

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE SLOVENIAN INTELLECTUAL “OPPOSITION” IN THE 1980S UNDER THE SCREENING OF THE STATE SECURITY SERVICE

Ana ŠELA

University of Maribor, Faculty of Arts, Koroška cesta 160, 2000 Maribor, Slovenia
email: ana.sela1@um.si

ABSTRACT

The author discusses the entities that constituted the intellectual “opposition” in the 1980s in the Socialist Republic of Slovenia, the areas in which these entities operated and how they were treated by state authorities. Within the framework of cultural “opposition”, which was part of the intellectual “opposition”, the author discusses the significance of the alternative movements that began to appear more frequently in Slovenia in the 1980s. With different views and critiques of the former system, which they expressed through art, these entities had a strong influence on the Slovenian public at that time. Based on documents of the Slovenian secret political police, the State Security Service, kept in the Archives of the Republic of Slovenia (Arhiv Republike Slovenije), the author analyses the surveillance and control of the main intellectual “opposition” and alternative movements. With the aid of the archival documents and the existing scientific literature the author also discusses the role played by the intellectual “opposition” and new social movements and their influence on democratization and, ultimately, on the independence of Slovenia.

Keywords: intellectual “opposition”, alternative movements, eighties, State Security Service, Social Republic of Slovenia, democratization

CONTRIBUTO ALLA CONOSCENZA DELL’«OPPOSIZIONE» INTELLETTUALE SLOVENA NEGLI ANNI OTTANTA SOTTO IL CONTROLLO DEL SERVIZIO DI SICUREZZA DI STATO

SINTESI

Nell’articolo, l’autrice presenta chi erano coloro che negli anni Ottanta rappresentavano la cosiddetta opposizione intellettuale nell’allora Repubblica Socialista di Slovenia, di cosa si occupava e di come veniva «trattata» dalle autorità di allora. Nell’ambito dell’opposizione culturale, che faceva parte della cosiddetta opposizione intellettuale, tratta, inoltre, l’importanza dei movimenti alternativi che emersero negli anni Ottanta. Essi ebbero con diverse visioni critiche del sistema attraverso l’arte un forte impatto nella società. Con l’analisi degli archivi della polizia politica segreta slovena, il Servizio di sicurezza dello Stato (Služba državne varnosti), conservati presso l’Archivio della Repubblica di Slovenia, l’autrice analizza il monitoraggio e il controllo dei principali rappresentanti dell’allora opposizione intellettuale e dei movimenti alternativi. Con l’ausilio di documenti d’archivio e della bibliografia esistente sul tema dell’opposizione intellettuale e culturale vengono anche affrontati il ruolo e l’influenza dell’opposizione intellettuale e dei nuovi movimenti sociali sulla democratizzazione e, infine, sull’indipendenza della Slovenia.

Parole chiave: «opposizione» intellettuale, movimenti alternativi, anni Ottanta, Servizio di Sicurezza dello Stato, Repubblica Socialista di Slovenia, democratizzazione

INTRODUCTION¹

Opposition in any meaningful sense of the word and certainly in the form of political parties, as well as other actual political organizations, disappeared from the political scene after the Second World War, with the emergence of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. Initially the new government searched for its political opponents among the elder generation of pre-war politicians. In the second half of the 1950s, the need to monitor the elder generation was on the decline. Thus, the political police turned their attention towards the younger generation, which was discussing political issues and criticizing the political system existing at that time. Political top brass began considering the possibility of a new kind of opposition – a younger generation of intellectuals² – after 1956. This occurred after uprisings against the Soviet communist system in Budapest and in Poland, especially after Josip Broz Tito came out in favour of the second Soviet military intervention. He called the Soviet intervention a necessary evil and considered it more important for Hungary to remain communist than to become independent of the Soviet Union (Režek, 2014, 608). These uprisings impacted today's Slovenia as well. However, these events influenced intellectuals, in particular authors and publicists, most of all. Intellectuals began to rally around critical journals, e. g. the literary magazine *Beseda* (consequently shut down in 1956), its successor *Revija 57*, and later *Perspektive* (among others). The regime regarded the younger generation of intellectuals (who took the position that a person should be able to speak his or her own mind) as potential opposition and labelled them as such in its documents (Gabrič, 2019, 225). In spite of this label, this was not political opposition, i.e. a political group as we know it in a multi-party political system. Rather it was a group of artists and scientists, who publicly criticized and brought to light mistakes made by Yugoslav political system at that time. They were also coming forward with many suggestions and initiatives of improvements. After 1966, meaning after the plenary meeting at Brijuni and the reorganization of UDBA (Serbo-Croatian: Uprava državne bezbednosti, English: State Security Administration) as the State Security Service (Služba državne varnosti – SDV) (cf. Šela, Hazemali & Melanšek, 2020, 811–838) – which had the role of political police, but was otherwise mostly concerned with internal matters (among the priorities of control was the fight against the internal enemy) (Šela & Hazemali, 2020,

897; Jenuš & Friš, 2017, 778) – labelled the "opposition" an "internal enemy" and classified members of the "opposition" into various categories. These were the so-called holdovers of class structures, clerical groups, nationalist groups, the Informbiro group, liberal groups, meaning liberal-anarchist groups, a bureaucratic-dogmatic group, a bourgeoisie-rightist group, and alternative movements. At the end of the 1980s these categorizations were being used less and less (Repe, 2002a, 10). Somehow the intellectual group was considered the leading, that is the main critical movement in all the groups cited above. Thus, for example we find, the intellectual "clergy", the cultural intelligentsia, the intellectual youth and so on. The SDV's main focus was the question of how to prevent threats to the existing regime. Consequently, the SDV kept tabs on all potential opponents of the system that was in place until 1991.

Western political analysts began studying the concept of opposition early on. In 1968 Canadian political scientist, Harold Gordon Skilling distinguished four types of opposition (integral opposition, fractional opposition, fundamental opposition, and dissidence) (Skilling, 1968, 297–324). Notwithstanding these distinctions, there was no political opposition in the real sense of the word in socialist countries. In the past, many political theorists have tried to classify groups of opponents to socialist systems. For instance, Leonard Schapiro (1972, 4–10) discusses political dissidence, pragmatic dissidence, activity of pressure groups, internal Communist Party power struggle and full rejection of the system. Rudolf L. Tökes (using the Soviet Union as the example) distinguishes between moral dissidence, pragmatic dissidence and radical dissidence (Tökes, 1975, 13–19). Christian Joppke most of all elaborates on the difference between dissidence and opposition (Joppke, 1994, 548). Sharon Zukin proposes criteria for dissidence – among other things (2008). Barbara Falk stresses links between dissidence and the principle of civil society (Falk, 2003) etc. With regard to research conducted in present-day Slovenia, on opposition during the era of the communist system, we find various criteria for defining the terms "opposition" or dissidence. Jure Ramšak (2019) uses the term "oporečništvo" (in English also "dissidence") as a general designation for all kinds of social criticism. Thus, he solves the problem of naming multiple types of opposition to socialist regimes (SDV itself writes of so-called malcontents relative to policies of the League of Communists of Slovenia (Zveza komunistov Slovenije – ZKS), that affected culture, art

1 The discussion arose within the research program *Preteklost severovzhodne Slovenije med srednjo Evropo in evropskim jugovzhodom* no. P6-0138 (A), funded by the Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije (ARRS).

2 For more about the younger generation of critics, see Gabrič (2019, 191–225).

and journalism).³ Aleš Gabrič uses the term "opposition" in Yugoslavia (among the ranks of cultural workers, meaning cultural "opposition") for specific intellectuals who proved themselves as independent thinkers and engaged citizens, and whose opinions differed from the basic points and political practices of the ZKS (Gabrič, 2006).

Let us take a brief look at the term "intellectual" in the socialist system, according to sociologist and political scientist Jeffrey Goldfarb (1998, 115–117). Goldfarb talks about four types of intellectuals, namely party ideologues, official cultural workers, "officially accepted" and relatively independent intellectuals and "opposition" intellectuals. Practically speaking, the difference between these last two types is by no means clearly defined, also, the level of definability relative to the system is dependent on the time period and a specific kind of socialism. Relatively independent intellectuals were those intellectuals, who were active as official cultural workers, but yet in some manner attempted to maintain a certain level of independence. These were state leaders, who showed a greater degree of leniency while fulfilling their repressive duties, as well as individuals working for communist publications, who turned a blind eye to critical articles, which otherwise would have been destined for censorship or would have caused the complete shut down of the magazine. The type of "opposition" intellectual – according to Goldfarb – came into existence mainly during the 1980s, since individuals of this type were allegedly strict oppositionists and held openly critical positions towards the ruling regimes in socialist societies. For the most part intellectuals of this type were silenced and persecuted by the system, consequently they emigrated abroad or pursued a similar course. Slovenian historian Marko Zajc, who deals specifically with Slovenian intellectuals in SFR Yugoslavia (Socialistična federativna republika Jugoslavija – SFRJ), tries to group these intellectuals (from the 1980s) into three categories: regime intellectuals (of the older generation, active in the League of Communists and having various political functions), dissident intellectuals (e. g. intellectuals gathered around *Nova revija*) and left-leaning liberal intellectuals (e. g. intellectuals gathered around *Mladina*, some of whom participated in the Association of Socialist Youth of Slovenia (Zveza socialistične mladine – ZSMS)). Zajc admits that strict delimitations between these categories cannot be set absolutely and that there were most certainly also intellectuals, who we are unable to sort into any of the categories previously cited (Zajc, 2015, 241–255).

