Ideologies and New Forms of Garbage

Focusing, for a moment, on this new garbage, and the earlier the lack of it in the immediate postwar period it is indeed possible to see this as a marker in the complex process of modernization. Both peasant villagers and urban workers began to experience the throw away culture of plastic beginning in the 1960s. It is certainly true that life did improve in a material way for most everyone. But this achievement did not bring lasting satisfaction. This despite the fact that Tito successfully transitioned from wartime leader to acceptable father figure. In the fifties there were then no plastic items to speak of. Just as newspaper was used more often than the less available toilet paper and acceptable hand soap was not easily obtainable. It was a time when women on boarding a bus would carefully arrange their skirts before sitting down so as not to put much stress on the fabric. Burlap sacks and crude paper bags were used to carry home the items purchased from the limited inventory in the state stores. Within a decade, however, the throwaway plastic culture began in earnest. The 1960s saw the cautious beginning of this mass consumption culture along with the innovation of the supermarket and TV. advertising which may also be termed garbage promotion media, referring to the packaging, not the aesthetic content. Now there was a mass of cheap items on the market designed for immediate use and not for long-term retention. How did the increasing availability of consumer goods, the innovation of mass marketing and the overall rise in living standards relate to other transitions? The political culture was also concerned with novelty, innovation and mass appeal. Yesterday's versions of both were certainly

discarded rather than recycled in the decades to come. But, of course, the communist party continued to monopolize power even if many of its ways had changed.

These matters can more easily be observed in the villages, the countryside, than in the towns. For in the latter there was trash collection, which, of course, was unknown in the villages (my specific point of reference here is Serbia and not Slovenia). Thus village homes began to accumulate less perishable detritus in their surroundings. Rotten vegetables, spoiled meat, old wooden implements could all be counted on to slowly return to the soil but not plastic or metal as combined in an auto carcass.

Remittances and Autos, the Countryside Transformed

The appearance of the private automobile in the socialist state was a transforming force. With its increasing use came greater individually focused mobility not only within Yugoslavia but also across international borders. The Tito regime did little to restrict free movement. It was in the sixties that there began the mass migrations of Yugoslav workers to a then labor short Western Europe. The workers' remittances were certainly economically useful to the regime. Just as the family had been useful to the state in allowing it not to be too concerned about social support services when these could be, at least partially, taken care of by multi-generational agriculturally based households in which there was also cash income.

Certainly, the triumphant return of the new urban workers to their villages became a regular part of rural life. I was impressed when I saw for the first time in the 1960s a Mercedes with a German license plate in a remote Macedonian village, a community I had reached with a jeep. The link here to new forms of garbage is also direct. When I returned to this village in the 1980s automobile carcasses dotted the countryside. Yesterday's triumph became today's discard. There also was no audience to whom to display an urban triumph. The village was now largely deserted the inhabitants having left for the towns. In both rural and urban households where both parents worked in state enterprises, a relative, often a grandma (baba), could be counted on to provide for the necessary childcare. Folk sayings were coined to celebrate the fact that parents had to make sure about the presence of a baba before they had a child.

Party Ideology and Private Investment

In retrospect the frozen ideology of the Party prevented the growth of a vibrant domestic economy. Thus the massive remittances of those who worked abroad were not invested in the domestic economy but rather in private household construction, which strengthened family ties and regional affiliations, a process that has continued into the 21st century. From the 1960s to the 1980s the housing stock of rural Yugoslavia was transformed. A uniformity of reinforced concrete, stucco, tile and brick replaced the historically nurtured regional styles attuned to local resources. The new structures were of enormous symbolic significance to the individuals and their families but their economic was questionable. For often the worker, and frequently his family as well, remained abroad for much of the year, returning only for vacations, and much of this newly constructed housing was under used. By the begin-

ning of the 21st century many isolated villages had begun to be abandoned. And the significance of investments made in decades past?

