Aleksandar Vranješ [1]
Borislav Vukojević [2]

THE USES AND ABUSES OF PARTICIPATORY IDEOLOGIES IN THE SOCIALIST FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

UPOTREBE I ZLOUPOTREBE PARTICIPATIVNIH IDEOLOGIJA U SOCIJALISTIČKOJ FEDERATIVNOJ REPUBLICI JUGOSLAVIJI

Abstract: *After the formation of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY), the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CPY) has organized large work and youth actions aimed at rebuilding the country after the Second World War. The main hypothesis of this paper is that in Yugoslavia there was no participation in the true sense, but that there were mechanisms which represented the ideology of participation. Work actions had huge impact on rebuilding the land, but they were not voluntary - which is a basic requirement of modern theory of participation. Likewise, the term participation is further explained in this paper, in order to further explain the thesis of formal participation in the former Yugoslavia. Student protests in 1968 were not an isolated case of revolt against the system, the basic characteristics of popular revolt that had its roots back in the early sixties. The aim of this paper is theoretical analysis of the theory of participation and the basic characteristics of Yugoslavia, in order to show that the participation of the people in the exercise of power was just an illusion, ie. formal. Case Study about films of the sixties and seventies in Yugoslavia illustrates the processes of censorship and imposition of ideology of participation.*

Keywords: *participation, Yugoslavia, Communist Party of Yugoslavia, movies, protests*

Сажетак*: Након формирања Социјалистичке Федеративне Републи-ке Југославије (СФРЈ), Комунистичка партија Југославије (КПЈ) је*

---

[1] Senior Teaching Assistant at the Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Banja Luka
[2] Researcher at the Institute for social research on Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina

организовала велике радне и омладинске акције које су имале за циљ обнову земље након Другог свјетског рата. Главна претпоставка овог рада је да у СФРЈ није постојала партиципација у правом смислу, већ да су постојали механизми који су представљали идеологију партиципације. Радне акције јесу обновиле земљу, али оне нису биле добровољне, што представља основни услов модерних теорија партиципације. Исто тако, сам термин партиципације се додатно објашњава у овом раду, са циљем да се додатно одбрани теза о непостојању истинске партиципације у СФРЈ. Студентски протести 1968. године нису били изолован случај револта против система, па је задатак рада да прикаже основне карактеристике народног бунта који је имао своје коријене још почетком шездесетих година. Циљ рада је да се теоријском анализом теорија партиципације и основних карактеристика СФРЈ и КПЈ покаже како је партиципација народа у вршењу власти (самоуправљање) била само илузија, тј. формална. Студија случаја филма шездесетих и седамдесетих година у СФРЈ најбоље илуструје процесе цензуре и наметања идеологије партиципације.

Кључне ријечи*: партиципација, СФРЈ, Комунистичка партија Југославије, филм, студентски протести*

Following the slogan "The Factories to the Workers", Communist League established the system of socialist self-management in the 1950s as a way of transferring economic (and political) management from the state to the workers[3]. Although it was mainly only a form of provisional management through workers' councils, this model was used as the archetype of workers' participation and as an argument for the political elite to show that democracy existed in Yugoslavia. The call for workers to participate in inexhaustible sessions and making decisions at different levels, represented the simulation of respect of different opinions and the realization of the dream of the rule of the working class, even though all the power at all levels was in the hands of a small number of powerful representatives of the Party elite. In practice, the use of the notion of participation was rather dubious. For instance, Carol Pateman stated that the role of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in the self-management system certainly was ambiguous because, while, on one hand it officially proclaimed a strong participatory model without direct control of the Party over the Workers' Council and the whole self-management system; it, however, maintained the

---

[3] Source: http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/yutoc.html, visited 05/15/2015

lead through centralized and authoritarian decision-making system that belonged to the closest circle of the Party elite (Pateman, 1970, p. 91). Self-management was not the only area where the Yugoslav people were involved, also popular mobilizations through mass events, from work actions to parades such as the "Youth Day" played this role. Propaganda activities, promoted through the People's Front of Yugoslavia, later renamed to SAWPY (The Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia), were expressed through the construction of the "cult" of physical labor, competition in voluntary work of young people during work actions, strengthening the team spirit and awareness of the importance and significance of the work.

Examining social movements and organizations, Djordje Tomic (2009) makes a clear distinction between them by defining a movement as an informal form of association, whereas organizations are formal. In order to analyze participation of citizens in the SFRY, the basic classification of the movement is defined: the concept of political opportunity structure, the concept of resource mobilization and the concept of framing (Tomic, 2009, p.18). The last concept refers to the possibility of organizing a movement which is not that apparent. It implies gathering of people having similar interpretations of an event, which means that the movement is not dependent upon some actual political situation, but upon similar interpretations. Resistance within a country started emerging by this collective identity, and not by individual perceptions of a situation.

Boris Kanzleiter (2009) studied the student movement in 1968 in Yugoslavia, noting that it was not so superficial and immediate – there existed events of the late fifties that became an overture. Furthermore, students' protests had been a global event, but every country had its particularities. "The protests in Yugoslavia at the same time integrated the elements of the protest movements from the socialist bloc, the capitalist West and, in some way, the post-colonial countries in the so called Third World (Kanzleiter, 2009, p. 33).