In addition to cultural workers (who were striving

to achieve artistic independence by publishing/performing works dealing with taboo subject matter, e. g. post-war mass executions, the Goli Otok Labour Camp, political persecutions, etc.) (Nežmah, 2020, 132–134) and journalists (who were publishing articles directly critical of the system) there were also Catholic intellectuals (especially the group of Christian socialists, gathered around Edvard Kocbek, Roman Catholic theologians, as well as intellectual members of the Slovenian ethnic minority in Trieste, gathered around Boris Pahor and who met in Draga) who were part of the intellectual "opposition" (Šela & Matjašič Friš, 2019). Scientists, primarily philosophers and sociologists from the University of Ljubljana (considered particularly dangerous to the government, as the system acknowledged their professional excellence) played a major role in creating critical public opinion. The so-called technical intelligentsia (who spoke out for liberalization of the economy according to the Stane Kavčič model) and political émigrés (who published various newsletters in the Slovenian language, e. g. *Slovenski glas* in Germany, *Naša luč* in Austria/Klagenfurt, *Ameriška domovina* in the US, *Amerikanski Slovenec* in the US, *Klic Triglava* in Great Britain, *Slovenska Svoboda* in Germany, *Slovenski vestnik* in Australia, *Slovenska država* in Canada, *Svobodna Slovenija* in Argentina, *Slovenska pot* in Argentina, *Vestnik* in Argentina, *Most* in Italia/Trieste, *Glas slovenske kulturne akcije* in Argentina) were also considered political opposition (Gabrič, 2002, 199–201). It was the constantly monitored political emigration, which most often published articles in its newspapers about its disagreement with the political system in Yugoslavia, e.g. Ciril Žebot, Ljubo Sirc, Mirko Javornik, Franc Jeza, Branko Pistivšek etc. (Valič Zver, 2019, 315–340; Kladnik, 2018, 305–324; Griesser-Pečar, 2018, 277–304; Friš & Hazemali, 2017, 807–822; Ramšak, 2010, 961–986).

The intellectual "opposition" also extended its criticism from ideological issues to economic, cultural and political issues, a development that the authorities found increasingly bothersome. For example, they reacted by attempting to ban certain publications, enforce censorship, impose prison sentences, and execute other political manoeuvres (Repe, 1990).

In spite of these strict measures the ideas put forth by the intellectuals never died out. The 1980s, when after Tito's death Yugoslavia went into a deep economic, social, national and on the whole a political crisis – the worst crisis in Yugoslavia since the conflict with the Soviet Union (Bajc, Osojnik & Friš, 2019, 220) – was also a decade that saw increasingly

3 For example, ARS-1931, 2313, UA-108, Varnostna ocena, Aktivnosti notranjih oponentskih in oporečnih struktur, Ljubljana, november 1982, 5.

larger shifts in the direction of the awakening of critical voices. With regard to these shifts, the political leadership of the SR Slovenia proved to be indecisive when it came to intervening against new social movements. This indecision opened a certain political space for exposing taboos and engaging in debate on "forbidden subjects". Intellectuals, cultural workers, scientists, publicists, and others availed themselves of this opportunity. This analysis on the part of the Slovenian "opposition" in Yugoslavia (and in the Socialist Republic of Slovenia – SRS) has its roots in the era of the critical culture wave. In the early 1980s this expression designated the so-called intellectual and cultural "opposition" in SRS, in the indigenous Slovene areas as well as in diaspora.

INTELLECTUAL AND CULTURAL "OPPOSITION" IN THE EIGHTIES IN THE SLOVENIAN LANDS

In the 1980s the entire European continent (including Yugoslavia) was impacted by an economic crisis. In Yugoslavia's case this was a consequence of slow modernization and rash economic decisions. Even though the SRS – at the beginning of the decade – fared better than most of the other republics (when taking out new loans, it was more careful in ensuring that it could repay them), it was still viewed as a "powerhouse" to drag the entire Yugoslav economy out of the crisis. By the middle of the decade, the Slovenian economy was already stagnating. During the second half of the decade, it was in recession (Calic, 2012, 251–254; Lorenčič, 2011, 459–461; Prinčič, 2002, 33–56; Repe, 2002b, 134). With the growing unemployment, the economic crisis had led to a social crisis. Political inconstancy also increased after Tito's death. Due to their diversity, the republics were increasingly divided. These circumstances did not go unnoticed by the intellectuals – on the contrary. These circumstances triggered a wave of discussion among sociologists and humanists, warning of the weaknesses of the system in general. Intellectuals, the bourgeoisie right, adherents of different social movements and the media were all impacted by the increasing influence of the West and by the Polish anti-system movement Solidarity (*Solidarność*) – an extremely broad alliance of parties and movements from the political right to the center-left (Maver & Friš, 2018, 539). These groups started pointing out demands for free speech, democracy, and human rights with increasing frequency (Calic, 2012, 254).

The control situation slowly started to change due to the ever-increasing crisis. Opponents of the regime started banding together and became louder. The crisis situation gave rise to great uncertainty among the people and uncertainty eroded their faith in the capability of the official institutions. The good relations among the republics were slowly being frayed. What started to emerge was the so-called civil society,⁴ giving shelter to the origins of anti-institutions. The intellectuals had the tools to express what the majority was thinking – namely the media, through which they were able to verbalize and conceptualize social aspirations. Faith in the practicality of Yugoslavia began to wane.

In addition to sociologists from the University of Ljubljana, the loudest critics of the crisis-like circumstances also included writers. For example, the Association of Slovenian Writers (*Društvo slovenskih pisateljev* – DSP) started actively participating in political, ideational, and cultural-political discourses, its members organized public debates, where multiple issues were discussed. In these public debates, participants discussed national and patriotic questions, equality of languages in Yugoslavia, freedom of artistic expression, and so on. In 1985 the so-called Committee for Protection of Thought and Writing was established with links to the DSP. It directed attention to violations and attempted limitations of freedom and thus stood for basic human liberties (Gabrič, 2006, 1169). Meetings of intellectuals at Draga as cited above (which started in 1966) were also taking place. These meetings were a gathering spot for intellectuals, cultural workers, and alternative thinkers (mostly from the Slovenian ethnic minority in Italy) held in the small border village, Draga, located in the Karst region. At the meetings, multiple topics were debated, such as the general state of affairs in Slovenia, the condition of Slovenian ethnic minorities abroad, the Slovenian diaspora and immigrant workers, democratization of the Slovenian state and economic problems. After 1976 the venue for the meetings was moved from Draga to Villa Opicina (Opčine). The SDV carefully monitored each meeting; indeed, they sent their own people as attendees. Surveillance of these meetings – code-name "KARLA"⁵ – provided the SDV with a lot of information pertaining to "hostile activities" (even during the 1980s).

A large, even crucial role involving critical questioning of the existing regime and alternative

4 The notion of civil society was "rediscovered" as an alternative concept – an alternative to the official institutions of power, as defined by Tomaž Mastnak at the 1983 seminar entitled "What is Alternative?". The seminar was organized by the alternative scene in Ljubljana (Mastnak, 1990, 305–317).

5 ARS-1931, 2313, UA-100, XVII. Študijski dnevi društva slovenskih izobražencev v Trstu – Draga*82, Ljubljana, september 1982, 2–4; ARS-1931, 2313, UA 113, Zamejska problematika na študijskih srečanjih društva slovenskih izobražencev v Trstu – "Draga", Ljubljana, 1982, 1–32; ARS-1931, 2313, UA-119, Ideološki vidik študijskih srečanj slovenskih izobražencev v Dragi (Metoda merjenja stališč), Ljubljana, november 1986, 1–69.

ideas, was played by the youth, primarily university students and the movements they organized, they attempted to popularize their ideas through the Student Cultural Centre (Kirbiš et al., 2019, 848; Repe & Kerec, 2017, 72). As early as the 1970s youth – since then, the values of self-expression, which are a central element of a democratic political culture, have become increasingly important (Kirbiš, 2018, 27) – trying to fend off the authorities (who were imposing the leading ideology), started to form the nucleus of the independent political public (this was not yet political opposition in the real sense of the word). The independent student organization was abolished in 1974. It was subsumed under the youth wing of the ZSMS. This manoeuvre caused the partial and gradual passivation of university students. Even so, students were able to preserve continuity with the student movement with the aid of *Tribuna* (a student newsletter and an immensely important information source), the *Katedra* magazine, Radio Študent and the Student Cultural Centre (ŠKUC). Later, the student organization (as part of the ZSMS) and with the magazine *Mladina*, gained some considerable strength. The collective activities of the youth (i.e., university students) were thus the actual carriers of serious social initiatives in the areas of politics and culture of the 1980s. These collective activities were manifested first and foremost in alternative cultural movements. We find written in an SDV report from early 1980 that the student population of that year had not yet widely exposed itself, whereas *the former student leaders lost leverage to influence the contemporary student generation and were increasingly becoming an "elite" intellectual group, establishing links with similar groups (of other republics). At the same time, they showed no readiness to engage in collaboration.*⁶ Nevertheless, the student movement was able to reach a wider public and by the late 1980s, in fact, in numbers it exceeded the university student population alone (Gabrič, 2006, 1158; Vurnik, 2005, 345). The student movement managed to do this in spite of the government's unfavourable

attitude towards it.⁷ The significance of this achievement is underscored by the fact,⁸ that *Tribuna*, *Mladina* and *Katedra*⁹ were some of the newspapers most frequently banned and confiscated in the 1980s (Šela & Friš, 2017, 825; Horvat, 1998, 126–139). Such actions were supposedly taken due to claims of "*disparaging the reputation of a foreign country*", "*disseminating untrue news (with potential to upset the public)*" and "*grave disparaging of morality*".¹⁰ Other bulletins, run by university students and (intermittently) publishing articles critical towards society of the time were also watched by the SDV. These were *Fri fak* (bulletin of the Faculty of Arts), *PF* (bulletin of the Faculty of Law), *Če* (bulletin of the Faculty of Economics) as well as *Pogledi* and *Razmerja* (bulletins of the students from the Faculty for Sociology, Political sciences and Journalism – today's Faculty of Social Sciences).¹¹