For those who stayed behind from the 1960s on there were massive and symbolic government investments made in an attempt to appease growing national regional interests. Thus to parallel the private sector's overly robust housing stock in rural areas, which were based on exporting part of their work force, there was the felt political need for every republic to have its very own uneconomical major industrial enterprise such as a steel mill or auto plant. Meanwhile the quality of locally manufactured items such as autos an international joke. This was notably the case with the Yugoslav licensed Fiat produced at what had been an historic armaments plant in central Serbia. *Its shoddy construction hastened its achievement of junk status both on the international market and domestically.

New Car Owners and Junk

By the late 1970s, early 1980s, the remains of worn out cars from the first generations of car owners were beginning to clutter up not only rural byways but also appeared on the verges of highways. This at the same time that the first generation of manufactured wood and electric stoves, TVs and small refrigerators also began to wear out. At least in central Serbia, no effective recycling system functioned so behind individual homesteads the piles of discarded stoves, TVs, and refrigerators began to pile up. This development raises interesting questions for the ecologically oriented concerning rural water supplies e.g. does the freon and other chemicals as in the florescent tubes get into the ground water. As a further example, how is the used crankcase fluid from cars, and tractors disposed of? The pride of a Yugoslav worker driving his new Mercedes to his home village for the first time was a frequent sight in the 1970s and 1980s and individually owned rural repair shops began to appear to service these cars.

These problems are in no way unique to the former Yugoslavia. Countries such as the United States are well advanced in the ways in which its industries have created numerous examples of widespread pollution of water supplies. But, of course, it is necessary to view this matter in some perspective. Ecological devastation in Yugoslavia and its health consequences seem to pale in comparison to places like the former Soviet Union and the massive transformation of landscapes in areas such as Central Asia.

The "Impartial" Observer Anthropologist as Spy, TV "Personality" and Peasant Icon – A Personal Journey

Lest this all seem too distant, too objectifying it seems appropriate to describe how my personal image came front and center, briefly, and in a not so minor way, first in the public press, then on Serbian TV and, finally, in a popular magazine. On several occasions, beginning in the 1960's, I was denounced as a CIA agent in the public press in both Belgrade and Sarajevo. Other American researchers were also identified in this way. But since I had done fieldwork in Yugoslavia for a longer time, and researched most intensively in rural areas, I became an inviting target. This was because the security authorities, even in their more relaxed phases, wanted to control access to those areas that they could not as easily supervise as urban

places. After each article appeared I made a point of writing to the Yugoslav Ambassador in Washington that the charges were untrue and libelous. In the fullness of time I received a reply saying that I would be welcome to return to Yugoslavia to continue my researches.

It was quite clear that the Foreign Ministry and the Ministry of the Interior had somewhat different goals, a not unfamiliar situation in the U.S. Then in 1986, through the good offices of a colleague at Belgrade University, I was introduced to a Serbian TV personality. He made a specialty on his weekly program of discovering odd things in remote places. Clearly, my long-term ethnographic fieldwork in a Serbian village qualified. His TV program had a folksy ambience; even its title was people friendly, "By the Way (Uzgred budi rečeno)." In no time at all we (my wife and I plus a film crew) were ensconced in "our" village. They remained on site for several weeks and the production of an hour-long film resulted. Unlike American TV there were not many outtakes. That summer my wife and I lived out Andy Warhol's (the American pop artist's) dictum that everyone can be famous for 15 minutes. The program was broadcast not only in Serbia but nation-wide throughout what was then Yugoslavia. Thus when we left the village that summer after the filming we were recognized most everywhere even as we tried to vacation in Dalmatia. There were "serious" consequences – thus waiters would recognize us in a restaurant and insist on feeding us "real peasant food." At that time we were more than middle aged and our diet tended to be strong in vegetables and occasional chicken and fish. But here our plates were being piled high with greasy, roasted meat! But it was quite a different persona than that in which I had been portrayed in at least one article, which commented, about my appearance and "disappearance" in Yugoslavia that I had "vanished in a fog."