The leading group of the organization was known as the Praxis group which founded the Praxis Journal in Zagreb 1964. Nonetheless, according to the author, student movements were significant for three reasons. The first consequence of the movement is causing fear among the political leadership in 1968, which is proved by the existence of stenographic records: the second repercussion is the fact that the protests showed that Yugoslavia was not a conflict-free society. The third one is the very programme of student movements, which proved its maturity and disclosed a different perception of the society (the idea of the free media, democratization, gender equality, social justice) (Kanzleiter, 2009).The criticism of the

theory of participation lies in criticizing the liberal concept which describes democracy as a competition of political elites trying to gain political power. The theory of participation does not mention such participation: it includes a considerable number of citizens who take part in policy-making decisions and who share a mutual sense of responsibility. Advocates of this theory believe that participation can be ensured by institutional reforms (Zittel, 2007). The focal point of their argument is that "institutional constraints weaken political participation and create long-term political apathy, while the institutional reforms yield contrary behavioral effects. Nevertheless, the theory has been criticized from three aspects: "the theory does not say which institutions would have a positive effect on participation; secondly, it does not take into account the context within such institutions would operate; thirdly, it does not explain what kind of behavioral effects are generated by certain institutional changes" (Zittel, 2007, p. 10). Perhaps the most important notion in this theory is distinguishing totalitarianism from participation: participation creates a connection between education and political choice (Zittel, 2007). Specifically, participation aims to expand citizens' right so that they could have a greater impact on policy making, i.e. it does not replace the political decision-making with self-transformation (as totalitarianism does).

<div align="center">***</div>

At the center of all social and political events of the time was the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the only political party and head of the entire government. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia - SFRY was a state founded after World War II which, until its disintegration in 1992, consisted of six socialist republics: Serbia (which included two autonomous provinces: Vojvodina and Kosovo), Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Slovenia and Montenegro. The Communist Party of Yugoslavia - CPY (1919-1952), which carried the name The League of Communists of Yugoslavia - LCY from 1952 until 1990, was the bearer of the political system and the enormous social power of the former SFRY. Branko Petranović states that the CPY was not mentioned anywhere in the first Constitution of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia[4], and belonging to the organization during the first decade of the Second Yugoslavia was neither very distinguished nor did the inner-party life receive publicity (Petranović, 1982, p. 422). Also, the political elite of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed to the idea that the only and ruling party in

---

[4] The Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia was Yugoslavia's full name until 1963

the former SFRY be categorized as a political party, but rather insisted on identifying it as a "socio-political organization and a leading ideological, subjective force of the entire social development, socialist, self-management provenance" (Nagradić, 2010, p. 190-191). People's Front of Yugoslavia (PFY) was a unique political organization formed in 1945, but according to its statutes had the character of classical political party although agitation and propaganda functions of this organization were more than emphasized. (Petranović, 1987, p. 422-424). CPY gained broad political basis of government through PFY, but the absolute leadership role in the political system of Yugoslavia belonged to the Party, with no other political alternative. Any citizen of Yugoslavia who had political and civil rights and accepted the program and statutes and paid a membership fee, could become a PFY member.

In a way, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia used PFY to simulate political pluralism, through numerous members of PFY, such as the League of Socialist Youth of Yugoslavia, The Women's Antifascist Front and similar organizations with mass membership; and also the civil parties who approached PFY after World War II[5] to make the simulation of diversity of political ideas look as convincing as possible (Petranović, 1987, p. 424). People's Front of Yugoslavia changed its name to The Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia (SAWPY) and by the end of the existence of Yugoslavia remained the most massive organization, and by its constitution was the most similar to today's NGO sector. Slobodan Nagradić explains that during the single-party system in Yugoslavia, there was no non-governmental sector as we know it today, but there were social organizations that had the outlines of citizens' associations and organizations, and were placed under the same roof as SAWPY[6] (Nagradić, 2010, p. 191). And, as mentioned before, within the SAWPY operated the other so-called socio-political organizations such as trade unions[7], youth federations[8] and associa-

---

[5] Existing citizens' groups that were already part of PFY could not threaten the political strength of the organization, because they were scarce and politically weak, and after 1946 they completely disintegrated and lost all political significance

[6] "The Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia (SAWPY), formerly the People's Front, was the largest and most influential mass organization in Yugoslavia from 1945 through 1990. In 1990 its membership was thirteen million, including most of the adult population of the country. The political purpose of this national organization, sponsored by the LCY, was to involve as many people as possible in activities on the party agenda, without the restrictions and negative connotations of direct party control." (http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/yutoc.html), visited 05/15/2015)

[7] "The Confederation of Trade Unions of Yugoslavia also was a party-dominated mass organization. It had the constitutional mandate of protecting the rights of workers and preserving the self-management system." (http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/yutoc.html, visited 05/15/2015). The Confederation of Trade Unions of Yugoslavia gathered all employees, from industry to universities, and its political and educational role manifested in "the development of a new attitude towards work

tions of veterans of war[9], and also organizations like the scouts, writers associations, philosophers societies, sociologists, ecologists, blood donors, religious leaders, cultural associations, sports clubs and their associations, etc. (Ibid., 192). Therefore, a wide variety of NGOs existed in Yugoslavia, which differs greatly with their methods of action, programs and objectives from similar organizations today, but can be seen as a precursor of today's NGOs. Nagradić highlights women's association called The Women's Anti-fascist Front, which later resulted in an organization under the SAWPY called the Conference for the Social Activity of Women of Yugoslavia, whose main goal was to get women to become more politically and socially involved (Nagradić, 2010, p. 192).