The artistic and cultural intelligentsia of the 1980s also started to critically consider the situation in the country and form strategies with which to sovereignly enter into an international exchange of ideas for the new sociality. This strong emancipation movement was primarily being channelled by civil society, alternative movements, and subcultures, where the pivotal role was played by intellectuals, scientists, journalists, but also artists, more often than not, through the alternative movements (Rendla, 2018, 139–159). Due to freedom of expression, these movements were turning towards private economy, greater national autonomy and political freedom – meaning a multi-party system. As far as the authorities were concerned, this manner of expressing new ideas did not fall on deaf ears. On the contrary. "The ears" of official authorities were paying very close attention. This attention was directed towards (for example) alternative music – punk (which first appeared in the late 1970s) (Repe & Kerec, 2017, 72). On October 18th, 1977, the very first Slovenian punk group, Pankrti, performed at the Moste College Preparatory School gym. In 1978, record label ŠKUC released the group's first record

6 »[...] bivši študentski leaderji izgubili vpliv na sedanjo študijsko generacijo ter vse bolj postajali „elitna“ intelektualna skupina, ki se povezuje s podobnimi skupinami v ostalih republikah, vendar ne kažejo pripravljenosti tudi za obojestransko sodelovanje [...]« (ARS-1931, 2313, UA-41, Poročilo o realizaciji programskih nalog SDV RSNZ SR Slovenije za leto 1980, Ljubljana, februar 1981, 46).

7 ARS-1931, 2313, UA-123, Varnostna ocena, Ljubljana, maj 1982, 4.

8 In Slovenia between 1963 and 1989, 32 printed works were banned, and legal proceedings were initiated against more than 40 writers and editors (Horvat, 1998, 128).

9 ARS-1931, 2313, RTZ 857, MA-1, Prošnja javnega tožilca za podatke o pravi identiteti avtorja članka v Tribuni, 194; ARS-1931, 2313, RTZ 857, MA-1, Zoper sklep Temeljnega sodišča v Ljubljani, enote v Ljubljani, 195–198; ARS-1931, 2313, RTZ 857, MA-1, Obtožni predlog zveznega javnega tožilca in prepoved razširjanja "Tribune", 265–266; ARS-1931, 2313, RTZ 857, MA-1, Odločba o začasni prepovedi 26. in 27. številke Mladine, 235–237; ARS-1931, 2313, RTZ 857, MA-1, Začasna prepoved "Katedre", 231–233; ARS-1931, 2313, UA-65, Provokativne vsebine zadnje številke študentskega lista Tribuna, Ljubljana, 11. 7 1983, 1–2.

10 ARS-1931, 2313, RTZ 857 – "Deviacija", MA-1, Odločba o začasni prepovedi razširjanja študentskega časopisa "Tribuna", 162–167.

11 ARS-1931, 2313, UA-120, Značilnosti vsebin nekaterih internih študentskih glasil, Ljubljana, december 1982, 1–26.

entitled *Lublana je bulana*. Other alternative groups followed, e. g. Laibach¹² (from Trbovlje), that was hit with a first performance ban in September 1980.¹³ These pioneers of punk had no ambition to change the world but rather wanted to spread a freer manner of action and expression in the public space. The young people that followed them developed their own social and socio-political function (Repe & Kerec, 2017, 72–73). Punk was more than just a genre of music, it was also a provocative movement that directly and most radically negated social norms and attempted to destroy the involuntary notion of what Slovenian self-managing socialist culture should be. Adherents were also in doubt about the belief that to live in socialism was to live in the best possible political system (Vurnik, 2005, 248). More and more, adherents of the punk movement were connecting with groups of fine artists, painters, and theatre employees who shared their ideology. For example, Laibach connected with the Irwin painters group as well as The Scipion Nasice Sisters Theatre. Thus, the collective Neue Slowenische Kunst (NSK) was established (Jeffs, 2008, 102).

Concomitant with the youth subculture, other movements (pacifist, ecological, feminist, etc.) also emerged, still with origins in the alternative youth clubs. For example, in 1984 Lilith, a lesbian and feminist section was formed, and the homosexual section Magnus, organized their first festival in Ljubljana the same year. Thus, different kinds of movements in the civil society became part of the changing image of Slovenia by being critical of the government and its members (Repe & Kerec, 2017, 74–75; Repe, 2002a, 49). A coordination committee of the work group for ecological and pacifist issues was formed in early 1983 in Novo Mesto by RK ZSMS. The work group was organized in ecological and pacifist sub-groups, and later there was also a work group for spiritual movements. The main objectives of these organisations were to reduce the term of mandatory military service, to form a non-nuclear area in the Balkans, to abolish deposit of nuclear waste, to control sales of weapons abroad, to abolish the death penalty and the alteration or abolition of Article 133 of the Penal Code (which sanctioned so-called verbal offence) and so on (Repe & Kerec, 2017, 49; Gabrič, 2002, 202). As pointed out by Jože Kos Grabar Jr., the attitude of the socio-political authorities in office at the time, relative to the alternative scene as a whole

was inconsistent. Some of its members were diametrically opposed to the alternative scene, others were constructively critical, and some were in a symbiotic relationship with it (Kos Grabar ml., 2013, 57). Out of all of this, an "opposition" started slowly emerging. In some segments it later turned into various political parties (Goldfarb, 1998, 87).

Therefore, it must be said that the young people of the 1980s played one of the crucial roles in the process of the Slovenian Spring. The student newsletters, bulletins and magazines, cited above, which contained articles critical towards society, were being controlled, despite partial liberalization. This particularly came to light with a specific critical magazine, entitled *Nova revija*, which was established in 1982. The magazine was symbolic of a breakthrough of the cultural and critical magazines in Slovenia and Yugoslavia. The SDV labelled the collaborators and authors of the media cited as anarcho-liberals or radically minded young intellectuals, who "cunningly" publish provocative articles and ideas which are "unacceptable to the self-managing socialist society".¹⁴ One of the politically and socially critical magazines (founded on the initiative of the "opposition") was *Nova revija*. It wanted more freedom while creating and communicating its socio-political criticism. Due to articles that expressed ever-increasing concern for the gloomy future of the country and criticized cultural politics, it was under the watchful eye of the authorities from the very beginning. *Nova revija* particularly focused on the national question, defended "Slovenism" and criticized "Yugoslavism" (Zajc, 2015, 241–255). In special 57th issue (symbolically in memory of the defunct magazine *Revija 57*) from 1987 was subtitled "Articles for the Slovenian National Program". In this issue 16 authors outlined program guidelines for the Slovenian struggle for independence. They wrote in favour of increasing emancipation and democratization of Slovenia. At the 68th meeting of the governing body of the national conference of the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Slovenia (Socialistična zveza delovnega ljudstva – SZDL), the Slovenian political leadership reacted (after debating for several hours) by forcing editor-in-chief Dimitrij Rupel and managing editor Niko Grafenauer to step down from their positions. The magazine was not shut down, in spite of demands from Belgrade. This happened because the Slovenian political leadership

12 Laibach symbolically emphasized totalitarianism and used symbols such as Triglav (an iconic mountain) a hayrack or antlers. The members identified themselves as "a group that pays a lot of attention to psychology of the masses and the logic of manipulation through information and channels all of the means of its artistic action towards definition of a mass-psychological character of social (culturally-political) meeting, such as a rock concert." (Mladina, 12 May 1983: Prejeli smo, 28). What the authorities recognized in them was the manifestation of neo-Nazism.

13 Mladina, 24. 03. 2017: Kako je nastal Laibach. In kako je preprečil fašizacijo Slovenije, 12. Dostopno na: <https://www.mladina.si/179257/kako-je-nastal-laibach> (zadnji pristop: 12. 3. 2020).

14 ARS-1931, 2313, A-11-14, Poročilo o realizaciji programskih nalog SDV RSNZ SR Slovenije za leto 1981, Ljubljana, februar 1982, 70.

realized that further repressive measures against the creators of *Nova revija* would only strengthen the "opposition" and increase public dissatisfaction (Šela & Friš, 2017, 823–833).