But our "fame" was to last for more than 15 minutes in a different context. The American Embassy's glossy propaganda magazine, intended primarily for the intelligentsia, featured a long article about our film with many color photos from our time in Serbia. Among the photos was one of the two of us taken in Orašac in 1954 explicitly captioned as "the Halperns in peasant dress."

The idea to pose this way had not been ours but derived from another American couple that had visited us in the village and wanted to be photographed in peasant costume. We decided to follow their example. Our hosts were most cooperative even if some of the costumes were no longer worn, especially women's folk dress which was often saved for burial. It should be added that back then our village family was most curious about our clothes and had tried them on when we had been away. For this reason we viewed dressing in their clothes a fair exchange. The photos were then put away for more than 30 years and only surfaced again in their use in the film. At the time we thought to introduce an element of humor that was in consonance with the theme of the production. In any case, the editors of the Embassy magazine gave this photo very prominent play in their article and combined it with a long caption about our personal history including our research work in Serbia.

Further Media Adventures

Surprise! Four years later we revisited Serbia in 1990 and one of our Belgrade friends showed us a copy of an article that had recently appeared in a Serbian weekly. It was all about spying in Yugoslavia and was actually an article about a book written by a British Embassy, press attaché in the late 1940s, who subsequently became a well-known British novelist. It had the symbolically catching title, "White Eagle Over Serbia." The theme of the novel was a tale of rural based espionage in Macedonia. But no matter, photos from Serbia would give it just the right peasant flavor. At least this is what the journalist involved subsequently told a colleague of ours when he saw the photos in the American Embassy magazine. They seemed appropriate and he used them without permission or payment of royalties. He did, however, list me as the photographer of myself, certainly a technical possibility. There were also several of my other photos from the Serbian village of Orašac. The photo spread also included other pictures. They were of a well-known art photographer, German by origin, recently deceased, a Hollywood publicist named Helmut Newton. His most famous work, I later learned, was a massive actual coffee table sized volume entitled, "The Nude and the Refrigerator." In captioning my photos the journalist spared no inspiration. Our photo in peasant dress was captioned: "True Serbian peasants a barrier against communism." Alongside were other of my photos that had appeared in the Embassy magazine. These were of a poor but picturesque old couple posing in front of their house, bunches of grapes hanging from the rafters. Another one was of teen-age twins, who were making decorations for light fixtures to celebrate the introduction of electricity to their home. Helmut Newton's photos focused on the activities of "British Agents in Belgrade," no refrigerators here just "congenial" soft porn. One "agent" was "investigating" the crotch of a large bare breasted model. Another shot featured an obviously dissolute but curious intellectual looking up from his book at the bare bottom of a local lady, if that is quite the appropriate term. It surely is a comment on the transitory nature of media that only a few years after the documentary film which prominently used the same photo, and after its appearance in the widely circulated American Embassy magazine that it could be used again in a totally different setting in a popular magazine.

I guess it would have been too much to expect the caption; "ex-CIA agent and former American anthropologist becomes 'true' Serbian peasant." Earlier I had spoken of the introduction of plastic discards as contributing to the altering nature of garbage production changed in a modernizing society. Orašac in 1953-54 had been a setting with a still vibrant oral tradition in which elder males would perform epic poetry and women would create individualized mourning chants to memorialize the deceased. But contemporary Serbian TV with its massive programming features an almost infinity of little remembered moments and our 15 minutes of fame had long since expired. As noted the journalist who stole the photos from the American Embassy magazine must have assumed that his readers would not remember the TV film about, "The Halperns in Orašac," and even less the photo of them posing in peasant dress. It is fitting that now at 76 I can look back on a truly "memorable" career, one in which I "evolved" from a youthful and ignorant

stranger, to a CIA agent, to my final apotheosis as a “true” Serbian peasant, boldly preserving Serbian society from the contamination of communism. Perhaps that had been my goal from the beginning? How appropriate for an anthropologist to be concerned with preserving the “soul” of a nation. More to the point, the impression I have from the third party with whom I communicated about the matter was that the “journalist” was simply “earning” his living by consciously creating a scene of momentary sexual interest with overtones of nationalism and espionage - a potent brew for the moment but the text is clearly suitable to line one’s garbage can the following morning. Perhaps the best that can be said for such matters is that there was no tragedy or deadly violence overtly involved in this media charade.