One of the most important components of SAWPY for political and economic actions was the League of Socialist Youth of Yugoslavia, whose main function was to organize youth work actions, political "education" of young people and the like. In a way, it can be observed that a "cult" of manual labour had developed through LSYY, which helped the growth of participation, especially with young people, who were also the main bearers of rebuilding the country through work actions. The post-war revolutionary fervor, but also the repressive state machinery, helped in organizing mass labor actions for the reconstruction and development of post-war Yugoslavia, and in various socio-political, humanitarian, cultural and promotional events whose founder and holder were the People's Front of Yugoslavia in which a large percentage of the population was included. For example, the PFY organized fundraiser events in 1946 for the flood relief in Albania, also for refugees from Aegean Macedonia; it popularized Soviet culture, participated in the labour camps, organized humanitarian activities to help vulnerable parts of Yugoslavia, sent teams of workers to help rebuild villages, and so on (Petranović, 1987, p. 429). Based on this, PFY, and also the SAWPY later on, can be viewed as precursors of non-governmental sector whose main function was to strengthen citizen participation through the prism of the then dominant communist (or socialist) ideology.

Youth organizations in the SFRY played a significant role in work actions and the reconstruction of the country. As stated in the Programme of the Communist Party (1948), the People's Youth of Yugoslavia "emerged

---

and production, protection of state assets and the strengthening of the alliance between the working class and peasantry" (Petranović, 1987: 428).
[8] "The National Youth Federation was the training organization for future members of the LCY, SAWPY, and the trade unions" (http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/yutoc.html), visited 05/20/2015)
[9] "The Federation of Associations of Veterans of the National Liberation War was an aging, dwindling group of former World War II partisans" (http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/yutoc.html), visited 05/15/2015).

during the long-standing work of the Young Communist League of Yugo-slavia which, under the leadership of the Communist Party, strived for the unity of the young generation in their fight against fascism, fascist occupiers and treacherous bourgeoisie "(p. 67). E. Kardelj (1948) provides more pre-cise accounts on the young people's participation: following the liberation from the occupying forces, the youth presented a strong upturn in the coun-try's reconstruction, with working groups numbering several hundred thou-sand young people. The author also reveals the fact that "in 1945 the youth carried out a number of extensive and independent actions. The competition became their system of work" (Kardelj, 1948, p. 246). Nonetheless, these accounts can be found in the ideological documents of the CPY and are, therefore, to be taken with a grain of salt. This way precisely embodied the possibility of participation the country was offering – which often boiled down to the formal sense of participation, while the most important deci-sions were made without the participation of people. The burden of the re-construction of Yugoslavia after the Second World War fell on all social strata. The country had been restored within three years and, aside from the youth, the biggest burden fell on the working class. "Yugoslavia achieved a record in the reconstruction of the country owing to the participation of the whole nation. In 1945, only 461 thousand people were employed and in 1946 a total of 721 thousand, which is 260 thousand more than in 1954 or 199 thousand less than in 1939 (Moraca, Bilandzić, Stojanovic, 1977, p. 177). The authors state that the bourgeois counter-revolution tried to impede the restoration, however work actions managed to prevent labour strikes, famine and the black market. From all this, it can be noted that a great num-ber of employees and young people participated in work actions, but when referring to the forms of full participation (primarily political), we can say that it did not have enough participatory elements.

The Youth Organization carried out mass work actions; for example, 25,000 young people had worked from April 1 to November 15 to construct a railway line which was 242 kilometers long and ran from Samac to Sara-jevo. By January 1948, over 16,000 young people participated in building the Machine tools factory "Ivo Lola Ribar" in Zeleznik near Belgrade, Ironworks factory in Niksic, Copper rolling mill factory in Sevojno, Cables factory in Svetozar, Textile factory in Novi Pazar, Magnesite factory in Kraljevo, Steam locomotive and hydraulic machines factory in Zagreb, in-dustrial facilities in Zenica, Vares, Gorazde, etc. (Petranović, 1987, p. 448, 509). During 1951 over 85,000 young people built the railroad from Doboj to Banja Luka and almost a million young people participated in building 54 other facilities. Those young people had a system of mutual competition over who can do more and earn an adequate award, and that was a moral

and practical momentum for stronger and wider mobilization of citizens of the former Yugoslavia.

One of the mass events that can be viewed as an expression of this popular mobilization, aimed to strengthen the personality cult of Josip Broz Tito, was certainly the "Youth Day" – a mass event which was organized every May 25 in the honor of Tito. The event was attended by thousands of young people who would go from Kumrovec (Tito's birthplace) through the largest cities in SFRY to end in Belgrade and give over the "The Relay of Youth" to Tito during a mass parade in the Yugoslav People's Army Stadium. It is interesting that this event took place even after the death of Tito and the last one was organized in 1988.