The content of all magazines cited presented not only taboo topics from the past, but also doubts concerning the society of the authorities at the time as well as criticism of the system. Therefore, these magazines became dangerous, especially after 1988, when we started to enter the Slovenian Spring process. The magazine *Mladina*, whose articles undoubtedly expedited the current of events of the Slovenian spring, played a major role in this regard. One of these decisive articles, meant to be published by *Mladina*, was entitled "Night of the Long Knives". It contained references from the 72nd meeting of the central committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia,¹⁵ where one of the topics was political reform in the Socialist Republic of Slovenia. By agreement of the top members of the Yugoslav Communist Party, the minutes of the meeting should have remained clandestine. Even so, the transcripts of the meeting minutes started circulating in Slovenia (Čepič, 2006, 1187–1188). It was believed that Milan Kučan, one of the speakers at the meeting, afterwards distributed the shorthand minutes of the deliberations. Supposedly, Jože Knez, Vice President of SZDL also received a copy. Knez' cabinet was headed by Igor Bavčar who photocopied the shorthand minutes and handed them over to Janez Janša, who in turn delivered them to Franci Zavrl, the managing editor of *Mladina* (Pesek, 2007, 60). Franci Zavrl used the minutes in the article cited above. Due to the subject matter of the article the SDV conducted a secret investigation at the facilities of the company Mikro Ada,¹⁶ on April 27th, 1988. In this process, they discovered a transcript of the meeting minutes, as well as two pages of a secret military document in the possession of employee Janez Janša. Consequently, SDV and the Military Security Service arrested Janša (then a *Mladina* commentator) and Ivan Borštner (then a Slovene sergeant in the in the Yugoslav People's Army)¹⁷ on suspicion of betraying military secrets. One day later, Janez Janša was handed over to the military prosecutor and imprisoned at Metelkova Street in Ljubljana, where Ivan Borštner was already being held in custody. Four days later, then internal political editor of *Mla-*

dina, David Tasić, was also arrested and detained, while the authorities failed to arrest the fourth man accused, then managing editor of *Mladina*, Franci Zavrl, who took refuge in a psychiatric clinic.¹⁸ On July 18th, 1988, the so-called Trial against the Four, also known as the JBTZ (Janša, Borštner, Tasić, Zavrl) affair, concerning the alleged betrayal of military secrets, opened. The trial was held behind closed doors at the military court in Ljubljana. The arrest and prosecution of the "Four" reached epic proportions. The British Embassy in Belgrade closely observed the four's detention and the implications it caused, and reported them to the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Commonwealth (FCO). They noted that the term "opposition" is becoming increasingly common in the debate about Slovenia's political growth. She regarded the events as the "birth" of Slovenia's "resistance." As a result, it began to form political alliances (e.g., with the Slovene Peasants' Union) as well as the Committee, which pressed the Yugoslav People's Army to conduct trials and expose different national procedures, therefore operating as a completely political motivated force.¹⁹

The trial was also conducted in the Serbo-Croatian language, a fact which particularly infuriated the Slovenian public. The Trial against the Four was the culmination of tensions between Slovenian civil society and what was then the Yugoslav People's Army. The political and military leadership of the SFR Yugoslavia had not expected the judicial procedure to provoke such a forceful response from the Slovenian public. As a sign of protest, the so-called Committee for the Protection of the Rights of Janez Janša was established on May 31st. It was renamed the Committee for the Protection of Human Rights on June 3rd, following the arrests of the other men accused.²⁰ Under the leadership of Igor Bavčar, the committee organized a protest rally on Ljubljana's Congress Square. More than 30,000 people participated in the protest. The committee also organized mass protests in front of the military court in Ljubljana. In so doing it became the strongest civil society organization during the period of the Slovenian Spring process (Pesek, 2007, 65). During the Trial against the Four, citizens gathered in massive numbers in front of the military court, protesting against violations of fundamental human rights. In addition, they also demanded political reforms and

15 ARS-1931, 1147, Informacija glede citatov v članku "Noč dolgih nožev", od Petra Prebila za tov. Borisa Stadlerja, 10/5/1988, 1.

16 ARS-1931, 1147, Ukrepi ONZ zoper Janeza Janšo, 31/5/1988, 1.

17 ARS-1931, 1147, Obrazložitev postopkov proti Janezi Janši, Ivanu Borštnerju in Davidu Tasiću, Ljubljana, 6/6/1988.

18 ARS-1931, 1147, Uradni zaznamek o hišni preiskavi pri Davidu Tasiću v Mostu na Soči in izročitev vojaškemu preiskovalnemu sodniku, 5/6/1988, 1–2; ARS-1931, 1147, Vložena obtožnica zoper Borštnerja, Tasića, Janšo in Zavrla, Ljubljana, 30/6/1988, 1.

19 TNA FCO 28/8642: Yugoslavia: Internal Political Situation. Duty Journey to Slovenia: 5-6 December (Mr. Huxter to Mr Madden), 13. 1. 1989, 239–240; TNA, FCO 28/8642: Yugoslavia: Internal Political Situation: Rupert J. Huxter (British Embassy Belgrade) to Miss A W Lewis EED FCO: SLOVENIA, 237–238.

20 ARS-1289, 1, Seznam članov kolegija, 1–2; ARS-1289, 1, Ustanovili smo odbor za varstvo pravic Janeza Janše, 1–4.

democratic change. The trial and especially the demonstrations directed attention of the Slovenian public towards developments in Slovene and Yugoslav politics. The trial also caused 10,000 people, to gather at Congress Square to express their support of the incarcerated Janša, Borštner, Tasić and Zavrl in May 1989. The so-called *May Declaration*, drafted by Slovene opposition political parties, was publicly read before the crowd. With the *May Declaration*, these parties demanded a sovereign Slovenian state.

We conclude this section with the thought that the role of the intellectual "opposition" in the 1980s was primarily to work in civil society, build cultural institutions, start discussions and in so doing influence civil society and politics – all of this ultimately helped accelerate the Slovenian Spring process.

CLOSELY EXAMINED BY SDV

In the 1980s, the SDV, the Slovenian intelligence and security service, and the secret political police, better known to the public as UDBA, were in charge of analysing "opposition" movements on the operative level (Bajc, Melanšek & Friš, 2020, 840). Among its duties, the SDV prepared annual security reports, which were then discussed by the Council for the Protection of the Constitutional Order (and thereafter the Presidency of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia). The Council included the President of the Assembly, the Secretary of the SZDL, the Secretary of the Presidency of the Central Committee of the ZKS, the President of the Republican Committee of the Association of the Federation of Fighters' Associations of the National Liberation Struggle (Zveza zvez borcev narodno-osvobodilnega boja – ZZB NOB), the President of the Republican Council of the Association of Trade Unions of Slovenia (Zveza sindikatov Slovenije – ZSS), the President of the Ljubljana City Council of the ZKS, the President of the Executive Council of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia (i.e. the government), and the Republic's Secretary for Internal Affairs. The Council was headed by a member of the Presidency of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia, President of the SRS Supreme Court, etc.²¹ In the 1980s, the Council was first headed by Stane Markič and later by Andrej Marinc (Repe, 2002a, 10). The council categorized different kinds of hate speech and then submitted suggestions to various judicial organs about how to deal with a specific problem. Most important and most informative for the SDV were the appraisals of the so-called Analytical Administration of the then Republic Secretariat for Internal Affairs (RSNZ) in collaboration with the administrative SDV. In the annual analyses, personal

information, notices, security assessments, monthly reviews of "hostile activities", etc. were provided to the authorities. Thus various "opposition" organizations were constantly under the scrutiny of a few state institutions (SRS presidency) and institutions of political organizations (SZDL, ZSMS, and so on).²²

The most frequently cited critical magazines in SDV reports were the magazines that most often experienced article censorship, were prohibited from publishing a specific article, or had the entire issue confiscated. These were also the magazines most often accused of "inappropriate or hostile content", "causing public unrest and endangering public order." This was going on even though these publications only drew attention to specific issues in the country – particularly human rights violations, inter-ethnic friction, corruption, changeable policies, inadequate resolution of the economic crisis, abuse of high political office, arms trafficking, etc. Use of such means and methods was approved by the Federal and Republican Secretaries of the Secretariat of the Interior and, exceptionally, by the Heads of Security Services (who were part of the Secretariat of Internal Affairs). In the annual reports on the realization of SDV program tasks, indicative and informative bulletins and safety assessments, SDV staff members provided analyses of the occurrence of so-called hostile or "opposition" phenomena and wrote reports on the most active movers and organizations and their activities.