After Yugoslav Socialism - the Destruction and Some Questions

It is certainly true that a modern state in terms of infrastructure and economy, however flawed and incomplete, was created under the years of socialism in Yugoslavia. (I have documented parts of the processes involved in many of my publications.) But it was a hollow structure that its inhabitants were only too ready and even eager to rip apart even if this had to be done in a very bloody way. There are images in my mind and in the photos I took of the drastic consequences of war in Yugoslavia that I saw on my visits in the 1990s, especially, to Bosnia and Croatia.

The massive destruction of urban areas was all too visible, particularly in Bosnia’s major cities well as in smaller towns in Croatia. There was also the devastation of the countryside. Particularly vivid was my winter 1996 visit including trips to Sarajevo and Mostar. Fighting was just ending and the scars of war were very recent. But it was not only the destroyed factories, the blown up villages and the burned out blocks of modern apartment houses that caught my attention - it was the new graveyards that I focused on. They were then everywhere - in Sarajevo’s Olympic soccer field, in the city’s parks, in the small gardens in front of the surviving apartment houses - most were not the graves of young soldiers but of old men, women and children.

Even in this, the first decade of the 21st century, the potential for future conflict has not been eliminated from what was once Yugoslavia, especially in Kosovo but also in Macedonia. In the spring of 2004 I visited communities, that I had previously studied in southern Macedonia in 1962, both Muslim Albanian and Orthodox. The words that I heard were not those of peaceful coexistence. Although I do think that the current Macedonian leadership of both groups are anxious to find an equitable solution but perceived injustices still fester. Trust to build a fully viable society is lacking.

Complex Matters Broadly Defined

Complex matters have been painted with a broad brush in this essay. Yugoslav socialism was not a fascist state built on death camps and ethnic hatred, nor was the ideology of socialism built on conquest and inequality.

Did Yugoslav Socialism Lead to Ethnic Inspired Destruction?

It seems possible to infer that by its authoritarian rule which helped to shape the nature of Yugoslav socialism the regime helped to facilitate much of what followed its demise. Certainly, the lack of provision for an orderly succession One cannot say that Yugoslav socialism was only a hollow structure although the deceptions of the state were abundantly evident. Further, it is not possible to assert that a regime that lasted almost a half-century, or something over two generations, did not enjoy a degree of legitimacy and popular support. After all there was the crucial role the Partisans played in defeating the German invaders and there was the reality of many aspects of modernization accomplished without drastic and crushing class inequalities. One has to now only look at the modernization process in much of the developing world today to see the consequences of unrestrained, socially irresponsible, capitalism. Some have noted that the Yugoslav state did enjoy at least a degree of support, not only because of modernization but also because many people subscribed to the basic ideological tenets of socialism. Certainly the state was able to insert at least some of its ideological tropes into the life-courses of its citizens. But was there ever a real commitment on the part of rural peoples, who were initially the majority of the population, to worker participation and socialist development?

Or, conversely, did the peasants and the new groupings of peasant-workers have only a very instrumental relationship toward this socialist/Yugoslav state? Or did they just enjoy the growing material achievements during the 1960’s and 1970’s and when the economy turned sour and could not satisfy the growing consumer demand in the 1980s were they then most ready to part with the Yugoslav state? What role did consumerism have in de-legitimizing the socialist state? Was there, in fact, a generational gap in the attitudes towards the Yugoslav state? Was the older generation which had experienced poverty, world war and the consequences of active ethnic hatreds more committed to support of socialist norms? In terms of the younger generation, did they increasingly see the Yugoslav state and its socialist framework as obstacles to their wish to make full use of their abilities? Certainly the lack of free elections and the monopolization of state power by the Party prevented these questions from ever being raised effectively in a public forum.