***

Zoran Stojiljkovic, in the Encyclopedia of political culture (1993, p. 807), defines political participation as a process of voluntary participation of individuals and social groups in initiating, reviewing and adopting political positions and decisions and their implementation. Stojiljkovic warns that political participation must be perceived as voluntary and autonomously elected citizen engagement, as opposed to mandatory, imposed or predominantly ritual-ceremonial activities; thus simulating the illusion of legitimacy of the regime (Ibid.).

Norman Barry finds the roots of participatory democracy in Rousseau's philosophy which assumes that people can be directly involved in the legislative process through debate and discussion, in order to determine the public interest more precisely (Beri, 2007, p. 362). The weak point of this view, and also of the modern theory of participation, is that it depends on the nature of man, which, as Barry says, is "moralized" by the process of democratic negotiation and social interaction, and in case of resistance or failure to meet the necessary conditions, there is no protection for individuals who find themselves at odds with collective decisions (Ibid., 363). However, some models, such as the theories of deliberative, participatory and radical democracy, insist on the importance of citizens' role in the political process and the decentralized system of decision-making. In this context, Carol Pateman provides a definition of partial and full participation, where the first is defined as a process in which one or more interested parties (parties or individuals) are affected by each other when making decisions, but the final power lies in the hands of one party alone; while the full participation is a process where each decision making member in a system has the power to determine the outcome of the decision (Pateman, 1970, p. 70-71).

Political participation at the same time means everything and nothing (Carpentier, 2012). The author argues that elections are one of the most significant formal institutions of democracy, nevertheless, as the state has complete control over this process, the participation have to be considered from another point of view. "On the other side of democratic balance is the sense of participation, which implies the involvement of citizens in institutionalized polices (Carpentier, 2012, p. 166). In that sense, participation is not only limited to active but also to passive suffrage. However, considering the concept of full participation, even this definition is not comprehensive enough, as it is controlled through institutional, legal and cultural logic. The best parallel is noticed when we compare this conception with the one of Marx who defined work as a wish to please others, and not something we do out of a sense of a duty. In that case, full participation is only possible in an egalitarian society, where the role of a state is boiled down only to "the orchestra conductor" (Carpentier, 2012, p. 167). The most important part of the work of this author, while trying to prove that only formal participation existed in Yugoslavia, is his description of the most significant elements of participation. Namely, the first characteristic of full participation is understanding it as power in every sense, as participation takes place within an institutionalized system at the micro and macro level. The second feature is the interconnection of particular processes and localities, with the involvement of specific actors (at the macro level, participation is subject to a debate on its role in political decision making; while at the micro level, participation refers to the division of political power within the state). An important aspect is the tendency towards not regarding the role of participation as a democratic-populist fantasy (since it is not because the theories of participation are not inclined to the destruction of the elite, but a fairer distribution of real power in decision making). Ultimately, participation is not to be equated with an approach or interaction, it implies these two concepts, but at the same time transcends them.

The deliberative democratic model is also based on communication and free discussion (consultation, negotiation, persuasion) of equal citizens (Carpentier, 2011, p. 19). As Habermas says, the deliberative model is more interested in the epistemological function of discourse and negotiation rather than rational choice or political ethos, through which citizens cooperate in the process of searching for solutions to political problems (Habermas, 2007, p. 7). According to proponents of this form of democracy, transparency and public deliberative process is guaranteed, and makes the basis of its legitimacy in which all members have an equal chance to participate, with the assumption that they will eventually come to a reasonable outcome, which is based on the expectation that relevant topics and requirements will

be mobilized and will be subjected to critical evaluation, which, in turn, would lead to, as Habermas states, rational "yes" or "no" response (Ibid., 8).

In his discussion on the role of participation in democratic theory, Carpentier (2011) notes the relationship between the concepts of representation and participation in the theories of democracy, explaining that putting emphasis on one of those categories in the definition, different models of democracy are determined. Joseph Alois Schumpeter's determinant of policy as "privileges of certain competing elites" is taken as an example where, as Carpentier states, the role of citizenship in favour of representation is visibly diminished, while on the opposite side, in models such as participatory and radical democracy, citizen participation goes beyond not just periodic activity during regular elections, but involves a continuous role in the political process, their enduring importance in making decisions, etc.

Dieter Fuchs (2007) points out that the concept of rational choice is always important when it comes to participation. The concept implies a situation in which a citizen chooses alternatives based on to what extent his/her decision would bring benefits and at what costs. In that sense, a citizen defines one's own participation (or the theory of participation) as a "form in which people literally rule themselves, directly or participatorily, day in day out, in all matters that affect them in their common lives …. participatory democracy involves extensive and active engagement of citizens in the self-governing process. (Fuchs, 2007, p. 40). One of the basic postulates of self-government is a referendum, which belongs to motivational aspects. Fuchs (2007) notes that it is important to have the institutional framework which citizens use for referendums. However, even in recent times, these assumptions are questionable (e.g. a very low turnout in Switzerland). This means that Yugoslavia did not have such a framework, which supports the thesis that participation is only formally guaranteed.