In its 1988 statistical report on political criminality the SDV noted that between 1978 and 1988, 528 persons were examined in connection with offences of a political character. The statistics showed a peak in 1980, which probably had to do with the sensitive socio-political situation at the time of Tito's death and the ever-more strained situation in Kosovo. At this time, the predominant offence was violation of Article 228 of the Penal Code (PC) of the SRS – Article 228 concerned the so-called spreading of false information with the possible consequence of endangering public order and peace (32 persons were sentenced to up to three years in prison). 19 criminal offences involved "disgracing the Socialist Republic of Slovenia, another socialist republic or socialist autonomous province, its flag, coat of arms or anthem, its highest bodies or representatives of these bodies". 10 persons were tried for violating Article 113 of the SRS Penal Code, which cites humiliation of the nation or nationality of Yugoslavia or an ethnic group living in the SFR Yugoslavia. 234 persons (41% of all criminal offences of a political character) were accused of insulting the SFR Yugoslavia under Article 157 of SFR Yugoslavia's PC. 325

21 ARS-1931, 2313, UA-1982, MA 701, Varnostna ocena (januar-junij), Uvodna stran, Ljubljana, 1982.

22 ARS-1931, 2313, UA-1982, MA 701, Varnostna ocena (januar-junij), Uvodna stran, Ljubljana, 1982.

persons were investigated for inciting ethnic, racial or religious hatred, discord or intolerance, 59 people were investigated for spreading hostile propaganda under Article 133 of SFR Yugoslavia's PC, and in other cases people were tried for other crimes of a political character (e. g. banding together to commit a hostile act, war crimes against civilians, insults to foreign countries, enslavement, terrorism, sabotage, betrayal of state secrets, etc.).²³

After reviewing the preserved archival sources, we find that in the early 1980s, the government began to detect danger from anarcho-liberalist groups, foreign intelligence, information and propaganda institutions, as well as diplomatic-consular delegations and trade delegations, "Fascist and Nazi extremists" from Italy and Austria and the Roman Catholic Church. All of these groups were marked as groups "antagonistically working against the constitutional order in SR Slovenia".²⁴ In the semi-annual "Security Assessment" (January-June 1982) we read that in spite of the strained economic relations, some individuals and "internal enemy groups, political émigrés and other anti-Yugoslav structures" failed to develop their activities but were still being watched because of their potential to ignite "possible internal unrest." The government expected the increase in "opposition" activity. The initial measures against such activity were confiscation of specific issues of magazines deemed controversial by the authorities, replacement of editors, suspending the printing of certain books, censorship, cessation of possible funding, etc.²⁵

In Slovenia, in the early 1980s, the SDV divided intellectual "opposition", whose activity so far "required a broader political security consideration",²⁶ into the following groups of intellectuals:

- the group of "intellectual freethinkers",
- the group of "active young social scientists" and
- the group of journalists.

For the first group, it was written that they were mostly employees at the Edvard Kardelj University of Ljubljana, who also cooperated with Ljubljana Radio Television (RTV). This group was supposedly well organized, and primarily engaged in fighting for freedom of speech in the press, e. g. resolving the

situation with *Tribuna*. In 1982, Vanja Brišček was under investigation due to his article published on the death of Leonid Brezhnev in *Tribuna*. According to the SDV report, the group was trying to contact like-minded individuals abroad (in Italy and France) "for the purpose of exchanging banned materials of objectionable and opposition structures" and also with proponents of neo-leftist and anarchist ideas. The centres of operation were supposedly Zagreb and Belgrade. Slovene group members were alleged to only represent the "peripherals". The objectives of this group were supposedly focused on compromising the political system.

*They want to use the government's mistakes to their advantage by intending to invoke true democracy and to encourage dissatisfaction among workers, businesspeople, teachers, cultural workers, writers and students in their contributions. They have apparently increased their presence mainly at various problem-solving lectures and not only in university departments, but also in organizations of united labour and in secondary schools.*²⁷

The group of active young social scientists also supposedly included adherents from the University of Ljubljana, the Marxist Centre of the Central Committee of the League of Communists and Radio Študent – many who were also members of the League of Communists of Slovenia. The group was suspected of wanting democratization of the system, but within the boundaries of the League of Communists. The last group of journalists (the SDV report specifically cites Alenka Puhar, Bogdan Novak, Srečo Zajc, Darko Štrajnc, Bojana Leskovar, Bogo Sajovic and Katarina Lavš) was supposedly using Slovenian media to express their dissatisfaction with the situation. Representatives of this group published their views in the magazines *Mladina*, *Teleks* and *Pavliha*.²⁸

As already mentioned in the preceding section, the SDV was (by the early 1980s) classifying the beginnings of the "opposition", in other words the "internal enemy" by specific categories. Information from the 14th meeting of the Presidency of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Slovenia on the

23 ARS-1931, 2314, UA-91, Kazniva dejanja s političnim obeležjem v SR Sloveniji v letih 1978–1987, Ljubljana, november 1988, 1–10.

24 ARS-1931, 2313, UA-51, Mnenje o gradivu "Osnovne karakteristike aktualne bezbednosne situacije", Ljubljana, 10/5/1982, 1–2.

25 ARS-1931, 2313, UA-51, Mnenje o gradivu "Osnovne karakteristike aktualne bezbednosne situacije", Ljubljana, 10/5/1982.

26 ARS-1931, 2314, MA 701, Varnostno politični vidiki delovanja nekaterih novih skupin izobražencev v SR Sloveniji, Ljubljana, 1983, 2.

27 »Napake vlade željo izrabiti sebi v prid s tem, da se nameravajo sklicevati na pravo demokracijo ter v svojih prispevkih spodbujati nezadovoljstvo nad delavci, gospodarstveniki, prosvetarji, kulturniki, literati in študenti. Svojo prisotnost naj bi povečali predvsem na raznih problemskih predavanjih ne le na fakultetah, temveč tudi po organizacijah združenega dela in v srednjih šolah« (ARS-1931, 2314, MA 701, Varnostno politični vidiki delovanja nekaterih novih skupin izobražencev v SR Sloveniji, Ljubljana, 1983, 3–5).

28 ARS-1931, 2314, MA 701, Varnostno politični vidiki delovanja nekaterih novih skupin izobražencev v SR Sloveniji, Ljubljana, 1983, 6–7.

security situation and activities of "opposition" forces in Slovenia from 1979, states that the opposition movements do not have a lot of chances for emergence due to the broad and intensive political activities of the ZKS. Categorization of opposition movements also appears in the information. This categorization was maintained throughout the 1980s (with only minor changes). The categories represented:

- **Bourgeois-pluralistic groups** – these were groups around Edvard Kocbek in the late 1970s. The same groups were interested in political pluralism (possibly also within Yugoslavia) in conjunction with Christian values as well as Slovenian national independence and sovereignty. After the events in Poland (associated with *Solidarność*) these groups defended the position that Poland's distancing itself from socialism was a mirror image of the situation in Yugoslavia and that it demonstrated the need for a rigorous approach, meaning intervention.
- **Holdovers of those opposed to the Informbiro:**
- **Techno-liberalists** – This group included former politicians, cultural and public workers, whose activities had already been condemned and in principle did not act in a "publicly destructive" manner, but who nonetheless were socio-politically active on local levels.
- **Anarcho-liberalists** – This group was said to attack the role of the League of Communists in society and supposedly constituted the central critical mass of the "opposition". It consisted of the younger intelligentsia of social scientists (mostly philosophers), publicists, critics, and other public workers. After Tito's death, this group gradually started to intensify their activities, university students became particularly active. For example, through student press and critical magazines, especially *Tribuna*, *Mladina* and *Nova revija*;
- **The clergy** – meaning members of the Roman Catholic Church, gathered around the Faculty of Theology (part of the University of Ljubljana), the magazine *Znamenje*, founded in 1971 – although the magazine's label on religious content was already severely limited due to regime pressure (Maver & Ravnikar, 2017, 796), The Slovenian Association of Priests, Herma-goras Society, the Diocese of Maribor, as well as political and clerical émigrés (Repe, 2002a, 18–30; 30–37; 37–44).²⁹ Between 1978 and

1990, there was a phase of desecularization in the field of religion among Slovenians, which the authorities were concerned about (Lavrič & Friš, 2018, 43–44; Lavrič, 2019, 260).

The term **bourgeois right** began to appear more frequently in the critical opposition group during the 1980s. The name is derived from similarities in the expression of ideas expressed by Western bourgeois magazines and their "*bourgeois ideas of democracy and freedom*."³⁰ The SDV wrote that, in the past, the right was a catch-all term for conservatively oriented ideological political forces defending the position of the old classes; at the time, they were primarily concerned with the affirmation of the bourgeois right in the form of neoliberalism. New correct. In a broader sense, this group included all those who identified as "anarcho-liberalists." In a 1987 report titled "*Objectives, Methods, and Forms of Action of the Bourgeois Right in the SRS*"³¹, SDV wrote that representatives of the bourgeois right violently exploited the then-poor economic situation and were thus equated with the concept of an internal enemy. In the 1980s, the group of the bourgeois right also included members of the DSP, which (in the first half of the 1980s) gradually began to transcend the framework of solely cultural activities. It was difficult to label all their articles as bourgeois right-wing, since they were ideologically and politically diverse. Their most massive and resounding event was the organization of a public tribunal with the title *Slovene Nation and Slovene Culture* on January 9th and 10th 1985 in Ljubljana.³²

Members of *Nova Revija* or those who gathered around the magazine, also belonged to the bourgeois right. Initially, adherents of this group discussed the so-called national question in discursive articles. They advocated the exercise of classic bourgeois freedoms, and in the mid-1980s they also began, as it was mentioned before, to make concrete proposals for the national program. It clearly showed that the intellectual "opposition" had taken the initiative in forming the Slovenian national program (Repe, 2002a, 99–102). The SDV established even more specific goals and tasks for monitoring the bourgeois right in 1987. They discovered that the monitored members of the bourgeois right suspected that they were being watched, so they avoided making phone calls, for example, because they knew the SDV was listening in. They also avoided sending letters and meeting in their usual places. According to the report, Slovenian philosopher, sociologist and publicist Spomenka Hribar once told Janez Gradi-

29 ARS-1592, CK ZKS, fond seje CK ZKS, *Informacija s 14. seje Predsedstva CK ZKS o varnostnih razmerah in delovanju opozicijskih sil v Sloveniji iz leta 1979*, Ljubljana, 8/2/1979, 1–13.