It is uncertain whether these vital questions have definitive answers, and certainly they cannot be answered in a brief introspective essay. But perhaps some very general reflections are a place to begin. It certainly needs to be strongly stated that the failure of socialist Yugoslavia is a double one that is all of the new states that have emerged have definitively rejected socialism and communism as the dominant ideology much as they have also absolutely rejected the idea of a multinational state. Even in inherently multiethnic areas whether within Croatia, in Bosnia and in Macedonia many people appear to have voted with their feet i.e. mixed ethnic areas have, to a significant degree, been replaced by ethnically homogeneous ones within a state that officially multi-ethnic. Bosnia provides an excellent illustration of this process. In keeping with the spirit of this essay, I would like to cite some personal reflections 31 years apart. Both of these reflections center on Bosnia.

Bosnian Research in 1964

In 1964 I did research in the multiethnic town of Maglaj and its surrounding rural area. In this region Moslems, Serbs and Catholics then lived in close proximity both in the town of Maglaj and in the surrounding villages. In a walk through the marketplace one could see these groups actively trading with one another while in Maglaj factories they worked in the same enterprise. How did this seemingly established co-existence turn into warfare and massive destruction? Platitudes about ancient hatreds don't suffice to explain the evidence of death and destruction I saw in Sarajevo and, even more directly, in Mostar and its surrounding area in 1995. I emphasize the latter city because, unlike Sarajevo, the Serbs were not directly involved in the final fatal years. While places like Srebrenica and Sarajevo demonstrate the brutality of Serb forces, in Mostar the fight was between Croats and Moslems militaries. The Serbs had been eliminated from the region earlier in the fighting.

What conclusions can one draw? It is clear to me that it would have been nice not to have followed the then academic norm and been so wrapped up in the illusions of modernization and urbanization as some kind of fixed point of achievement in the human condition in the Balkans and elsewhere. Modernization was, in this sense, a profound illusion and post-modern a fantasy. Neither will see us into the future. Contemplating the ruins of Mostar in 1995 can one say that this was Tito's heritage? Perhaps, because a political entity, which has a president for life, has, by definition, no future, no way of effectively resolving conflicts as exemplified by a favorite slogan of his time. Brotherhood and Unity. Pairing that with Socialist Yugoslavia one can easily see how this linking was implicitly programmed to mutually self-destruct. One can even imaginatively diagram the process.

Background to Selective Destruction

As any visitor to parts of former Yugoslavia today can testify - the whole country wasn't blown up in the internal wars, only in selected places as in Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo, some of these sites of recent destruction have now been repaired. In most of the country, especially in the rural areas, the countryside was transformed by massive building of private homes. This new housing was, in effect, both a monument to a fading familism by those who lived abroad or in cities as well as a promise to those left behind that their village had a future. Yet this housing absorbed resources, which were never invested in productive activities. Unfortunately this process continues in what were some the poorest areas of Yugoslavia as in Macedonia. This use of personal funds, almost exclusively, for private purposes represents a profound aversion to public needs. New research questions need to be asked that involve individual motivations and how institutional structures than can adjudicate conflict can come into being. Another question the cries out for some considered reflection has to do with the ability of human societies to destroy, for ideological reasons, that which they had so painfully built. The ruins of villages and towns in Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo and the mass loss of civilian life in the 1990s, overlapping into the 21st century, were not created by foreign invaders but by the inhabitants who had formerly lived peacefully together. The uninhibited, and even

enthusiastic, destruction of private and public structures along with large-scale murder of the defenseless cannot be attributed only to the Serbs. Decades of construction were obliterated and the mutual destruction of historical monuments involved all of the dominant ethnic groups. Why?

We need to examine carefully motivations for destruction and killing at the same time as we consider how construction was accomplished and reconstruction is planned and implemented. Reconstruction to have a viable future must be preceded by an understanding of why and how destruction came about. The International Criminal Court in The Hague is addressing an aspect of this question on the individual level. Knowledge obtained from these trial proceedings can hopefully be integrated into future institution building. Can this be more than a pious hope?