Silvano Moeckli (2007) distinguishes between two main procedures involving direct democracy, that is, direct participation: direct democracy through plebiscite and direct democracy through minority's action. In a narrow sense, direct democracy implies only the latter, where a small number of qualified voters or members of parliament can initiate an issue against the will of the majority government. In Yugoslavia, participation meant only the first procedure in which citizens could partially approve or overrule the decisions by the majority government. Nonetheless, Grant Jordan and William Maloney (2007, p. 127) offer a different explanation: "Each of us has an interest in *not* contributing a personal share, say, a political campaign, because each of us will benefit from all others' contributions while our own contribution may cost us more than it is worth to us alone. Hence, each of us has incentive to be a free-rider". True political participation, which is not only

formal, requires making contributions due to mutual benefit regardless of the personal benefit of an individual. Neil Carter (2007) introduced the spillover thesis criticizing the definitions of participation (based on Mila, Rousseau) by authors such as Schumpeter and Sartori, as Carter believes that participation cannot be regarded only in terms of political elites. Such a case existed in Yugoslavia where political decisions were made solely by the elite, whereas citizens participation was manifested in the formal framework of civic work actions and elections that were uncompetitive (an individual citizen was not involved a decision making process).

The self-proclaimed participatory system of self-management of former SFRY had never reached this form of democratization, although in some theoretical discussions it celebrated the role of workers and workers' councils in the decision-making processes based primarily on the qualitative and argumentative debate, which remained provisional until the very end of Yugoslavia existence. This form of participation could be called "commandeered participation" or "incorporated participation" meaning that the citizen participation implied, to some extent, an obligation or even a form of socially-acceptable behavior, and where in certain situations there might even be consequences if there was refusal to comply.

During 1966 there had been a growing political crisis manifested through a conflict with a group supporting the state centralism. "Not having the ability to restore old relations, they sought to stop the process of converting etatist structure into a self-governing social one" (Moraca, Bilandzić Stojanovic, 1977, p. 280).

On the other hand, there was a group that struggled to mitigate the impact of the state, and it could not allow passivity in those moments, especially for people who held important posts in the government. Open confrontation could not be avoided, and it happened in 1966 when the top leaders of the State Security Administration were dismissed. The State Security Service played an important factor in the revolution, as some leaders remained in the high-level positions, fighting against self-government and hindering the establishment of the general conception of CPY (Moraca, Bilandzić Stojanovic, 1977). The process of political democratization in 1966 created many enemies. It was not only the resistance to the reform of the federation, but the general resistance to democracy and institutions arising from democracy. A considerable part of the population felt resistance to weakening government, strengthening market and commodity production, new influences from the West and the spread of consumerism.

One of the most important examples were the famous student protests of 1968, which also took place in Yugoslavia. Students went on strike seeking to draw attention to deformities in society, the social polarization,

the existence of the so-called "red bourgeoisie" and essential failure of self-managed socialism to create a society of equals; they insisted that it was necessary to return to the original Marxism, from which the political elite had significantly drifted away (Petranović, 1987, p. 575). During the seven days of protests in Belgrade there was a conflict with the police in which several students were injured, faculty buildings were blocked, and students had demanded a lot, from the dismissal of the head of the Belgrade police department, to the freedom of the press. Essentially this protest had changed nothing in the political system of the former Yugoslavia.

***

When regarding this topic through the lens of mass media of the former Yugoslavia, especially through film, powerful propaganda activities can be noticed, whose main goal was to preserve the system of values, ideological forms, "brotherhood and unity", and to promote the political system of the SFRY as the best form of governance, and it was necessary to censorship all forms of rebellion. The system control and also abuse of film for propaganda purposes stems from the feature of "moving pictures" which is also the audio-visual medium and the message, i.e. content. So, when we talk about the film, we usually think about content which is mass communicated, and rarely about classic audio-visual medium of mass communication that structurally consists of film tape, the projector and a cinema (Radojković, Miletic, 2005, p. 123).

Film is different from other mass media, because the film is primarily a "medium of artistic presentation of ideas, instrument of aesthetic experience of phenomena, processes and events" (Đorđević, 1989, p. 171). Toma Đorđević also came to the conclusion which is very important for this work, "A film medium, even when their specific means tells "universal truths", ideas and experiences that do not have close ties with the political aspects of human practice, remains at the level of the medium of political communication, even indirectly. We cannot imagine a film scene devoid of political implications, i.e. the work of filmmaking, in which the ruling ideology as a principled layer of consciousness is not pressed into the viewers own consciousness at least indirectly, at any given time in human history" (Ibid., 171). In other words, it is hard to imagine the film as a neutral expression in relation to the ruling political-ideological formation and cultural standards, free from all possible political implications on the behavior of recipients, that is, movie viewers. When we think about the Yugoslav cinema, just as Lenin, and Stalin later on, had used the film to gather people

around the Soviet idea, the authorities from the CPY used the art of film to restore, reconstruct and transform social relations in the new Yugoslavia.