30 ARS-1931, 2314, UA-1987, Cilji, metode in oblike delovanja meščanske desnice v SR Sloveniji, Ljubljana, december 1987, 1–2.

31 ARS-1931, 2314, UA-1987, Cilji, metode in oblike delovanja meščanske desnice v SR Sloveniji, Ljubljana, december 1987, 1–2.

32 ARS-1931, 2314, UA-1987, Cilji, metode in oblike delovanja meščanske desnice v SR Sloveniji, Ljubljana, december 1987, 1–8.

šnik, Slovenian author and translator, that she had telephone interference or that there were so many eavesdropping devices that calling to her house was simply impossible.³³

In published books, articles, poems and films, intellectuals and cultural workers presented and disclosed the pivotal topics cited above: the Communist power grab, concentration camps, forced collectivization, individuals connected to Informbiro, Goli otok, the national question, etc. All of these were taboo subjects that the authorities were carefully concealing. These topics were now being presented from a new and different perspective, which the authorities did not appreciate and refused to countenance. When it came to dealing with the "bourgeois right", the SDV in the 1980s resorted to repressive measures. It made accusations of hostile propaganda and slandering of the country, spreading untrue information, and presenting the social situation in the country in a distorted manner. It took writers of such texts (books, articles, poems, etc.) to court, which was the KPS's tool for settling accounts with actual and alleged opponents (Čoh Kladnik, 2019, 108), and tried them under several articles of the Penal Code (particularly under Article 133 of the Penal Code cited above) (Gabrič, 2008, 63–77).

Since the early 1980s the SDV had noticed that the public was increasingly politicizing the issues associated with realization of certain general social needs and general human needs. New social movements, meaning the emerging mass civil initiative, was said to be a holdover in "some form of latent state, but was, at times of social crisis, re-emerging and becoming more politically aggressive, moving from the subculture stage to the anti-cultural phase."³⁴ The SDV estimated that the new social movements at that time "have no impact on the acceptance of important social issues in society". According to the SDV, at that time the mass civil initiative was thus in the phase of a cultural movement, which included the so-called **alternative movements**. In June 1986, when the SDV had reached the boiling point,³⁵ it published an analysis of the characteristics of the new social movements in Slovenia. In the comprehensive report they analysed the general characteristics of new social and cultural movements and gave exam-

ples, focusing on the Republic Conference of the ZSMS (working group for peace, ecological and spiritual movements), the Student Cultural and Artistic Centre (ŠKUC), The Slovenian Sociological Society, The Slovenian Journalists Association and foreign organizations, with which the Slovenian cultural alternative had cooperated. The analysis was prepared based on operatively collected SDV data and "legal sources and documents".³⁶

The SDV separated the new alternative models into the co-called **hippie culture** (which included secondary school and university students and intellectuals), **rock culture** (which supposedly rejected established cultural values), **punk culture** (which included urban secondary school students and blue collar youth and provoked with its lifestyle and world view. This group was also characterized by extreme homogeneity and use of emerging semantic symbols), and an **intellectual "fashion" culture** (which intellectuals, secondary school and university students). Among these cultures were feminist, ecological, pacifist, spiritual and other movements, with a "new romanticism", or "post romanticism" orientation. Their ideological basis was supposedly expressed through social science literature, and these movements themselves were supposedly characterized by engagement, radical rejection of social values through different behaviours or theoretical discussion as well as creative activity.³⁷ Presumably what separated these movements from other alternative models was the fact they were included in the existing institutional "ideological and cultural apparatus of the state." The next category were **artistically creative cultural groupings, that is informal association of artists** (e. g. journalists) linked by the same ideas and resisting the prevailing regulations, in particular cultural regulations, but also social regulations. This category included artists as well as cultural workers and public workers. Supposedly their objective was to create their own media and institutions. Another special category was the so-called **dissident intellectual subculture**, presumably including intellectuals who radically rejected social values, the attitude of the authorities and the authorities' power over society. Dissident intellectuals were said to be in constant conflict with cultural policy and were thus looking

33 ARS-1931, 2314, UA-1987, Cilji, metode in oblike delovanja meščanske desnice v SR Sloveniji, Ljubljana, december 1987, 43–45.

34 »[...] neki obliki latentnega stanja, v obdobjih družbenih kriz pa oživlja in postaja napadalnejša in politično agresivnejša ter iz stopnje podkulture prehaja v fazo protikulturnega delovanja.« (ARS-1931, 2313, UA-1986, Značilnosti novih družbenih gibanj v SR Sloveniji: Splošne značilnosti pojava novih družbenih gibanj (Ljubljana, 1986), 3).

35 More than 75% of respondents to the public opinion poll (SJM) were aware of alternative movements and more than 45% of respondents were willing to participate in them (Toš, 1995). With its "revelations", the SJM survey was in step with civil society movements, it indicated the meaning and justification of alternative forms of ownership, fostered a new understanding of the importance of pluralism of political actors, and critical views of Yugoslav federalism. Awareness of the identity (sovereignty) of the nation was awakening and – at last – the possibilities for and necessity of the nation's independence were being recognized (Toš, 2018, 15–16).

36 ARS-1931, 2313, UA-1986, Značilnosti novih družbenih gibanj v SR Sloveniji, Ljubljana, 1986.

37 This group included, for example, Tomaž Mastnak and Dimitrij Rupel, who in 1986 found themselves under "the scrutiny" of the media and the authorities in Slovenia and Yugoslavia for critical articles in *Teleks* and *Mladina* magazines (Zajc, 2020, 923).

for opportunities outside of institutional activities, photocopying and reproducing leaflets and uniting with the purpose of discussion, and organizing informal meetings, etc.

*It is typical for cultural movements that they do not fight against the class enemy, but rather against the archaic (classical) forms of social authorities. Through their activities (e. g. passive resistance, protests, demonstrations, etc.) they attack the political institutions of the state, express their dissatisfaction with political decisions, etc. However, they do this without the ambitions of class struggle.*³⁸

SDV dated the beginning of increased interest in individual alternative movements to 1983, when the previously mentioned Coordination Committee of the Working Group on Ecological and Peace Issues was established. The SDV concluded that the origins of pacifist, ecological, feminist and other movements belonged in the context of the youth alternative scene, which was, in individual phases, marked by the counter-culture scene, especially within the Centre for Youth Interest Activities (CIDM) in Ljubljana. In addition to Radio Študent, ŠKUC and Forum, the CIDM was the central "alternative institution". The operational regularity of all established groups (social scientists, journalists, ecologists, pacifists, etc.) was considered to be the tendency to function legally within existing institutions and socio-political organizations. According to the SDV report, the pacifist, ecological and spiritual movements (meaning the working groups of these movements), the Lilith Club, the so-called Section for Social Movements and informal groups of journalists cooperated in organizing joint lectures, debates, discussions, rallies, gatherings, camps, stands, petition signings, writing open protest letters and so on. A major role was also played by their most active members, who were on the editorial boards of Radio Študent, *Mladina*, *Tribuna*, *Problemi*, *Knjižnica revolucionarne teorije*, *Časopis za kritiko znanosti*, and at RTV, *Delo*, *Dnevnik*, *Teleks*, etc.³⁹

The measures set up by the SDV in 1986 (from the vocational and security perspective, while regarding alternative movements in the region of the SRS)

were: a) uncovering cases of recruitment for intelligence-gathering or subversive activity (gathering of data, introduction and dissemination of hostile propagandistic literature, organizing campaigns for hostile purposes, etc.), b) informing people, who were adherents of the alternative movements of the methods and intentions of foreign intelligence services, also informing the same group of people of the dangers of subversive propaganda, etc. c) monitoring, identifying and preventing attempts to include new alternative movements in "unconstitutional activities of structures of the internal enemy" and d) monitoring and uncovering the modes of operation of foreign social movements as well as their ideological (and political) orientation.⁴⁰

The SDV also looked for reasons to explain such a successful spread of alternative movements in the fact that some organizations (particularly, pacifist organizations) were under the direct control of foreign intelligence services. SDV also took notice that "some of the organizations abuse block forces as means of special war, and that some organizations were being entered infiltrated by (members of) extreme émigré organizations".⁴¹ The report concluded with an interesting objective, namely that new movements should in fact become part of the delegate system, as well as part of pluralism of self-governing interests of working people and citizens.⁴²

Critically thinking intellectuals, involved with various magazines and in associations throughout Yugoslavia, started (based on their common interests) connecting and countering the regime more and more. They organized panels and debates. They also published critical articles. This was tolerated by the authorities. At such meetings, freedom of expression was discussed. They advocated the cause of those convicted for their writing or for publicly expressing their opinions (Repe, 2001, 19).