Role of Research in Slovenia

At the end of this essay I wish to try to explain my motivations and reflections about research in Slovenia. First it needs to be stated that my initial research in Slovenia in 1961-62 was initially part of my "grand plan" in 1961 for replicating my Serbian study in the diverse ethnic areas that then comprised Yugoslavia. For this purpose I selected a number of research sites. These included in addition to Šenčur and Gradenc in Slovenia; Lekenik and Bobovac in Croatia, as well as Slano in Dalmatia; in Serbia the town of Indjia as well as further study of Orašac and its surrounding area; Župča in Bosnia, later, in 1964, supplemented by Maglaj; Bukovica in Montenegro and Velešte and Labunište in Macedonia. Unfortunately, and largely for reasons of political difficulty, no villages in the Kosovo area were selected. This area was closed to me by the authorities in Belgrade with whom I had to work as part of an international exchange agreement.

Successes and Failures

I made an application to the American National Science Foundation and was awarded a grant and thus came to Yugoslavia for 18 months beginning in the summer of 1961. While in Yugoslavia I was also able to secure U.S. Department of State counterpart agricultural funds (explained above) to supplement my grant monies. With these funds I was able to work with Universities and research institutes in Bosnia, Croatia, Macedonia and, especially Serbia, including parallel work in Slovenia. Under arrangements, which were set up, I was able to employ research teams of students to implement investigations through questionnaires that I had drawn up with the assistance of Professors in the Department of Sociology at the University of Belgrade. Students from both the departments of sociology and ethnology were employed. Organizationally the research prospered best in Slovenia with the assistance of the late Professor Jože Goričar and particularly the help of Professor Zdravko Mlinar in sociology. In ethnology the initial help of Professor Vilko Novak was most useful and I also had the valuable assistance of Professor Slavko Kremenšek. As part of my overall program I conscientiously deposited copies of all my field materials in the pertinent university departments. However, regrettably when I attempted to find these documents some 40 years later I was not successful.

My research also included the gathering of archival materials,

local vital records and original nominally specific household census records. The latter was made possible by the cooperation of the Federal Statistical Office in Belgrade then led by the demographer Dr. Miloš Macura. Under a later National Science Foundation research grant the original census recorded for 1948, 1953 (in some cases) and 1961 were computerized. Although I may be mistaken, I think that my records may be the only instance where these original records have been preserved. It was possible to do this computerization because I took copies of all of these records back with me to the United States when I left Yugoslavia at the end of 1962. Thousands of photographs were also taken. In each Republic I formally cooperated with a faculty member or researcher at an institute. The project was a great success in terms of material gathered and the overall results amounted to some tens of thousands of pages of typed field notes. From another perspective the project was a total failure in that this research data was not then used in any long-term collaboration. There was some publication on my part but no joint reports. There were also other problems. In Bosnia one of the students, then at the law faculty, decided soon after the work was over to join the police. I later learned that he took all the papers from the Bosnia project that I had deposited at the Law Faculty of the University of Sarajevo with Professor Ante Fiamengo. When he joined the police he turned these papers over to the security services. As a result I was publicly denounced as a CIA agent in the Sarajevo paper *Oslobodjenje*. One question that they took particular interest in was in the part of the questionnaire concerning contacts outside the village community I had inserted the questions as to where men had served in the army. Immediately this was interpreted by the journalist who wrote the article as a matter of great strategic importance. When I learned of this article, which appeared in 1964, I immediately protested to the Yugoslav Embassy in the U.S. and, after much correspondence, was told, again, officially that I was welcome to continue to my researches in Yugoslavia. In the light of the horrors that accompanied the breakup of Yugoslavia in the 1990s such a matter now seems most trivial. This student, whose name appeared on the transcription of the interviews, which he conducted, obviously saw this as an opportunity to begin a career. The question itself had been placed in the questionnaire at the suggestion of a professor of sociology at the University of Belgrade with whose help the document had been originally constructed. This was the beginning of the decade when empirical sociological investigations were beginning in Yugoslavia. This survey was one of many that were conducted at this time in Yugoslavia both with and without international cooperation. Later such efforts were the subject of public denunciation as when one survey was not confined to villagers or urban workers but focused on officials at the policy making level.