After the liberation of all the occupied territories, in early July, 1945 the Film Company of the Democratic Federal Yugoslavia is formed, which was under the Ministry of Education of the Federal Government, and which set the film industry to a higher level, it was treated as a creation and production of special artistic and social significance (Volk, 1986, p. 319). During 1945 a number of regulations, directives and orders were made that regulated activities of the Film Company. Certainly, the most significant to us was the Regulation of censorship of films, made in August 7, 1945, according to which each film had to go through censorship prior to public use. From the very beginning, the possibilities of propaganda through film and content control were taken into account in the entire process of establishing a new cinema, especially when there were no large domestic productions. This decree established a new basis that is directly related to the interference of politics in the art of film, which continued through various forms until the end of the Yugoslav cinema. Although the form changed, the intensity of influence and control decreased or increased, the party in power had never left the film as a tool to visually design their own ideology (Vranješ, 2008, p. 113).

The decision to establish the state's Film Company also determined the conceptual and artistic direction of domestic production, propaganda film, censorship, etc. Specific Directives stipulate that the film material should be handled "quickly and swiftly like weapons" (Dimic, 1988, p. 50-51). During this period there was a general view that the development of the film in the new state was in the direct jurisdiction of the Party elite, the view close to the Stalinist concept of activist role of the film. People who stood out were Milovan Djilas, in charge of the department of agitation; Aleksandar Rankovic, the head of the police authorities; an intellectual of "modest theoretical considerations" Edvard Kardelj and, of course, the leader Josip Broz, all of whom together decided upon new and finished film projects (Ljubojev, 1995, p. 541).

The main feature of the former cinematography was that the overall activity was centralized with the Committee for Cinematography in charge, and also in charge of the ideological and aesthetic content and artistic value of film production. Controlled by the Committee there were state film companies in all national republics, they managed studios, laboratories and workshops, and they were given freedom to film documentary reportage, while making news was strictly centralized. All issues related to the recording of the first films (themes, scripts, storyboards, choice of producers and actors, cost estimates, etc.) were solely the responsibility of the federal

authorities and the Committee for Cinematography of the FPRY Government. It was believed that cinema has to support all political decisions and evaluation in all areas of social and even private life, and that every written word or recorded scene must be carefully analyzed (Volk, 1994, p. 40). The film development was inseparable from the social and political orientation of the former Yugoslavia. Everything that was favored in the world of ideology and culture was particularly present in the cinema. Politics was dominant over filmmaking and has played a crucial role in the formulation of its ideological and aesthetic grounds (Volk, 1986, p. 531). In the postwar years there was a lot of distrust towards citizen circles that practiced art, and especially those who had something to do with the film. The film was supposed to be applied party ideology and therefore the various committees formed teams who accompanied and directed all of the events in the field of cinematography, especially taking care that the films do not show objective events, verified truth or critical awareness of the reality. It was important to point out what was desired, not real, and create the illusion of authenticity even of what had not happened (Volk, 1996, p. 76).

The Ministry of Education and Culture adopted the Regulation on censorship[10] of cinematographic films in 1946, which was valid until 1949, when the new Regulation on the review of films for public display was adopted, and that was valid, with slight modifications, until 1962 (Volk, 1996, p. 326). There were no strict rules that particular film could be categorized as undesirable. The policy directed censors using the common question: whether the community is interested in movies that do not represent the desired vision of reality (Ljubojev, 1995, p. 545). When, in the early fifties, direct political influence on the realization of films had stopped, the mechanism of control transformed into different social councils, committees, commissions, arts bodies, which assessed the ideological and aesthetic values of films based on free political evaluations. Film workers, who were members of various commissions, and who decided on the "social benefits" of films, were aware of their roles and often resorted to self-censorship when creating their own films. One of the forms of censorship was the unofficial obstruction of a particular film, which was reflected in the rare showings of the film, the lack of a marketing campaign, displaying the film at a time when viewers least visited cinemas, taking the film off the cinema listings too soon, etc. Also, there was a form of censorship in which distributors did not want to send certain movies to cinemas, films with a strong critical distance towards the reality of the political elite; and the directors of

---

[10] More than 800 films were made after the World War II in Yugoslavia, out of which more than 40 were censored in various ways and placed in bunkers (Nikodijević, 1995: 53).

cinemas had publicly boasted in the press that such films would never be shown in their cinemas. It is well known that certain films which provoked most disputes in public never came to most cinemas. This phenomenon was not specific for Serbia alone, but in a different form repeated in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Croatia and Slovenia (Volk, 1994, p. 71-72). All of these forms of censorship had been associated with the current political and ideological paradigm that could not stand criticism; especially the affirmation of some alternative view of reality and society. The censorship was undertaken by regime devotees who were in different organizational bodies, and sometimes a controversial film was obstructed away from the public eye, and sometimes it was banned directly in court.

The Committee for Cinematography existed until 7 April 1951, when the decision was made to close it down, which decentralized the film production in the former Yugoslavia and terminated budget financing of films. The producers were expected to operate profitably, but the state still covered fraction of the cost of production. The separation of industrial activities of the film, such as making and technical processing of the film, from production and creative work, were brought on by the Film legislation from 1956. Also, another novelty in the Yugoslav film industry took place in 1961 when it was decided, through the correction of federal laws and new regulations, that the funds raised in the territory of one republic can only be used to finance film production in its territory, which, according to Volk, paved the way for the later development of each national cinematography (Volk, 1994, p. 55).