CONCLUSION

In Slovenia the process of moving away from Yugoslavia and towards Central Europe began in the 1980s. Criticism was coming from all sides, but particularly from the so-called intellectual "opposition", which was associated with various magazines (especially

38 »Značilno za kulturna gibanja je, da se ne borijo zoper razrednega nasprotnika, marveč zoper arhaične (klasične) oblike družbene oblasti. S svojimi postopki (npr. pasivni odpor, protesti, demonstracije ipd.) napadajo politične institucije države, izražajo svoje nezadovoljstvo nad političnimi odločitvami ipd., vendar brez ambicij razredne konfrontacije.« (ARS-1931, 2313, UA-1986, Značilnosti novih družbenih gibanj v SR Sloveniji: Splošne značilnosti pojava novih družbenih gibanj, Ljubljana, 1986, 4–5).

39 ARS-1931, 2313, UA-1986, MA-701, Značilnosti novih družbenih gibanj v SR Sloveniji: Splošne značilnosti pojava novih družbenih gibanj, Ljubljana, 1986, 11–16.

40 ARS-1931, 2313, UA-1986, MA-701, Značilnosti novih družbenih gibanj v SR Sloveniji: Splošne značilnosti pojava novih družbenih gibanj, Ljubljana, 1986, 84–88.

41 ARS-1931, 2313, UA-1986, MA-701, Značilnosti novih družbenih gibanj v SR Sloveniji: Splošne značilnosti pojava novih družbenih gibanj, Ljubljana, 1986, 87.

42 ARS-1931, 2313, UA-1986, MA-701, Značilnosti novih družbenih gibanj v SR Sloveniji: Splošne značilnosti pojava novih družbenih gibanj, Ljubljana, 88.

Nova revija). To a great extent the intellectual "opposition" referred to Yugoslavia's inability to democratize, modernize, and to start guaranteeing national rights to its nations. Social change was progressing very rapidly and thus society became even more uncertain. Suddenly, notions which had previously been praised were now rejected and criticized. Intellectuals who embarked on a wave of post-modern critique of the existing order had to abandon the key foundations of "security" of the industrial age, such as modernity, progress, and future. The *Zeitgeist* was rife with lack of orientation and opportunities for intellectuals. Such an atmosphere was conducive for the founding of multiple social movements organized into environmental, pacifistic, anti-nuclear and feminist groups – all of which had their political agendas and were directing attention to human rights violations, violations to the rights of freedom of speech and freedom of the press, political instability, doubt concerning the self-management system and the burning national problems inside SFR Yugoslavia. The process of the Slovenian Spring (beginning in the 1980s) culminated in the independence of Slovenia. The Slovenian Spring was strongly influenced by favourable circumstances, mostly the relatively open political space, which enabled circulation of ideas as well as meeting of authorities with the growing "opposition", particularly the so-called intellectual "opposition". Shaping this open political space for all kinds of avenues to express ideas (including ideas about independence) was specifically enabled by democratization movements and a strong civil society, where alternative movements, a reformist current within the League of Communists and a high degree of consensus on fundamental national issues, all played a crucial role. Without concrete foundations and ideas on the part of the intellectual "opposition",

the transition would not have been feasible. By no longer considering certain historical, social, economic, and political topics taboo, the intellectual "opposition" began warning leaders and the general public about the irregularities of the system. The intellectual "opposition" combined criticism of what was then the one-party political system, with possible solutions and thus became the most visible herald of the Slovenian Spring. The intellectual "opposition" made a crucial contribution to the founding of the sovereign nation of Slovenia. The SDV, which was still very active at that time, closely monitored the newly emerging movements, most particularly the "dangerous" intellectual "opposition", both operatively as well as analytically. The main goal of SDV employees was to inform state authorities of so-called "hostile activities". In their reports, the critical magazine press appeared most frequently. This same magazine press was also the media, which most frequently had its articles censored (or banned completely) or saw entire issues of its magazines confiscated – usually after an accusation of "improper or hostile content", or an accusation of "causing unrest among the population and endangering public order". Repressive measures by the Slovenian Secret Political Police most likely contributed to even louder warnings from the "opposition". A fact established by the protests against the arrests made just prior to the so-called Trial against the Four. We could therefore conclude that the SDV, with its censoring, banning of magazines, strict monitoring of all of activities of alternative movements and the intellectual "opposition", attempted to slow down the process of the Slovenian spring. But yet at the same time SDV members were (unwittingly) encouraging the critical mass of civil society initiatives and became the main historical agents of change in the Slovenian area.

PRISPEVEK K POZNAVANJU SLOVENSKE INTELEKTUALNE „OPOZICIJE“ V OSEMDESETIH LETIH POD DROBNOGLEDOM SLUŽBE DRŽAVNE VARNOSTI

Ana ŠELA

Univerza v Mariboru, Filozofska fakulteta, Koroška cesta 160, 2000 Maribor, Slovenija
e-mail: ana.sela1@um.si

POVZETEK

Avtorica v prispevku na podlagi že uveljavljene znanstvene literature in zlasti arhivskega gradiva Službe državne varnosti Arhiva Republike Slovenije predstavi v prvi vrsti okoliščine nastanka intelektualne „opozicije“ v osemdesetih letih na Slovenskem, samo dejavnost tako nastajajoče kritične mase civilne družbe, vse glasnejša in dejavnejša alternativna umetniška gibanja ter spremljanje in opazovanje novo nastalih gibanj skozi oči Službe državne varnosti. Osemdeseta, ki so bile že v začetku zaznamovane s smrtjo Josipa Broza Tita in Borisa Kidriča ter s tem povezano politično krizo, finančnimi stiskami in posledično gospodarsko krizo, pretirani federalizem, hegemonistična trenja, ki so poglobljala mednacionalno krizo, so sprožile val kritik, ki so prihajale z vseh strani, še posebej pa s t. i. intelektualne „opozicije“ (ne v smislu političnih strank), ki je bila zbrana okrog raznih revij, zlasti Nove revije, so se v največji meri nanašale na nezmožnost, da se Jugoslavija demokratizira, modernizira in zagotovi nacionalne pravice svojim narodom. Te ideje so za tedanji enopartijski sistem pomenile grožnjo, zato so bili intelektualna „opozicija“ ter alternativna gibanja pod strogim drobnogledom države, natančneje pod operativnim in analitičnim delom Službe državne varnosti. Glavna naloga omenjene službe je bila obveščati vodilne republiške (in posredno zvezne) organe o t. i. »sovražni aktivnosti«, med katere so spadali kritični mediji (predvsem kritiške revije), politična in duhovniška emigracija, nekateri znanstveniki in kulturniki, ki so v javnosti kritizirali tedanji sistem, ter nova alternativna umetnost, mnoga feministična, ekološka, mirovna in duhovna gibanja idr. Med sredstvi in metodami tajnega zbiranja podatkov so bila tajno sodelovanje z informatorji, prisluškovanje, nadzor telefona in telekomunikacijskih sredstev, tajni nadzor pisem in poštnih pošiljk, tajno spremljanje in nadzor oseb, tajno fotografiranje in snemanje pogovorov, uporaba evidenc in dokumentacije in drugo.

Ključne besede: intelektualna „opozicija“, alternativna gibanja, Služba državne varnosti, Socialistična republika Slovenija, demokratizacija

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARS, 1931 – Arhiv Republike Slovenije (ARS), fond Republiški sekretariat za notranje zadeve Socialistične republike Slovenije (AS 1931).

ARS, 1289 – Arhiv Republike Slovenije (ARS), Odbor za varstvo človekovih pravic – Bavčarjev odbor (AS 1289).

Mladina (1983): Prejeli smo. Mladina 12 May 1983, 8.

Mladina (2017): Kako je nastal Laibach. In kako je preprečil fašizacijo Slovenije. Mladina, 24. 3. 2017, 12. Dostopno na: <https://www.mladina.si/179257/kako-je-nastal-laibach> (zadnji pristop: 12. 3. 2020).

TNA FCO 28/8642 – The National Archives (TNA), Foreign Office and Foreign and Commonwealth Office: Northern Department and East European and Soviet Department Internal political situation in Yugoslavia (FCO 28/8642).

Bajc, G., Osojnik, J. & D. Friš (2019): Nekateri vidiki mednarodnega priznanja Slovenije s posebnim ozirom na ameriški pogled, junij 1991–april 1992. *Studia Historica Slovenica*, 19, 1, 217–256.

Bajc, G., Melanšek, T. & D. Friš (2020): Uvod v zgodovino spremljanja britanske obveščevalne dejavnosti na Slovenskem – „samoevalvacije“ slovenske Službe državne varnosti. *Studia Historica Slovenica*, 20, 3, 839–878.

Calic, M. (2019): A History of Yugoslavia. West Lafayette, Purdue University Press.

Čepič, Z. (2006): Jugoslvanska krizna žarišča. V: Fišer, J. (ur.): Slovenska novejša zgodovina 2. Ljubljana, Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 1179–1188.

Čoh Kladnik, M. (2019): Sodišče slovenske narodne časti na Ptuj. *Studia Historica Slovenica*, 19, 1, 107–134.