The University of Graz Archive

Relatively complete records of these researches now exist in the Archive of the Southeast European Institute at the University of Graz where Professor Karl Kaser has established a collection. Further, two students at the University of Graz have written their doctoral dissertations dealing with these materials. One by Hannes Grandits deals with data primarily from Lekenik but also considers Bobovac. A revised version of his

dissertation has been published in Vienna. Sigfried Gruber has also completed a dissertation on the village of Orašac. In addition, Kaser and Grandits have edited a volume, also published in Vienna dealing with autobiographical materials collected, in the villages surveyed. I detail these events here because it is my strong position that the results of scholarly investigations be open and available to qualified researchers.

Thanks to the efforts of Professor Jože Hudales a complete file of Šenčur data has been reconstituted in Ljubljana. In this respect I am particularly delighted that the hundred of photos taken by the young Slovene ethnologist, Andrej Triler will now find their proper place in this archival collection, of Slovene ethnology and sociology. Unfortunately, Triler was tragically killed in a highway accident not long after the initial work in Šenčur had been completed in 1962. But the material gathered can serve as a base line for future investigations.

Value of a Community Study Approach

From a present-day point of view it is clear that in Western European and American social – cultural anthropology the prominence of community studies no longer exists. Indeed it would be remarkable and a sure sign of stagnation if research objectives remained constant. However, in an recent issue of the journal *Anthropology of East Europe Review* the Czech anthropologist Petr Skalník has suggested that the value of these studies still remains clear for those working from an East European perspective, that is within the culture concerned. The viewpoint being the study of one's own society rather than the focus being on the "other." Even in the U.S., restudies of communities have resulted in a number of publications.

Role of Slovene Researchers

A unique value of the Šenčur study derives from this "insiders" Slovene society has been characterized both as relatively stable and of comparatively small scale with an overall high standard. When I visited Ljubljana in 2003 a reception was held to commemorate the original research I was amazed to discover that among those present and carefully noted were a significant number of the original student researchers from 1962. Although younger than I, a number of these former student researchers had already retired after full careers. Thus, if there is sufficient means and interest, it is now possible to reconstruct an oral history of the project including the specifics of the research. Their recollections given at the reception were the highlight of that event. One of the points that was made concerned the then existing profound regional differences between relatively prosperous Šenčur and less well off Gradenc. I had originally selected Gradenc, with the help of my Slovene advisors, because of this economic contrast. It is most pertinent that the challenges of fieldwork to students from Ljubljana were dramatically apparent in their vivid recollections.

One key point in assembling such recollections would be to try to reconstruct the settings in which those interviews took place. These recollections, although now reaching across approximately two generations, should be revealing not only for reconstructing the experiences of fieldwork at that time but overall providing some, new, perspectives on Slovene social history but also on the nature of survey research itself. For

here we have both the questionnaire with its instructions and the way the research objectives were implemented. . Perhaps other such histories of research projects have already been done. My knowledge of the pertinent scholarly literature is too limited for me to be able to comment directly but even if such histories of research projects exist the experiences of those connected with the Šenčur investigation would, at the very least, provide a needed comparative perspective.

Such an investigation would highlight not only the results of the research but how, in fact, the data was collected. Given the enormous corpus of published data on Slovene rural (and urban) life already published from anthropological, ethnological and sociological perspectives. It hardly needs to be stressed that in 1962 I was 33 so that those informants who were over the age of 50 at that time, if, remarkably, some will still be alive, they would now be well into their nineties. Given my knowledge of my age mates in their mid to late seventies the question, of course, would also be even if they have survived to that age how many are able to well articulate their past experiences.

As I write these words a concurrent experience of a later date comes to mind. As earlier noted in a different context, in 1987 Belgrade TV made an hour long documentary about the work of my wife and myself in the Serbian village of Orašac. Our researches there began in 1953. At the time the film was being made I took many photographs which document how the work was done. In examining these pictures and reviewing the film footage I am now impressed, although it should come as no surprise, that many of the then vigorous participants in that film are no longer around.