During the period of decentralization of the film production, also comes the period of the rejection of socialist realism as the basic artistic direction, primarily because of the broken ties with the Soviet Union in 1948. Similar to the other economic branches, “self-management” enters the film industry in the early fifties, based on the reorganization of the industry, which in turn led to declaration of autonomy of the republic film centers (modeled after the factories) in terms of economic independence, their own administration and budget (Lim, Lim, 2006, p. 130). In essence, the reorganization of film production was not able to reduce the political influence on filmmaking, or prevent filmmakers to self-censorship. For Party ideologues it remained important not to question the political order and not allow the viewers any cause for doubt in the reality of their lives (Volk, 1996, p. 12-13). Although it was stated that politics will not have direct or indirect interference in the film in the system of self-management, more refined opportunities opened up with the help of film tips and similar collective decision-making bodies. The fifties had been crucial to the development of the entire filmmaking industry in the former Yugoslavia, and relations between

the republic cinemas. Many have insisted on conformity and cooperation with political forums in their communities, so all the support had gone to impersonal form of production, various structures of programmed images of reality and everything that supported local illusions and delusions about the system and the life itself. Volk states that most of the films created then were for propaganda purposes, and lacking in strength that could provide lasting artistic effect (Ibid.). In the sixties, a rebellion began against conformists ideas in the film, which were primarily supported by the ideological and political forums. Certain themes were favored by the political elite, and above all there were war themed spectacles which claimed to have contained some sort of visual monuments and, consequently, were the films of importance to society. Movies with contemporary themes had nomenclature of undesirable topics that were avoided. It was most desired to avoid social issues and social criticism or reduce criticism to a certain extent, while, say, comedies were desirable (Volk, 1996, p. 85). During this period, the advocates of auteur theory or modern film begin to appear, especially in the "Belgrade Circle"; they were opposed to conformism, and they succeeded, by the mid-sixties, to clearly articulate their views on art. It was expected that these young authors would provoke criticism of dogmatists who were trying to maintain the established view of reality, especially with the appearance of the films containing social themes that are indicative of alienation and meaninglessness of life and the separation of man from collective illusions about socialism as a society of equal, free and happy people (Volk, 1994, p. 71). Aleksandar Petrovic is considered one of the most prominent fighters for auteur film; he was disputed and criticized for films such as "Two" and "Days," but also praised for the films "Three" and "Feather Gatherers." His active promotion of the idea of auteur film was stimulating for many young directors. Petrovic did not shrink from public controversy; he defended his views and wrote many articles about these changes, and his works, artistry, his feeling for the visual metaphor, had become one of the synonyms of the new Yugoslav films of the time (Ibid.).

In the sixties many quality films were made, which were very important to the Yugoslav film industry, because they affirmed ideas that significantly contributed to transformation of film expression, and escape from the established view of film as an art of special importance for society. Volk states that these changes very much bothered compromised demagogues, because the new film was seen as an aggressive attack on the social ideology. Many wondered whether it was possible to accept the notion that the presence of ideology in the film is something foreign, because if you move away from the basic values of a socialist society, on what else to base the production and how will a new vision of life be designed? (Volk, 1996, p.

87) In that period, the audience accepted many auteur films (synonyms for auteur film are "critical film" or "Black Wave" film), which significantly disrupted the established relationships in contemporary cinematography. On the opposite side, dogmatists closely related to the Ideological commission of CC LCY could not accept the new tendencies in art.

The culmination of the conflict occurred in 1968, during the student riots at the University of Belgrade, which inspired a director from Novi Sad, Želimir Žilnik to make the film "Early Works", which he completed in 1969. The film is full of controversial ideas, desires, moods, explanations, unusual content, and it immediately became a role model for many young directors (Volk, 1996, p. 90). Political showdown with this film began in mid-June 1969, with the public prosecutor's decision to temporarily ban the film. In the explanation of the ban it was stated that the director showed adventures of three boys and a girl, looking to find answers to ideological and political issues, and thus both the heroes of the film and author devalued all contemporary settings of society; the author was especially blamed for the negative characterization of political issues and international relations, agricultural policy, the treatment of unemployment, the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 , the role of the Party in society, social and historical values and achievements of progressive revolutionary past (Ljubojev, 1995, p. 559). This film did not undergo the already established censorship process; Žilnik had the opportunity to defend himself before the Trial Chamber of the Municipal Court in Belgrade, in the end the court rejected the prosecutor's request with a decision to adopt author's attitude.

Everything that had failed with the film "Early Works" was repeated in another more unpleasant form with "WR: Mysteries of the Organism" by Dusan Makavejev in 1971. Following well-established procedures, the film was first debated by the local communities, from Veterans' organizations to the Party forum and staged public forums to discuss the ideas that represent not only the author but also a number of other directors who, in their works, aspired toward auteur film (Volk, 1996, p. 91). The example of this film is an absurd, but also a benchmark in contemporary practice, because the film passed the censorship procedure, received permission to be publicly displayed, presented to audiences and critics at Cannes, and then it was tried and got the definitive injunction as counter-revolutionary and unacceptable offense. The war against the so-called "Black Wave" in the Yugoslav cinema began in 1969, and ended in 1973 with the judicial prohibition of a student film "Plastic Jesus" by Lazar Stojanović , who allegedly represented concrete proof of anti-Tito policy of so-called Serbian liberals. The film was shown as a political diversion because it equated both fascism and communism as authoritarian systems. For the first time, a film director was sen-

tenced to prison because of his ideas; professors who evaluated his thesis were excluded from the Party , and the directors and professors Aleksandar Petrovic and Živojin Pavlović were expelled from the university, which represented the final victory of the dogmatists over the "Black Wave" i.e. auteur film in the former Yugoslavia. The showdown with the so-called "Black Film" represents one of the most significant political failures in relation to the arts, in which repression wiped a wider creative potential (Ljubojev , 1995 : 574) . After this, a new era of Yugoslav film began, in which many directors, then critics of the "Black Wave" made "politically convenient" movies. This era lasted until the mid-eighties when the country finally ceased to directly interfere in film production.