Falk, B. (2003): The Dilemmas of Dissidence in East-Central Europe. Budapest/New York, Central European University Press.

Friš, D. & D. Hazemali (2017): Slovenski glas in Branko Pistivšek pod nadzorom Službe državne varnosti. *Annales, Series Historia et Sociologia*, 27, 4, 807–822.

Gabrič, A. (2002): Slovenska kulturno politična razhajanja med kulturno ustvarjalnostjo in politično akcijo 1980–1987. *Zgodovinski časopis*, 56, 1–2, 199–221.

Gabrič, A. (2006): Zaostrenost mednacionalnih odnosov. V: Fišer, J. (ur.): Slovenska novejša zgodovina II. Ljubljana, Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 1165–1174.

Gabrič, A. (2008): Cenzura v Sloveniji po drugi svetovni vojni: od komunističnega Index librorum prohibitorum do ukinitve »verbalnega delikta«. *Primerjalna književnost*, 31, posebna številka: Literatura in cenzura, 221–236.

Gabrič, A. (2019): V senci politike. Ljubljana, Cankarjeva založba.

Goldfarb, J. (1998): Civility and Subversion. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Griesser-Pečar, T. (2018): Ciril Žebot. Prizadevanja za samostojno Slovenijo. *Acta Histriae*, 26, 1, 277–304.

Horvat, M. (1998): Prepovedi in zaplembe tiskane besede v Sloveniji 1945–1990. V: Jančar, D. (ur.): Ljubljana, Nova revija, 126–139.

Jeffs, N. (2008): FV in "tretja scena" 1980–1990. V: Škrjanec, B. (ur.): FV alternativa osemdesetih = alternative scene of the eighties. Ljubljana, Mednarodni grafični likovni center, 101–145.

Jenuš, G. & D. Friš (2017): Specialna vojna. Prispevek o ukrepih jugoslovanskih organov za notranje zadeve pri nadzoru državne meje in v boju proti »zunanjim« in »notranjim sovražnikom«. *Annales, Series Historia et Sociologia*, 27, 4, 777–792.

Joppke, C. (1994): Revisionism, Dissidence, Nationalism: Opposition in Leninist Regimes, *The British Journal of Sociology*, 45, 4, 543–561.

Kirbiš, A. (2018): Regionalne razlike v kulturni participaciji mladih v Sloveniji: severovzhodna Slovenija v primerjalni perspektivi. *Studia Historica Slovenica*, 18, 1, 23–40.

Kirbiš, A., Lamot, M., Kotnik, K., Tavčar Kranjc, M. & M. Javornik Krečič (2019): The Role of Gender in Participation and Health Among Slovenian Youth: A Regional Comparison. *Studia Historica Slovenica*, 19, 3, 847–874.

Kladnik, T. (2018): Mirko Javornik, kot interes Sužbe državne varnosti Socialistične republike Slovenije. *Acta Histriae*, 26, 1, 305–324.

Kos Grabar ml., J. (2013): Alternativna scena v Mariboru in okolici v 80. letih 20. stoletja. *Dialogi* 10, 13, 55–68.

Lavrič, M. (2019): Mladi in religija v severovzhodni Sloveniji po letu 2000. *Studia Historica Slovenica* 19, 1, 257–276.

Lavrič, M. & D. Friš (2018): Institucionalna in zasebna religioznost v severovzhodni Sloveniji. Primerjalna analiza slovenskih regij po letu 1969. *Studia Historica Slovenica*, 18, 1, 41–60.

Lorenčič, A. (2011): Prelom s starim, začetek novega: slovensko gospodarstvo v času prehoda iz socializma v kapitalizem. *Zgodovinski časopis*, 65, 3–4, 458–479.

Mastnak, T. (1990): Civil Society in Slovenia: From Opposition to Power. *Studies in Comparative Communism*, 23, 3–4, 305–317.

Maver, A. & T. Ravnikar (2017): Zastrta znamenja: vprašanje disidentstva katoliške cerkve v Sloveniji v obdobju »vzhodne politike« in revija Znamenje. *Annales, Series Historia et Sociologia*, 27, 4, 777–792.

- Maver, A. & D. Friš (2018):** Demokratične parlamentarne volitve v Srednji in Vzhodni Evropi med letoma 1989 in 1991 in njihov vpliv na oblikovanje strankarskega prostora do leta 2013. *Studia Historica Slovenica*, 18, 2, 529–556.
- Nežmah, B. (2020):** Oktobrska revolucija med mitom in realnostjo. *Studia Historica Slovenica* 20, 1, 119–142.
- Pesek, R. (2007):** Osamosvojitve Slovenije. Ljubljana, Nova revija.
- Prinčič, J. (2002):** Gospodarski vidiki osamosvajanja Slovenije (1986–1991). V: Perovšek, J., Šatej, B., Granda, S., Guštin, D. & T. Teropšič (ur.): Slovenska osamosvojitve 1991. Pričevanja in analize, Simpozij Brežice. Ljubljana, Državni zbor Republike Slovenije & Zveza zgodovinskih društev Slovenije, 33–57.
- Ramšak, J. (2010):** Politična emigracija v Trstu in vprašanje samostojne Slovenije – primer Franc Jeza. *Acta Histriae*, 18, 4, 961–986.
- Ramšak, J. (2019):** (Samo)upravljanje intelekta. Družbena kritika v poznosocialistični Sloveniji. Ljubljana, Modrijan.
- Rendla, M. (2018):** Alternativna kulturna gibanja in »konglomerat FV« v osemdesetih letih v Sloveniji, 58, 2, 139–159.
- Repe, B. (1990):** Obračun s Perspektivami. Ljubljana, Znanstveno in publicistično središče.
- Repe, B. (2001):** Slovenci v osemdesetih letih. Ljubljana, Zveza zgodovinskih društev Slovenije.
- Repe, B. (2002a):** Viri o demokratizaciji in osamosvojitvi Slovenije, 1. del: Opozicija in oblast. Ljubljana, Arhivsko društvo Slovenije.
- Repe, B. (2002b):** Jutri je nov dan. Slovenci in razpad Jugoslavije. Ljubljana, Modrijan.
- Repe, B. & D. Kerec (2017):** Slovenija, moja dežela. Ljubljana, Cankarjeva založba.
- Režek, M. (2014):** Vročja jesen 1956: Sueška kriza, madžarska vstaja in bloga Jugoslavije. *Annales, Series Historia et Sociologia*, 24, 4, 601–614.
- Schapiro, L. (1972):** Political Opposition in One-Party States. London/Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Skilling, H. G. (1968):** Background to the Study of Opposition in Communist Eastern Europe. *Government and Opposition*, 3, 3, 297–324.
- Šela, A. & D. Friš (2017):** Nova revija v primežu Službe državne varnosti. *Annales, Series Historia et Sociologia*, 27, 4, 823–833.
- Šela, A. & M. Matjašič Friš (2019):** Nadzor Službe državne varnosti nad revijo Zaliv. *Annales, Series Historia et Sociologia*, 29, 4, 675–688.
- Šela, A., Hazemali, D. & T. Melanšek (2020):** Ustroj in delovanje slovenske tajne politične policije v drugi polovici šestdesetih let dvajsetega stoletja. *Studia Historica Slovenica*, 20, 3, 811–838.
- Šela, A. & D. Hazemali (2020):** Spremljanje slovenskih delavcev na začasnem delu in bivanju v Zvezni republiki Nemčiji v sedemdesetih letih dvajsetega stoletja: prispevek k poznavanju zgodovine slovenske Službe državne varnosti. *Studia Historica Slovenica*, 20, 3, 879–920.
- Tökes, R. L. (1975):** Dissent in the USSR. Politics, Ideology and People. Baltimore/London, The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Toš, N. (1995):** Dozorevanje slovenske samoza-vesti, zbirka Dokumenti SJM. Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede, IDV, Center za raziskovanje javnega mnenja in množičnih komunikacij.
- Toš, N. (2018):** Vrednote v prehodu – dvanajstič: petdeset let projekta Slovensko javno mnenje. V: Toš, N. (ur.): Vrednote v prehodu XII. Slovenija v mednarodnih in medčasovnih primerjavah ISSP 1994–2018, ESS 2002–2016, EVS/WVS 1992–2017, SJM 2018. Ljubljana, Fakulteta za družbene vede, 11–21.
- Valič Zver, A. (2019):** Jože Pučnik: dialog z Ljubom Sircem. *Acta Histriae*, 27, 2, 315–340.
- Vurnik, B. (2005):** Med Marxom in punkom: vloga Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije pri demokratizaciji Slovenije (1980–1990). Ljubljana, Modrijan.
- Zajc, M. (2015):** Slovenski intelektualci in Jugoslovansko v osemdesetih letih. Izhodišča in teze. V: Čepič, Z. (ur.): Slovenija v Jugoslaviji. Ljubljana, Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 241–255.
- Zajc, M. (2020):** Poletni aferi kritičnih misli. Tomaž Mastnak in Dimitrij Rupel, slovenska kritična intelektualca med jugoslovansko in slovensko javnostjo v letu 1986. *Studia Historica Slovenica*, 20, 3, 921–956.
- Zukin, S. (2008):** Beyond Marx and Tito: Theory and Practice in Yugoslav Socialism. Cambridge/New York, Cambridge University Press.