Obviously, to an even greater degree, this applies to the photographs of Šenčur and Gradenc that were taken in 1962. Certainly a significant part of any restudy of Šenčur would necessarily be to place these photographs in some historic context. In addition to the evident aim to identify the people and define the setting in the photographs as much as possible, an equally important matter would be to ascertain the value, or better put, the significance that these photos have, if any, for the contemporary inhabitants. These values would necessarily be not only for those who had some kin ties to those in the photographs or some personal knowledge of the people and specific scenes depicted but overall for those who now live in the same place in which the photos were taken is there a cultural continuity? How is it constituted?

These preliminary comments about the setting of the research and the ways in which the research was conducted raise more general questions. Overall these questions have to do with time and space and, most specifically, with people inhabiting a defined space over time. In thinking about these matters it might be useful to try to apply temporal categories as analytical frameworks. In this respect we can conceive of time (for the purposes of our analysis) as composed of three dimensions - cyclical, linear and liminal. The nature of these categories can be precisely defined and the socio-cultural specifics inputted into these frameworks. But it is not the specifics of the description which should be the end point of our analysis but rather they ways in which these frameworks interact which can give us, it is hoped, some partial insight into the ways in which change takes place.

JUGOSLOVANSKI SOCIALIZEM IN NJEGOVE POSLEDICE SKOZI OBJEKTIV OSEBNIH IZKUŠENJ NA BALKANU 1953–2004

Kratek povzetek osebne intelektualne zgodovine J. Halperna obsega tudi izčrpne podatke o podiplomskem usposabljanju na Univerzi Kolumbija v New York Cityju. Poleg tega, da je opravil specializacijo za sociokulturnega antropologa na Oddelku za antropologijo, je obiskoval predavanja na Ruskem inštitutu. Omenjeni so podatki o članih univerze, s katerimi je delal. Posebej zanimive so študije, ki jih je naredil skupaj s Philipom Moselyjem. V poznih tridesetih letih 20. stoletja je Mosely preživel leto dni na Balkanu, večinoma v Jugoslaviji, kjer je proučeval zadrugo. Tam je spoznal srbskega etnologa Milenka Filipovića, ki je leta 1952 dobil štipendijo in prišel v Združene države Amerike. Halpern ga je tam spoznal prek Moselyja. Halpern je tako prvič prišel v Jugoslavijo leta 1953 in 1954, da bi v Srbiji raziskoval za svojo doktorsko disertacijo. Pokojni Conrad Aarensberg, ki je, poleg svojega dela v drugih disciplinah, znan po svojih pionirskih študijah irskih kmetov, skupnosti in proevropski antropologiji, je bil njegov mentor pri predmetu antropologije.

V zaključku eseja avtor opisuje, kako je leta 1962 začel proučevati vas Šenčur in nadaljevanje svojega dela vse do sedanjih dni, ko dela skupaj s profesorjem Jožetom Hudalesom. Naj omenimo tudi to, da je Halpern poklonil kopije svoje obširne zbirke fotografij Slovenije arhivu Oddelka za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo na Univerzi v Ljubljani. Omenjeni instituciji je poklonil tudi obširno zbirko knjig. V zbirki fotografij so tudi fotografije mladega etnologa Andreja Trilerja iz leta 1962, ki se je kmalu po začetku svojega sodelovanja s Halpernom smrtno ponesrečil v avtomobilski nesreči.

Nenazadnje naj omenimo, da je Halpern poleg raziskav v Jugovzhodni Evropi, terensko raziskoval tudi v Jugovzhodni Aziji, zlasti v Laosu in na Aljaski, kanadski Arktiki kot tudi etnične skupine v Združenih državah Amerike. Med slovenskimi raziskovalci, ki so pomagali Halpernu, naj omenimo zlasti Slavka Kremenška in Zdravka Mlinarja.