References

Beri, N. (2007): Uvod u modernu političku teoriju, Beograd: Službeni glasnik

Carpentier, N. (2011): The concept of participation - If they have access and interact, do they really participate?, u: CM - *Časopis za upravljanje komuniciranjem* , broj 21, godina VI, FPN, Beograd; CDC, Novi Sad

Carter, N. (2007): Workplace democracy: turning workers into citizens. Published in *Participatory democracy and political participation: Can participatory engineering bring citizens back in?* New York, Routledge, p. 167-184.

Dimić, LJ. (1988): Agitrprop kultura – Agitpropovska faza kulturne politike u Srbiji 1945–1952, Beograd, Izdavačka radna organizacija „Rad"

Đorđević, T. (1989): Teorija masovnih komunikacija, Beograd, Savez inženjera i tehničara Jugoslavije

Enciklopedija politicke kulture (1993): Beograd, Savremena administracija

Fuchs, D. (2007): Participatory, liberal and electronic democracy. Published in *Participatory democracy and political participation: Can participatory engineering bring citizens back in?* New York, Routledge, p. 29-54.

Habermas, J. (2007): "Politička komunikacija u medijskom društvu", in CM - Communication Manageement Quarterly , no 5, year II, FPN, Beograd; CDC, Novi Sad

Jordan, G., Maloney, W. (2007): Explaining low participation rates: collective action and the "concerned unmobilized". Published in *Participatory democracy and political participation: Can participatory engineering bring citizens back in?* New York, Routledge, p. 127-151.

Kanzleiter, B. (2009): 1968. u Jugoslaviji, tema koja čeka istraživanje. objavljeno u Društvo u pokretu: Novi društveni pokreti u Jugoslaviji od 1968. do danas. Cenzura, Novi sad. str. 30-48.

Lim, M., Lim, A.J. (2006): Najvažnija umetnost: Istočnoevropski film u dvadesetom veku, Beograd, Clio

Ljubojev, Petar. (1995): Evropski film i društveno nasilje: svet minulog kolektivizma, Novi Sad: Matica srpska; Beograd: Yu film danas, Prosveta

Moeckli, S. (2007): Direct democracy and political participation from a cross-national perspective. Published in *Participatory democracy and political participation: Can participatory engineering bring citizens back in?* New York, Routledge, p. 107-124.

Morača, P., Bilandžić, D., Stojanović, S. (1977): Istorija saveza komunista Jugoslavije. Rad, Beograd.

Nagradić, S. (2010): Političke ideje i akcija, KZ "Vaso Pelagić", Banja Luka

Nikodijević, M. (1995): Zabranjeni bez zabrane – Zona sumraka jugoslovenskog filma, Beograd, Jugoslovenska kinoteka.

Pateman, C. (1970): Participation and Democarcy Theory, London: Cambridge University Press

Petranović, B. (1982): Istorija Jugoslavije 1918-1978 (II izdanje), Nolit, Novi Sad

Radojković, M., Miletić M. (2005): Komuniciranje, mediji i društvo, Novi Sad, Stylos

Tomić, Đ. (2009): Društveni pokreti: pitanja, pojmovi, teorije metode. objavljeno u Društvo u pokretu: Novi društveni pokreti u Jugoslaviji od 1968. do danas. Cenzura, Novi sad. str. 12-29.

Uprava za agitaciju i propaganda Pokrajinskog komiteta KPJ za Bosnu i Hercegovinu (1948): KPJ i Narodni front, Rad partije u masama, Državno i privredno uređenje FNRJ, O našem Petogodišnjem planu. Sarajevo. Svezak II. Sarajevo.

Volk, P. (1983): Savremeni jugoslovenski film, Beograd, Univerzitet umetnosti, Institut za film.

Volk, P. (1986): Istorija jugoslovenskog filma, Beograd, Institut za film.

Volk, P. (1994): Povratak u budućnost – Rasprava o filmu i nama poslije zajedničke istorije, Beograd, Institut za film

Volk, P. (1996): Srpski film, Beograd, Institut za film.

Volk, P. (1999): Let nad močvarom – Aleksandar Petrović, svojim životom, delom i filmovima, Beograd, Institut za film, Novi Sad, Prometej.

Vranješ, A. (2008): The Yugoslav partisan movies and propaganda, Glas srpski - Grafika, Banja Luka

Zittel, T. (2007): Participatory democracy and political participation. Published in *Participatory democracy and political participation: Can participatory engineering bring citizens back in?* New York, Routledge, p. 9-28.